

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

11:30 a.m.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Pearlman, Hyland

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Johnck

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY COMMISSIONER PEARLMAN AT 11:31 AM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Stephanie Cisneros, Frances McMillen, Allison Vanderslice, Tim Frye – Preservation Officer, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

A. COMMITTEE MATTERS

1. Committee Comments & Questions

None.

B. REGULAR

2. [2018-002022COA](#) (S. CISNEROS: (415) 575-9186)
SFDPW REPLACEMENT OF PATH OF GOLD LIGHT STANDARDS – located on Market Street from the Embarcadero to Octavia Boulevard (District 3, District 5, and District 6). **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee regarding a revised proposal to remove, replace, partially restore, and realign 236 of the 327 existing Path of Gold Light Standards (City Landmark No. 200) located in the public right-of-way. The project proposes to replace the landmarked light standards with larger components of the same style and design to accommodate new transportation infrastructure along Market Street. The project also proposes to restore and reinstall the existing trident top light fixtures and light globes. Additionally, some standards are proposed for removal.
Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Stephanie Cisneros – Staff presentation
 + Christine Olea – Project Presentation
 + Michael Levin – Gold color

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC COMMENTS**1. General**

- Commissioner Hyland requested confirmation that the material of the recast light standards would be aluminum and agreed overall with staff's recommendations for the proposed modifications to the project.
- Commissioner Pearlman questioned the original paint color based on public comment and recommended that the color of the proposed reconstructed light standards match the historical color based on one of the two periods of significance. He also concurred overall with staff's recommendations.
- Both commissioners directed staff to work with the project sponsor to compile different scenarios (through photo renderings and further clarification) for what potential options are for relocation of light standards – either with one out of alignment from the others or realignment of entire blocks on a block-by-block basis - and to provide the full HPC with reason(s) for each scenario at the time of the full Certificate of Appropriateness hearing.

2. The number of standards scheduled for relocation.

- Commissioner Hyland questioned the possibility of alignment to be matched on blocks where realignment is necessary. He also noted that when a single standard is not able to align with the rest of the standards, an analysis of whether re-aligning the entire block is a better solution, or if having the one out of alignment might be better for that particular location, and the HPC would be interested in seeing and opining the analysis and conclusion.

- Commissioner Hyland urged the project to include design for the entire length of the resource, and not end at the current project boundary. Even if the currently funded project can't address changes to the entire length of the resource, having a complete and holistic solution would be beneficial to guide future work in the remaining area. This would include a maintenance plan and/or a plan for addressing future modifications to the light standards located outside of the project boundary.
- In response to public comment that addressed the necessity of maintaining a linear alignment of street trees and light standards, Commissioner Hyland commented that having a stronger relationship between street trees and the light standards is better.
- Commissioner Pearlman commented on the limitations of relocating light standards based on other work proposed for the public-right-of-way (i.e. bicycle lanes, sidewalks, etc.) and posed the question of what makes the most sense when designing realignment based on these conflicts. He questioned the importance of alignment and directed staff and the project sponsor to spend more time looking at the best possible way to (re)align on a block by block basis.
- With regard to proposed spacing and rhythm, Commissioner Pearlman did not have an issue with variation of the distances between poles.

3. The number of standards scheduled for removal.

- Commissioner Hyland commented that he would be uncomfortable seeing the six poles currently slated for removal actually removed and is concerned about the need to remove more than six. He supported staff's recommendation to keep all light standards to the extent possible and would like to see the modified design and (re)alignment carried over to all light standards and not be limited to those within the project area.
- He also commented that the full commission would like to be able to evaluate the options for poles that need to be completely removed on a case-by-case basis to ensure removal is necessary and discuss options for potentially reusing them elsewhere.
- Commissioner Pearlman asked if relocation of removed poles is appropriate given that they would not fit in with the rest given that dimensions and design of the bases would not be the same. He also asked if removed poles could be used for maintaining the remainder of light standards continuing up Market Street outside of the project area that are not going to change as part of this proposal.

4. Project compliance with *Discrimination by Omission: Issues of Concern for Native Americans in San Francisco*, a report published by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission in 2007.

- Both commissioners agreed with Staff's recommendation that the project sponsor should produce a plan for addressing the design of the clamshell bases in coordination with Planning staff, the Arts Commission and the Native American Community.

3. [2014.0012E](#)

(F. MCMILLEN: (415) 575-9076)

BETTER MARKET STREET – 2.2 mile section of Market Street from the Embarcadero to Octavia Boulevard (District 3, District 5, and District 6). **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee on the proposed preservation alternatives in advance of the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the project. The project proposes to redesign and provide transportation and streetscape upgrades, including changes to roadway configuration, traffic signals, public transit lanes and stops, and streetscape features and furnishings along a 2.2 mile stretch of Market Street between Steuart Street and Octavia Boulevard. The project proposes to partially restore, reconstruct, and realign the Path of Gold (City Landmark No. 200) light standards to accommodate new OCS to increase transit service along Market Street; remove or alter several streetscape features, including the red brick sidewalk and plazas, granite curbs, street trees, traffic signals and signage.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Frances McMillen – Staff presentation
 + Christina Olea – Project presentation
 + Nicole Vaughn – Accessibility issues
 = Allison Vanderslice – Preservation alternatives

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC Comments

General

- The Commissioners acknowledged the challenge of developing the alternatives while meeting Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and project objectives.
- Commissioner Pearlman remarked that the brick paving and the granite curbs are part of the evolution of Market Street, noting that prior to their installation the sidewalks and curbs were another material and Market Street continued to function as it has historically. The Commissioner further stated that we have to retain Market Street's character, but our needs today, such as the needs of cyclists, and in the future, are different from what they were in 1979, when the brick was installed.
- Commissioner Pearlman noted that accessibility is a significant issue, particularly in mid-Market, and the street has to be accessible as is feasible.

Path of Gold

The project includes the proposed relocation or removal of up to 24.6% of the Path of Gold light standards and modifying the *Winning the West* imagery on the bases to comply with the 2007 San Francisco Human Rights Commission report: *Discrimination by Omission: Issues of Concern for Native Americans in San Francisco*.

On January 16, 2019 Staff presented the ARC with the following recommendations as part of the review and comment on the Certificate of Appropriateness:

- If complete retention of the landmark in place and in its entirety cannot be achieved, a single realignment of all standards within the project area should be explored to maintain a high level of consistency and uniformity;
- If a single realignment of all standards within the project area cannot be achieved, then the Department recommends that realignment of standards occur on a block-by-block basis, as current conditions exhibit, to encompass those blocks that will require a minimum of one standard to be relocated out of alignment;
- To avoid diminishing the integrity and visual character of the Landmark, retain the standards in their entirety, either in existing locations or through the process of relocation outlined in the previous recommendations.

Staff confirmed with the Commissioners that the DEIR project description and Partial Preservation Alternatives should be updated to reflect the recommendations.

- The Commissioners confirmed that the Path of Gold is a contributor to the Market Street Cultural Landscape District and an Article 10 landmark that will require a Certificate of Appropriateness, so alternatives focusing on the light standards is not necessary.

Materials

- The Commissioners expressed concern over consistency of the design and materials throughout the project area as the project falls within or borders multiple Article 10 Landmark and Article 11 Conservation districts.

Brick

- Commissioner Hyland acknowledged the challenge that brick paving presents in regard to ADA accessibility, but that perhaps ADA issues could be addressed by laying the bricks in a different manner or using installation procedures that meets accessibility needs.
- Commissioner Hyland expressed that ideally an alternative should replicate the material and the pattern of the brick while achieving the accessibility requirements and project objectives.

Granite

- Commissioner Hyland asked whether all the granite curbs and concrete bollards would be removed. He stated the granite curbs should be kept and noted that the HPC prefers they remain as they are a character-defining feature. Commissioner Pearlman concurred and stated that he hoped the HPC would have a voice in the treatment and incorporation of character-defining features as part of the project development.

Adequacy of the Alternatives Summary

- The Commissioners found the alternatives to be complete and adequate for the Environmental Impact Report, noting the alternatives address the character-defining features, historic resources, design and accessibility issues.

Full Preservation Alternative

- Commissioner Pearlman stated the Full Preservation Alternative was fine in terms of what is necessary for an EIR. He noted that in many respects it similar to a No Project Alternative because it meets very few of the project objectives but confirmed that it was adequate. Commissioner Hyland inquired whether it would be possible to add a sidewalk level bicycle lane to the Full Preservation Alternative but did not request the Project Sponsor further explore adding the lane because it would have little impact on the Full Preservation Alternative meeting additional project objectives.

Partial Preservation Alternative One and Partial Preservation Alternative Two

- Commissioner Pearlman stated that no revisions to the Partial Preservation Alternatives were needed.

Follow-up

- The Commissioners requested that when the project returns for review and comment on the Environmental Impact Report the alternatives drawings should be the same scale as the full project drawings. The Commissioners also requested an alternatives summary and comparison chart.
- Staff confirmed the alternatives would return to the HPC as part of the EIR review and comment and the Path of Gold would return for the Certificate of Appropriateness. The remainder of the project is not otherwise subject to HPC review as the project is limited to the public right of way and does not involve properties or character-defining features found within Article 10 and Article 11 districts.

ADJOURNMENT 12:40 PM
ADOPTED FEBRUARY 20, 2019