DATE: February 6, 2019

TO: Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Historic Preservation Commission

FROM: Jonathan Vimr, Preservation Planner, (415) 575-9109

REVIEWED BY: Tim Frye, Historic Preservation Officer, (415) 575-6822

RE: Review and Comment for the proposed new construction at 1 Bush Street (City Landmark No. 183) Case No. 2018-014839COA

BACKGROUND

The Planning Department (Department) is requesting review and comment before the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) regarding the proposal to construct a new, fixed kiosk structure at the northwest corner of the subject property’s plaza. This plaza and the new kiosk will be located on the same parcel as the Crown Zellerbach building designated as City Landmark No. 183 under Article 10, Section 1004 of the Planning Code.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The subject property (parcel 0290/011) is developed with two buildings set amongst a sunken plaza: the twenty-story Crown Zellerbach tower that occupies much of the lot, and a one-story round banking pavilion at the southwestern corner of the lot. All three of these elements were designed by Edward Bassett of architecture firm Skidmore, Owings, & Merrill, with Hertzka & Knowles having contributed specifically to the International Style tower. The complex was constructed in 1959 to provide office space for the Crown Zellerbach Corporation, a banking/retail use in the pavilion, and public open space via the plaza. The complex was designated City Landmark No. 183 in 1987 for its association with a prominent San Francisco family and corporation; as the work of a master architectural firm; and as the first of San Francisco’s glass curtain wall towers and a prime example of the tower-plaza setting.

As described in the landmark designation case report, the property is characterized by features such as the glass curtain walls found at both buildings, the floating base of the tower, the overall composition of the structures within the plaza, and the materials and landscaping of the plaza itself, which Edward Bassett intended to have a Japanese character. This case report has been included as an attachment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Sponsor proposes to construct a 120-square-foot kiosk sited above and outside of the sunken plaza, within a small nook at the northwest corner of the property. The kiosk would house an automated coffee dispensing robot. No interior or exterior changes to the tower or pavilion are proposed.
OTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED

The proposed project is being brought to the ARC for review and comment prior to review by the HPC of a request for Certificates of Appropriateness pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project is currently undergoing environment review pertaining to its compatibility with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. No other environmental areas of concern were identified in the preliminary evaluation.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT

To date, the Department has received no public correspondence related to the proposed project.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Department seeks the initial feedback of the ARC regarding the design, materiality and relationship to the setting of the proposed new construction. Additionally, the Department seeks advice of the ARC with regard to compatibility of the project with Article 10 of the Planning Code, the designating Ordinance, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary’s Standards). The project involves proposed changes to a local landmark (Landmark No. 183). For efficiency, the Department is reviewing the proposal under the Secretary’s Standards unless the designating Ordinance or Appendix to Article 10 includes specific standards. The Department would like the ARC to consider the following information:

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

Standard #2
The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

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

Standard #10
New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: The proposed project would not destroy or damage any contributing elements of Landmark No. 183. Department staff will undertake a complete analysis of the proposed project per the applicable Standards as part of the environmental review and the subsequent Certificate of Appropriateness. In addition, Department staff will undertake additional analysis of the proposed project per the standards outlined in Article 10 of the Planning Code, specifically to assess the project’s conformance to the guidelines for new construction and compatibility with landmark sites.

Overall Form and Continuity: The kiosk itself will only occupy a 120-square-foot area, and will be located entirely outside of the sunken plaza in nook at the northwest corner of the lot. This portion of the property was previously occupied by a freestanding flower kiosk. Given this, the new construction will be clearly separated from the historic buildings and will result in no changes to the character of the plaza.

Recommendation: Staff believes that the new kiosk structure appears compatible with the overall form and continuity of the subject property.

Scale and Proportion: The new construction will occupy a 120-square-foot area located at the northwestern corner of the landmark site on an area previously occupied by a freestanding flower kiosk. The building’s overall height and massing are substantially reduced from those of the historic buildings. New construction will appear subordinate to the Crown-Zellerbach tower while relating to its overall form.

Recommendation: Staff believes that the new kiosk structure appears compatible with the overall scale and proportion of the subject property.

Fenestration: The facades of both the tower and pavilion consist of floor to ceiling curtain wall systems. While the alternatively perforated and glazed exterior of the kiosk does not achieve the same levels of transparency, it does acknowledge and relate to this characteristic while also providing differentiation for the new kiosk. Generally, the Department believes that the project’s overall fenestration is differentiated yet compatible with the adjacent landmark with regard to design, materials, and orientation.

Recommendation: Staff believes that the new kiosk structure appears compatible with the overall fenestration pattern of the subject property.

Materials: The exterior of the tower’s primary massing consists of floor to ceiling aluminum framed glass curtain walls with dark green tinted spandrels, while the stair projects perpendicularly from the southern elevation and is clad with glass mosaic tile. The glazed office portion of the tower visually floats atop masonry clad pilotis and a deeply inset lobby. The similarly curtain walled pavilion rests on a concrete base and is capped by a metal compression ring roof. As currently proposed, the new construction would largely be composed of metal, but perforated to acknowledge the ample transparency and lightness of the existing structures. This is particularly expressed through the roll up door on the west (front) elevation, which consists of glass panels set within a metal frame and will continue to reflect this focus on transparency even when the kiosk is closed.

Recommendation: Department staff generally finds that the proposed materials of the new construction will be compatible with that of the subject landmark property. However, the
Department recommends that the synthetic wood slats used as accents on the north and south (left and rear in per project plans) elevations be composed of metal with a powder-coated finish matching the color of the tower’s dark spandrels. Doing so would allow the new structure to more directly relate to and harmonize with the character of the property. Renderings of this approach are included as an attachment, but Department staff believes the color match needs to be further developed.

Although this synthetic wood is also proposed for the base of the café robot, Department staff believes that said robot represents a use-related fixture and is distinct from concerns related to the design of the new structure.

REQUESTED ACTION
Specifically, the Department seeks comments on:
- The project recommendations proposed by staff;
- The compatibility of the project with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

ATTACHMENTS
- Overhead Map
- Site Photograph
- Project Plans
  - Renderings of color change
- Crown Zellerbach Building, Landmark No. 183, Designating Ordinance
APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF PROPOSED KIOSK

Overhead Map

ARC Hearing
Case Number 2018-014839COA
1 Bush Street
1. STREET CORNER (BUSH ST & SANSOME ST)

2. PLAZA VIEW (BUSH ST)

3. PLAZA VIEW (SANSOME ST)

4. ACROSS STREET CORNER (BUSH ST & SANSOME ST)

5. ACROSS BUSH ST

6. ACROSS SANSOME ST

SITE PHOTO KEY

1/8" = 1'-0"
1. Mount outlets & switches that are above obstacles (e.g. counters) at 44" A.F.F.
2. Environmental controls shall be operable without grasping or twisting.
3. Fire extinguisher cabinets shall be installed so that both the handle of the cabinet and the handle of the extinguisher are located between 36" & 48" A.F.F. per the NFPA. Fire extinguisher cabinets shall be installed so that the top of the fire extinguisher is no more than 60" A.F.F.

2. Dimensions shown are maximum allowable.

1. PROVIDE SAFETY GLAZING PER CBC SEC. 2406.
2. All exit doors are to be operable from the inside without use of a key, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The maximum effort to operate exterior & interior doors is 5 pounds. Doors requiring more than 5 pounds of pressure to operate shall be equipped with power-assisted openers. Fire-rated doors are to operate with the minimum pressure to close and latch, not to exceed 15 pounds.
4. See accessibility diagram sheet for additional information on clearances & hardware.
5. Provide weather stripping per Title 24 for all exterior doors. Perimeter seal shall provide continuous barrier, with no visible gaps between the door and the frame or threshold.
6. Signage: All doors to receive signage, either on the door or on an adjacent wall as indicated. See floor plans & door schedules for call-outs & additional information.

1. PROVIDE SAFETY GLAZING PER CBC SEC. 2406.
2. All exit doors are to be operable from the inside without use of a key, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The maximum effort to operate exterior & interior doors is 5 pounds. Doors requiring more than 5 pounds of pressure to operate shall be equipped with power-assisted openers. Fire-rated doors are to operate with the minimum pressure to close and latch, not to exceed 15 pounds.
4. See accessibility diagram sheet for additional information on clearances & hardware.
5. Provide weather stripping per Title 24 for all exterior doors. Perimeter seal shall provide continuous barrier, with no visible gaps between the door and the frame or threshold.
6. Signage: All doors to receive signage, either on the door or on an adjacent wall as indicated. See floor plans & door schedules for call-outs & additional information.
WHEREAS, A proposal to designate the Crown Zellerbach Building at One Bush Street as a landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code was initiated by the City Planning Commission on March 19, 1981; and

WHEREAS, The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, after due consideration, recommended against landmark designation for the subject property at their meeting of April 15, 1981 based on the age of the structure and the fact that the building is not threatened; and

WHEREAS, The Landmarks Board did suggest a Structure of Merit listing for the building based on its architectural excellence and trendsetting importance in urban design; and

WHEREAS, On the basis of the case report titled The Crown Zellerbach Building which describes the architectural, historic, urban design and aesthetic importance of the structure, the Commission finds the Crown Zellerbach Building worthy of landmark designation:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, First, the proposal to designate the aforementioned structure, the Crown Zellerbach Building, One Bush Street, as a landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the City Planning Code is hereby APPROVED; the precise location and boundaries of the landmark site are Lots 11 and 12 in Assessor's Block 290;

Second, That the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the said landmark justifying its designation are set forth in the case report titled The Crown Zellerbach Building, approved by the City Planning Commission on June 4, 1981;

Third, That the said landmark should be preserved generally in all of its particular exterior features as existing on the date hereof and as described and depicted in the photographs, case report and other material on file in the Department of City Planning Docket No. L1181.13;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the proposal for designation, with a copy of this Resolution, to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of June 4, 1981.

Lee Woods, Jr.
Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Bieman, Karasick, Keileher, Klein, Nakashima, Rosenblatt, Salazar

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

PASSED: June 4, 1981
FINAL CASE REPORT  
APPROVED BY CPC: LANKMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD  
JUNE 4, 1981

BUILDING NAME: Crown Zellerbach Bldg. 
OWNER: New York Life Insurance Company

BUILDING ADDRESS: 1 Bush Street 
BLOCK & LOT: 290/11 & 12 
ZONING: C-3-0

ORIGIONAL USE: Office tower 
NO. OF STORIES: 20 
LPAB VOTE:

CURRENT USE: Office tower 
EXTERIOR MATERIALS: Aluminum, glass, concrete

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:
(Describe special CHARACTER, or special HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL or AESTHETIC interest or value;)

In 1959, the Crown Zellerbach Building was the first of San Francisco's post W.W.II office buildings to be built in a plaza surrounded by open space. As such, it was a major departure from the previous standard of lot line development.

This form of design represents the widely held 20th century view of cities as mechanical systems subject to comprehensive rational planning. Dating back to Le Corbusier's Voisin Plan of 1925 which proposed the demolition of a vast section of Paris to be replaced by towers and parkland, this concept is dramatically expressed in the redevelopment projects in most major American cities in the 1960's and 70's (Western Addition clearance, Yerba Buena, Embarcadero, and Golden Gateway Centers in San Francisco). Where this vast scale was not feasible or not attempted, "the tower in the park" approach became a standard model for architects and planners.(over)

(Evaluation criteria may be continued on back)

EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. ARCHITECTURE
1. Style: International Corporate
2. Construction Type: steel frame curtain wall
3. Construction Date: 1959
4. Design Quality: (LPAB ONLY)
5. Architect: Tower: Skidmore Owings and Merrill/Herzog and Knowles, 1959; (over)
6. Interior Quality: (LPAB ONLY)

B. HISTORY
(as building is significantly associated with specific)

7. Persons: The Zellerbachs are a prominent San Francisco family founded by Anthony Zellerbach (1832-1911) who came to California during the Gold Rush. He moved to San Francisco in 1868 where he became wealthy in the paper business.

8. FACTS: It is said that James D. Zellerbach, president of the family firm, wished to build a structure to reflect his gratitude to a city that had done so well by his family.

9. Patterns of History:
(cultural, social, political, military, economic or industrial) The structure reflects San Francisco's post W.W.II growth as a major point in national and international corporate economies.

C. ENVIRONMENT
(relation to surroundings, specifically in terms of:)

10. Continuity: Set in its plaza, the structure was a radical departure from traditional lot line development. The office tower in a plaza became the (over)

11. Setting: The tower, banking hall and plaza interact as a cohesive unit.


D. INTEGRITY
(cite alterations and physical condition)

Unaltered.

RATING

DCP: 3
NRE: ICCAY: N.A.
SEI/ID: ENV.: pp 43, 72, 236, 239
NAT'L. REGISTER:
NAT'L. LANDMARK:
STATE LANDMARK:

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
(List sources on back)

PREPARED BY: Jonathan H. Malone
ADDRESS: 180 Larkin
S.F., CA 94102
PHONE: 558-3533
DATE: 3/27/81

Revised 3/29/81
The widespread acceptance and application of this viewpoint is evident in San Francisco’s City Planning Code which, until recently, included provisions for sources in the allowable size of downtown buildings if the project included public amenities. Creation of widened sidewalks and/or plazas were among the list of possible amenities.

Construction of the Crown Zellerbach Building began the transformation of downtown San Francisco from the low-rise character of the first half of the 20th century (a product of cautious post 1906 earthquake reconstruction, Depression era economic limitations and W.W.II) to the much more dense, higher skyline of today.

5. Architect, continued


10. Continuity, continued

Favored design for high-rise construction through the 1960’s and 1970’s. In recent years the concept has been criticized for disrupting the continuity of street facades, blocking sunlight, aggravating wind conditions, and failing to relate to the character of the urban environment.

Bibliography

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 10931

WHEREAS, A proposal to designate the Crown Zellerbach complex and site as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code was initiated by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on November 19, 1986, and said Advisory Board, after due consideration, has recommended approval of this proposal; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission, after due notice given, held a public hearing on February 19, 1987 to consider the proposed designation and the report of said Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, The Commission believes that the proposed Landmark has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value; and that the proposed designation would be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes and standards of the said Article 10;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, First, the proposal to designate the aforementioned structure, the Crown Zellerbach complex and site, as a Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the City Planning Code is hereby APPROVED, the precise location and boundaries of the Landmark site being those of Lots 11 and 12 in Assessor's Block 290;

Second, That the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the said Landmark justifying its designation are set forth in the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Resolution 388 as adopted on November 19, 1986 and which Resolution is incorporated herein and made a part thereof as though fully set forth;

Third, That the said Landmark should be preserved generally in all of its particular exterior features as existing on the date hereof and described and depicted in the photographs, case report and other material on file in the Department of City Planning Docket No. 86.697L;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the proposal for designation, with a copy of this Resolution, to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on February 19, 1987.

Lori Yamauchi
Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Bieman, Hemphill, Karasick and Nakashima

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioners Rosenblatt and Wright

ADOPTED: February 19, 1987

JHM/chl/252
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:
The Crown Zellerbach Complex is significant by its association with a prominent San Francisco family and corporation; as the work of a noted architectural firm which has shaped design trends in this century; and as an aesthetically attractive open space resource.

Anthony Zellerbach (1832-1911) came to California during the Gold Rush, and to San Francisco in 1868. In 1870 he established a small stationery business, not far from the site of the current Crown Zellerbach building. The business grew into a forest paper products enterprise now deeply rooted the economic life of the United States and Canada. His grand-son James David (*"J.D." 1892-1963) worked in the family business at all levels, and ultimately became Chairman of the Board. A socially prominent and civic-minded San Franciscan, his concerns for the revitalization of the city found expression in the Blyth-Zellerbach Committee of 1955 which funded site plans (by SOM) for San Francisco's first redevelopment project: the Golden Gateway.

The San Francisco office of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (which opened in 1946) and Hertzka and Knowles were selected by Zellerbach to design a new headquarters for Crown Zellerbach. San Francisco had witnessed the construction of only one, the Equitable high-rise since 1930. Crown Zellerbach with its radical, elegant design and environmental departure from San Francisco's past marked the beginning of the largest revitalization of San Francisco since the earthquake of 1906. The resulting skyline is, today, largely dominated by various SOM buildings.

Noted architectural critics Sally and John Woodbridge describe the complex as "The first of the city's glass curtain-walled towers in the first and best of the tower-plaza settings. (The) Expensive wall of the tower, where the air-conditioning console is set-in to permit the glass to extend unbroken from the floor to above the ceiling, will never be done again. The same goes for the elegant but extravagant placement of the stairs in their own mosaic-clad tower, outside the office block. The playful form of the round bank is an integral part of the plaza composition".

EVALUATION CRITERIA
A. ARCHITECTURE
1. Style: International Style influenced. The term is derivative of the work of a group of innovative architects working mainly in Europe during the early 1920's.

2. Construction Type: Tower: Steel framed, curtain wall
   Pavilion: Compression ring roof structure steel, concrete, glass
   Plaza: Hand crafted, sculptural

3. Construction Date: 1959

4. Design Quality: Excellent. Its Composition, detailing, and (in this case) lack of ornamentation, combine with its originality and superb craftsmanship to produce a remarkable complex.

5. Architects: Tower: Hertzka & Knowles and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
   Pavilion: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
   Plaza: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
   Partner-in-charge of Design: Edward C. Bassett

6. Interior Quality: Excellent. Crown Zellerbach's interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship and detail are particularly attractive and innovative. Unfortunately the large Mark Adams mural in the 2nd floor dining room has been removed, or covered over, but the highly innovative "Rose" ceiling of the Pavilion remains intact.
B. HISTORY

1. Persons: The Crown Zellerbach complex is intimately associated with the Zellerbach family and the architectural firm Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, both of whom have made significant contributions to the community, state and nation.

J.D. Zellerbach was Chairman of the Board of the Crown Zellerbach Corporation, and served on several corporate Boards. As a Director of the American Trust (later Wells Fargo) Board, he caused construction of the banking pavilion for American Trust within the Crown Zellerbach complex. From 1948-1950, he was chief of the Mission to Italy for the Economic Cooperation Administration (Marshall Plan). He was an alternate U.S. delegate to the 8th General Assembly of the United Nations of 1953. From 1957-60 he was U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

Locally, he was Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development (1955), a director of SPUR, and head of the Blyth-Zellerbach Committee. He was also very active in cultural circles, as was his brother Harold. They established the Zellerbach Family Fund, source of donations toward Zellerbach Hall at U/C Berkeley and the Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall at Civic Center.

"Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (was) the architectural firm that, more than any other, was to influence American skyscraper design" in the "50s and '60s.3 "Since its opening, the San Francisco office of SOM has pursued in many of its works, formally diverse compositional solutions..... In these, the latent regionalism of the American West Coast is given reflection."4 In fact, the entire Plaza/Pavilion complex has a distinct Japanese character that is missing from SOM's east coast work. The distinguished Japanese sculptor Isamu Noguchi designed an early study for the Zellerbach Plaza, but it was not used. The existing Plaza with its "Japanese" character was designed entirely by Bassett. Other San Francisco works by SOM include Bank of America Headquarters, the Bechtel Headquarters, the Crocker Headquarters and the Federal Reserve Bank.

8. Events:

9. Patterns of History: Both the building and the corporate history of Crown are associated with and effectively illustrate broad patterns of cultural, social, economic and industrial history and the urban development of the City. Little changed in Depression and World War II era San Francisco. "But the change, when it did come, transformed the skyline completely. The next wave of large-scale construction adopted the internationally favored glass box. The first example of this new mode was the well-regarded Crown Zellerbach building. Constructed for a proud San Francisco-based paper company whose owners have long had an interest in fine architecture, the building introduced the notion of the tower in open space, first proposed by Le Corbusier in the late teens, to San Francisco."4

C. ENVIRONMENT

10. Continuity: With an entire city block used as a plaza for only two buildings, this project was a radical departure from traditional urban lot-line development.

While the complex may not contribute to the "continuity" of the street, it definitely meets the alternate criteria in its contribution to the "character" of the street and provides much-appreciated open space and light for the many surrounding buildings which are lucky enough to look down upon this sculptural plaza. It is of particular importance in establishing the character of the area.

11. Setting: Though now shadowed by many taller high-rises on the south side of Market Street, Crown Zellerbach Plaza remains a valued open space resource in the increasingly dense downtown area. The corner location adds to the prominence of the complex.
12. Significance as a Visual Landmark: In spite of its relatively small scale (or perhaps because of it), coupled with its quality design and generous open space, Crown Zellerbach is a conspicuous and familiar complex recognized as a corporate symbol for the Bay Area region.

D. INTEGRITY
13. The complex appears to be unaltered from its original design.

NOTES:

RATINGS
DCP: 3
HERE TODAY: N.A.
SPENDID SURVIV: Not rated due to age.
NAT'L REGISTER: -
NAT'L LANDMARK: -
STATE LANDMARK: -

PREPARED BY: Patrick McGrew
ADDRESS: 41 Sutter Street, Suite 208
San Francisco, Calif. 94108
PHONE: 981-2060
Edited by Staff
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JHM/ch1/226
Delivered Via Electronic Mail and Hand Delivery

Chair Jonathan Pearlman and Committee Members
San Francisco Architectural Review Committee
Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

Re:  One Bush Street
Planning Case No.: 2018-014839COA
Hearing Date: February 6, 2019
Our File No.: 10946.01

Dear Chair Pearlman and Committee Members:

This office represents CafeX Technologies, Inc. (“Project Sponsor”). Project Sponsor seeks to develop a 120 square foot semi-permanent modular building/kiosk with an automated coffee dispensing robot (the “Project”). The Project would be at the northwest corner of the lot near the southeast corner of the intersection of Sansome and Bush Street. The Project will provide the surrounding public and commuters with coffee beverages. The Project’s robotic operation, i.e., making coffee, would be entirely within the modular structure. Two ordering stations are outfitted with electronic pads for ordering beverages. After hours, the kiosk will be self-enclosed with sliding sides made of perforated metal and a transparent roll-down door. The structure would not be within the public right-of-way.

The Project will provide benefits to the City, including the following:

- **Development Conforms to Historical Use.** The Project respects the historical resources at the Property, namely the Crown Zellerbach Building. The Project will construct an attractive modular kiosk on the corner of the lot, which has historically been occupied by a neighborhood-serving retail kiosk as far back as 1961. (See Exhibit A)

- **Provides Sense of Past without Historical Misappropriation.** The Project has been designed with perforated metal siding to match the historical context of the Crown Zellerbach Building without creating a false sense of history.
• **Improves Area Safety.** The Project is located in a transit-rich area, a few hundred feet from a BART/MUNI entrance on west side of Sansome Street at the corner of Sutter Street and numerous MUNI bus line stops. The Project would create a safe space for pedestrian movement to conveniently procure a coffee beverage as they commute within the downtown area.

The Project will transform an underutilized corner of the Property that has historically been a neighborhood-serving retail kiosk. It will further activate the street corner at Bush and Sansome Streets and create a safer pedestrian experience. We look forward to presenting the Project to you on February 6, 2019. For all of the reasons stated herein and those listed in the applications, we respectfully urge the Architectural Review Committee to support this Project. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

[Signature]

Justin A. Zucker

Enclosure: Exhibit A – Kelly Consulting March 27, 2017, Memorandum

cc: Aaron Hyland, Committee Member
    Ellen Johnck, Committee Member
    Andrew J. Junius
EXHIBIT A
MEMO  March 27, 2017
To: Ann Akhromtsev, Tishman Speyers
From: Tim Kelley
Subject: Replacement/Relocation of One Bush Street flower stand

As I have reported, our research indicates the following history:

1. In 1960, shortly after the building complex opened, Skidmore Owings & Merrill designed a flower stand for the property. This stand is pictured in the attached clipping from the San Francisco Chronicle of November 3, 1960. Its location is described as "beside" the circular building. Our research has been unable to locate any drawings for this stand.

2. When the property was designated a City Landmark in 1987, the nomination included the entire property (parcels number 0290-11 and 12). A photograph attached to the nomination shows a kiosk at the corner of Market and Sansome, outside the perimeter wall of the property but apparently within the property line. A copy of that photo is attached. Although difficult to discern from the attached copy, I believe the photo shows the 1960 flower stand. The location appears to match that shown in the 1960 photo.

3. Regardless of whether the kiosk shown in the 1987 photo is the original 1960 design, it is a feature of the designated Landmark and its replacement in substantially accurate form and location should be encouraged by the Planning Department.

4. The existing flower stand at Bush and Sansome streets is not included in the 1987 designation and its removal would not diminish the integrity of the Landmark.

5. A project to remove the existing flower stand and install a reconstructed version of the 1960 stand at its original location should easily qualify for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Sincerely,

Tim Kelley Consulting
Historical Resources
New Sprout on Market

The newest structure to grace lower Market street opened for business yesterday.

It is smaller than a cable car, yet it is the joint venture of three giants—the noted architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (the design); Crown Zellerbach Corporation (the lease); and Wells Fargo Bank American Trust Company (the financing).

It's a flower stand, and it stands in floral splendor beside Wells Fargo American Trust's eye-catching circular bank, which stands beside Crown Zellerbach's imposing glass skyscraper.

Proprietors of the flower stand, Bob and Don Germano, are the sons of Sal Germano, who has run the flower stand beside the Wells Fargo American Trust Bank at No. 1 Grant for a quarter century.

San Francisco Chronicle November 3, 1960