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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 770 Woolsey Street ("the project").

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 which is expected to be released for public review in Spring 2021. A hearing to receive the HPC’s comments on the Draft EIR would occur during the Draft EIR public comment period.

Background

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 Architectural Review Committee ("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 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 sponsor seeks the HPC’s input in design of the preservation alternatives to address the anticipated significant impact to the historic resource at 770 Woolsey Street.

**Property Description**

770 Woolsey, also known as the University Mound Nursery, is located in the Portola/Excelsior neighborhood and is generally situated amongst single family homes constructed during the 1920s and 1930 and during the 1950s and 1960s, as well as being directly east of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s University Mound Reservoir. The subject property encompasses the entire 2.2-acre city block bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west (Figure 1: for an aerial view of the site). The site was once an agricultural nursery and features 18 greenhouses arranged along a central walkway that runs north-south and acts as an axial spine for the site. The greenhouses are arranged lengthwise east to west with the short gable-ends of the greenhouses facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets and the long ends parallel to Woolsey and Wayland streets. As shown on figure 3 of the HRE, the greenhouses are numbered 1-10 moving north along Bowdoin Street and 11-18 moving north along Bowdoin Street. Greenhouses 1 and 16-17 are partially collapsed. Although there are some minor variations in the greenhouses, most are approximately 30-34 feet wide and 110-120 feet long and are conjoined lengthwise at the base where the roof gables meet. The wood frame structures have gable ends supported by 4 rows of square wood studs set in narrow concrete foundations. Most buildings also have a 2-foot tall wall covered in shiplap siding that sits on top of the 6-inch-high concrete foundation wall (a detail of this low wall is included on p.A-6 of Attachment A: Historic Resource Evaluation – 770 Woolsey Street, prepared by Architectural Resources Group, (dated March 2019)). The remaining walls and roofs of the greenhouses consist of sparsely framed wood studs that support simple glass panes measuring approximately 18 by 20 inches. No more than approximately 20 percent of the glass panes remain attached to the greenhouses as the rest have shattered or fallen on the ground.

Although the site is mostly occupied by greenhouses, the southern portion of the property contains a number of ancillary agricultural structures. Facing Woolsey Street is a garage/storage building, mixing shed, water storage and pressure tanks, and a hand-dug well. Further east towards Hamilton is a boiler house, pesticide mixing tank, and a second hand-dug well. The northwest corner of the site is vacant and was the location of two water tanks that have since been demolished.

**Site History**

The University Mound Nursery was owned and operated by the Garibaldi brothers and their descendants for almost 50 years. In 1921, 5 brothers – Vittorio, Antonio, Giovanni, Ernesto, and Gio Batta Garibaldi – purchased two city blocks from Bernard and Felicie Cassou and established the University Mound Nursery. The brothers first grew fields of flowers on the eastern block (not a part of the subject property), and slowly subdivided it so each brother could have a house, before finally selling off the remaining portion to be developed with houses between 1959 and 1962. On the western block (subject property), the brothers constructed greenhouses and by 1925 the Garibaldis had constructed two rows of 14 greenhouses along a central walkway (identified in the HRE as greenhouses #2-10 and #12-15) and the boilerhouse (a map of the subject property’s site features is located
on p. of the HRER and is labeled as figure 1). A well was also dug on the site by this time (identified as hand dug well #1). By 1941 greenhouses #1 and 11 had been constructed along with the pesticide mixing tank. According to building permits, the architect Robert Nordin was responsible for the design of 4 greenhouses that were built in 1951, but it appears only #16-18 were constructed during this time along with the water storage tank.

In 1958, Steve Garibaldi, the son of Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi, and his cousin, Andrew L. Garibaldi, the son of Antonio and Assunta Garibaldi, purchased the subject property from the other brothers and continued the farming operation. Later that year the two cousins added the garage facing Woolsey Street and installed a fence around the perimeter of the site. The cousins were also responsible for the construction of the pesticide mixing shed (built sometime between 1963 and 1965), and the water pressure tank (built ca. 1960s or later). Since the nursery closed in the early 1990s the site has remained vacant but largely intact with the most significant change being the collapse of greenhouses 1, 2, and 15-17.

CEQA Historic Resources Evaluation

The subject property is considered a known historic resource and was evaluated in a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), prepared by ARG, dated March, 2019. In an HRE dated May 4, 2020, the department concurred with the findings of the HRE that 770 Woolsey is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. The subject property is also eligible under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape of San Francisco. As a small-scale family-operated nursery 770 Woolsey represents an extremely rare property type for San Francisco and even the Bay Area.

The period of significance spans from 1921-1990 and encompasses the time from when the Garibaldi family purchased the subject property and began operation of the University Mound Nursery, up until 1990 with the death of Steve Garibaldi, as the nursery operation closed shortly thereafter and remained vacant.

Integrity

The site as it exists today remains largely unaltered since the Garibaldi family stopped cultivating roses there in 1990 and while a number of greenhouses may have collapsed and the buildings may be in poor condition, the site itself still retains a high degree of integrity. Planning staff agree with the findings of the HRE that the site retains all 7 aspects of integrity.

Character-defining features

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

**Site**

- Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing
- Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner
- Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and the southern end
• Axial circulation through the site via a 9-foot wide pathway extending north-south through the center of
the site
• Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses

Greenhouses
• Rectangular plans with short gabled ends facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets
• Location in two parallel rows with the majority abutting each other
• One-story height
• Asymmetrical gable roofs
• Wood structural system with wood studs, rafters, and mullions
• Perimeter concrete foundation
• Horizontal wood cladding along the base
• Sliding wood doors, some with concrete steps
• Louver panels with associated chains and sprockets
• Wood box gutters and metal downspouts
• Narrow concrete walkways adjacent to the exterior facades

Boiler House
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame building
• Asymmetrical gable roof with no overhand and rolled roofing
• Horizontal wood v-groove cladding
• Openings including hinged door on east façade, five-light wood-sash clerestory window on south
façade, and wood louvered panels at gable ends
• Tall metal smoke stack

Garage/Storage Building
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame
• Shallow gable roof with wide eave overhangs
• Horizontal wood v-groove siding
• Garage doors on north and south facades
• Multi-light, steel sash windows on north and south facades

Mixing Shed
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame building
• Shed roof
• Vertical wood v-groove siding
• Hinged door on north façade
• Associated piping connecting to water storage and pressure tanks

Infrastructure
• All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank;
water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and belowground, to
convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending
along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building
Project description and objectives

The project sponsor proposes to demolish the existing structures at 770 Woolsey Street and construct 62 residential units, comprised of 31 duplexes, and 62 vehicle parking spaces accessed via 32 new curb cuts. The proposed residential units would be approximately 35 feet in height. Of the 62 total units, 12 would be affordable housing units. The project proposes to regrade the project site and improve the right-of-way along the block's street frontages, which would include four bulb-outs, adding a sidewalk along Wayland Street, filling an existing trench as well as adding a sidewalk and curb along Bowdoin Street, and adding 33 street trees along the perimeter of the block. The proposed project would also include an approximately 0.38-acre (16,390-square-foot) public park/community garden (which would include two repurposed greenhouse structures), an approximately 7,510 square foot open space referred to as “the spine" for residents only, and approximately 23,640 square feet of private open space would be provided as private open spaces (e.g. balconies and rear yards) and private shared open space (e.g. shared rear yards and courtyards) for residents.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project sponsor has identified the following are the project objectives:

1. Develop a mixed-income residential development consistent and maximize housing density pursuant to the Planning Code within project site constraints and incorporating on-site affordable units.
2. Replace an abandoned commercial cut-flower lot with residential uses and design consistent with the surrounding Portola neighborhood without displacement.
3. Contribute to the city’s goal as designated in the General Plan of maximizing housing potential in keeping with the character of the Portola District neighborhood.
4. Provide public open space and replicate some site conditions to preserve elements of the historical uses.
5. Provide adequate light and air to all housing units in the new development.
6. Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the equity and debt returns as required by investors and lenders without public subsidy.

PROJECT IMPACTS

Planning staff find that because the project would demolish the subject property, it would cause a significant and unavoidable impact to the identified historic resource.

Preservation Alternatives

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 avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project listed above.

Summary of Preservation Alternatives

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 Alternatives are depicted in the attached plans and massing studies in Attachment C.
No Project Alternative
Under the No Project Alternative, no modifications, repairs, or restoration activities would be conducted on the existing historic resource. The No Project Alternative would retain all the character-defining features of the subject property.

However, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the basic project objectives.

Full Preservation Alternative
Under the Full Preservation Alternative 24 units of housing featuring the same architecture and massing as the proposed project would be developed on the west side of the site fronting onto Bowdoin and Wayland Streets and would be bordered by Greenhouse #11 to the south and the central pathway to the east. Approximately 1.45 acres of open space would be incorporated in this alternative, and the character-defining open spaces to the south of the property would be retained along with 11 of the 15 extant greenhouses (#1-11), and other contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

The Full Preservation Alternative would retain the majority of the character-defining features of the historic resource, including the majority of greenhouses, central pathway, along with the ancillary buildings, structures, small-scale features, and open space at the south and west end of the property. For a more detailed description of the full preservation alternative see p. 8 of Attachment C.

The Full Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets the basic objectives of the project but would only construct 24 units of housing as opposed to the proposed project that would construct 62 units of housing.

Partial Preservation Alternative
Under the Partial Preservation Alternative 40 units of housing of similar massing as the proposed project would be developed on the northern portion of the site, fronting Bowdoin, Wayland, and Hamilton streets. The new housing would be bordered by Greenhouses #3 and #13 to the south, and the central pathway would extend through the new construction. Approximately 0.9 acres of public open space would be incorporated as part of this alternative, and the character-defining open spaces to the south of the property would be retained along with 6 of the 15 extant greenhouses (#1-3 and #11-13), and other contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

Partial Preservation Alternative would retain some of the character-defining features of the site, including some of the greenhouses, central pathway, and the ancillary buildings, structures, and small scale-features, and open space at the south end of the property. For a more detailed description of the full preservation alternative see p. 13 of Attachment C.

The Partial Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets the basic objectives of the project and would construct 40 units of housing in comparison with the proposed project’s 62 units.

Development of Preservation Alternatives
In developing preservation alternatives, the department and project sponsor explored several different approaches based on the location of character-defining features on the site and the project objectives. Some alternatives considered and rejected included alternatives that incorporated the same units of housing as the proposed project by concentrating housing and increasing the height of the housing in one area of the site. Some other alternatives refocused the development of the site in a less linear fashion so as to retain a number of greenhouses around the site’s edges in an effort to retain some elements of the historic resource across the entirety of the site. Some of these alternatives were rejected based on the character of the surrounding neighborhood while other were rejected because they left the retained buildings scattered across the site rather than grouped together on the site.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** The Department seeks comments on the adequacy of the proposed Preservation Alternatives.

**Attachments**

- **Attachment A:** Historic Resource Evaluation – 770 Woolsey Street, prepared by Architectural Resources Group, (dated March 2019)

- **Attachment B:** Historic Resource Evaluation Review Part 1 and 2, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated May 4, 2020 and November 24, 2020)

- **Attachment C:** Preservation Alternatives Analysis and graphics package, prepared by Architectural Resources Group and Iwamotoscott Architecture, (dated December 2, 2020)

- **Attachment D:** Availability of Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated August 26, 2020)
Figure 1: Aerial view of 770 Woolsey showing key structures and buildings on site (image courtesy of HRE Part 1, p. 5)
Historic Resource Evaluation
770 Woolsey Street
San Francisco, California

Final – March 2019
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1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

At the request of 140 Partners LP, Architectural Resources Group (ARG) prepared this Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) for the University Mound Nursery located at 770 Woolsey Street (Block 6055, Lot 001) in San Francisco’s Portola neighborhood. In 1921, the Garibaldi brothers purchased two adjacent blocks and established the University Mound Nursery on the outskirts of the urban core. The brothers developed the eastern block with fields of flowers and the western block with greenhouses and associated infrastructure (Figure 1). Over the next several decades, the Garibaldi family operated a successful small-scale nursery, growing a variety of flowers for the thriving cut flower market in San Francisco. In 1958, the remaining Garibaldi brothers retired and dissolved the original business. A private developer purchased the eastern block and converted the flower fields to single-family residences. Steve Garibaldi and Andrew L. Garibaldi, sons of the original founders, retained the western block (subject property) and continued to grow roses until Steve Garibaldi’s death in 1990. Over time, the other nurseries in the Portola neighborhood have been demolished, leaving the University Mound Nursery as the sole example of this property type that dominated the neighborhood landscape for nearly a century.

This report provides a physical description and historical summary of the former nursery at 770 Woolsey Street and its surroundings. The property is also evaluated for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) to determine whether it qualifies as a historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Figure 1. Location of the University Mound Nursery, with the original boundary spanning two blocks in yellow and the boundary of 700 Woolsey Street (subject property) in red (Google Earth, amended by author)
Methodology

To complete the HRE for 770 Woolsey Street, ARG:

- Conducted a site visit to examine and photograph the subject property and its surroundings on May 10, 2018;

- Completed archival research at repositories, including the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), San Francisco Recorder’s Office, San Francisco Public Library History Center, California Historical Society North Baker Research Library, and The Bancroft Library;

- Reviewed online repositories, including the San Francisco Chronicle Historical Database, California Digital Newspaper Collection, Newspapers.com, Ancestry.com, Internet Archive, Online Archive of California, David Rumsey Map Collection, and United States Geological Society (USGS) EarthExplorer;

- Reviewed primary and secondary sources regarding the history of the Italian American community and the cut flower industry in the San Francisco Bay Area; and

- Met with Diane Garibaldi, daughter of Steve and Mary Garibaldi and granddaughter of Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi, who shared memories and photographs of her father and other family members.

Current Historic Status

The University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street is classified by the San Francisco Planning Department as “Category B–Unknown/Age Eligible,” indicating it has not been formally evaluated for individual listing in the California Register and National Register of Historic Places (National Register) or as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. Likewise, the property has not been evaluated as a contributor to a historic district eligible at the local, state, or national level. Lastly, the property was not surveyed as part of previous historic resources surveys completed by the Junior League of San Francisco in 1968, the San Francisco Planning Department from 1974-1976, and San Francisco Heritage over the past three decades.¹

In 2017, the San Francisco Planning Department prepared a historic context statement for the Excelsior and Portola neighborhoods. The report identified the University Mound Nursery as a potential historic cultural landscape:

Very few physical traces of the Excelsior’s agricultural history remain, as all of the agricultural land was redeveloped for residential uses during the 20th century. However, a few structures remain and should be understood as important cultural landscape resources that help tell the history of the agricultural past. Remaining features include the greenhouses on the block.

between Wayland, Hamilton, Woolsey, and Bowdoin, right next to the University Mound Reservoir.²

Very few buildings and structures are extant from the Excelsior’s agricultural past. The 6055 block of Portola [770 Woolsey Street] is a notable exception containing a series of greenhouses and other auxiliary structures associated with the former nursery.³

2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street is recommended as eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. In addition to dairies and vegetable and duck farms, the Portola became home to upward of 20 small-scale, family-run nurseries established by Italian immigrants. By operating efficiently within one to two city blocks, employing family members, and living on site, Italian flower growers in the Portola earned a profit and in turn, sustained San Francisco’s thriving cut flower market in conjunction with Japanese and Chinese growers. The five Garibaldi brothers, who had emigrated from Genoa, Italy, in the preceding decades, founded the University Mound Nursery shortly after purchasing two adjacent blocks in the Portola neighborhood in 1921. The family operated the nursery for nearly 70 years, thereby contributing both to the neighborhood’s and San Francisco’s floriculture industry.

Additionally, the subject property is recommended as eligible under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape in San Francisco. The city’s early twentieth century nurseries were efficiently laid out with fields of flowers, rows of greenhouses accessed by narrow walkways, ancillary buildings clustered together, and single-family homes located at the margin. Although only the western portion of the University Mound Nursery survives, it retains the compact spatial layout, orderly rows of greenhouses serrated with gable roofs, hand-dug wells, and small-scale buildings, including the original boiler house with its distinctive smokestack. The small-scale, family-operated commercial nursery is an extremely rare property type, both in the city and the larger San Francisco Bay Area, with the majority of the nurseries demolished and redeveloped for other uses.

The period of significance spans from 1921 when the Garibaldi brothers purchased the property to 1990 when Steve Garibaldi unexpectedly passed away and the business closed shortly thereafter. Despite the residential development of the eastern half in the early 1960s and the vacancy of the subject property since the early 1990s, the University Mound Nursery retains a high level of integrity. The majority of the greenhouses; the boiler house and other support buildings; surviving rose plants; unpaved surface; and layout and circulation pattern of the site remain intact.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

The following site description is based on the landscape characteristics established in the National Park Service’s A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. According to the guidelines, landscape characteristics include tangible and intangible aspects that collectively convey a cultural landscape’s historic character and aid in the understanding of its cultural importance. These characteristics are categorized as follows:

² Hannah Lise Simonson, “Draft Excelsior & Portola Historic Context Statement” (San Francisco Planning Department, 2017), 31. The draft report is on file at the San Francisco Planning Department.
³ Ibid., 145.
natural systems and features; spatial organization; land use; cultural traditions; cluster arrangements; circulation; topography; vegetation; buildings and structures; views and vistas; constructed water features; small-scale features; and archaeological sites.4

Not all characteristics are present in each cultural landscape. As such, only those relevant to the University Mound University are discussed below. The physical description is based on current conditions observed by ARG during the field survey on May 10, 2018 and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group in March 2017.5 The Phase I ESA incorporates information provided by Steve Garibaldi and Steve Assalino (third generation Garibaldi family members) during a site visit with Cornerstone Earth Group staff on February 10, 2017. During ARG’s field survey, the property was heavily overgrown with approximately four-foot-tall grass and weeds that obscured the majority of the ground surface, including one of the wells. Additional photographs of the subject property are presented in Appendix A.

Setting

The subject property encompasses the entire 240-foot by 400-foot (2.2-acre) block bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west (Figure 2). Within the Portola neighborhood, one-story-over-garage, single-family homes are located to the north, east, and south. The residences adjacent to the subject property were constructed in two phases: during the 1920s and 1930s and during the 1950s to early 1960s. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s University Mound Reservoir is located directly to the west. The reservoir consists of two approximate 10-acre basins: the northern basin dates to 1885, while the southern basin adjacent to the subject property was completed in 1937.

Figure 2. Single-family homes lining the east side of Hamilton Street opposite the subject property; these homes were constructed in the early 1960s on the eastern portion of the University Mound Nursery. (ARG, May 2018)

Spatial Organization

Two long rows of 18 greenhouses fill the majority of the 2.2-acre parcel. The greenhouses are arranged along a central, 9-foot-wide pathway with a north-south axis (Figure 3). The short, gable ends of the greenhouses line Bowdoin and Hamilton streets, while the long ends are aligned parallel to Woolsey and Wayland streets. Two open spaces are located south of the greenhouses and at the northwest corner of the parcel. The southern end has been developed with buildings and infrastructure to provide heat, water, and pesticides to the greenhouses. These include a cluster of buildings adjacent to Woolsey Street: garage/storage building, mixing shed, water storage and pressure tanks, and a hand-dug well. The boiler house, pesticide mixing tank, and a second hand-dug well are located adjacent to Hamilton Street just south of the eastern row of greenhouses. Three greenhouses (greenhouses #15-17) at the west end have largely collapsed, creating a small, non-original open space between the buildings.

Figure 3. Site map of 770 Woolsey Street with construction dates for extant and demolished features (Pictometry, amended by author)
Land Use

The property has been used as a cut flower nursery since the establishment of the University Mound Nursery in 1922 by the Garibaldi brothers (one year after acquiring the property). It retains the greenhouses, boiler house, and hand-dug well dating to its initial construction, along with the addition of several greenhouses, garage/storage building, second well, and infrastructure for storing water and pesticides on site. It has remained vacant since the business closed in the early 1990s.6

Topography

The topography slopes gradually from the high point at the northwest corner at approximately 145 feet above mean sea level (amsl) toward the southeast corner at 100 feet amsl. The wood fence and building façades along the perimeter block views into the site. However, the high vantage point along Bowdoin Street at the northwest corner provides views into the property (Figure 4).

![Figure 4. View south toward the subject property from Bowdoin Street (ARG, May 2018)](image)

Vegetation

A combination of grass, blackberry bushes, and tall weeds currently grows throughout the unpaved site. Several rose plants, both red and pink, are located within the greenhouses (Figure 5). These are presumed to have survived from the nursery business based on their location within the greenhouses and that Garibaldi rose plants are known to grow nearby.7 The trunk of a topped pine tree extends through the roof of greenhouse #11, and small 6- to 8-inch-diameter trees are located just east of the water pressure tank and west of greenhouses #9-10.

---

6 Diane Garibaldi confirmed that the family does not know the exact date the nursery closed. Diane Garibaldi, personal communication with ARG staff, July 17, 2018.
7 Ibid.
Circulation

The 2.2-acre parcel is enclosed by a combination of building façades facing Woolsey and Hamilton streets and a 6-foot-tall fence constructed of 10-inch-wide vertical wood boards. Vehicular access to the site is provided from Woolsey Street through the garage/storage building, which has garage doors on the south and north façades. Pedestrian access is provided by a gate in the wood fence along Woolsey Street and the sliding wood doors on the greenhouses facing Hamilton Street. The Boiler House also has an entrance accessed from Hamilton Street. The greenhouse entrances provided easy access to the site from the flower fields and family homes across the street.

The site is unpaved, with the perimeter along Bowdoin and Wayland streets continuing to lack sidewalks. An approximate 9-foot-wide pathway extends north-south just west of center nearly the entire length of the property (Figure 6). It provides access to the greenhouses as well as the open space at the northwest corner of the property. Narrow concrete pathways extend along the exterior of select greenhouses.
Figure 6. Central pathway extending between the greenhouses, view north; greenhouse #13 is on the left and greenhouse #3 is on the right (ARG, May 2018)

Water Features

The nursery contains two approximate 30-foot-deep, hand-dug wells. Hand-dug well #1 is located just west of the garage/storage building near the underground alignment of Yosemite Creek, which starts at McNab Lake in McLaren Park and extends east along Woolsey Street at the southern end of the nursery. The creek empties into the San Francisco Bay just south of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. The second hand-dug well is located just south of the boiler house adjacent to Hamilton Street. The older well is cased reportedly with redwood boards, while the newer well is cased with concrete. Both have square concrete structures that extend slightly aboveground and are enclosed by wood boards.

Additionally, the site contains a series of pipes to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses. In the latter years of operation, pesticides were pumped from tanks within the mixing shed through a series of underground pipes that extend north underneath the central pathway running between the greenhouses. The piping connects with aboveground hose bibs placed at regular intervals in front of the greenhouses. Flexible hoses connected to the bibs and were used to spray plants inside the greenhouses. Flexible hosing with a larger diameter extends from the boiler house and circulates along the greenhouses to provide steam heating (Figure 7). A narrow, unlined drainage ditch extends along the west side of the central aisle and conveys storm water to a shallow, concrete-lined ditch adjacent to the north façade of the garage/storage building. The concrete-lined ditch connects to a storm water drain. Water was stored on site for irrigation and pesticides using large water storage and pressure tanks, as described in more detail below. Both tanks are connected to the adjacent mixing shed via narrow-diameter metal pipes.
Water Storage Tank
The large water storage tank is located immediately south of the mixing shed (Figure 8). It consists of a 16-foot-diameter cylindrical tank with seamed steel panels. It rests on a steel cradle situated on a 20-foot-square concrete pad. A ladder with 15-inch-wide metal rungs is located on the south end. The tank stored water pumped from the hand-dug wells.
Water Pressure Tank
The water pressure tank is located north of the water storage tank and east of the mixing shed (Figure 9). It is constructed of riveted steel panels and has an approximate 51-inch diameter. It rests on an approximate 42-inch-tall concrete cradle.

![Figure 9. Water pressure tank, view northwest (ARG, May 2018)](image)

Buildings and Structures
The buildings and structures consist of 18 greenhouses (both extant and collapsed) arranged in two rows and a boiler house, garage/storage building, and mixing shed located at the southern end of the site.

Greenhouses
The nursery contains 18 greenhouses, both extant and collapsed, which are arranged in two rows extending north-south along a central axis (Figure 1). The short gabled ends face Hamilton and Bowdoin streets, while the long ends are aligned parallel to Woolsey and Wayland streets.

The eastern row contains 10 greenhouses (#1-10) lining the west side of Hamilton Street (Figure 10). The southern two greenhouses (#1 and #2) are partially collapsed with extant framing located only at the east end. The southern greenhouse (#1) is the smallest greenhouse, measuring approximately 33 feet wide by 80 feet long. It is also set back from the eastern property line with the boiler house located immediately to the east. Greenhouse #2 is a detached structure directly to the north that measures approximately 30 feet wide by 120 feet long. The remaining greenhouses (#3-10) are extant and measure approximately 30 to 34 feet wide by 120 feet long. They adjoin each other at the lower edges of the roof slopes (also known as the ridge-and-furrow configuration), with wood box gutters extending lengthwise in the roof valleys. The gutters are approximately 5 inches tall by 11 inches wide and connect with metal downspouts.

The western row contains eight greenhouses (#11-18) lining Bowdoin Street. The southern four greenhouses (#11-14) measure approximately 34 feet wide by 110 feet long and adjoin each other in a similar fashion to greenhouses #3-10, with wood box gutters extending the length of the roof valleys. Three collapsed greenhouses (#15-17) are located directly to the north of greenhouse #1. Only a remnant portion of a wall at the northeast corner (#14) extends above the overgrown vegetation,
leaving a non-original, 100-foot-wide by 110-foot-long open space. The remaining detached greenhouse (#18), measuring approximately 29 feet wide by 110 feet long, is located at the north end.

The wood frame greenhouses have dirt floors and slightly asymmetrical gable roofs (Figure 11). Each roof is supported by four rows of 4-inch square wood studs resting on narrow, square concrete foundations. Except for greenhouse #18 at the northwest corner, the buildings have concrete foundation walls that extend approximately 6 inches aboveground. The concrete foundation walls are stepped to accommodate the sloped site. The lower two feet of the buildings are clad with wood shiplap boards with a 7-inch exposure. The northwest greenhouse (#18) is constructed in a similar fashion, although its concrete foundation wall extends 30 inches aboveground. The lower 28 inches of the wood frame are clad with wood, horizontal v-groove boards with a 7-inch exposure. One row of wood studs supports the roof ridge.

The remaining portion of the walls and gable roofs are covered with overlapping glass panes that measure approximately 18 inches wide by 20 inches tall. The panes are adhered to slender wood mullions with putty. Many of the glass panes are missing or broken; the surviving panes retain remnants of whitewash. All of the greenhouses except for the southwest building (#11) have a louver window at the roof ridge used for ventilation. The louver windows are the height of one pane of glass and are operated with an interior hand crank attached to a chain and sprocket, in turn connected to a horizontal bar attached to the windows. Greenhouse #11 has similar louver windows on the south façade.

The greenhouses are accessed by sliding wood doors constructed of vertical wood boards. The western greenhouses have doors with a concrete step on the east façade accessed by the central walkway. The eastern greenhouses have sliding doors on the east and west façades. Select doors are operated by finger holes.
Boiler House
The boiler house abuts the eastern property line just east of the smallest greenhouse (#1) (Figure 12). It is a small, one-story, wood frame building with a rectangular, 35-foot-long by 19-foot-wide footprint. It has a board formed concrete foundation and below-grade concrete floor. The asymmetrical gable roof has no eave overhang. The southern roof slope is partially collapsed and covered with wood boards. The northern roof slope is covered with wood boards and asphalt roll roofing. A tall, circular metal chimney extends through the roof ridge toward the western end. The building is clad with wood, horizontal v-groove boards with a 7-inch exposure.

The east façade facing Hamilton Street has a hinged wood door constructed of vertical wood boards and a wood louvered vent in the gable. The south façade has a fixed, wood sash clerestory window at the northwest corner. The clerestory window has five square lights, with the glazing missing in the eastern light.

The west façade has a large, approximately 42-inch-tall by 69-inch-wide opening. The opening is covered by a wood panel constructed of 3-inch-wide boards and hinged at the bottom. A large wood louvered vent is located in the gable. Three, narrow diameter metal pipes extend from the west façade toward greenhouse (#1) to the west. The north façade is devoid of fenestration, although large diameter piping extends through the wall and circulates through the site to deliver steam to the greenhouses.

The building contains a non-operational boiler fueled by natural gas. The boiler was operated using fuel oil stored within a non-extant underground storage tank (UST) underneath Hamilton Street. Steel aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) are located inside the boiler house and south of the building along the southern fence line. The ASTs were used to collect condensate during operation of the steam boiler system.
Garage/Storage Building
The garage/storage building abuts the southern property line and is accessed by a short driveway from Woolsey Street (Figure 13). The building was used to process roses and to provide vehicular access to the site. The one-story, wood frame building has a rectangular plan that measures approximately 58 feet long by 33 feet wide. It has a concrete slab floor and a gable roof with a shallow pitch and wide eave overhang. The building is clad with wood horizontal, v-groove boards with a 7-inch exposure. The south façade facing Woolsey Street has a plywood overhead garage door and a 9-light, steel sash, fixed window with plain wood trim. The glazing is missing from the window. The north façade has a plywood overhead garage door and three steel sash, 12-light fixed windows on the north façade. These windows measure approximately 4 feet wide and 5.5 feet tall and have plain wood trim. The east and west façades lack fenestration.
Mixing Shed
The mixing shed is a small, lean-to structure that abuts the north end of the eastern façade of the garage/storage building (Figure 14). The one-story, wood frame building measures 17 feet wide by 21 feet long. It has a shed roof with a slight eave overhang. The building is clad with wood vertical, v-groove boards with an 11-inch exposure. The north façade has a large hinged door constructed of similar vertical wood boards. The east and south façades are devoid of fenestration, although metal pipes extend through the walls to connect with the adjacent water storage and pressure tanks. The interior contains two steel ASTs with associated pumps and piping to mix and store pesticides. The tanks are located on a concrete pad, while the remaining portion of the floor is unpaved.
Small-scale Features

Pesticide Mixing Tank
A small, 4-foot-square pesticide mixing tank is located just north of the boiler house (Figure 15). It is constructed of board form concrete with walls extending approximately 3 feet aboveground. The tank is open on top and contains an electric motor and steel piping extending from the east and west sides. It was replaced by the steel ASTs inside the mixing shed.
4. SITE HISTORY

The following section provides a summary of the ownership and construction history of the University Mound Nursery, which encompassed two adjacent city blocks. While this HRE report addresses the western block (770 Woolsey Street), both blocks are discussed below to provide a complete history of the nursery.

Ownership History

In 1921, the Garibaldi brothers—Vittorio, Antonio, Giovanni, Ernesto, and Gio Batta Garibaldi—purchased two adjacent blocks within the Portola district from Bernard and Felicie Cassou (Figure 16).^8

- **Eastern Block** (Block 6054; adjacent to the subject property) bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Holyoke Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west.\(^9\) This block became the eastern half of the University Mound Nursery.

- **Western Block** (Block 6055; subject property) bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west.\(^10\) This block became the western half of the University Mound Nursery, and it is currently addressed as 770 Woolsey Street.

The following year, the Garibaldi brothers established the University Mound Nursery across both blocks. They planted fields of flowers in the eastern portion (Block 6054) and constructed greenhouses in the western portion (Block 6055, subject property).

**Eastern Block (Block 6054)**

Over the next two decades, the Garibaldis subdivided the eastern block into five 37.5-foot-wide by 120-foot-deep lots at the north end (Lots 1, 1A, 1B, 1C, and 1E) and a large lot to the south encompassing the flower fields (Lot 1D) (Figure 16). Four brothers acquired the smaller lots, which were developed as follows:

- **Lot 1**: In 1930, Vittorio and Margaret T. Garibaldi purchased Lot 1 and constructed the single-family residence at 500 Holyoke Street.\(^11\) In 1972, the family sold the property to Louis and Marie E. Sevien.\(^12\)

---

^8 Recorded document, Book 290, Page 383, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office. The document states the Garibaldi brothers also purchased two smaller parcels from the Cassous. The parcels were located to the southwest along Dwight Street in the Portola neighborhood and consisted of 1) a 200-foot-wide by 120-foot-long lot at the southwest corner of Dwight and Yale streets and now part of McLaren Park and 2) a 100-foot-wide by 120-foot-long lot at the northeast corner of Dwight and Colby streets. It was subdivided into six lots and developed with single-family residences built from 1951 to 1955 (Lots 61-21 within Block 6133).

^9 Block 6054 was originally Block 32 in the University Mound Survey.

^10 Block 6055 was originally Block 43 in the University Mound Survey.

^11 Recorded document, Book 2104, Page 54, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office. In 1935, Vittorio Garibaldi gifted Lots 1 and his share of Lot 1D of Block 6054 and 770 Woolsey Street to his wife. See recorded document, Book 3745, Pages 220 and 221, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

^12 Order Confirming the Sale of Real Property, Book 716, Page 674, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.
• **Lot 1A:** In 1925, Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi purchased Lot 1A and constructed a single-family residence addressed as 502 Holyoke Street.\(^ \text{13} \) The Garibaldi family still owns the property.

• **Lot 1B:** In 1927, Gio Batta and Margaret C. Garibaldi purchased Lot 1B and constructed a single-family residence addressed as 506 Holyoke Street.\(^ \text{14} \) The Garibaldi family still owns the parcel.

• **Lot 1C:** In 1930, Ernesto and Maria Garibaldi purchased Lot 1C. However, they resided at 19 Crane Street (approximately 0.5 mile to the east) and left this lot undeveloped.\(^ \text{15} \) In 1958, the Portola Building Company acquired the parcel and developed it with housing.

• **Lot 1E:** In 1935, Ernesto and Maria Garibaldi purchased 1E. Similar to Lot 1C, they left this lot undeveloped.\(^ \text{16} \) In 1959, their son Raymond M. Garibaldi and his wife Marie L. Garibaldi acquired the parcel and constructed the single-family residence addressed as 526 Holyoke Street.\(^ \text{17} \) It is still under family ownership.

By 1958, Vittorio and Gio Batta Garibaldi had passed away, and their wives and remaining brothers dissolved the University Mound Nursery partnership (Figure 17). Shortly thereafter, the Portola Building Company acquired the eastern block, excluding the four parcels at 500-526 Holyoke Street (Lots 1, 1A, 1B, and 1E). The building company subdivided the remaining land and constructed single-family residences between 1959 and 1962.\(^ \text{18} \)

**Western Block (Block 6054)**

In 1958, Steve Garibaldi, the son of Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi, and his cousin Andrew L. Garibaldi, the son of Antonio and Assunta Garibaldi, acquired the western half of the University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street.\(^ \text{19} \) The cousins continued operation of the nursery until Steve Garibaldi’s death in 1990. The nursery closed in the early 1990s and remained vacant. In 2017, the family sold the property to 140 Partners LP.\(^ \text{20} \)

\( \text{13} \) Recorded document, Book 1113, Page 179, on file the San Francisco Recorder’s Office. In 1943, Giovanni Garibaldi and his wife Matilda Garibaldi placed the lot in joint tenancy. See recorded document, Book 4037, Page 136, on file the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

\( \text{14} \) Recorded document, Book 1490, Page 87, on file at the San Francisco’s Recorder’s Office. Between 1930 and 1933, the property changes hands between Gio Batta and Margaret Garibaldi and E. and Lillian Garibaldi several times, with Gio Batta and Margaret Garibaldi retaining ownership of the lot. See recorded documents in Book 2105, Page 33; Book 2105, Page 34; and Book 2480, Page 467, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office. In 1951, Gio Batta gifted Margaret Garibaldi Lot 1B of Block 6054 and his portion of 1D of Block 6054 and 770 Woolsey Street. See Gift Deed, Book 5802, Page 462, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

\( \text{15} \) Recorded document, Book 2104, Page 190, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

\( \text{16} \) Ibid.

\( \text{17} \) Recorded document, Book 2855, Page 476, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

\( \text{18} \) Joint Tenancy Deed, Book 7321, Page 324, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.

\( \text{19} \) The sale and division of the two blocks is recorded in the following documents at the San Francisco Recorder’s office: Grant Deed, Book 7299, Pages 427 and 429; Book 7323, Page 323; Book 7321, Pages 324-329; Book 7321, Pages 331-332. The Portola Building Company retained the right of first refusal to purchase 770 Woolsey Street until 1982. See the following recorded documents on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office: D460, Page 249; Book D460, Page 253; Doc #2014-J907335-00.

\( \text{20} \) The transfer of 770 Woolsey Street between members of the Garibaldi family and the sale to 140 Partners LP is recorded in the following documents at the San Francisco’s Recorder’s Office: Book D460, Page 249; Book D460, Page 253; Book J018, Page 0516; Doc #2014-J90733400; Doc #2014-J90733500; Doc #2017-K474165-00.
Figure 16. Block 6055 (left) and Block 6054 (right) as they were subdivided and developed by the Garibaldi family by the 1930s (San Francisco Assessor’s Office, amended by author)

Figure 17. Notice of the dissolution of the University Mound Nursery partnership published in The Richmond Banner, 1958 (Diane Garibaldi)
Construction History

The following construction history was compiled using Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Appendix B), building permits and plans (Appendix C), historic photographs (Appendix D), the Phase I ESA, and existing conditions observed during the field survey. Table 1 presents a summary of the construction dates for buildings and structures, and Table 2 compiles building permits on file for the property at the San Francisco DBI.

As early as 1902, Bernard and Felicie Cassou owned and operated a dairy in the eastern block that became the University Mound Nursery.21 The dairy buildings were clustered in the northwest quadrant of the block and consisted of a two-story residence with a rear bay window and a row of adjoined buildings extending to the south, and a large, detached two-story building facing Hamilton Street. Several smaller buildings, including a bunkhouse, were located at the rear (Figure 18).22 After 1907, the Cassous acquired the western block (subject property) from the Spring Estate Co.23 Yosemite Creek originally flowed aboveground, along the southern property line toward the San Francisco Bay, providing a convenient source of water for the dairy operation. It would later be channeled underground through a pipeline.24 In 1921, the Cassous sold both blocks to the Garibaldi brothers, who established the University Mound Nursery shortly thereafter.

![Figure 18. Detail of the 1915 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866 (amended by author)](image)

---

21 “Say Curtis is Against Them,” San Francisco Chronicle, October 14, 1903.
**Eastern Block (Block 6054)**

Within the eastern block, the Garibaldis retained the dairy residence with the attached buildings at the northwest corner and added a 10-foot tall water tower to the south and a small one-story building to the southeast. The remaining portion of the block was developed with three fields of flowers separated by hedges (Figure 19). As noted above, the family subdivided the northern portion of the eastern block into five residential lots over the next decade. Single-family homes were constructed at 502 Holyoke Street in 1925, 506 Holyoke Street in 1927, and 500 Holyoke Street in 1930 (Figure 20). Vittorio, Gio Batta, and Giovanni Garibaldi and their families lived on site in these residences, while Ernesto and Antonio lived a half-mile away on Crane Street. The family likely moved the two-story residence and water tower a short distance to the south to accommodate a future residence at Lot 1C. In 1958, the majority of the block was sold to the Portola Building Company and built out with single-family houses by 1962.

---

26 Only the original building permit for the residence at 500 Holyoke Street was on file at the San Francisco DBI; see permit No. 144660, issued on July 7, 1930.
27 According to San Francisco city directories, Ernesto and Maria Garibaldi lived at 19 Crane Street, and Antonio and Assunta Garibaldi lived at 14 Crane Street.
28 The building footprint is identical in the 1928 and 1950 Sanborn maps; Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, 1928 and 1950, Volume 8, Sheet 866.
Western Block (Block 6054; Subject Property)
By 1925, the Garibaldis constructed two rows of 14 greenhouses along a central walkway, with the short gabled ends of the greenhouses lining Hamilton and Bowdoin streets. Nine greenhouses (greenhouses #2-10), along with a small boiler house, were constructed along the eastern property line, and five greenhouses (greenhouses #12-15) were constructed along the western property line. The boiler house originally had a larger entrance on the east façade and two small square windows on the south façade; the louvered vents also were a later addition (Figure 21). The family erected a small windmill (non extant) and dug an approximate 30-foot-deep well (hand-dug well #1) adjacent to Yosemite Creek at the southern end of the block. Two elevated water tanks (non extant) also were located at the northwest corner of the block. The northwest portion of the site appears to have been planted with a small orchard.30

Over the next several decades, the western block would be infilled slightly yet retain its overall use and spatial layout. The Garibaldis added greenhouse #11 by 1928 and the smallest greenhouse (#1), hand-dug well #2 south of the boiler house, and two unidentified buildings at the southwest corner of the site by 1938 (Figure 22). By 1941, they demolished the unidentified buildings and installed the pesticide mixing tank (Figure 23).\(^{31}\)

In 1951, they retained architect Robert Nordin to design four greenhouses, grouped in pairs, at the north end of the existing greenhouses lining Bowdoin Street. Each greenhouse would be 33 feet wide and 110 feet long.\(^{32}\) Based on a 1956 aerial photograph, it appears only three greenhouses were constructed (greenhouses #16-18; Figure 25). In 1951, an additional building permit was filed to construct an 8-foot-tall concrete storage tank near the intersection of Hamilton and Woolsey streets.\(^{33}\) It is unknown exactly where the tank was constructed, as it is non extant. The water tanks at the northwest corner were demolished between 1951 and 1956 (Figure 24).\(^{34}\)

In 1958, Steve Garibaldi and his cousin Andrew L. Garibaldi acquired the western block and continued operation of the nursery. Later that year, they added the garage/storage building facing Woolsey Street and installed a wood fence around the perimeter.\(^{35}\) The cousins added the water storage tank (1953), pesticide mixing shed (between 1963 and 1965), and water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or later) at the

---

\(^{31}\) Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, 1928, Volume 8, Sheet 866; Harrison Ryker, “Composite: 1-164 San Francisco Aerial Views” [aerial photographs of San Francisco], 1938, David Rumsey Map Collection; Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Flight C-660, Frame 221 [aerial photograph], 1941, University of California, Santa Barbara.

\(^{32}\) Building Permit No. A142, on file at the San Francisco DBI.

\(^{33}\) Building Permit No. 125535, on file at the San Francisco DBI.

\(^{34}\) 1956 aerial photograph, USGS EarthExplorer.

\(^{35}\) Plans associated with Building Permit No. A142, on file at the San Francisco DBI; Building Permit Nos. 193494 and 194601, on file at the San Francisco DBI.
south end of the site to improve steam and pesticide circulation among the greenhouses. The mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows an oil tank where the extant water tanks are located. However, the larger tank stored water for irrigation rather than oil, and it was installed to replace the two water tanks at the northwest corner of the property (Figure 27). Following the construction of the mixing shed, they discontinued use of the small mixing tank just north of the boiler house. The windmill was removed at an unknown date after 1965. In 1989, a 2,000-gallon heating oil UST used to operate the boiler was removed under the sidewalk at the east end of the site along Hamilton Street.

Since the nursery closed in the early 1990s, the property has remained vacant yet largely intact. The most significant change is the collapse of five greenhouses. These include one original greenhouse (#15) and two early 1950s greenhouses (#16-17) on the west side and two greenhouses, one original (#2) and one added by 1938 (#1), on the east side. Numerous glass panes in the greenhouses are missing or broken. However, the nursery retains the majority of the original structures, including the greenhouses, boiler house, ancillary buildings, wells, and network of pipes, as well its circulation pattern and spatial layout.

Figure 22. Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1938 (Harrison Ryker, “Composite: 1-164 San Francisco Aerial Views,” David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author).

---

36 Building Permit No. 141210, on file at the San Francisco DBI; 1963 aerial photograph in Cornerstone Earth Group, “Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Soil Quality Evaluation, 770 Woolsey Street,” Appendix C; Cartwright Aerial Surveys, Flight CAS-65-130, Frame 1-79 [aerial photograph], 1965, University of California, Santa Barbara.

37 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, mid-1990s, Volume 8, Sheet 866.

38 Cartwright Aerial Surveys, Flight CAS-65-130, Frame 1-79 [aerial photograph], 1965, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Figure 23. Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1941 (Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Flight C-660, Frame 221, University of California, Santa Barbara, amended by author)

Figure 24. Detail of the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866 (amended by author)
Figure 25. Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1956 (USGS EarthExplorer, amended by author)

Figure 26. Detail of the 1965 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866 (amended by author)
Figure 27. University Mound Nursery from the intersection of Woolsey and Hamilton streets, post-1960 (Diane Garibaldi)

The following table lists the buildings and structures, both extant and demolished, in chronological order.

Table 1. Construction Chronology for University Mound Nursery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By 1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>greenhouses #2-10, #12-15 (#15 is collapsed; all others are extant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boiler house (extant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>windmill (demolished after 1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand-dug well #1 (extant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two water tanks at northwest corner (demolished between 1951 and 1956)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1925-1928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse #11 (extant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below lists the building permits on file at San Francisco DBI for 770 Woolsey Street and 500 Holyoke Street, as both addresses are associated with the University Mound Nursery. A copy of the building permit record is included in Appendix C.

Table 2. Building Permits for the University Mound Nursery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144660</td>
<td>July 7, 1930</td>
<td>V. Garibaldi</td>
<td>Construct a one-story, wood frame residence at 500 Holyoke Street for $4,500; G. Carraro, builder (filed under 500 Holyoke Street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. HISTORIC CONTEXT

The following section provides a historic context for the development of the University Mound Nursery. Additional historic photographs are provided in Appendix D.

Neighborhood Development

The approximate 4,400-acre Rancho Rícon de las Salinas y Potrero Veijo, or “Ranch of the Salt Marsh and the Old Pasture,” encompassed the area that would become the Portola neighborhood. The Mexican government granted the land to Don José Cornelio Bernal in two sections in 1839 and 1840. Following the Gold Rush and California’s entry into the Union in 1850, it remained sparsely settled over the next decade as it was situated miles away from the center of the pioneer metropolis. By 1861, the roads that became San Bruno and Silver avenues had been platted (Figure 28).40

---

By 1864, the San Francisco and San Jose Railroad Company completed a new railroad connecting San Francisco and Palo Alto. Upon reaching the city’s southern boundary near present day Junipero Serra Boulevard, the railway curved east and then headed northeast parallel to San Jose Avenue before terminating at 25th and Valencia streets in the Mission District. The closest railroad station to the subject property was located 1.5 mile to the northwest near the present day intersection of Monterey Boulevard and Diamond Street (the current location of the Glen Park BART station). In 1868, the Southern Pacific Railroad acquired the rail line and later abandoned it due to the construction of I-280.  

Concurrent with the construction of the railroad, real estate speculators, along with newly established homestead associations, purchased land along the rail line and began subdividing lots, creating a patchwork of street grids that did not align with each other. By 1863, Harvey S. (H.S.) Brown, a lawyer and developer, acquired the land that became the Portola neighborhood and had it platted and recorded as the University Mound Survey. The new development was bounded by Silver Avenue to the north, San Bruno Avenue to the east, Olmstead Street to the south and Oxford Street to the west, with a large parcel reserved at the west end for a “University College.” North-south streets were named after East Coast colleges, such as Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine, and Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, Massachusetts. East-west streets were named after notable figures involved in higher education.

---

42 San Francisco City Directory, 1864; San Francisco Planning Department, “University Mound Old Ladies Home, 350 University Street, Landmark Designation Report,” Landmark No. 269, November 25, 2015, 18.
43 In the early 1860s, the Presbyterians were operating the college, which was destroyed in a fire in 1875. In 1931, the Sisters of the Good Shepard purchased a portion of the site and operated a home for girls. The building complex is currently occupied by Cornerstone Academy. See Rayna Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2007), 38; SF Genealogy, “Historical Abstract of San Francisco,” San Francisco History, accessed August 2, 2018, http://www.sfgenealogy.org/sf/history/hbabs2.htm.
in the early to mid-nineteenth century, including Theodore Dwight Woolsey, Francis Wayland, and Leonard Bacon (Figure 29).44 By 1867, the University Homestead Association had acquired the neighborhood development and expanded it west to Harvard Street.45 The University Mound Nursery would be constructed within Blocks 43 (western portion, present day 770 Woolsey Street) and 32 (eastern portion) of this surveyed land (Figure 29).

![Figure 29. Map of University Homestead Association, 1867. The two blocks that became the University Mound Nursery are bounded in red. (San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco History Room, amended by author)](image)

45 San Francisco Planning Department, “University Mound Old Ladies Home, 350 University Street, Landmark Designation Report,” 18.
While the University Mound neighborhood had been platted on paper, it appears the street grid was not immediately constructed as depicted in the 1869 U.S. Coast Survey Map. The area is sparsely developed with a series of fenced yards, likely used for agriculture, dairies, or cattle operations. Cattle roamed freely in the area well into the late nineteenth century, as reported in the 1895 San Francisco Call article describing encounters with the animal in the neighborhood.46 A fenced cluster of buildings had been constructed straddling what became Hamilton Street between Wayland and Woolsey streets (Figure 30).47 The exact function of these buildings remains unknown, although a dairy was known to operate at this location by the turn of the twentieth century.

![Figure 30. United States Coast Survey Map of the San Francisco Peninsula, 1869.](image)

The arrow indicates the fenced building cluster located along present day Hamilton Street between Wayland and Woolsey streets (David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)

Promotional literature highlighting development potential within the former Rancho Rícon de las Salinas y Potrero Veijo emphasized the advantage of the land’s “deep, rich, permanent soil” and abundance of spring water. Fresh water sources included Islais Creek, which began at Lake Geneva near present-day Geneva and Cayuga avenues (nearly two miles west of the subject property). The creek now flows underground east along Cayuga Avenue and empties into San Francisco Bay just south of Cesar Chavez Street.48 To the south, Yosemite Creek starts at McNab Lake in McLaren Park, extends east underground along Woolsey Street, and empties into the bay just south of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

46 “Four Supervisors Under Another Cloud, Charged by Southside Residents with Accepting Boodle,” San Francisco Call, December 9, 1895; San Francisco Planning Department, “University Mound Old Ladies Home, 350 University Street, Landmark Designation Report,” 18.
47 U.S. Coast Survey, San Francisco Peninsula [map], 1869, David Rumsey Map Collection.
Indeed, the area attracted farmers in the 1860s, including large numbers of Italian, German, Swiss, and Irish immigrants who established small farms and grew a wide variety of produce that they transported in trucks to markets and local restaurants downtown. The Excelsior neighborhood immediately to the west also became one of the city’s principal concentrations of dairies through the 1880s. Grazing land for cattle and sheep and dairy farms once blanketed the area now designated as McLaren Park and continuing east into the Portola. By the turn of the twentieth century, Bernard and Felicie Cassou were operating a dairy at what later became the University Mound Nursery. The dairy was advantageously located in close proximity to Yosemite Creek, as dairy ranchers relied on natural drainages to provide water for animals and to carry wastewater away from their operations. As late as 1905, Cassou, along with several other property owners, were fined for installing fencing obstructing neighborhood streets, attesting to the rural character of the area. Although the Portola neighborhood would begin to be filled with single-family homes in the 1920s, the Cassous property provided an existing land use primed for the construction of a nursery.

**Italian American Settlement in San Francisco**

In the early 1850s, Italians began immigrating to California in search of fortune in the state’s gold fields but by 1860, they had largely dispersed throughout Northern California as placer mining proved to be difficult and dangerous. They particularly settled in San Francisco, the Sacramento Valley, and the Sierra Nevada foothills and found employment in lumber camps, orchards, farms, and fishing camps. Those that traveled directly to San Francisco established businesses, such as grocery and dry goods stores, restaurants, hotels, and boarding houses, at the base of Telegraph Hill at what was then known as the “Latin Quarter” as it was home to Basque, French, Italian, Mexican, Portuguese, and Spanish immigrants. Among the first wave of Italian merchants in San Francisco were Domingo Ghirardelli, the famed chocolate manufacturer, and Domenico di Domenconini, who established the Golden Grain macaroni factory. By the early 1850s, Italian language supplements began appearing in local newspapers, followed by the first, albeit short-lived, Italian language newspaper, *L’Eco della Patria*, in 1859. The first Italian institution, the Societa’ Italiana di Mutua Beneficenza, was established in 1858 in a social hall on Grant Street.

By 1870, approximately 2,000 Italians had settled in San Francisco, and after immigration to California increased in the 1880s, close to one-third of the state’s Italian population (approximately 5,200 out of 15,500 Italians) were residing in San Francisco by 1890. They dispersed throughout the city to various neighborhoods, including North Beach, Hayes Valley, Hunter’s Point, the Marina, the Inner and Outer Mission, Excelsior, Portola and Bernal Heights, based in part on their occupation and skills. For example,


50 “Budget Goes to the Mayor,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 6, 1905. Other cited property owners include E. Gregori and L. Chiappari, who may be associate with early nurseries in the area.


the area between the Marina District south to the city border became home to numerous Italian truck farms and dairies, while Italian fisherman coalesced in Hunter’s Point and Bernal Heights. 54

North Beach, or “Little Italy,” formed the city’s largest and most well known Italian American neighborhood. A scattering of homes were initially located at Dupont Street (now Grant Avenue) and Vallejo Street. Italian businesses, including grocery stores, commercial and wholesale businesses, restaurants, and fruit and vegetable vendors, soon lined Grant Avenue to the north and formed the social heart of the neighborhood. Italian residents lived in small cottages, shacks, and crowded tenement buildings on Telegraph Hill and then moved downhill into North Beach in the 1880s and 1890s. Many enduring Italian commercial, civic, and religious institutions were founded in North Beach through the early twentieth century, including Saints Peter and Paul Church (1884, rebuilt in 1913), the Bank of Italy (founded by A.P. Giannini in 1904), John Fugazi’s Casa Fugazi (1912), and the Italian Community Services Agency (1916). 55

In the 1920s, Italian immigration tapered in response to restrictive immigration laws, such as the Immigration Act of 1924, at which time they comprised the largest European ethnic group in San Francisco, surpassing the Irish and German communities, who had ranked first and second respectively. By 1930, the number of foreign-born Italians in San Francisco peaked at just over 27,300. North Beach remained home to the largest concentration of residents with Italian ancestry, with 60,000 residents and 5 circulating Italian language newspapers through World War II. Over the next several decades, the city’s Italian American population steadily declined as immigration waned and Italian Americans relocated to suburbs outside of San Francisco. 56

Italian American Settlement in the Portola/Excelsior

Italian settlement in the adjacent Portola and Excelsior neighborhoods initially was composed of an insular community of truck farmers from the Liguria, Tuscany, and Campania regions and Italian-Swiss dairymen. The early settlers successfully transformed the hilly terrain into vegetable fields and dairy farms ranging in size from 10-15 acres to 250 acres. 57 The smaller farms primarily produced tomatoes and lettuce, while the larger farms diversified by growing a wide array of vegetables, including artichokes, cauliflower, cabbage, brussels sprouts, and onions. These early Italian farmers typically rented plots of land either individually or in partnership and conveyed their produce on horse-drawn wagons along Mission Street and San Bruno Avenue to wholesale markets in the city’s burgeoning downtown. Among the most prominent was the Colombo Market, a large vegetable and produce market established by the Italian community in 1876 and spanning the block bounded by Davis, Jackson, Front, and Pacific streets. 58

While Italian-owned retail flower shops operated in downtown San Francisco, Italian nurseries were largely concentrated in the Portola neighborhood, complementing the existing agricultural land use, and to the south on the slopes of the San Bruno mountains and in the vicinity of Colma in San Mateo

54 Fichera, Italy on the Pacific, 3, 27; Gumina, The Italians of San Francisco, 20, 25-27.
57 Gumina, The Italians of San Francisco, 33.
58 Ibid., 35, 99.
County.\textsuperscript{59} Italian growers initially focused on cultivating greenery incorporated into bouquets, and they soon formed the San Francisco Fern Growers Association, the precursor to the San Francisco Flower Growers Association. Within the Portola neighborhood, the California Evergreen Co.’s nursery was located in the block bounded by Felton, Goettingen, Burrows, and Somerset streets and presumably named after its primary product.\textsuperscript{60} Larger operations based in San Francisco foraged for ferns in the mountains in Sonoma and Santa Cruz counties to augment locally grown greenery. Italian growers then began to cultivate a diverse range of flowers to capitalize on the thriving cut flower market, and small-scale, family-operated nurseries with tidy rows of greenhouses and flower fields soon blanketed the Portola.\textsuperscript{61} Gerald Garibaldi, the son of Gio Batta Garibaldi who co-founded the University Mound Nursery, estimates that nearly 20 Italian nurseries operated in the Portola neighborhood (Figure 31).\textsuperscript{62}

![Map of Portola nurseries created by Gerald Garibaldi](San Francisco’s Portola, page 11)

\textsuperscript{59} Early Italian flower shops included Podesta & Baldocchi, Rossi and Rosaia, Canepa and Figone, Antonini’s Sutter Street Florist, and Pelicano (Angelo Rossi, a partner in the Pelicano, served as mayor of San Francisco from 1931 to 1944). Gary Kawaguchi, \textit{Living with Flowers: The California Flower Market History} (San Francisco: California Flower Market, Inc., 1993), 33.

\textsuperscript{60} Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, 1915, Volume 8, Sheet 857.

\textsuperscript{61} Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, 1915, Volume 8, Sheet 869; Kawaguchi, \textit{Living with Flowers}, 34.

\textsuperscript{62} Reyna Garibaldi, \textit{San Francisco’s Portola}, 11.
The Ferrari Bros. established one of the largest nurseries in the Portola and specialized in both ferns and other greenery as well roses and carnations. Their facility spanned a block-and-a-half just northwest of the University Mound Reservoir’s north basin. They hired crews to gather rich soil for rooting ferns in the Santa Cruz mountains in the summer and later in the fall to forage maidenhair fern growing prevalently alongside creek banks. They later expanded to Colma where they grew violets, which were transported to San Francisco weekly, and imported Christmas trees from Oregon. Larger operations, like the Ferraris Bros., became involved in shipping as well. By the mid-1950s, the University Mound Nursery was selling their award-winning roses and snapdragons locally at the San Francisco Flower Market and transporting them across California and by plane to New York.

The Italian American community remained strong through the mid-twentieth century as numerous religious and cultural institutions and commercial businesses were established, largely in the Excelsior neighborhood. By 1898, the community had grown large enough to warrant the construction of the Corpus Christi Church as an auxiliary church to Saints Peter and Paul in North Beach. The original church building at Santa Rosa Avenue and Alemany Boulevard was later replaced with a modern church designed by architect Mario Ciampi in 1952. Along Mission Street in the Excelsior, the copious Italian stores, delis, restaurants, bakeries, pasta and ravioli factories, and butcher shops served as an extension of North Beach. Residents also enjoyed playing bocce ball on numerous courts built on empty lots in the Excelsior in the 1920s and 1930s. Major social institutions include the Italian American Social Club, which met in a member’s home beginning in 1928 until moving to its permanent location at 21-25 Russian Avenue in 1940. Club members must have Italian ancestry, although the restaurant is open to the public. In 1952, the fraternal lodge Sons of Italy moved to a new building at 5051 Mission Street. Within the Portola neighborhood, St. Elizabeth’s Church, currently at located two blocks east of the subject property at the northeast corner of Wayland and Somerset streets, became home to a large branch of the Italian Catholic Federation, second in size only to the branch in North Beach.

By the early 1970s, Italian Americans began moving to the suburbs as Latina/o, Filipina/o, and Chinese residents moved into the area. By the turn of the twenty-first century, the Excelsior neighborhood was home to a large concentration of Filipina/o residents in San Francisco, with other significant concentrations in the nearby Portola and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods. As the demographics shifted, the range of businesses along Mission Street began to change to serve new clientele. Similarly, the congregation of Corpus Christi Church evolved such that Italian Americans only comprised about one-fifth of the parishioners. Today these neighborhoods remain among the most diverse in the city.

---

63 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, 1915, Volume 8, Sheet 869; Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, 34.
64 Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, 34.
66 Gumina, The Italians of San Francisco, 35.
67 Jebe, San Francisco’s Excelsior District, 94.
69 Scherini, The Italian American Community of San Francisco, 36.
San Francisco’s Flower Industry

The floral industry in the San Francisco Bay Area traces its roots to the early 1880s when Japanese immigrant Hiroshi Yoshiike began selling chrysanthemums that he cultivated in Oakland from imported cuttings. Other Japanese immigrants, including the famed Domoto family, followed suit and began growing chrysanthemums, as well as camellias, wisteria, lilies, and azaleas, at a large scale for the wholesale cut flower market. Early Japanese flower growers were joined by Italian and Chinese immigrants in establishing profitable family-run nurseries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Compact rows of greenhouses and flower fields would be located on small plots of land, often just several acres in size, in proximity to urban cores, such San Francisco and Oakland.\(^71\) Nurseries were also established along rail lines and near ferry terminals, with flowers transported on trains and boats bound for San Francisco. In his history of the California Flower Market, author Gary Kawaguchi states that Japanese growers walked with baskets of flowers no more than two miles to reach transit stations.\(^72\)

Flower growers initially converged on Wednesdays and Fridays at an open-air wholesale market centered at Kearny and Market streets in San Francisco. The market was conveniently serviced by a range of transportation options, including ferry, rail, and cable car. Buyers representing approximately 80 flower shops arrived to make their purchases. After an hour, the exchange concluded, with flower growers returning to their nurseries to tend to their plants and greenhouses.\(^73\) Following the 1906 earthquake and fires, the open-air flower market quickly resumed to satisfy the demand for fresh flowers in the wake of the tragedy. By 1909, however, the wholesale market moved indoors, following a citywide ban on street sales.\(^74\)

Eventually the three main groups comprised of Japanese, Chinese, and Italian growers formed a coalition to control their interests in the wholesale cut flower market. By doing so, they reduced competition among each other by specializing in particular plants and retained a larger share of the profit by removing the middleman. Initially, Chinese growers specialized in asters, sweet peas, and pompoms; Japanese growers focused on chrysanthemums and greenhouse cut flowers; and Italians growers were known for their violets and ferns, which they grew in fields adjacent to vegetables. Italian growers would also become known for their roses, carnations, and other cut flowers.\(^75\)

Each group formed a separate corporation, with shareholders initially limited to growers. This business structure allowed the organizations to maintain low rents and maximize profits for individual growers.\(^76\) In 1912, Japanese growers incorporated the California Flower Market, followed by the Italian growers’ San Francisco Flower Growers Association in 1923 (formerly the San Francisco Fern Growers Association), and the Chinese growers’ Peninsula Flower Growers Association.\(^77\)

---


\(^{72}\) Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, x, 20-21.

\(^{73}\) Chinese growers met separately along Stevenson Street, one block south of Market Street. Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, ix, 21-22.

\(^{74}\) Ibid., 24.

\(^{75}\) Ibid., xi, 28-30.

\(^{76}\) Ibid., 32.

\(^{77}\) Ibid., vii, 32.
In 1924, the three groups relocated the indoor market to 5th and Howard streets in the South of Market district. Despite different languages and business cultures, they cooperated on the subdivision and operation of the new space, yet retained separate identities. The three associations operated independently, with Japanese flower growers claiming the majority of the market. Within their organization’s allotted space, individual growers rented counter space to sell their products.\(^{78}\)

When Japanese citizens were interred during World War II, the San Francisco Flower Growers Association became the caretaker of the California Flower Market and kept the market doors open, albeit at a financial loss. Some Italian growers turned to cultivating vegetables to make ends meet. After the war, the Japanese growers returned and established a new Board of Directors for the California Flower Market. Demand for flowers continued for the next three decades as inexpensive air freight rates opened up new markets nationwide.\(^{79}\)

In 1956, the San Francisco Flower Terminal moved to a new building nearby at 640 Brannan Street. It proved to be a financially advantageous decision with the mortgage paid in full within a decade. The three organizations continued to operate in separate spaces within the new market. Japanese vendors with the California Flower Market initially sold their flowers from 12-foot-long tables, while Italian growers with the San Francisco Flower Growers Association sold their flowers from the backs of trucks lined up inside the building. In the mid-1980s, they installed partition walls along the perimeter to create separate stalls. After taking over the University Mound Nursery with his cousin Andrew Garibaldi, Steve Garibaldi loaded his truck with roses and drove to the San Francisco Flower Terminal three days a week (Figure 32). Fellow growers affectionately dubbed him the “Rose King” during his 60th birthday celebration at the market. The Chinese Peninsula Flower Growers occupied the smallest space accessed at the rear from Morris Street, and wholesalers coalesced around the new market in a row of buildings lining Brannan Street.\(^{80}\)

---

\(^{78}\) Ibid., 30-31, 43.

\(^{79}\) Ibid., 58-64.

\(^{80}\) Kawaguchi, *Living with Flowers*, 70-71; Diane Garibaldi, personal communication with ARG staff, July 17, 2018.
Beginning in the 1970s, however, flower sales in California, began decreasing in large part due the rise in imported flowers from Central and South America. In particular, Columbian growers took advantage of year round warm weather, abundant land, government-subsidized construction of large-scale nurseries, and affordable and efficient cargo flights. By 1990, half of the roses and chrysanthemums sold in the United States were imported.81 Flower growers in California saw their profits decrease, and many began closing their operations due to stiff competition from imports, the retirement or death of the first and second generation growers, and the encroachment of suburban development. Others relocated south to larger nurseries in Half Moon Bay and Pescadero in San Mateo County, Gilroy and Morgan Hill in Santa Clara County, and Watsonville and Salinas in Monterey County.82

In San Francisco, the University Mound Nursery was the last commercially operated nursery until it closed in the early 1990s. The remaining nurseries in the Portola neighborhood were demolished and replaced with housing. Robyn Huey, who grew up in the Portola, remembers the Restani and Fatima nursery greenhouses being demolished in the early 2000s. She recalls that “even at such a young age, I

81 Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, 81-82.
felt an immense amount of grief watching bulldozers tear apart the glass structures.”83 This development trend was replicated around the Bay Area. For example, the last remaining nursery, operated by Masaji Honda, in Redwood City, was demolished in 1992 and replaced with new residences.84 The Sakai and Oishi nurseries in Richmond are being replaced with Miraflores senior housing development, albeit with the former nursery residence and representative greenhouse integrated on site. The Sakai and Oishi nurseries were the Bay Area’s only extant cut flower nurseries established by Japanese Americans before World War II and are the last nurseries in the City of Richmond.85 While a comprehensive survey of remaining nurseries has not been completed to date, research indicates that cut flower nurseries are an exceedingly rare property type in the San Francisco Bay Area landscape.

Garibaldi Family

Vittorio, Antonio, Giovanni, Ernesto, and Gio Batta Garibaldi established the University Mound Nursery across two adjacent blocks they purchased from Bernard and Felicia Cassou in 1921. The five Garibaldi brothers followed each other from Genoa, Italy, to San Francisco, beginning with the oldest brother Vittorio Garibaldi in 1900 and ending with the youngest Gio Batta Garibaldi in 1921.86 The following is a brief biographical summary of the Garibaldi family members involved in the University Mound Nursery until it closed in the early 1990s.

Vittorio Garibaldi (1881-1941)

Vittorio Garibaldi was born in 1881 in the Genoa, Italy, and immigrated to the San Francisco, sailing from France, in 1900. He may have been involved in an earlier truck garden business at 2345 San Jose Avenue with Gio Batta Garibaldi; the business ended in 1908.87 In 1911, he became a naturalized citizen and was married to Margaret Garibaldi (1887-1972), also born in Italy. The couple had nine children, including Slyva, Catherine, Linda, Bernice, Aileen, Ernest, and Victor J. Garibaldi. In 1920, they owned a house at 14 Crane Street, and Vittorio Garibaldi worked as carpenter at the railroad company.88 Shortly thereafter, he established the nursery with his brothers, and by 1930, they were residing on site at 500 Holyoke Street.89 He died in 1941, and his wife Margaret Garibaldi inherited his share in the family business.

84 Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, 72-73, 81-84.
87 “Notice of Dissolution of Copartnership,” San Francisco Chronicle, September 24, 1908.
Antonio Garibaldi (b. ca. 1885)
Antonio Garibaldi immigrated in 1906 and applied for a marriage license in San Francisco in 1910. In 1920, he and his wife Assunta Garibaldi (the sister of Matilda Garibaldi) had two children, Mary L. and Andrew L. Garibaldi, and they were residing at the rear of 14 Crane Street. He worked for an oil company just prior to the founding of the family nursery. By 1940, the family had relocated to Cabrillo Street. Their son Andrew L. Garibaldi would continue operation of the nursery after he purchased it with his cousin Steve Garibaldi in 1958.

Giovanni Garibaldi (1887-1967)
Giovanni Garibaldi immigrated in 1906 and became a naturalized citizen by 1909. He was also issued a World War I draft registration card, which indicates he was residing at 14 Crane Street and employed as a pulley man for the Municipal Railway (Muni) at Mason and Washington streets. By 1930, he was married to Matilda Garibaldi (1894-1969) and living at 502 Holyoke Street, which was the first house built by the family in 1925. They had two children, Angela Garibaldi and Steve Garibaldi, who would take over the nursery with his cousin.

Ernesto Garibaldi (1890-1984)
Ernesto Garibaldi was born in 1890 and immigrated to San Francisco in 1910. He later became a citizen in 1922. That year, he was living at 14 Crane Street and they had at least three children: Ernesto, Raymond, and Dorothy Garibaldi. The couple had purchased Lots 1C and 1E within the eastern block of the University Mound Nursery but left them undeveloped. It was not until 1959 when their son Raymond and his wife Marie built the existing house at 526 Holyoke Street (Lot 1E).

Gio Batta Garibaldi (1894-1951)
Gio Batta Garibaldi was born ca. 1896 and immigrated to the United States in 1921. Around 1927, he married Margaret Garibaldi (1906-1998), the newlyweds moved to the newly built residence at 506 Holyoke Street.

Steve Garibaldi (1927-1990)
Steve Garibaldi was born in 1927 to Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi. He lived at the family home at 502 Holyoke Street, learning the floral trade from his father and uncles. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy during World War II and the Army during the Korean War. His work as a machinist at the Reese Blow Pipe Co. in Berkeley, California, proved handy for repairing and upgrading the nursery’s systems during his

---

ownership of the family business from 1958 onward. He married Mary Telleria in 1962, and they had two children, Diane and Steve Garibaldi Jr. His daughter Diane Garibaldi remembers her father as a hard worker, visiting the nursery daily to tend to the flowers and to light the boiler at night to keep the greenhouses warm. He woke at 3 am three days a week to transport roses to the San Francisco Flower Mart in his truck and would return afterward to resume cutting flowers. At his 60th birthday, his fellow florists threw him a party at the market, dubbing him the “Rose King.” He died unexpectedly in 1990, and the nursery closed shortly thereafter.98

Andrew L. Garibaldi (1917-2002)
Cousins Andrew and Steve Garibaldi were very close to each other, with Andrew Garibaldi serving as best man at Steve and Mary Garibaldi’s wedding in 1962. Andrew Garibaldi took care of the bookkeeping and helped cut flowers, and in later years, Steve Garibaldi picked up his cousin daily from his home on Crane Street.99 He died in 2002.100

Greenhouse Architecture

Beginning around the seventeenth century, greenhouses developed in England and across northern Europe in response to the importation of exotic plants.101 By the eighteenth century, horticulturists experimented with greenhouse design through trial and error. When successful designs were developed, they were published by the gardeners or architects that devised them. The material and maintenance cost of these early structures, however, meant that construction of greenhouses was limited to the wealthier landowners. New materials and technologies were introduced during the Industrial Revolution that reduced the cost of materials and manufacture, allowing for wider production of greenhouses and greater affordability to the emerging middle class.102

Greenhouses have been built in the United States since the mid-eighteenth century, and many early structures were modeled after methods of construction and heating that originated in Europe (Figure 33). Some early American greenhouse examples mimicked the orangeries (citrus greenhouses) of Northern Europe and England, with glass only on the sides of the building. All-glass greenhouses had developed in the United States by the 1830s, and by the 1870s, Frederic A. Lord and William A. Burnham had joined to form Lord and Burnham, one of the most prominent greenhouse manufacturers in the country. Lord and Burnham specialized in both the curvilinear frame construction of the more well-known conservatories, as well as the more utilitarian designs of greenhouse construction.103 Prominent late nineteenth century conservatories in San Francisco include the San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers in Golden Gate Park (San Francisco Landmark No. 50) and the Sunnyside Conservatory on Monterey Boulevard (San Francisco Landmark No. 78). The company also developed heating systems for greenhouses and introduced their first boiler design to the market in the 1870s.104 Manure and hot air

98 Diane Garibaldi, personal communication with ARG staff, July 17, 2018. No business records are known to have survived.
99 Ibid.
100 Certificate of Death for Andrew L. Garibaldi, 2002, on file at the San Francisco Recorder’s Office.
systems were used as the primary heating methods for greenhouses through the middle of the nineteenth century, but were replaced by centralized hydraulic systems predominated by the end of the century.105

Figure 33. Illustration from the American Florist in 1887 showing what is reportedly the first American greenhouse built for James Beekman in New York in 1764. (Taft, Greenhouse Construction, 3)

Design and development of commercial greenhouses continued through the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth as demand for these types of structures increased. According to records related to the Lord and Burnham Company:

After the civil war the development of greenhouses for commercial purposes became more evident throughout the United States. Plants and flowers became increasingly popular for social occasions such as funerals, weddings and parties and Victorian interiors called for houseplants such as palms and ferns. Private greenhouses became a common accessory to many estates, providing readily available fresh fruits and flowers as well as a place for entertaining for the social, financial and political elite. Soon, municipalities added to the demand for greenhouse and conservatory structures. Public parks and gardens sought to build greenhouses for public and educational use.106

A number of greenhouse manufacturing companies had been established before the turn of the twentieth century including The Hitchings Company (established 1844), which “specialized in the manufacture of greenhouse components such as ventiliating apparatus and heating systems”; this company began manufacturing greenhouses in 1888.107 Lord and Burnham merged with Hitchings & Co. in 1905, and also with the Pierson-Sefton Co. to form the Burnham-Pierson-Sefton Corporation. Lord and Burnham would continue to acquire other greenhouse companies over the next several decades to become a leader in the industry. However, other independent greenhouse manufacturers also operated throughout the country. According to U.S. census reports, the total number of square feet in

106 Lord & Burnham Co. Records Finding Aid.
107 Ibid.
greenhouse glass increased from about 39,000,000 sq. ft. in 1890 to nearly 115,000,000 sq. ft. in 1910.\textsuperscript{108}

A text by L.R. Taft, a professor of horticulture at Michigan Agricultural College, provides one of the earlier guides related to greenhouse construction and design published in the United States. Issued in 1891, the volume entitled \textit{Greenhouse Construction: A Complete Manual on the Building, Heating, Ventilating, and Arrangement of Greenhouses}, provides guidance on the construction of greenhouses and other propagating structures. Concurrent with the construction of the University Mound Nursery and other nurseries in the Portola, a 1923 publication by W.J. Wright, entitled \textit{Greenhouses: Their Construction and Equipment}, addresses many of the same building types and techniques found in the 1891 publication. It provides overviews of typical greenhouse construction and discusses basic structural types, materials, layout, glazing, and heating equipment. Later publications, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Farmers’ bulletin “Greenhouse Construction and Heating” (also published in 1923), provided information on modern equipment and materials, though the building types and construction techniques appeared to remain relatively standard over time. The publications discussed above addressed typologies of greenhouses, which are named and recognized by the style of their roofs. Greenhouse types include 1) even-span or span-roof, 2) uneven or three-quarter-span, 3) ridge-and-furrow, 4) lean-to or shed-roof, 5) curved roof and curved eave houses, and 6) circular houses. The types with gable roofs are defined below according to the Wright’s publication. The ridge-and-furrow greenhouses were constructed at the University Mound Nursery and other nurseries in the Portola and throughout the San Francisco Bay Area.

\textbf{Even-span or Span-roof Houses:} In these houses, as the name indicates, the sides of the roof are of equal length. They are the most popular form, fully 80 per cent, of all houses of recent construction being of this type. They are superior to the lean-to in that they admit light from two sides, and also because they may be run either north and south, or east and west, as may be desired.\textsuperscript{109}

![Figure 34. Drawing of an even span greenhouse (Taft, Greenhouse Construction, 7)](image)


\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 51.
Uneven Span Houses [also known as Three-Quarter Houses]: The uneven distribution of light in even-span houses running east and west early led to the experiment of cutting off the north one-fourth, so as to make an uneven or three-quarter span house. The following advantages are claimed for these houses: (1) They secure a more even distribution of direct sunlight to all plants. (2) The north span admits indirect light which insures better results than may be secured from a lean-to house. (3) The heat is more evenly distributed than in a lean-to house. They are often used in growing roses and other plants requiring a maximum of light.\textsuperscript{110}

![Figure 35. Drawing of a three-quarter span house (Taft, *Greenhouse Construction*, 17).](image)

Ridge-and-Furrow Houses
A ridge-and-furrow house is in reality simply two or more houses joined together. They may be even span or uneven span so long as the side walls are of equal height. The advantages of this form of construction may be mentioned as follows: (1) They are less expensive to build than separate houses of similar size, on account of the saving in side walls. (2) Not only is there a saving in the number of side walls, but the interior walls may be of cheap construction or may be left out entirely, the weight of the roof being supported by posts alone. (3) Considerable saving is made in labor because easy passage may be had between houses. (4) They conserve ground space which is often a considerable item. (5) Because there is less exposed wall surface, and because the interior houses are protected, they require less fuel than do separate houses.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{110} Wright, *Greenhouses: Their Construction and Equipment*, 54.
\textsuperscript{111} Wright, *Greenhouses: Their Construction and Equipment*, 56-57.
As described in the 1923 greenhouse construction publication, the typical construction materials for greenhouses were wood and metal, both of which were commonly milled or shaped by a greenhouse construction firm, of which there were several in the country. It further describes the general classes of framing used in greenhouse construction:

(1) Wood frame, in which all members, including the posts, are of wood; (2) semi-iron frame [also known as pipe-frame], in which the posts, purlins and purlin posts are of pipe or structural iron, and (3) all-iron or all-steel frame. Wood frame houses cast more shade than semi-iron, and are less durable, especially the posts. Semi-iron houses are very durable, and for houses of medium width, are very satisfactory. Probably more houses of this type have been built during the past ten years than of all others, though the all-metal frame house is now gaining in favor. This is especially true in the East, where large houses are coming into vogue.

The all-metal frames are cut and fitted at the factory and are then shipped, knocked down, to the place of erection. Most styles of all-metal frames have rafters, which are bolted to the side posts by means of gusset plates to form bents.112

For all wood greenhouses, like those at the University Mound Nursery, the components should be milled from “light, strong, straight-grained durable wood allowing of a small dimensions,” including cypress, redwood, and pine.113 By the early 1920s, the solid base walls of greenhouses were typically constructed of concrete, rising to no higher than the tops of interior work benches. The concrete foundation walls supported the upper portion of the walls composed of posts, mullions, and glass.114 They also had operable sashes, or louver windows, either along the roofline or a sidewall, to regulate temperature and air flow. The operable windows were typically the same dimension as those enclosing the structure.115

112 Wright, Greenhouses: Their Construction and Equipment, 80-82.
114 Ibid., 83-84.
Guides to constructing greenhouses from this era also recommended locating these structures in places with fertile soil and a sufficient supply of water. If a property did not have access to the municipal water supply, a windmill and water tanks were recommended as a cost effective method of securing abundant water. Other ancillary buildings included boiler houses and buildings to prepare and store plants, flowers, and bulbs for delivery or shipment. Boiler houses in particular were necessary for heating greenhouses with steam or water. These buildings house horizontal, cylindrical boilers, then fueled by wood, coal, oil, or gas. Due to the labor intensive nature of growing plants in greenhouses, it was suggested that growers and their employees live in close proximity to the site.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{116} White, The Principals of Floriculture, 66, 96-98.
Robert Nordin, Architect

Robert Nordin was born in ca. 1896 to August and Annie Nordin. His father August Nordin, a prominent San Francisco-based architect, initially trained him in the construction profession. Through the 1920s, Robert Nordin worked as a carpenter, and in 1931, he received his architectural license. From then on, he worked as a self-employed architect, appearing to have designed a modest number of buildings in the San Francisco Bay Area. His known work includes the greenhouses for 770 Woolsey Street (1951), a commercial building at 4731-4733 Mission Street in San Francisco (1949), and a two-story bowling alley in Daly City (1950). Little else is known about his career as he was not widely featured in newspaper articles or architectural periodicals. Nordin died in San Francisco in 1961.

6. EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is the authoritative guide to the State’s significant historical and archaeological resources. It serves to identify, evaluate, register, and protect California’s historical resources. The California Register program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). All resources listed in or formally determined eligible for the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register. In addition, properties designated under municipal or county ordinances are eligible for listing in the California Register.

The California Register criteria are modeled on the National Register criteria. A historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following criteria:

1. It is associated with events or patterns of 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.

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

3. It 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.

4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, state or the nation.

Second, for a property to qualify under the National Register’s Criteria for Evaluation, it must also retain “historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance.” While a property’s significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to “a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.” Since integrity is based on a property’s significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property’s integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established. To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register has identified seven aspects of integrity:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- **Setting** is the physical environment of a historic property.
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- **Feeling** is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Like the National Register, evaluation for eligibility to the California Register requires an establishment of historic significance before integrity is considered. California’s integrity threshold is slightly lower than the federal level. As a result, some resources that are historically significant but do not meet National Register integrity standards may be eligible for listing on the California Register.

7. EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

**California Register of Historical Resources**

Based on the evaluation presented below, the subject property at 770 Woolsey Street appears to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3 as significant cultural landscape comprised of an early twentieth century nursery established by Italian immigrants in the Portola neighborhood. Despite remaining vacant for the past three decades, the extant portion of the original nursery at 770 Woolsey Street retains a high level of integrity.

---


122 Ibid.
California Register Criterion 1 [Association with Significant Events]

The University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street is recommended as eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. In addition to dairies and vegetable and duck farms, the Portola became home to upward of 20 small-scale, family-run nurseries established by Italian immigrants. By operating efficiently within one to two city blocks, employing family members, and living on site, Italian flower growers in the Portola earned a profit and in turn, sustained San Francisco’s thriving cut flower market in conjunction with Japanese and Chinese growers.

The University Mound Nursery conveys the story of these early twentieth century, Italian nurseries in the Portola. Five Garibaldi brothers followed each other from Genoa, Italy, to San Francisco, beginning with the eldest brother Vittorio Garibaldi in 1900 and concluding with the youngest Gio Batta Garibaldi in 1921. They pooled their resources to purchase two city blocks containing a former dairy on the outskirts of the city and developed the University Mound Nursery, specializing in award-winning roses and snapdragons that they sold at the newly established San Francisco Flower Terminal. The brothers married and raised their families either on site or in close proximity to the family business. Over the next 70 years, the University Mound Nursery weathered the Great Depression, World War II and the internment of fellow Japanese flower growers, the retirement and death of the original brothers, the sale of half the property, rising competition from imported flowers, and suburban encroachment that resulted in the demolition of nearby cut flower nurseries. As such, the subject property conveys both the Italian community and the Portola neighborhood’s agricultural roots and role in developing and sustaining the local floriculture industry.

California Register Criterion 2 [Association with Significant Persons]

The five founding Garibaldi brothers, followed by the second generation, Steve and Andrew Garibaldi, operated a successful, family-owned nursery, growing roses and other plants for the cut flower market in San Francisco and beyond. Beyond operating a successful business in San Francisco, the Garibaldi family members are not known to have made broader contributions to the cut flower industry or to the Italian American community in San Francisco. Rather their contributions to the industry and settlement of the Portola neighborhood are best reflected under Criterion 1. Therefore, the subject property does not appear to meet the threshold for listing in the California Register under this criterion.

California Register Criterion 3 [Architectural Significance]

Additionally, the subject property is recommended eligible under California Register Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape in San Francisco. The city’s early twentieth century nurseries were efficiently laid out with fields of flowers, rows of greenhouses accessed by narrow walkways, ancillary buildings clustered together, and single-family homes located at the margins. Although only the western portion of the University Mound Nursery survives, it retains the compact spatial layout, orderly rows of greenhouses serrated with gable roofs, hand-dug wells, unpaved surface, and small-scale buildings, including the original boiler house with its distinctive smokestack. The small-scale, family-operated commercial nursery is an extremely rare property type, both in the city and the larger San Francisco Bay Area, with the majority of the nurseries demolished and redeveloped for other uses.
Although the Garibalis retained a registered architect, Robert Nordin, to design the greenhouses added in the early 1950s, he is not regarded as a master architect. In order to be considered a master in the field, an architect must be “recognized for greatness in the field,” rather than just be known for an extensive body of work. Based on a search of the Avery Index of Architectural Periodicals, the Pacific Coast Architectural Database, and other sources, his work was not widely featured in architectural publications, lauded by architectural critics, or included in contemporary guidebooks to Bay Area architecture. As such, the property is not eligible for under this criterion as the work of a master architect.

*California Register Criterion 4 [Potential to Yield Information]*

Criterion 4 is typically applied to archaeological resources, and evaluation of the subject property for eligibility under this criterion was beyond the scope of this report.

**Period of Significance**

The period of significance spans from 1921 to 1990. It begins in 1921 when the Garibaldi family purchased the adjacent blocks from the Cassous and began operation of the University Mound Nursery the following year. They planted fields of flowers and repurposed some of the existing dairy buildings on the eastern half and constructed the greenhouses, boiler house, and other infrastructure in the western half. It continues for the next seven decades, through the retirement and death of the original Garibaldi brothers and the acquisition of the western parcel by cousins Steve Garibaldi and Andrew L. Garibaldi, who continued to successfully operate the nursery for over three decades. The period of significance ends in 1990 with the death of Steve Garibaldi, as the nursery operation closed shortly thereafter and remained vacant.

**Integrity Analysis**

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Integrity involves several aspects including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These aspects closely relate to the building’s significance and must be primarily intact for eligibility.

**Location**

The nursery remains in its original location within the block bounded by Woolsey Street to the south, Bowdoin Street to the west, Wayland Street to the north, and Hamilton Street to the east.

**Setting**

Since it was established in the early 1920s, the area around the University Mound Nursery has been infilled with a city-owned reservoir to the west and single-family homes to the north, east, and south. In 1937, the southern basin of the University Mound Reservoir was completed across the equivalent of six city blocks. Located immediately across Bowdoin Street from the nursery, the reservoir has a park-like appearance with a grass surface and bank of trees lining the street. A small building cluster is situated at the reservoir’s southeast corner. The surrounding homes were added in the 1920s concurrent with the establishment of the nursery or in the late 1950s and 1960s, including the eastern half of the nursery. However, these residences are all one-story-over-garage homes, thus sharing a similar form and scale.

---

While the subject property has lost a physical and visual connection with the Garibaldi homes on Holyoke Street, it continues to be located in a predominantly residential setting. As such, the subject property retains integrity of setting.

**Design**

The subject property maintains integrity of design both in the overall spatial layout and circulation of the site and through the individual buildings and structures. The majority of the greenhouses are extant and retain their original design, including their long, rectangular plans; earthen floors; and distinctive ridge-and-furrow gable roofs. The boiler house retains its smokestack, forming the tallest visual element in the cultural landscape. The remaining buildings and structures added after Steve and Andrew Garibaldi acquired the site in 1958 are all low-scale, small buildings clustered at the south end of the site. As such, they are in keeping with the scale and function of the nursery and constructed within the period of significance. Thus, the cultural landscape retains integrity of design.

**Materials and Workmanship**

Despite 30 years of vacancy after it closed in the early 1990s, the buildings at the nursery retain integrity of materials and workmanship. Excluding the handful of greenhouses that have collapsed, these structures retain their slender wood frames and mullions and wood sliding doors. Although many glass panes are broken or missing, enough survives to indicate the original material and whitewash treatment. The roof of the boiler house has collapsed on one side, but the building retains its cladding, concrete foundation, boiler, and metal smokestack. The other buildings, including the garage/storage building, mixing shed, and water and pressure tanks, were added after the 1958 transition to the second generation and retain their original construction material. Lastly, the site is still unpaved throughout.

**Feeling and Association**

Through the retention of the spatial layout, circulation pattern, and design and material of the buildings, structures, and water conveyance features, the subject property continues to convey its significance as a small-scale, family-operated commercial nursery operating for over seven decades in the Portola neighborhood. Thus, it retains integrity of feeling and association.

**8. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES**

A character-defining feature is an aspect of a building or structure’s design, construction, or detail that is representative of its function, type, or architectural style. Generally, character-defining features include specific building systems, architectural ornament, construction details, massing, materials, craftsmanship, site characteristics, and landscaping built or installed within the period of significance. In order for an important historic property to retain its significance, its character-defining features must be retained to the greatest extent possible.
Character-defining features of 770 Woolsey Street include those pertaining to the overall site as well as individual buildings and structures:

**Site**

- Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed by building façades and wood fencing
- Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corners, providing views into the site from the northwest corner
- Spatial organization consisting of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and southern end
- Vehicular access from Woolsey Street via the garage entrances on the garage/storage building
- Pedestrian access through the greenhouse doors along Hamilton Street and the gate in the fence from Woolsey Street
- Circulation through the site via a 9-foot-wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site
- Unpaved surfaces throughout the site
- Buildings oriented at right angles to the streets
- All extant buildings and structures (primary), including the greenhouses, boiler house, garage/storage building, mixing shed
- All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and belowground, to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building
- Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses

**Greenhouses**

- Rectangular plans with the short gabled ends facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets
- Location in two parallel rows with the majority abutting each other
- One-story height
- Asymmetrical gable roofs
- Wood structural system with wood studs, rafters, and mullions
- Perimeter concrete foundation
- Horizontal wood cladding along the base
- Sliding wood doors, some with concrete steps
- Louver panels with associated chains and sprockets
- Wood box gutters and metal downspouts
- Narrow concrete walkways adjacent to the exterior façades

**Boiler House**

- Rectangular plan
- One-story height
- Wood frame
- Asymmetrical gable roof with no overhang and rolled roofing
- Wood horizontal v-groove cladding
- Hinged door on the east façade
- Opening with hinged cover on the west façade
- Five-light, wood-sash clerestory window on the south façade
- Tall metal smoke stack
- Concrete foundation and below-grade concrete floor
- Boiler
- Wood louvered panels in the gable ends

**Garage/Storage Building**

- Rectangular plan
- One-story height
- Wood frame
- Gable roof with a shallow pitch and wide eave overhang
- Concrete slab floor
- Garage doors on the north and south façades
- Multi-light, steel sash windows on the north and south façades

**Mixing Shed**

- Rectangular plan
- One-story height, lower-in-height than the adjacent garage/storage building
- Wood frame
- Shed roof
- Vertical wood v-groove cladding
- Large hinged door on the north façade
- Lack of fenestration
- Physical connection to the water storage and pressure tanks via pipes
- ASTs in the interior
- Concrete pad
- Partial earthen floor
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Appendix A: Existing Conditions Photographs
770 WOOLSEY STREET

General Views

770 Woolsey Street, view northwest from the intersection of Woolsey and Hamilton streets (ARG, May 2018)

770 Woolsey Street, view northwest from Hamilton Street (ARG, May 2018)
Appendix A. Existing Conditions Photographs

770 Woolsey Street, view southwest from the intersection of Wayland and Hamilton streets (ARG, May 2018)

770 Woolsey Street, view southwest from Hamilton Street (ARG, May 2018)
770 Woolsey Street, view southeast from the intersection of Wayland and Bowdoin streets (ARG, May 2018)

770 Woolsey Street, view south from Bowdoin Street (ARG, May 2018)
770 Woolsey Street, view east from Bowdoin Street (ARG, May 2018)

770 Woolsey Street, view east from the intersection of Bowdoin and Woolsey streets (ARG, May 2018)
Historic Resource Evaluation
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770 Woolsey Street, view northeast from Woolsey Street (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouses

Greenhouses lining Hamilton Street, view northwest from Hamilton Street (ARG, May 2018)
Greenhouse #3, view west from Hamilton Street (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of the sliding wood door accessing greenhouse #6, view west from Hamilton Street; note: the number 5 painted on the door does not correspond with the numbers assigned to the greenhouses in this report (ARG, May 2018)
Greenhouse #10, view south from Wayland Street (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of greenhouse #10, view south from Wayland Street (ARG, May 2018)
Greenhouse #13, view east from Bowdoin Street (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouse roofs, view southeast from Bowdoin Street (ARG, May 2018)
Central pathway extending between the greenhouses, view north from the southern end; greenhouse #11 is on the left and greenhouse #1 (collapsed) is on the right (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouse #1 (collapsed), view west (ARG, May 2018)
Central pathway extending between the greenhouses, view north; greenhouse #13 is on the left and greenhouse #3 is on the right (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouse #3, view northeast (ARG, May 2018)
Location of greenhouses #15-17 (collapsed), view north (ARG, May 2018)

Remnant of greenhouse #17 (collapsed), including the entrance, view west (ARG, May 2018)
Central pathway extending between the greenhouses, view north; greenhouse #18 is on the left and greenhouse #8 is on the right (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouse #18, view west/northwest (ARG, May 2018)
Central pathway extending between the greenhouses, view south from the northern end (ARG, May 2018)

Greenhouses #2 (left) and #1 (right), both collapsed, view northeast (ARG, May 2018)
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Detail of the roof of greenhouse #1 (collapsed); note the louver window located along the roof ridge (ARG, May 2018)

Partial framing of the eastern portion of greenhouse #2, view northwest (ARG, May 2018)
Greenhouse #11, view west (ARG, May 2018)

South wall of greenhouse #11, view northeast (ARG, May 2018)
Detail of the louver window on the south wall of greenhouse #11 (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of a glass pane on the south wall of greenhouse #11 (ARG, May 2018)
Interior of greenhouse #11, view west (ARG, May 2018)

South wall of greenhouse #11, view southwest from the interior (ARG, May 2018)
Detail of the gable roof of greenhouse #11 (ARG, May 2018)

Northern roof slope of greenhouse #11 where it connects with greenhouse #12 (ARG, May 2018)
Detail of glass panes on the northern roof slope of greenhouse #11 (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of the sliding wood door of greenhouse #12, view east from the interior (ARG, May 2018)
Wood gutter between greenhouses #4 and #3, view east (left) and the wood gutter with an intact downspout between greenhouses #13 and #14, view south (right) (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of the typical angled rabbet in the studs (ARG, May 2018)
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**Boiler House**

Detail of metal piping inside greenhouse #12, view east (ARG, May 2018)

Boiler house, south and east façades, view west (ARG, May 2018)
Boiler house, east and north façades, view west (ARG, May 2018)

Boiler house, south façade, view north (ARG, May 2018)
Boiler house, west façade with remnant framing of greenhouse #1 (collapsed) in front, view east (ARG, May 2018)

Boiler house, north façade, view southeast (ARG, May 2018)
Boiler house, north façade, view southwest (ARG, May 2018)

Boiler house, west façade, view south (ARG, May 2018)
Boiler house, west façade, view south (ARG, May 2018)

Boiler inside the structure, view east (ARG, May 2018)
Garage/Storage Building

Garage/storage building, view north from Woolsey Street (ARG, May 2018)

Garage/storage building, west and south façades, view northeast (ARG, May 2018)
Garage/storage building, north façade, with greenhouse #11 in the foreground, view south (ARG, May 2018)

Garage/storage building, west façade, view east (ARG, May 2018)
Garage/storage building, east façade, view west, with the water storage tank in the foreground (ARG, May 2018)

Mixing Shed

Mixing shed, east and north façades, view southwest (ARG, May 2018)
Mixing shed, north façade, view southeast (ARG, May 2018)

Mixing shed, south façade, view west (ARG, May 2018)
Water Storage Tank

Water storage tank, view north (ARG, May 2018)

Water storage tank, view northwest (ARG, May 2018)
Water storage tank, view west (ARG, May 2018)

Water storage tank, detail of the metal cradle (ARG, May 2018)
Water Pressure Tank

Water pressure tank, view north (ARG, May 2018)

Water pressure tank, view northwest (ARG, May 2018)
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Water pressure tank, view south (ARG, May 2018)

Water pressure tank, detail of the concrete cradle (ARG, May 2018)
Other Site Features

Roses located throughout the site (ARG, May 2018)
Detail of the concrete pathway extending east-west along the south wall of greenhouse #11 (ARG, May 2018)

Detail of the concrete pathway extending east-west between greenhouse #3 and greenhouse #2 (collapsed) (ARG, May 2018)
Typical pipe extending above ground just east of the garage/storage building and south of the water storage tank (ARG, May 2018)

Portable circular saw located east of the water pressure tank (ARG, May 2018)
Typical pile of lumber and metal pipes laying on the ground throughout the site
(ARG, May 2018)

Concrete water channel located just north of the garage, largely obscured by vegetation
(ARG, May 2018)
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Pile of window sashes (ARG, May 2018)

Piping extending from the boiler house and conveying steam to the greenhouses throughout the site (ARG, May 2018)
Hand-dug well #2 located just south of the boiler house, view northwest (ARG, May 2018)

Concrete mixing tank located just north of the boiler house, view north (ARG, May 2018)
BLOCK FACES

East side of Hamilton Street between Wayland and Woolsey streets, north to south (ARG, May 2018)
South side of Wayland Street between Bowdoin and Hamilton streets, east to west (ARG, May 2018)
University Mound Reservoir on the west side of Bowdoin Street between Wayland and Woolsey streets, north to south (ARG, May 2018)
South side of Woolsey Street between Bowdoin and Hamilton streets, west to east (ARG, May 2018)
Appendix B: Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps
1915 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
The two blocks that became the University Mound Nursery are outlined in red above and in subsequent maps.
Detail of the 1915 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
(Note: The 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the property is identical.)
Detail of the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Detail of the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
1965 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Detail of the 1965 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
1968 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Detail of the 1968 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Detail of the mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, San Francisco, California, Volume 8, Sheet 866
Appendix C: Building Permit Record
MARK STREET LINE ON PLANS
WRITE IN INK—FILE TWO COPIES

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
FRAME BUILDING

Application is hereby made to the Board of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build

One Story Frame Wedg on the lot situated South West Corner
of Holmbye & Maryland

in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith.

The building law shall be complied with in the erection of the building, whether otherwise specified or not.

Estimated cost of building $4500.00. Building to be occupied as Residency by No. One

Families.

Size of Lot: 37 1/2 feet front, 37 1/2 feet rear. 100 feet deep.

Size of proposed building: 30 ft. by 62 9/4 ft.

Height from curb to top of roof beams in center of front: 18 ft.

Height in clear of basement or cellar: 9 ft. Height in clear of first story: 9 ft.

Height in clear of second story: 9 ft. Height in clear of third story: 9 ft.

Foundation to be of: Concrete, thickness, on top: 18 inches.

Width of footings: 18 inches. Greatest height of foundation walls: 2 ft.

Size of studs in basement (underpinning): 2 by 4 inches, 16 inches on centers.

Size of stud in first story: 2 by 4 inches, 16 inches on centers.

Size of stud in second story: 2 by 4 inches, 16 inches on centers.

Size of stud in third story: 2 by 4 inches, 16 inches on centers.

Wall covering to be of: Rustic, outside, and Plaster, inside.

First floor joists: 2 by 12 inches, 16 inches on centers. Longest span between supports: 15 ft.

Second floor joists: 2 by 12 inches, 16 inches on centers. Longest span between supports: 15 ft.

Third floor joists: 2 by 12 inches, 16 inches on centers. Longest span between supports: 15 ft.

Rafter: 2 by 4 inches, 32 inches on centers. Longest span between supports: 15 ft.

Roof covered with: Last Dield

Studs in bearing partitions: 2 by 4 inch.

Chimney of: Terra Cotta, Patent Fires

There shall be no encroachments upon the street or sidewalk.

I hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, costs and expenses which may in any wise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit, and the Building Law.

Architect
Owner, V. Zambra

Builder, G. Canaro
Address, 1500 Sutler St

(addresses must be signed by himself or his Architect or authorized agent.)

Section 102a for Sub. Floors;
Ordinance 7791 to notify Inspector before tiling.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

INSPECTOR'S CONSTRUCTION REPORT

Permit No. 144 660

Location No. W. Holyoke & Wayland

New Construction 4000

Work Started 9 1930

Work Completed 12 23 1930

Remarks

D. H. Kohn

SPatterson

INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS
10-24-30 Left notice to put proper vent & partition in garages.
11-28-30 Notified contractor for vent & partition for garage.
11-30 Nothing done.
11-30 SF Patterson
11-20-30 Ordered sheets in garage.
12-23-30 Completed.
Approved:

Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection

Zoning:

approved

City Planning Commission

Approved:

Director of Public Health

Workmen's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate filed with Central Permit Bureau

No Workmen's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate on file for reason of exclusion checked:

(a) No one to be employed

(b) Casual labor only to be employed

(c) Services or labor to be performed in return for aid or sustenance only, received from any religious, charitable or relief organization

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Art Commission

10/15/48

Favorable

Fred W. Schlickley

OCT 14, 1948

Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection

Permit No. 107452

Issued 10/1/48

OCT 21, 1948
Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: 500 Holyoke Street

(2) Present use of building: Nursery

(3) Use of building hereafter: Nursery

(4) Total Cost $25.00

(5) Description of work to be done:

Install boiler in present boiler room without any alterations whatsoever.

(6) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION INSURANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE.

(7) Supervision of construction by:

Address:

(8) Architect

Certification No.

State of California

License No.

City and County of San Francisco

Address:

(9) Engineer

Certification No.

State of California

License No.

City and County of San Francisco

Address:

(10) Plans and specifications prepared by

Other than Architect or Engineer:

Address:

(11) Contractor: Ocean Shore Iron Works

License No. 66756

State of California

License No. M436

City and County of San Francisco

Address: 550 8th Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.

I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued herein that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW AND BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA, and of said permit will be complied with, whether specified herein or shown on any plans submitted herewith, and hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco and its officials against all damages, liabilities, judgments, costs and expenses which may in anywise accrue against said City and County or any of its officials in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street, or sub-sidewalk space by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit. The foregoing covenants shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

(12) Owner: University Mound Nursery

Address: 500 Holyoke Street, San Francisco, Calif.

By: Ocean Shore Iron Works

Ray O. Brown

Owner's Authorized Agent.

THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO. Underhill 1-4310

IF ANY ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED.
Approved:  
Zone  
CPC Setback, Access  
No retail sales at the premises permitted  

Signature:  
Department of City Planning  

Approved:  
Structural Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection  

Approved:  
Director of Public Health  

Approved:  
Bureau of Engineering  

Approved:  
Department of Electricity  

Approved:  
Faul Check: Bureau of Building Inspection  

Approved:  

FOR PERMIT TO ERECT  

BLDG. FORM  
No. 2  
APPLICATION OF  
University Press  
Owner  

FOR PERMIT TO ERECT  
Story Type 5 STRUCTURE  
Location  
35th St.  
Wayland Ave.  

Total Cost:  
$20,000  

Filed:  
JUL 22 1951  

Approved:  

Lot No.  
East Lot 7 + 1  

Assessor's Block No.  
6055  

Workmen's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate on file with Central Policy Bureau  

No Workmen's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate on file with Central Policy Bureau  

(a)  

No Exemption  

(b)  

Art Commission  

Approved:  

(c)  

Services or labor to be performed in return for aid or sustenance only, received from any religious, charitable or relief organization  

Supervisor, Bureau of Building Inspection  

Permit No.  
A 142  

Issued:  
JUL 2 1951  

Certificate of Final Completion:  
Issued:  

195.  

195.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING
FOR NON-HAZARDOUS USE ONLY

June 12

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(6) Note: Sect. 105, S.P. Bldg. Code. Change in use. No change in use shall be made in the character of occupancy, or use of any building which would put the building to a different use, unless such building is made to comply with the requirements of this code for that use, and unless the Bureau of Building Inspection and the Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety have been notified before such a change has been made.

(7) Note: Sec. 15165, State Housing Act. Any building or structure not erected for use as an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, which is converted to or altered for such use, shall conform to all the provisions of this part affecting an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, as the case may be.

(12) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION INSURANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE.

(13) PLOT PLANS, FLOOR PLANS, DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATIONS IN DUPLICATE.

(14) Supervision of construction by

Robert Nordam

Address: 1040 Mills Blvd

(15) General contractor. Not let

California License No.

(16) Architect: Robert Nordam

California Certificate No.

(17) Engineer: Robert Nordam

California Certificate No.

(18) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit, and all the laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

(19) Owner: University Mound Nursery

Address: 500 Holyoke St

Phone No. 37-5-1941 (For contact by Bureau)

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY MUST BE OBTAINED ON COMPLETION OF HOTEL OR APARTMENT HOUSE PURSUANT TO SECT. 306, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE.
Drawings that presumably accompanied the 1951 building permit for additional greenhouses at 770 Woolsey Street
Approved:

Zone: 1st

CPC Setbacks

Department of City Planning

Approved:

WATER STORAGE TANK TO HAVE FIRE DEPT. CONNECTION SEC. 8A FIRE CODE.

Department of Public Health

Approved:

Department of Electricity

Approved:

Art Commission

Approved:

Boiler Inspector

Bureau of Engineering

Workman's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate filed with Central Permit Bureau.

No Workman's Compensation Insurance Policy or Certificate on file for reason of exclusion checked:
(a) No one to be employed.
(b) Casual labor only to be employed.
(c) Services or labor to be performed in return for aid or sustenance only, received from any religious, charitable or relief organization.

Approved:

Building Inspector, Bureau of Building Inspection

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various Bureaus or Departments noted herein.

Owner's Authorized Agent

Permit No. 12551

Issued 11/4/51

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

1 - 6

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: Hamilton + Wolsley (500 Holzofe St.)

(2) Total Cost $ 19,500

(3) No. of stories

(4) Basement No.

(5) Present use of building

Concrete

(6) No. of families

(7) Proposed use of building Water Storage Tank

(8) No. of families

(9) Type of construction 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5

Building Code Occupancy Classification

(10) Any other building on lot Yes or No

(Must be shown on plot plan if answer is Yes.)

(11) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy Yes or No

(12) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building Yes or No

(13) Electrical work to be performed Yes or No

Plumbing work to be performed Yes or No

(14) Ground floor area of building 480 sq. ft.

(15) Height of building 8 ft.

(16) Detailed description of work to be done

(17) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 388, California Penal Code.

(18) Supervision of construction by Alfred N. George Address 550 9th St.

(19) General contractor California License No.

(20) Address


Address

(22) Engineer Alfred N. George California Certificate No. 550 9th St.

Address

(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(24) Owner University Press Office (Phone: 919-1997)

Address 500 Holzofe St.

(25) By Ernesto Carujo Address 500 Holzofe St.

Owner's Authorized Person to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY MUST BE OBTAINED ON COMPLETION OF HOTEL OR APARTMENT HOUSE PURSUANT TO SEC. 808 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE.
Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: University Mary Nursery 500 Holy St. 18

(2) Total Cost $ 540.00 (3) No. of stories

(4) Basement Yes or No

(5) Present use of building

(6) No. of families

(7) Proposed use of building

(8) No. of families

(9) Type of construction: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 Building Code Occupancy Classification

(10) Any other building on lot: (Must be shown on plot plan if answer is Yes.)

(11) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy: Yes or No

(12) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building: Yes or No

(13) Electrical work to be performed: Yes or No

(14) Plumbing work to be performed: Yes or No

(15) Ground floor area of building: sq. ft. (16) Height of building: ft

(17) Detailed description of work to be done: General foundation for steel water tanks. See blueprints for details.

(18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6' 0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.

(19) Supervision of construction by: Address

(20) General contractor: Owner California, License No.

Address: 500 Holy St. 18


Address

(22) Engineer: California Certificate No.

Address

(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use, or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(24) Owner: University Mary Nursery (Phone: June 5, 1941) (For Contact by Bureau)

Address: 500 Holy St. 18

By: Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.
FOR SINGLE FAMILY USE ONLY

Zone: 10

CPC Setbacks:

July 29, 1959

Department of City Planning

Approved:

Zone.

Department of Public Health

Approved:

Electronic Inspector

Approved:

Art Commission

Approved:

Boiler Inspector

Approved:

Structural Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Office Form 6055

No. 215

APPLICATION OF

University Blvd. and Mission St.

Owner

FOR PERMIT TO MAKE

REPAIRS TO BUILDING

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS or REPAIRS

Location:

Hampton Bldg. 4th

770 Hoolay, St.

Total Cost $ 500.00

Filed: Jul 29 1950

Approved:

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection

Permit No. 194601

Issued: 11/1/1950

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various Bureaus or Departments noted herein.

Owner or Authorized Agent

A. G. Noonan
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: University Mount Hunsen

(2) Total Cost: $500.00

(3) No. of stories: 2

(4) Basement: Yes

(5) Present use of building:

(6) No. of families:

(7) Proposed use of building:

(8) No. of families:

(9) Type of construction: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 Building Code Occupancy Classification

(10) Building Code Occupancy Classification: 3

(11) Any other building on lot: No

(12) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy: No

(13) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building: No

(14) Electrical work to be performed: Yes

(15) Ground floor area of building: 500 sq. ft.

(16) Height of building: 20 ft.

(17) Describe Work to be done (in addition to reference to drawings & specifications):

Build new fence

(18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.

(19) Supervision of construction by: Owner

(20) General contractor: Owner

Address: 582 Nob Hill St

California License No: Owner

(21) Architect: Owner

Address: 582 Nob Hill St

California Certificate No: Owner

(22) Engineer: Owner

Address: 582 Nob Hill St

California Certificate No: Owner

(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subterfused space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(24) Owner: Lawrence M. Hunsen

Address: 582 Nob Hill St

(Phone 5-75-1941)

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor:

Name: Andrew Caribaldi (RM)
Approved:

C. Lehmann, 10-28-52
Department of City Planning

Approved:

Greggson, 10/26/52

Approved:

Provide roof gutters connected to sewer.

Garage in type 5 building limited to 650 sq. ft. see approximate location of walls on plan.

Drage ventilation to comply with §1903 (c) Blg. Code.

Footing to extend 12" above + 10" below natural grade.

10/9/52 Daniel J. Ryan
Plan Checker, Bureau of Building Inspection

Lot No. 5

Assessor's Block No. 6915

GRAGE LINES AS SHOWN ON DRAWINGS ACCOMPANYING THIS APPLICATION ARE ASSUMED TO BE CORRECT. IF ACTUAL GRAGE LINES ARE NOT THE SAME AS SHOWN REVISED DRAWINGS SHOWING CORRECT GRAGE LINES, CUTS AND FILLS TOGETHER WITH COMPLETE DETAILS OF RETAINING WALLS AND WALL FOOTINGS REQUIRED MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THIS BUREAU FOR APPROVAL.

10/22/52 Lister C. Rowsell
Superintendent, Bureau of Planning Administration

Permit No. 10-2/104

Issued: 10/22/52

Certificate of Final Completion: 1/9/58
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING

FOR NON-HAZARDOUS USE ONLY

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

1. Location of Lot
   N Side of Holsing st
   70 ft. E of Broadway

2. Number of stories
   1

3. Total cost of building
   $50,000

4. Use of building
   Residential

5. Occupancy
   Building Code Classification

6. Note: Sect. 105, S.F. Bldg. Code. Change in use. No change in use shall be made in the character of occupancy, or use of any building which would put the building to a different use, unless such building is made to comply with the requirements of this code for that use, and unless the Bureau of Building Inspection and the Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety have been notified before such a change has been made.

7. Note: Sec. 15115, State Housing Act. Any building or structure not erected for use as an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, which is converted to or altered for such use, shall conform to all the provisions of this part affecting an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, as the case may be.

8. No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 760 volts. See Sec. 389, California Penal Code.

9. Size of lot. front 25 ft., rear 100 ft., depth of lot 80 ft.

10. Ground floor area of building
    2040 square ft.

11. Any other building on lot
    No

12. Any building designed for any more stories
    No

13. PLOT PLANS, FLOOR PLANS, DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATIONS IN DUPLICATE.

14. Supervision of construction
    City Building Official

15. General contractor
    California License No.

16. Architect
    California Certificate No.

17. Engineer
    California Certificate No.

18. I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit, and all the laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

19. Owner
    University Manor Nursery
    500 Holly st
    Phone No. 76 4194

By
    H. H. Murphy
    Address 1018 Sutter st

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.
Appendix D: Historic Photographs
UNIVERSITY MOUND NURSERY

View northwest toward Woolsey Street, with the University Mound Nursery on the right, ca. 1925 (OpenSFHistory, wnp14.0098.jpg)

View south on Hamilton Street with Margaret Garibaldi and her son Victor Garibaldi in the foreground and the University Mound Nursery on the right, ca. 1920s (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 16)
View north on Hamilton Street toward Wayland Street, ca. 1920s. The University Mound Nursery greenhouses at the northeast corner of the 770 Woolsey Street property are on the left. (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 14)

View east toward the southern portion of the University Mound Nursery from the intersection of Woolsey and Bowdoin streets, ca. 1930s (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 17)
View north on Bowdoin Street from Woolsey Street with University Mound Nursery on the right, ca. 1930s. The elevated water tanks are located in the background and the greenhouses are located in the foreground on the right. (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 16)

View south on Holyoke Street toward Woolsey Street, ca. 1930s. The L. Chiappari & Sons Nursery is located on the left, and the eastern half of the University Mound Nursery is on the right. (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 15)
View north on Hamilton Street with Margaret Garibaldi and her son Victor Garibaldi standing in the foreground and the University Mound Nursery greenhouses located on the left, 1924 (Gerald Garibaldi, *San Francisco’s Portola*, page 13)
Gio Batta Garibaldi standing inside a greenhouse at the University Mound Nursery, 1930 (Rayna Garibaldi, *San Francisco’s Portola*, 14)
Giovanni, Andrew [Antonio?], Ernesto, and Gio Batta Garibaldi (left to right) in a field of French marigolds, ca. 1920s (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 12)
Wedding of Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi (right), with Antonio and Assunta Garibaldi (left); they were married by 1930 (Diane Garibaldi)
Appendix D. Historic Photographs

Garibaldi children posing in front of a University Mound Nursery truck, ca. 1920s
(Gerald Garibaldi, *San Francisco’s Portola*, page 15)

View northeast toward the University Mound Nursery from Woolsey Street, 1940
(Gerald Garibaldi, *San Francisco’s Portola*, page 23)
View northwest toward the University Mound Nursery from Dwight Street, 1952 (Gerald Garibaldi, *San Francisco’s Portola*, page 26)
Antonio, Andrew, and Ernesto Garibaldi and Frank Ferrando (left to right) in the field of flowers at the University Mound Nursery, 1955. The boiler house is located in the background. (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 27)
View northwest toward the University Mound reservoir with the University Mound Nursery in the foreground, 1958 (San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco History Center)
University Mound Nursery from the intersection of Woolsey and Hamilton streets, post-1960 (Diane Garibaldi)
Steve Garibaldi selling bouquets of roses inside the San Francisco Flower Mart, 1983 (Diane Garibaldi)

Steve Garibaldi with newspapers to wrap bouquets of roses inside the San Francisco Flower Mart, 1983 (Diane Garibaldi)
AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1938 (Harrison Ryker, “Composite: 1-164 San Francisco Aerial Views,” David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)
Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1941 (Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Flight C-660, Frame 221, University of California, Santa Barbara, amended by author)
Aerial photograph of San Francisco, view southwest with Bayshore Boulevard in the foreground, ca. 1950. The arrow indicates the location of the University Mound Nursery. (Open SF History, wnp23.4138.jpg, amended by author)
Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1946
(USGS EarthExplorer, amended by author)
Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1956 (USGS EarthExplorer, amended by author)
Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1965 (Cartwright Aerial Surveys, Flight CAS-65-130, Frame 1-79, University of California, Santa Barbara, amended by author)
Aerial photograph depicting the University Mound Nursery (outlined in red), 1968
(USGS EarthExplorer, amended by author)
OTHER SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA NURSERIES

View north on Holyoke Street from Wayland Street, 1932. The G. Granara Nursery is located on the left, and the naval airship Akron is flying overhead in the background. (Gerald Garibaldi, San Francisco’s Portola, page 27)

View from the northern edge of McLaren Park, approximately from John F. Shelley Drive and Cambridge Street, ca. 1910. Several greenhouses are located in the foreground. (OpenSFHistory, wnp15.1119.jpg)
Gregoire Nursery located at the corner of Felton and Colby streets just north of the University Mound Reservoir, no date. Note the boiler house in the foreground. (Gerald Garibaldi in San Francisco’s Portola, page 27)

Geneva Nursery, near the intersection of present day Geneva Avenue and Alemany Boulevard, no date ("Italian Garden Project" website)
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Sunnyside Nursery, Oakland, ca. 1929 (Gary Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, page 81)

Domoto Brothers’ Nursery, Oakland, no date (Gary Kawaguchi, Living with Flowers, page 21)
Historic Photographs

Sugihara Nursery, Richmond, no date ("Growing a Community: Pioneers of the Japanese American Floral Industry" website)

Mt. Eden Nursery, Hayward, 1940s ("Growing a Community: Pioneers of the Japanese American Floral Industry" website)
Greenhouses at the former Sakai Nursery in Richmond, 2007; the site is now the location of the Miaflores Senior Apartments (Historic American Landscape Survey No. CA-6-B)

Unnamed nursery in Redwood City, no date (Nicholas Veronico et al., Redwood City (Then & Now), page 26)
SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

Record No.: 2017-012086ENV
Project Address: 770 WOOLSEY ST
Zoning: RH-1 RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, ONE FAMILY Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6055/001
Staff Contact: Alesia Hsiao, Senior Environmental Planner - 415-575-9044
Alesia.Hsiao@sfgov.org
Justin Grevig, Senior Preservation Planner – 415 – 575-9169
Justin.grevig@sfgov.org

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTAL:
To assist in the evaluation of the proposed project, the Project Sponsor has submitted a:

☐ Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination Form (HRD)
☒ Consultant-prepared Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE Part 1)


Staff consensus with Consultant’s HRE report: ☒ Agree ☐ Disagree

Additional Comments:
Planning Staff concurs with the HRE Part 1 provided by ARG including the statement of
significance and identification of character-defining features.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:
• Neighborhood: Portola/Excelsior
• Date of Construction:
• Construction Type: Wood-Frame
• Architect: Unknown/Robert Nordin
• Builder: Unknown

770 Woolsey, also known as the University Mound Nursery, is located in the Portola/Excelsior neighborhood and is generally situated amongst single family homes constructed during the 1920s and 1930 and during the 1950s and 1960s, as well as being directly east of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s University Mound Reservoir. The subject property encompasses the entire 2.2-acre city block bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west. The site was once an agricultural nursery and features 18 greenhouses arranged along a central walkway that runs north-south and acts as an axial spine for the site. The greenhouses are arranged lengthwise east to west with the short gable-ends of the greenhouses facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets and the long ends parallel to Woolsey and Wayland streets. As shown on figure 3 of the HRE, the greenhouses are numbered 1-10 moving north along Hamilton Street and 11-18 moving north.
along Bowdoin Street. Greenhouses 1 and 16-17 are partially collapsed. Although there are some minor variations in the greenhouses, most are approximately 30-34 feet wide and 110-120 feet long and are conjoined lengthwise at the base where the roof gables meet. The wood frame structures have gable ends supported by 4 rows of square wood studs set in narrow concrete foundations. Most buildings have a 2-foot tall wall covered in shiplap siding that sits on a 6-inch-high concrete foundation wall. The remaining walls and roofs of the greenhouses consist of sparsely framed wood studs that support simple glass panes measuring approximately 18 by 20 inches. No more than approximately 20 percent of the glass panes remain attached to the greenhouses as the rest have shattered or fallen on the ground.

Although the site is mostly occupied by greenhouses, the southern portion of the property is more open and contains a number of other ancillary agricultural structures. Facing Woolsey Street is a garage/storage building, mixing shed, water storage and pressure tanks, and a hand-dug well. Further east towards Hamilton is a boiler house, pesticide mixing tank, and a second hand-dug well. The northwest corner of the site is also not occupied by greenhouses and was the location of two water tanks that have since been demolished. See p. 3-15 of the HRE for a more detailed description of the site and individual features.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

☒ Category A – Known Historic Resource, per: ________________________________

☐ Category B – Age Eligible/Historic Status Unknown

☐ Category C – Not Age Eligible / No Historic Resource Present, per: ________________________________

Adjacent or Nearby Historic Resources:  ☒ No    ☐ Yes: ________________________________

770 Woolsey is located east of the SFPUC University Mound Reservoir, which is part of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System.

CEQA HISTORICAL RESOURCE(S) EVALUATION:

Step A: Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Significance</th>
<th>Historic District/Context Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:</td>
<td>Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1 - Event: ☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Criterion 1 - Event: ☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons: ☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons: ☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Period of Significance: 1925-1990

☐ Contributor ☐ Non-Contributor ☒ N/A

Analysis:

Preservation staff concurs with the HRE’s determination that the University Mound Nursery is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural
landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. Preservation staff also agree with the HRE’s conclusion that the subject property is eligible under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape of San Francisco. As a small-scale family-operated nursery 770 Woolsey represents an extremely rare property type for San Francisco and even the Bay Area.

The University Mound Nursery was owned and operated by the Garibaldi brothers and their descendants for almost 50 years. In 1921, 5 brothers – Vittorio, Antonio, Giovanni, Ernesto, and Gio Batta Garibaldi – purchased two city blocks from Bernard and Felicie Cassou and established the University Mound Nursery. The brothers first grew fields of flowers on the eastern block (not a part of the subject property), and slowly subdivided it so each brother could have a house, before finally selling off the remaining portion to be developed with houses between 1959 and 1962. On the western block (subject property), the brothers constructed greenhouses and by 1925 the Garibaldis had constructed two rows of 14 greenhouses along a central walkway (identified in the HRE as greenhouses #2-10 and #12-15) and the boilerhouse (a map of the subject property’s site features is located on p. of the HRER and is labeled as figure 1). A well was also dug on the site by this time (identified as hand dug well #1). By 1941 greenhouses # 1 and 11 had been constructed along with the pesticide mixing tank. According to building permits, the architect Robert Nordin was responsible for the design of 4 greenhouses that were built in 1951, but it appears only #16-18 were constructed during this time along with the water storage tank.

In 1958, Steve Garibaldi, the son of Giovanni and Matilda Garibaldi, and his cousin, Andrew L. Garibaldi, the son of Antonio and Assunta Garibaldi, purchased the subject property from the other brothers and continued the farming operation. Later that year the two cousins added the garage facing Woolsey Street and installed a fence around the perimeter of the site. The cousins were also responsible for the construction of the pesticide mixing shed (built sometime between 1963 and 1965), and the water pressure tank (built ca. 1960s or later). Since the nursery closed in the early 1990s the site has remained vacant but largely intact with the most significant change being the collapse of greenhouses 1, 2, and 15-17.

The University Mound nursery represents the significant contributions of the Italian farmers in the Portola neighborhood and it is estimated that this nursery was one of over 20 similarly sized nurseries operated by Italians in the Portola during the early to mid-twentieth century. The subject property represents but one part of San Francisco’s larger history as the center of an important cut flower industry that flourished during the twentieth century. In San Francisco the flower industry was dominated by three different groups that each had their own specialty: the Chinese were known for their asters, sweet peas, and pompons; the Japanese for their chrysanthemums and greenhouse cut flowers; and the Italians for their violets, ferns, roses, carnations, and other cut flowers. According to the HRE the Garibaldis were known particularly for their roses and Steve Garibaldi was known amongst the other flower growers as the “Rose King.” As one of the very last remaining greenhouses in San Francisco and the Bay Area, the subject property points to the Portola’s agricultural history that has all but disappeared in the urban environment.

The subject property also represents a significant property type that was once ubiquitous in neighborhoods like Portola and the Excelsior in San Francisco that have all but vanished. The HRE provides a detailed history of the greenhouse as an architectural typology and concludes that the subject property is significant under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape in San Francisco. Planning department staff agree that 770 Woolsey is a highly intact representation of an early twentieth century small-scale, family-operated commercial nursery that has become an increasingly rare property type.
The period of significance spans from 1921-1990 and encompasses the time from when the Garibaldi family purchased the subject property and began operation of the University Mound Nursery, up until 1990 with the death of Steve Garibaldi, as the nursery operation closed shortly thereafter and remained vacant.

### Step B: Integrity

| The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted in Step A: |
|---|---|---|
| Location: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | Setting: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Association: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | Feeling: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Design: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | Materials: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Workmanship: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |

**Analysis:**
In order to be determined eligible for the CRHR, the subject building must be found to retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance under Criterion 1 and 3. Planning staff concur with the HRE’s finding that the buildings and other structures retain all seven aspects of integrity. The site as it exists today remains largely unaltered since the Garibaldi family stopped cultivating roses there in 1990 and while a number of greenhouses may have collapsed and the buildings may be in poor condition, the site itself still retains a high degree of integrity. For a more detailed analysis of the 7 aspects of integrity, see p. 50-51 of the HRE.

### Step C: Character Defining Features

The character-defining features of the subject property include the following:

**Site**
- Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing
- Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner
- Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and the southern end
- Axial circulation through the site via a 9-foot wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site
- Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses

**Greenhouses**
- Rectangular plans with short gabled ends facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets
- Location in two parallel rows with the majority abutting each other
- One-story height
- Asymmetrical gable roofs
- Wood structural system with wood studs, rafters, and Mullions
- Perimeter concrete foundation
- Horizontal wood cladding along the base
- Sliding wood doors, some with concrete steps
- Louver panels with associated chains and sprockets
- Wood box gutters and metal downspouts
- Narrow concrete walkways adjacent to the exterior facades
Boiler House
- Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame building
- Asymmetrical gable roof with no overhand and rolled roofing
- Horizontal wood v-groove cladding
- Openings including hinged door on east façade, five-light wood-sash clerestory window on south façade, and wood louvered panels at gable ends
- Tall metal smoke stack

Garage/Storage Building
- Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame
- Shallow gable roof with wide eave overhangs
- Horizontal wood v-groove siding
- Garage doors on north and south facades
- Multi-light, steel sash windows on north and south facades

Mixing Shed
- Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame building
- Shed roof
- Vertical wood v-groove siding
- Hinged door on north façade
- Associated piping connecting to water storage and pressure tanks

Infrastructure
- All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and belowground, to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building

CEQA HISTORIC RESOURCE DETERMINATION:
☒ Individually-eligible Historical Resource Present
☐ Contributor to an eligible Historical District / Contextual Resource Present
☐ Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District / Context / Cultural District
☐ No Historical Resource Present

NEXT STEPS:
☒ HRER Part II Review Required
☐ Categorically Exempt, consult:
  ☐ Historic Design Review
  ☐ Design Advisory Team
  ☐ Current Planner
PART I: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Allison K. Vanderslice

Digitally signed by Allison K. Vanderslice
Date: 2020.05.04 16:00:28 -07'00'

Allison Vanderslice, Principal Preservation Planner
CEQA Cultural Resources Team Manager, Environmental Planning Division

CC: Kimberly Durandet, Senior Current Planner
    Alana Callagy, Senior Environmental Planner
Figure 1: Aerial view of 770 Woolsey showing key structures and buildings on site (image courtesy of HRE Part 1, p. 5)

Figure 2: View west of the northwest corner of Woolsey and Hamilton streets. (image courtesy of google maps)
Figure 3: View southeast of northwest corner of site at the intersection of Wayland and Bowdoin streets (SF Planning Department)

Figure 4: View west of the south elevation of greenhouse #11 (SF Planning Department)
Figure 5: Interior view of greenhouses (SF Planning Department)

Figure 6: Although the site has been vacant since the 1990s roses continue to grow in some areas (SF Planning Department)
PART II HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION RESPONSE

Record No.: 2017-012086ENV
Project Address: 770 Woolsey
Zoning: RH-1 RESIDENTIAL – House, ONE FAMILY Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6055/001
Staff Contact: Justin Greving, Senior Preservation Planner – (628) 652 – 7553
Justin.greving@sfgov.org

PART I: Historic Resource Summary

As stated in the Historic Resource Evaluation Response Part 1 dated May 4, 2020 (HRER Part 1), the subject property at 770 Woolsey, University Mound Nursery, is individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. 770 Woolsey is also eligible under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape of San Francisco. As a small-scale family-operated nursery 770 Woolsey represents an extremely rare property type for San Francisco and even the Bay Area. The period of significance spans from 1921-1990 and encompasses the time from when the Garibaldi family purchased the subject property and began operation of the University Mound Nursery, up until 1990 with the death of Steve Garibaldi, as the nursery operation closed shortly thereafter and remained vacant. The site as it exists today remains largely unaltered since the Garibaldi family stopped cultivating roses there in 1990 and while a number of greenhouses may have collapsed and the buildings may be in poor condition, the site itself still retains a high degree of integrity.

Character-defining features of the subject property include the following:

Site
- Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing
- Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner
- Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and the southern end
- Axial circulation through the site via a 9-foot wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site
- Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses

Greenhouses
- Rectangular plans with short gabled ends facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets
- Location in two parallel rows with the majority abutting each other
- One-story height
• Asymmetrical gable roofs
• Wood structural system with wood studs, rafters, and mullions
• Perimeter concrete foundation
• Horizontal wood cladding along the base
• Sliding wood doors, some with concrete steps
• Louver panels with associated chains and sprockets
• Wood box gutters and metal downspouts
• Narrow concrete walkways adjacent to the exterior facades

Boiler House
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame building
• Asymmetrical gable roof with no overhand and rolled roofing
• Horizontal wood v-groove cladding
• Openings including hinged door on east façade, five-light wood-sash clerestory window on south façade, and wood louvered panels at gable ends
• Tall metal smoke stack

Garage/Storage Building
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame
• Shallow gable roof with wide eave overhangs
• Horizontal wood v-groove siding
• Garage doors on north and south facades
• Multi-light, steel sash windows on north and south facades

Mixing Shed
• Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood-frame building
• Shed roof
• Vertical wood v-groove siding
• Hinged door on north façade
• Associated piping connecting to water storage and pressure tanks

Infrastructure
• All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and belowground, to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building

PART II: Project Determination:

Based on the Historic Resource Evaluation in Part I and the assessment below, the project’s scope of work:

☑ Will cause a significant impact to the individual historic resource as proposed.
☐ Will cause a significant impact to a historic district / context as proposed.
☐ Will not cause a significant impact to the individual historic resource as proposed.
Will not cause a significant impact to a historic district / context as proposed.

**PART II: Project Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project:</th>
<th>Per Drawings Dated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Demolition / New Construction ☐ Alteration</td>
<td>10/27/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project includes demolition of almost all existing structures on the site (including the perimeter wood fence), and the construction of 62 dwelling units comprised of 31 duplexes. The project will also include 62 parking spaces. The southeast corner of the site is to be used as an open space that will retain or rebuild some character-defining features of the site including the boiler house and greenhouses 1 and 2.

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

| The proposed project’s conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Standard 1 – Minimal Change: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 2 – Maintain Character: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 3 – Avoid Conjecture: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 4 – Acquired Significance: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 5 – Building Techniques: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 6 – Repairment: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 7 – Treatments: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 8 – Archaeology: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 9 – Compatibility: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |
| Standard 10 – Reversibility: | ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A |

**PROJECT IMPACT ANALYSIS**

While the majority of the character-defining site features on the site will be removed as part of the proposed project, there are a few that will be retained. The topography that slopes gently from the northwest to the southeast corner will not be removed as part of the proposed project. Additionally, the axial circulation pattern through the site will be partially maintained through the location of the duplexes around a landscaped center portion of the site, although this landscaped portion will not be the same width of the existing axial circulation, nor is it the same length. Additionally, there is an intention to protect the existing rose plants on the site so that they could be replanted or incorporated within the landscape plan in some way. However, all other character-defining site features will be removed as part of the proposed project.

Most of the structures on the site are proposed to be demolished, including greenhouses 3-18, the garage/storage building, and the mixing shed. Greenhouses 1 and 2 and the boiler house are proposed to be retained or reconstructed with the same dimensions and in their same locations.

The boundary of the site that is enclosed mostly by wood fencing will be removed, as will the spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end. While the open space at the southeastern end of the site will be retained and used as a park, the open space at the southwestern corner will be developed.
All of the character-defining infrastructure is also proposed to be removed, including the two-hand dug wells, water storage tank, water pressure tank, pesticide mixing tank, the system of piping (above and below ground), and the water drainage channel along the central pathway.

Despite the retention of some character-defining site features, the majority of the character-defining site features, buildings, and infrastructure will be removed as part of the proposed project. While some features related to the site’s agricultural history will remain, the extensive removal of most character-defining features combined with the development of 62 units of housing across the site is such that 770 Woolsey will no longer be able to convey its historical significance as a cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood and as a rare vernacular cultural landscape in the form of a family-operated nursery. The extensive demolition will remove historic materials, features, and spaces that characterize the property and would result in physical destruction, damage or alteration such that the significance of the individual historical resource would be materially impaired. As such, staff finds that the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable impact to 770 Woolsey Street.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Because it is determined that the proposed project will cause a significant unavoidable impact to 770 Woolsey Street, the Department requires the following Mitigation Measures to reduce impacts to the historic resource. Although these measures may reduce impacts to historic resources through the documentation of the affected property and presentation of the findings to the community, they will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Only avoidance of substantial adverse changes would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Although the following mitigation measures have been identified they may be amended and additional measures may be required as the project develops.

Mitigation Measure 1: Documentation of Historical Resource(s)
Mitigation Measure 2: Interpretive Program
Mitigation Measure 3: Salvage Plan
Mitigation Measure 4: Retention of Roses
The project sponsor will protect the existing roses that are currently growing on the site and will relocate them off site prior to any demolition. The roses will be incorporated into the landscape plan as well as the interpretation plan.

CONCLUSION
Although these mitigation measures may reduce impacts to historic resources through the documentation of the affected property and presentation of the findings to the community, they will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Only avoidance of substantial adverse changes would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the impact to the identified historic resource at 770 Woolsey will be significant and unavoidable.
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1. INTRODUCTION

At the request of the San Francisco Planning Department and the project sponsor L37 Partners, Architectural Resources Group (ARG) has prepared this Preservation Alternatives Analysis for the proposed project at 770 Woolsey Street (Block 6055, Lot 001) in San Francisco. The subject property encompasses the entire block bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Woolsey Street to the south, and Bowdoin Street to the west in the Portola neighborhood. The property contains greenhouses and other infrastructure that were operated as the University Mound Nursery by the Garibaldi family for seven decades (Figure 1). Founded in 1921, the Garibaldi family operated this successful small-scale nursery, growing a variety of flowers for the thriving cut flower market in San Francisco until the early 1990s. Over time, other cut flower nurseries in the Portola neighborhood were demolished, leaving the University Mound Nursery as the sole example of this property type that characterized the neighborhood landscape for nearly a century.

Figure 1. Site map of 770 Woolsey Street with construction dates for extant and demolished features (Pictometry, amended by author)
In March 2019, ARG prepared an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) Part 1 report for 770 Woolsey Street and found that the property qualifies for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) under Criteria 1 and 3 as a significant cultural landscape comprised of an early twentieth century nursery established by Italian immigrants in the Portola neighborhood. Despite remaining vacant for the past three decades, it retains a high level of integrity.\(^1\) In May 2020, the San Francisco Planning Department issued an Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) Part I memo, concurring with the statement of significance, eligibility for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3, and identification of character-defining features presented in the March 2019 HRE Part 1 report.\(^2\) As such, the property is an individual historical resource for the purposes of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The proposed project includes the demolition of almost all existing structures on the site (including the perimeter wood fence) and the construction of 62 dwelling units comprised of 31 duplexes. The project will also include 62 parking spaces. The southeast corner of the site will be used as open space that will retain or rebuild some character-defining features of the site, including Greenhouses #1 and #2 and the boiler house. In November 2020, the San Francisco Planning Department issued an HRER Part II memo (Project Evaluation) that concludes that the proposed project does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and therefore constitutes a significant impact to the historical resource under CEQA. The memo also includes a revised list of character-defining features.\(^3\)

This report analyzes two preservation alternatives to the proposed project to be included in the 770 Woolsey Street Environmental Impact Report (EIR): the Full Preservation Alternative and the Partial Preservation Alternative. Alternatives to a proposed project are developed to consider alternate schemes that would avoid or lessen significant project impacts resulting from demolition, additions, and related new construction.\(^4\) This report provides a description for both alternatives and an evaluation of impacts associated with each alternative. It also discusses the alternatives considered but rejected. Graphics illustrating the proposed project and preservation alternatives are appended.

**Methodology**

The preservation alternatives presented in this report were developed with input from ARG, project sponsor L37 Partners, and project architects IwamotoScott Architecture. Development of the alternatives has also been completed under the direction of the San Francisco Planning Department. This analysis focuses on the treatment of the existing historical resource at 770 Woolsey Street, proposed alterations and new construction under the Full Preservation and Partial Preservation Alternatives, as well as the impacts of these changes on the character-defining features of the resource.

---


\(^3\) San Francisco Planning Department, “Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part II: Project Evaluation, 770 Woolsey Street, Record No. 2017-012086ENV,” November 9, 2020, and summary of the project description provided by the project sponsor.

delineated in Section 2. The Full Preservation and Partial Preservation Alternatives are evaluated for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

*California Environmental Quality Act*

This analysis examines the character-defining features that would be affected by each proposed alternative, and then determines whether the alternative would cause a significant impact to the historical resource per CEQA. To evaluate potential impacts of each alternative, this memorandum draws primarily on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, “Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources.” Relevant sections are presented below:

(b) A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

(1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

(2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

(3) Generally, a project that follows the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* or the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (1995, revised 2017), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.5

*Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (Standards) are a series of concepts developed by the U.S. Department of the Interior to assist in the continued preservation of a property’s historical significance through the preservation of character-defining materials and features. They are intended to guide the appropriate maintenance, repair, and replacement of historic materials and to direct the design of compatible new additions or alterations to historic buildings. The Standards are used by federal, state, and local agencies to review both federal and nonfederal rehabilitation proposals.

In California, properties listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the California Register or a local historic register qualify as historical resources under CEQA and must be considered in the environmental review process. (Resources formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places are automatically listed in the California Register.) In general, a project involving a historical resource that has been determined to comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards can be considered a project that will not cause a significant impact on the historical resource per CEQA.

The Standards offer four approaches to the treatment of historic properties—preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. The Standards for Rehabilitation (codified in 36 CFR 67 for use in the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program) address the most prevalent treatment. Rehabilitation is defined as “the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values.” The ten Standards for Rehabilitation are:

1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

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

3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7) Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8) Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

---

9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

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.

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following statement of significance and description of the period of significance for 770 Woolsey Street have been excerpted from the March 2019 HRE Part 1 report. The revised list of character-defining features has been excerpted from the November 2020 HRER Part II memo.

Statement of Significance

The University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street is eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 as a significant cultural landscape associated with the agricultural settlement of the Portola neighborhood by the Italian American community in the early twentieth century. In addition to dairies and vegetable and duck farms, Portola became home to upward of twenty small-scale, family-run nurseries established by Italian immigrants. By operating efficiently within one to two city blocks, employing family members, and living on site, Italian flower growers in the Portola earned a profit and in turn, sustained San Francisco’s thriving cut flower market in conjunction with Japanese and Chinese growers. The five Garibaldi brothers, who had emigrated from Genoa, Italy, in the preceding decades, founded the University Mound Nursery shortly after purchasing two adjacent blocks in the Portola neighborhood in 1921. The family operated the nursery for nearly seventy years, thereby contributing both to the neighborhood’s and San Francisco’s floriculture industry.

Additionally, the subject property is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 as a rare vernacular cultural landscape in San Francisco. The city’s early twentieth century nurseries were efficiently laid out with fields of flowers, rows of greenhouses accessed by narrow walkways, ancillary buildings clustered together, and single-family homes located at the margin. Although only the western portion of the nursery survives, it retains the compact spatial layout, orderly rows of greenhouses serrated with gable roofs, hand-dug wells, and small-scale buildings, including the original boiler house with its distinctive smokestack. The small-scale, family-operated commercial nursery is an extremely rare property type, both in the city and the San Francisco Bay Area, with the majority of the nurseries demolished and redeveloped for other uses.

The property was found ineligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2. The five founding Garibaldi brothers, followed by the second generation, Steve and Andrew Garibaldi, operated a successful, family-owned nursery, growing roses and other plants for the cut flower market in San Francisco and beyond. Although they operated a successful business in San Francisco, the Garibaldi family members are not known to have made broader contributions to the cut flower industry or to the Italian American community in San Francisco. Rather their contributions to the industry and settlement of the Portola neighborhood are best reflected under Criterion 1. Therefore, the subject property does not appear to meet the threshold for listing in the California Register under this criterion.
Period of Significance

The period of significance spans from 1921 when the Garibaldi brothers purchased the property to 1990 when the third generation flower-grower Steve Garibaldi unexpectedly passed away, and the business closed shortly thereafter. Despite the vacancy of the subject property since the early 1990s, the former University Mound Nursery at 770 Woolsey Street retains a high level of integrity. The majority of the greenhouses; the boiler house and other support buildings; surviving rose plants; unpaved surface; and layout and circulation pattern of the site remain intact.

Character-defining Features

A character-defining feature is an aspect of a building or structure’s design, construction, or detail that is representative of its function, type, or architectural style. Generally, character-defining features include specific building systems, architectural ornament, construction details, massing, materials, craftsmanship, site characteristics, and landscaping built or installed within the period of significance. In order for an important historic property to retain its significance, its character-defining features must be retained to the greatest extent possible.

Character-defining features of 770 Woolsey Street include those pertaining to the overall site as well as individual buildings and structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and southern end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial circulation through the site via a nine-foot-wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenhouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular plans with the short gabled ends facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location in two parallel rows with the majority abutting each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-story height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical gable roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood structural system with wood studs, rafters, and mullions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter concrete foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal wood cladding along the base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding wood doors, some with concrete steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louver panels with associated chains and sprockets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood box gutters and metal downspouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow concrete walkways adjacent to the exterior façades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boiler House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical gable roof with no overhang and rolled roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal wood v-groove cladding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Openings, including hinged door on the east façade, five-light wood-sash clerestory window on the south façade, and wood louvered panels at the gable ends

Tall metal smoke stack

**Garage/Storage Building**
- Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame
- Shallow gable roof with wide eave overhang
- Horizontal wood v-groove siding
- Garage doors on the north and south façades
- Multi-light, steel sash windows on the north and south façades

**Mixing Shed**
- Rectangular plan, one-story height, wood frame
- Shed roof
- Vertical wood v-groove cladding
- Hinged door on the north façade
- Associated piping connecting to water storage and pressure tanks

**Infrastructure**
- All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and belowground, to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building

### 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**Project Sponsor’s Objectives**
The project sponsor would like to achieve the following objectives by undertaking the proposed project:

- Develop a mixed-income residential development consistent with and maximize housing density pursuant to the Planning Code within project site constraints and incorporating on-site affordable units.
- Replace an abandoned commercial cut-flower lot with residential uses and design consistent with the surrounding Portola neighborhood without displacement.
- Contribute to the city’s goal as designated in the General Plan of maximizing housing potential in keeping with the character of the Portola District neighborhood.
- Provide public open space and replicate some site conditions to preserve elements of the historical uses.
- Provide adequate light and air to all housing units in the new development.
- Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the equity and debt returns as required by investors and lenders without public subsidy.
Project Sponsor’s Description
The following project description was provided by the project sponsor:

- The majority of the existing greenhouses and associated buildings and structures would be demolished, and the site would be developed with 62 duplex units and public and private open space. The project would result in approximately 124,900 square feet of residential area consisting of three-story attached duplexes.

- The design of the new residential architecture would reference the existing asymmetrical gable rooflines of the greenhouses and the rhythm of existing neighborhood homes’ rectangular fenestration.

- Private open space landscaping would consist of a central spine similar to the existing central pathway between the existing greenhouses.

- Approximately 16,320 square feet of public open space would be developed at the corner of Woolsey and Hamilton streets (southeast corner of the site). Greenhouses #1 and #2 and the boiler house would be rebuilt in the original size and location.

- Surviving rose plants would be replanted throughout the site.

4. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

Description of the Alternative
The following description summarizes the Full Preservation Alternative. The graphic package detailing this alternative is appended to this document.

- Twenty-four housing units featuring the same architecture and massing as the proposed project would be developed on the west side of the lot fronting Bowdoin and Wayland streets. The new housing would be bordered by Greenhouse #11 to the south and the central pathway to the east.

- The duplexes facing Bowdoin Street would be arranged in tandem (with a front and rear unit) in parallel rows complementing the existing orientation and arrangement of the greenhouses. The new duplexes fronting Wayland Street would form a slightly taller, denser massing than those fronting Bowdoin Street.

- Greenhouses #12, #13, #14 and #18 and remnants of Greenhouses #15-17 would be demolished, because they are located within the footprint of the new housing.

- Approximately 1.45 acres open space with existing greenhouses (Greenhouses #1-10 and #11) and other contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features (including the boiler house, garage/storage building, pesticide mixing tank, water pressure tank, water storage tank, pesticide mixing tank, and two hand-dug wells) would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

- The portion of the property that would be retained, including the greenhouses, would be given a compatible new use, such as community garden space.
- Surviving rose plants would be replanted within the site.

The Full Preservation Alternative would retain the majority of the character-defining features of the site, including the majority of the greenhouses, central pathway, and the ancillary buildings, structures, and small-scale features at the south end of the property. The character-defining features specific to the greenhouses and individual buildings and structures would be retained in the surviving buildings and structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character-defining Feature</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Partially Retained</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary encompassing the entire block</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography that slopes from the northwest to southeast corner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial organization of greenhouses, ancillary buildings, and open spaces</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial circulation through the site via a nine-foot-wide pathway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving rose plants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis for Conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation

The following section evaluates the Full Preservation Alternative for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Standard 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

The portion of the property that would be retained would be given a compatible new use, such as community garden space. The horticultural use of the site would not require modifications to the character-defining features beyond rehabilitating the existing buildings, structures, and small-scale features within the boundary of the proposed public open space. The majority of the character-defining features, including Greenhouses #1-11 and the supporting infrastructure, including water and pesticide storage and conveyance, would remain. Site circulation, including the central pathway and the open space at the south end of the property, would be retained. The retention of the full row of greenhouses along Hamilton Street would convey the overall scale of the site and the massing and distinctive repetition of the gable roofs of the structures. The new housing would be developed in the northwest quadrant of the site, within a rectangular footprint that conforms to the existing footprint of the greenhouses. The greenhouses proposed for demolition include three that have already collapsed (#15-17). As such, the proposed location of new construction maximizes the retention of intact character-defining features. Although the Full Preservation Alternative would physically alter the site and result in the demolition of some contributing greenhouses, the overall historic character of the site would remain. It would be evident that the entire block had functioned as a nursery.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.
Standard 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

See the discussion under Standard 1. The proposed project would retain the majority of the character-defining features. The majority of the historic greenhouses and all of the supporting structures and small-scale features, surviving rose plants, and the overall plan and circulation would remain. Although a row of greenhouses (#12-18) would be demolished, this area has been compromised through the collapse of three greenhouses (Greenhouses #15-17) following the site’s closure in the early 1990s. The historic character of the site would be retained despite the removal of some contributing greenhouses.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Conjectural features or other elements that would create a false sense of historical development are not proposed under this alternative. No new construction would occur outside of the footprint of the proposed new housing. No greenhouse infrastructure from other nurseries would be relocated to this property. Although the design has not been finalized, the new housing would appear contemporary and distinct from the historic nursery (as described below under Standard 9), such that it would be clear that it was not constructed by or associated with the Garibaldi family’s development and use of the site.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

The broad period of significance (1921-1990) encompasses all of the extant character-defining features. No new construction or alterations (beyond the physical deterioration of select buildings and structures) have occurred since the Garibaldi family closed the nursery in the early 1990s. As such, the property does not contain changes that have acquired significance in their own right.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

See the discussion under Standards 1 and 2. This alternative would retain the majority of the greenhouses and all of the other extant buildings, structures, and small-scale features. These character-defining features would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Thus, the construction material, features, and distinctive construction and craftsmanship for the majority of the site (including the character-defining features of individual buildings and structures listed above in Section 2) would be retained.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.
Standard 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Although a condition assessment has not been completed to understand the current condition and treatment recommendations, the character-defining features to be retained would be repaired when feasible. Features that are severely deteriorated (such as sections of the wood framing of Greenhouse #1) would be replaced using the same design, color, texture, and material of the original structures.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Although cleaning treatments, both chemical and physical, have not been determined, they would follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and would be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

The San Francisco Planning Department’s procedures for the treatment of archaeological resources would be implemented should these resources be encountered during construction of the Full Preservation Alternative.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

See the discussion above under Standards 1 and 2. No additions or exterior alterations the building, structures, and small-scale features to be retained are proposed. The new housing is located within a discrete footprint at the northeast quadrant of the site; this location would minimize the number of greenhouses to be demolished. Thus, the majority of the character-defining features would remain. Although the design has not been finalized, the new housing would complement the greenhouses by echoing the asymmetrical gable roofs while featuring a contemporary design. This would achieve a compatible design that does not explicitly replicate original building fabric.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.
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.

Response: This alternative would result in the irreversible loss of some character-defining features of the site. However, the majority of the features would be rehabilitated and the essential form and integrity of the site would be retained. The new housing would be detached from the contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features, and the removal of the duplex units would not impact the remaining character-defining features of the property.

The Full Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Impact Analysis under CEQA

Based on the analysis presented above, the Full Preservation Alternative appears to be in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. A substantial number of character-defining features of 770 Woolsey Street would be preserved and would convey the property’s historic significance. Under CEQA, a project’s impact will generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant if it complies with the Standards.

The Full Preservation Alternative would meet the following project objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a mixed-income residential development consistent with and maximize housing density pursuant to the Planning Code within project site constraints and incorporating on-site affordable units.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace an abandoned commercial cut-flower lot with residential uses and design consistent with the surrounding Portola neighborhood without displacement.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the city’s goal as designated in the General Plan of maximizing housing potential in keeping with the character of the Portola District neighborhood.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide public open space and replicate some site conditions to preserve elements of the historical uses.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate light and air to all housing units in the new development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the equity and debt returns as required by investors and lenders without public subsidy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

The following description summarizes the Partial Preservation Alternative. The graphic package detailing this alternative is appended to this document.

- Forty housing units of the same architecture and massing as the proposed project would be developed on the northern portion of the site, fronting Bowdoin, Wayland, and Hamilton streets. The new housing would be bordered by Greenhouses #3 and 13 to the south, and the central pathway would extend through the new construction.

- The duplexes facing Bowdoin and Hamilton streets would be arranged in tandem (with a front and rear unit) in parallel rows complementing the existing orientation and arrangement of the greenhouses. The new duplexes fronting Wayland Street would form a slightly taller, denser massing than those fronting Bowdoin Street.

- Greenhouses #4-10, #14, #18 and remnants of Greenhouses #15-17 would be demolished, because they are located within the footprint of the new housing.

- Approximately 0.9 acre of public open space with existing greenhouses and other contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features (including Greenhouses #1-3 and #11-13 and the boiler house, garage/storage building, pesticide mixing tank, water pressure tank, water storage tank, pesticide mixing tank, and two hand-dug wells) would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

- The portion of the property that would be retained, including the greenhouses, would be given a compatible new use, such as community garden space.

- Surviving rose plants would be replanted throughout the site.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain the some of the character-defining features of the site, including the majority of the greenhouses, central pathway, and the ancillary buildings, structures, and small-scale features at the south end of the property. The character-defining features specific to the greenhouses and individual buildings and structures would be retained in the surviving buildings and structures. Under this preservation alternative, however, the majority of the greenhouses would be demolished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character-defining Feature</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Partially Retained</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary encompassing the entire block</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography that slopes from the northwest to southeast corner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial organization of greenhouses, ancillary buildings, and open spaces</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial circulation through the site via a nine-foot-wide pathway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving rose plants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis for Conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation

**Standard 1.** A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Under the Partial Preservation Alternative, the portion of the property that would be retained would be given a compatible new use, such as community garden space. The horticultural use of the site would not require modifications to the character-defining features beyond rehabilitating the existing buildings, structures, and small-scale features within the proposed public open space. Site circulation, including the central pathway and the open space at the south end of the property, would be retained. However, the accommodation of a new residential use in the northern half of the site would require the demolition of the majority of the greenhouses (#4-10 and #14-18) and would result in a substantial change to the distinctive materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the site. In particular, the overall scale of the nursery operation and the massing and distinctive repetition of the gable roofs of the greenhouses would be diminished through the demolition of the majority of the greenhouses along Hamilton Street. The overall historic character of the site would be greatly compromised by the new housing development.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would not be in conformance with this Standard.

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

See the discussion under Standard 1. The proposed alternative would result in the loss of a significant number of the contributing greenhouses, resulting in a loss of the scale, spatial relationship, and historic material of these structures and compromising the integrity of 770 Woolsey Street. While the southern portion of the site designated as public open space would retain character-defining features that convey the site’s historic use as a nursery, the full use of the entire block as a commercial cut-flower operation would be irreversibly lost.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would not be in conformance with this Standard.

**Standard 3.** Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Conjectural features or other elements that would create a false sense of historical development are not proposed under this alternative. No new construction would occur outside of the footprint of the proposed new housing. No greenhouse infrastructure from other nurseries would be relocated to this property. Although the design has not been finalized, the new housing would appear contemporary and distinct from the historic nursery (as described below under Standard 9), such that it would be clear that it was not constructed by or associated with the Garibaldi family’s development and use of the site.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.
Standard 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

The broad period of significance (1921-1990) encompasses all of the extant character-defining features. No new construction or alterations (beyond the physical deterioration of select buildings and structures) have occurred since the Garibaldi family closed the nursery in the early 1990s. As such, the property does not contain changes that have acquired significance in their own right.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

See the discussion under Standards 1 and 2. This alternative would retain the character-defining features (including Greenhouses #1-3 and #11-13, the boiler house, garage/storage building, water and pesticide storage and conveyance systems, and other small-scale features) located in the southern portion of the property that would be converted to public open space. These buildings, structures, and small-scale features would be rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. However, the majority of the greenhouses at 770 Woolsey Street would be demolished, resulting in a significant loss of the distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques and craftsmanship that characterize the property.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would not be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Although a condition assessment has not been completed to understand the current condition and treatment recommendations, the character-defining features to be retained would be repaired when feasible. Features that are severely deteriorated (such as sections of the wood framing of Greenhouse #1) would be replaced using the same design, color, texture, and material of the original.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Although cleaning treatments, both chemical and physical, have not been determined, they would follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and would be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.
Standard 8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

The San Francisco Planning Department’s procedures for the treatment of archaeological resources would be implemented should these resources be encountered during construction of the Partial Preservation Alternative.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in conformance with this Standard.

Standard 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Although the design has not been finalized, the new housing would complement the greenhouses by echoing the asymmetrical gable roofs while featuring a contemporary design. This would achieve a compatible design that does not explicitly replicate original building fabric. However, as described above under Standards 1 and 2, the Partial Preservation Alternative would result in the destruction of the historic materials, features, and spatial relationships of the majority of the greenhouses. These structures are the most visually distinctive within the property and were integral to the commercial operation and success of the nursery. The overall massing and scale of the property and the majority of the architectural features of the greenhouses would not be preserved.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would not be in conformance with this Standard.

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.

Response: The new housing would be detached from the contributing buildings, structures, and small-scale features, and the removal of the duplex units would not impact the remaining character-defining features of the property. However, this alternative would result in the irreversible loss of the majority of the greenhouses, which are among the most important character-defining features of the site. Thus, the essential form and integrity of 770 Woolsey Street would be significantly impaired.

The Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would not be in conformance with this Standard.

Impact Analysis under CEQA

The Partial Preservation Alternative does not appear to be in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and would result in a greater visual and physical impact on the character-defining features of 770 Woolsey Street than the Full Preservation Alternative. Thus, the Partial Preservation Alternative would materially impair the historical resource and would not result in a project with a less than significant impact under CEQA.
This alternative would meet the following project objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a mixed-income residential development consistent with and maximize housing density pursuant to the Planning Code within project site constraints and incorporating on-site affordable units.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace an abandoned commercial cut-flower lot with residential uses and design consistent with the surrounding Portola neighborhood without displacement.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the city’s goal as designated in the General Plan of maximizing housing potential in keeping with the character of the Portola District neighborhood.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide public open space and replicate some site conditions to preserve elements of the historical uses.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate light and air to all housing units in the new development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the equity and debt returns as required by investors and lenders without public subsidy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Several preservation alternatives were considered but ultimately discarded, as described below. Graphics illustrating these alternatives are appended.

- The San Francisco Planning Department, project sponsor L37 Partners, project architects IwamotoScott Architecture, and ARG considered concentrating the new residential units at the northwest corner of the parcel (identified as “Full Preservation Alternative – Considered but Rejected” in the graphics package). The new housing would be located in a seven-story residential building over a partially subterranean basement. It would require the demolition of Greenhouses #12, #13, #14 and #18 and remnants of Greenhouses #15-17, because they would be located within the footprint of the proposed residential building. The remaining greenhouses and other contributing buildings, structures, small-scale features, rose plants, and the central pathway would be retained. Although this alternative would result in a similar unit count as the proposed project, it was rejected, because the tall building is out-of-scale with the historic greenhouses. The height and bulky massing is not visually compatible with the historic property.
• The San Francisco Planning Department, project sponsor L37 Partners, project architects IwamotoScott Architecture, and ARG considered constructing three-story buildings containing 40 duplex units (identified as “Partial Preservation Alternative – Considered by Rejected 1” in the graphics package). The new buildings would face Bowdoin and Wayland streets north of Greenhouse #11 and face Hamilton Street between Greenhouses #3 and #9. Six greenhouses (Greenhouses #1-3, #9-11) and the other contributing buildings, structures, small-scale features, rose plants, and the central pathway would be retained. This alternative was rejected, because it physically and visually separates Greenhouses #9-10 at the northeast corner from the cluster of greenhouses and ancillary buildings at the south end of the site. This could make the greenhouses prone to demolition in the future.

• The San Francisco Planning Department, project sponsor L37 Partners, project architects IwamotoScott Architecture, and ARG considered constructing 40 duplex units along the northern and western sides of the property (identified as “Partial Preservation Alternative – Considered by Rejected 2” in the graphics package). Greenhouses #1-6 and #11, along with the other contributing buildings, structures, small-scale features, rose plants, and the central pathway would be retained. The retention of Greenhouses #1-6 facing Hamilton Street would convey the scale, density, and rhythm of these structures. This alternative was rejected, because it does not create a cohesive group of greenhouses that would more easily be maintained as a community garden in the southern portion of the site.

7. CONCLUSION

Originally founded in 1921 as the University Mound Nursery and continually operated as a cut-flower nursery by the Garibaldi family until it closed in the early 1990s, the property at 770 Woolsey Street is a significant cultural landscape comprising an early twentieth century nursery established by Italian immigrants in the Portola neighborhood. As such, it qualifies for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3 and retains a high level of integrity.

The proposed project at 770 Woolsey Street would remove most of the property’s historic material and eliminate a significant number of historic features and spaces that characterize the historical resource. As such, it would not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and constitutes a significant impact to this historical resource.

Two alternatives have been developed to the proposed project: a Full Preservation Alternative and a Partial Preservation Alternative. This analysis finds that the Full Preservation Alternative would maintain the majority of the character-defining features of the historic nursery and therefore, would result in a less-than-significant impact on the historical resource at 770 Woolsey Street. The Partial Preservation Alternative would maintain the character-defining features of the existing historical resource in the southern section of the site, which would be converted to public open space. However, the proposed new construction in the northern section of the site would result in the demolition of the majority of the historic greenhouses. In contrast to the Proposed Project, the Partial Preservation Alternative would reduce impacts to the historical resource and meet several of the project objectives; however, it would not result in a project with a less than significant impact.
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Email (5/21/2020) from Justin Greving (Senior Preservation Planner @ SF Planning) Envisioned by IwamotoScott for Coordination

cdfs from the HRER Part 1 for reference and they are as follows:

1. Site
   1a. Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing (the boundary will be retained, but the fencing doesn’t necessarily need to be retained)
   1b. Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner (this will likely remain)
   1c. Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and the southern end (this will be partially retained but will not give the idea that the greenhouses filled the majority of the site as the NW corner of the site will be developed).
   1d. Axial circulation through the site via a 9-foot wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site (this should be kept)
   1e. Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses (these should be incorporated somehow but they can be moved)

2. Greenhouses
3. Boiler House
4. Garage/Storage Building
5. Mixing Shed
6. Infrastructure (All extant water and small-scale features (secondary), including two hand-dug wells; water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank; the system of piping, both above and below ground, to convey water, steam, and pesticides to the greenhouses; and the water drainage channel extending along the central pathway and terminating at the garage/storage building)

Under the Full Preservation Alternative we would want to see the following cdfs retained:

1. Site
   1a. Boundary encompassing the entire 240-foot-wide by 400-foot-long block and enclosed mostly by wood fencing (the boundary will be retained, possibly keep some of the fencing in areas where the greenhouses are to be kept)
   1b. Topography that slopes gently from the northwest to southeast corner (this will likely remain)
   1c. Spatial organization of greenhouses oriented along a central north-south axis and filling the majority of the site, ancillary buildings clustered at the southern end, and small open spaces at the northwest corner and the southern end (this will generally be retained in some sense in areas where the greenhouses are to be kept. But we understand the NW corner will not be retained)
   1d. Axial circulation through the site via a 9-foot wide pathway extending north-south through the center of the site (this should be kept)
   1e. Surviving rose plants within the greenhouses (these should be incorporated somehow but they can be moved)

2. Greenhouses (retain Greenhouses 2-10, probably also 1 and 11. Retention of 11 would allow for understanding the the greenhouses were stacked two deep on the site. Keep open space south of greenhouses 1 and 11 open. As Erica notes the team should be aware that #1 and #2 are in poor condition; #1 has largely collapsed but enough remains that it could be reconstructed. Another option is to salvage, rehabilitate, and shift some of the greenhouses south)
3. Boiler House (retain)
4. Garage/Storage Building (retain)
5. Mixing Shed (retain)
6. Infrastructure (of the infrastructure listed it would be important to retain one of the two hand-dug wells (likely #2 on the SE corner), and possibly not all of the tanks on the site (water storage tank; water pressure tank; pesticide mixing tank). I don’t think the existing piping needs to be retained in its entirety under this alternative, maybe some small pieces to demonstrate their function as it relates to the greenhouses that would remain under this alternative. And piping would be documented as part of mitigation).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
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Figure 1: Aerial view of 770 Woolsey showing key structures and buildings on site (image courtesy of HRE Part I, p. 5)

Figure 2: View west of the northwest corner of Woolsey and Hamilton streets. (image courtesy of google maps)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
1a. Site Boundary to be retained
3. Pesticide mixing tank (1938-1941)
1d. 9ft wide central pathway
1e. Surviving roses scattered around the site
1b. Topography that slopes gently from NW to SE corner
2. Greenhouses retained
3. Hand-dug well #2 (by 1938)
4. Two unidentified buildings (by 1938, demolished)
4. Windmill (by 1925, demolished)
4. Garage/storage building (1958)
5. Pesticide mixing shed (1963-1965)
5. Water storage tank (1953)
5. Water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or after)
3. Boiler house (by 1925)
4. Hand-dug well #1 (by 1925)
4. Two water tanks (by 1925, demolished)
4. Pesticide mixing shed (1963-1965)
Greenhouse #1 (1928-1938)
Greenhouse #2 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #3 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #4 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #5 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #6 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #7 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #8 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #9 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #10 (by 1925)
Greenhouse #11 (1925-1928)
Greenhouse #12
Greenhouse #13
Greenhouse #14
Greenhouse #15 (collapsed)
Greenhouse #16-17 (1951, collapsed)
Greenhouse #18 (1951)
Wayland St
Bowdoin St
Hampshire St
Woolsey St
770 Woolsey
Existing Site Condition
770 Woolsey
Page 4
EXISTING SITE CONDITION

1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED
1b. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
1c. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
1d. 9FT WIDE CENTRAL PATHWAY

2. GREENHOUSE RETAINED

3. BILER HOUSE (BY 1925)
3. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)
3. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)

4. TWO UNIDENTIFIED BUILDINGS (BY 1938, DEMOLISHED)
4. HAND-DUG WELL #1 (BY 1925)
4. WINDMILL (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)
4. GARAGE/STORAGE BUILDING (1958)
4. TWO WATER TANKS (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)

5. PESTICIDE MIXING SHED (1963-1965)
5. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)
5. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1950 OR AFTER)
5. WIRE STORAGE SHED (1950)

10.22.2020
FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

24 Residential Units

1d. 9FT WIDE CENTRAL PATHWAY

1e. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE

1b. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER

1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED

2. GREENHOUSE RETAINED

3. BILER HOUSE (BY 1925)

3. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)

4. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)

4. TWO UNIDENTIFIED BUILDINGS (BY 1938, DEMOLISHED)

4. HAND-DUG WELL #1 (BY 1925)

4. WINDMILL (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)

4. GARAGE STORAGE BUILDING (1958)

5. PESTICIDE MIXING SHED (1963-1965)

5. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)

5. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1960S OR AFTER)

1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED

1e. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE

1b. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER

2. GREENHOUSE RETAINED

3. BILER HOUSE (BY 1925)

3. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)

4. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)
1a. Site Boundary to be Retained

1b. Topography that slopes gently from NW to SE corner

1c. 9ft wide central pathway

1d. Surviving roses scattered around the site

1e. Surprising roses

2. Greenhouses Retained

3. Pesticide mixing tank (1938-1941)

3. Hand-dug well #2 (by 1938)

4. Windmill (by 1925, demolished)

4. Hand-dug well #1 (by 1925)

4. Garages/storage building (1958)

4. Two unidentified buildings (by 1938, demolished)

5. Water storage tank (1953)

5. Water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or after)

5. Pesticide mixing shed (1963-1965)

2. Greenhouses #1-6 retained

DUPLEX TYPE A (front and back units)

DUPLEX TYPE B (flats)

PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

40 Residential Units
1. Site boundary to be retained
2. Surviving roses scattered around the site
3. Topography that slopes gently from NW to SE corner
4. Two unidentified buildings (by 1938, demolished)
5. Hand-dug well #1 (by 1925)
6. Windmill (by 1925, demolished)
7. Garage/storage building (1958)
9. Water storage tank (1953)
10. Water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or after)
11. Surviving roses - scattered around the site
12. Topography that slopes gently from NW to SE corner

3. Biler house (by 1925)
4. Pesticide mixing tank (1938-1941)
5. Hand-dug well #2 (by 1938)
6. Windmill (by 1925, demolished)
7. Garage/storage building (1958)
9. Water storage tank (1953)
10. Water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or after)

PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE
40 Residential Units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Unit #</th>
<th>SF Planning Resubmission</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit #</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area (SF)</td>
<td>120,947</td>
<td>46,677</td>
<td>77,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1d. 9FT WIDE CENTRAL PATHWAY
4. TWO UNIDENTIFIED BUILDINGS (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)
4. HAND-DUG WELL #1 (BY 1925)
4. WINDMILL (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)
4. GARAGE/STORAGE BUILDING (1958)
4. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)
4. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)
4. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)
4. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1960S OR AFTER)
1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED
1b. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
1a. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
3. BILER HOUSE (BY 1925)
3. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)
3. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)
3a. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
3b. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
5. PESTICIDE MIXING SHED (1963-1965)
5. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)
5. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1960S OR AFTER)
1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED
1e. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
1a. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
5. PESTICIDE MIXING SHED (1963-1965)
5. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)
5. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1960S OR AFTER)
1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED
1e. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
1a. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
7 STORIES OF RESIDENTIAL FLATS OVER 1 STORY OF PARTIALLY SUBTERRANEAN GARAGE
63 Residential Units

FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

770 WOOLSEY
1a. Site boundary to be retained
1b. Surviving roses scattered around the site
2. Greenhouse retained
3. Pesticide mixing tank (1938-1941)
3. Hand-dug well #2 (by 1938)
4. Two unidentified buildings (by 1925, demolished)
4. Hand-dug well #1 (by 1925)
4. Windmill (by 1925, demolished)
4. Garage/storage building (1958)
5. Pesticide mixing shed (1943-1945)
5. Water storage tank (1953)
5. Water pressure tank (ca. 1960s or after)
1a. Site boundary to be retained
2. Greenhouse retained
3. Pesticide mixing tank (1938-1941)
3. Hand-dug well #2 (by 1938)

Partial Preservation Alternative - Considered but Rejected 1
40 Residential Units
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED 2

40 Residential Units

1a. SITE BOUNDARY TO BE RETAINED
1b. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER
1c. 9FT WIDE CENTRAL PATHWAY
1d. SURVIVING ROSES SCATTERED AROUND THE SITE
1e. TOPOGRAPHY THAT SLOPES GENTLY FROM NW TO SE CORNER

2. GREENHOUSES #1-6 RETAINED
   DUPLEX TYPE A (FRONT AND BACK UNITS)
   DUPLEX TYPE B (FLATS)

3. HAND-DUG WELL #2 (BY 1938)
3. BOILER HOUSE (BY 1925)
5. PESTICIDE MIXING TANK (1938-1941)

4. HAND-DUG WELL #1 (BY 1925)
4. TWO UNIDENTIFIED BUILDINGS (BY 1938, DEMOLISHED)
4. WINDMILL (BY 1925, DEMOLISHED)
4. GARAGE/STORAGE BUILDING (1958)
5. PESTICIDE MIXING SHED (1963-1965)
5. WATER STORAGE TANK (1953)
5. WATER PRESSURE TANK (CA. 1960S OR AFTER)

770 WOOLSEY

IWAMOTOSCOOT ARCHITECTURE
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED 2

40 Residential Units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL UNIT#</th>
<th>SF PLANNING RESUBMISSION REV 2</th>
<th>FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>FULL PRESERVATION ALT. - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED</th>
<th>PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED 1</th>
<th>PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. - CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL UNIT#</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS FLOOR AREA (SF)</td>
<td>120,967</td>
<td>46,677</td>
<td>129,366</td>
<td>77,795</td>
<td>77,795</td>
<td>77,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D: Availability of Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated August 26, 2020)
The San Francisco Planning Department has prepared a notice of preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) regarding the 770 Woolsey Street project. The notice of preparation is available for public review and can be accessed on the Planning Department’s website at: http://www.sf-planning.org/sfceqadocs.

You may participate in the public process concerning the project’s environmental effects by contacting Alana Callagy via email, phone, or by mail. You may also request a CD or paper copy by contacting Alana Callagy. Please also refer to the Project Description and Purpose of Notice sections below for more information.

Project Description

The project sponsor (140 Partners LP) proposes to demolish the existing structures at 770 Woolsey Street and construct 63 residential units, comprised of 31 duplexes and one single-family home, and 64 vehicle parking spaces accessed via 32 new curb cuts. The proposed residential buildings would range in height from approximately 30 to 40 feet in height. Of the 63 total units, 13 would be affordable housing units. The project proposes to regrade the project site and improve the right-of-way along the block’s street frontages, which would include four bulb-outs, adding a sidewalk along Wayland Street, filling an existing trench as well as adding a sidewalk and curb along Bowdoin Street, and adding street trees along the perimeter of the block. The
proposed project would also include an approximately 0.36-acre (15,500-square-foot) public park/community garden and approximately 19,700 square feet of private common open space for residents.

**Purpose of Notice**

The Planning Department has determined that an EIR must be prepared for the proposed project prior to any final decision regarding whether to approve the project. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. Preparation of an NOP or EIR does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or to disapprove the project. However, prior to making any such decision, the City must review and consider the information contained in the EIR prior to making such approval decision.

The department welcomes your comments concerning the potential environmental effects of this project. Your comments could focus on significant environmental issues regarding this project, information that would help the environmental analysis, or factors to consider in the environmental analysis.

If you work for an agency that is a Responsible or a Trustee Agency, we need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is relevant 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. We will also need the name of the contact person for your agency.

If you have questions or comments concerning this notice, please contact Alana Callagy, alana.callagy@sfgov.org or 628.652.7540 by September 25, 2020.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the commission or the department. However, the department may make all written or oral communications available, including submitted personal contact information, for inspection and copying upon request from the public. These communications may also be posted on the department’s website or in other public documents.
Attachment E: 770 Woolsey proposed project, prepared by the San Iwamotoscott Architecture, (dated October 28, 2020)
FAMILY HOMES: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AT 770 WOOLSEY STREET
APPLICATION TO THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
## Expanded Unit Summary

### Unit Mix - Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Lot Depth</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Unit #</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Bathrooms</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Car Parking</th>
<th>Class I Bike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**
- Bedrooms: 60
- Bathrooms: 30
- Garages: 30
- Car Parking: 30
- Class I Bike: 30
Gross Floor Area
Level 01

Site Plan - Parking

Rear Yard Diagram

An additional 25% of non-service Common Utility Open Space is provided on the Rear Plan and the Site, along with an additional 5.5% of Private Utility Open Space in the Courtyard located between levels 6.1 and 6.2 (Level 01).

Gross Floor Area
Level 02

[Diagram of Gross Floor Area Level 02]

Gross Floor Area
Level 03

[Diagram of Gross Floor Area Level 03]
Dwelling Unit Exposure Diagram
Level 02

Planning Code Section 160 requires that each dwelling unit street front be open to and visible from a small street of a way, sidewalk, or rear yard, or an appropriately scaled courtyard.

Usable Open Space Diagram
Level 01

Set back 70 feet & 30 feet from the property line for street front and rear yard exposure and for non-public open space for each unit.

Usable Open Space Diagram
Level 02 (No Open Space on Level 02)

Set back 70 feet & 30 feet from the property line for street front and rear yard exposure and for non-public open space for each unit.

Usable Open Space Diagram
Roof

Set back 70 feet & 30 feet from the property line for street front and rear yard exposure and for non-public open space for each unit.

Street Frontage Diagram

Unit Type B.1

Pedestrian Entry

Indicates proposed pedestrian entry, excluding the pedestrian entry, an entrance to the garage, a driveway, or a walkway is not visible from a small street of a way, sidewalk, or rear yard, or an appropriately scaled courtyard.

Entrance to Garage (Pedestrian Entry)

Indicates entrance to the garage, an entrance to the garage, or a walkway is not visible from a small street of a way, sidewalk, or rear yard, or an appropriately scaled courtyard.

Usable Open Space Diagram
Level 03 (Incl. for Unit Type B.2)

Set back 70 feet & 30 feet from the property line for street front and rear yard exposure and for non-public open space for each unit.
CURRENT SITE CONTEXT ANALYSIS

- Rhythm of Repetitive/ Layered Rectangular Fenestration with Proportionally Less Glass.
- Carved / Sculptural Volume
- Naturalistic Landscaping / Soft Edges
- Varied Rhythm of Varied Gables
- Asymmetrical Gable
THE SPINE (SEATING GROVE)
THE SPINE (RESPITE STROLLING PATH)
IWAMOTOSCOTT
ARCHITECTURE

LIGHT COLORED WOOD
WEATHERING STEEL

07B
08B
07C
07A
06
05
04
03
02
01

(E) GREENHOUSE WOOD (DECORATIVE)

DARK BROWN ANODIZED ALUMINUM

MEDIUM COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM

DARK COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM

DROUGHT TOLERANT VEGETATION

DARK COLORED SLATS

MEDIUM COLORED SLATS

LIGHT COLORED SLATS

WOOD SLATS

LIGHT COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM

CONCRETE

MATERIAL PALLETE

THE SPINE - EAST T ELEVATION

WOLSEY ST

WAYLAND ST

THE SPINE - EAST T ELEVATION

WOLSEY ST

WAYLAND ST

MATERIAL PALLETE

CONCRETE

LIGHT COLORED WOOD

WEATHERING STEEL

DARK BROWN ANODIZED ALUMINUM

MEDIUM COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM

DARK COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM

DROUGHT TOLERANT VEGETATION

DARK COLORED SLATS

MEDIUM COLORED SLATS

LIGHT COLORED SLATS

WOOD SLATS

LIGHT COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM
SOUTHERN ELEVATION - WOOLSEY STREET

NORTHERN ELEVATION - WAYLAND STREET

MATERIAL PALLETE

1. LIGHT COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM
2. MEDIUM COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM
3. DARK COLORED PLASTER OR FIBER CEMENT SIDING SYSTEM
4. DROUGHT TOLERANT VEGETATION
5. MEDIUM COLORED SLATS
6. LIGHT COLORED SLATS
7. DARK COLORED SLATS
8. DARK BROWN ANODIZED ALUMINUM
9. GREENHOUSE WOOD (DECORATIVE)
10. CONCRETE
INDICATES MAX BUILDING HEIGHT (H) IN THE CASE OF PITCHED ROOF, THIS INDICATES THE ELEVATION MIDWAY BETWEEN THE RIDGE AND THE POINT WHERE THE ROOF MEETS THE WALL.
Indicates max building height. In the case of a pitched roof, this indicates the elevation midway between the ridge and the point where the roof meets the wall.