SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

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

Wednesday, June 15, 2022
12:00 p.m.
Architectural Review Committee
Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: BLACK, NAGESWARAN, MATSUDA, SO
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT MATSUDA AT 12:02 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Rebecca Salgado, Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer, Rich Sucre – Deputy Director of Current Planning, 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

ACTION: Nageswaran Elected Chair
AYES: So, Nageswaran, Matsuda
ABSENT: Black

B. REGULAR

2. 2021-005720PTA (R. SALGADO: (628) 652-7332)
2 STOCKTON STREET – located at the northeast corner of Market Street and Stockton Street, Assessor’s Block 0328, Lot 002 (District 3). Review and Comment before the Architectural Review Committee for construction of a three-story vertical addition on top of the existing four-story structure and replacement of the existing facades of the building. The subject property is located within the Article 11 Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District and is within a C-3-R (Downtown-Retail) Zoning District and 80-130-F Height and Bulk Limit. Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS:
• Rebecca Salgado – Staff presentation
• Michael Levin – Stark contrast to the Phelan building and Barneys
• Rich Sucre – Response to comments and questions
• Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC Comments
Commissioner Nageswaran noted that this project is sited on a prominent lot in the KMMS district, and that while the design is well developed overall, she would like to see the project team’s studies relate to the district’s characteristics, which may illuminate the proposed design’s relationship with the neighboring buildings and reasons for design decisions. The following are excerpts of the Character-defining Features of the Conservation District related to Commissioner Nageswaran’s comments:

Massing and Composition:
• Vertically oriented rectangular massing in a 1:2 or 1:4 ratio
• Two or three-part vertical compositions

Scale:
• Wider building facades articulated into narrow segments

Materials and Colors:
• Masonry cladding: terra cotta, brick, stone, and stucco
• Light or medium earth tones: white, cream, buff, yellow, brown

Detailing and Ornamentation:
• Used to relate buildings to their neighbors
• Deep window reveals

Commissioner Nageswaran recommended studying the base and crown of the building and how they relate to the neighboring buildings (Phelan and former Barneys Buildings), which each have a three-part composition. She recommended exploring whether the base could be expressed as a double story, which might include a subtle color or material change of the second story to relate to the first story or raising the first story further than shown in the proposal. Although the height of the proposed 21-foot base is the same as the height of the existing building’s base, the proportions of the existing and proposed facades differ so that the proposed base appears squatter. The existing building is three stories with a three-part vertical composition, where the base proportion “supports” the upper stories, whereas the proposed design is five stories of equal height on a “compressed” base of similar height. Although the proposed design’s upper story fins provide verticality similar to the adjacent district contributor’s window bay pilasters, the crown of the proposed building is less distinguishable from the upper stories. Commissioner Nageswaran noted that the verticality of the upper stories could be terminated by an element such as an arched detail, which distinguishes the “piano-nobile” (the second of a three-part composition) from the crown. This is the case in the adjacent Beaux-Arts buildings, where rounded arches articulate the crown and, in Art Deco designs (somewhat similar to the proposed design), where triangular arches have been used at upper stories. She asked the design team to further study the articulation of the top portion of the building or explore bringing the crown articulation down a story. She asked for clarification on the window recess dimension as it relates to those of the neighboring structures. Commissioner Nageswaran asked for material samples for this project to be presented. She noted that the storefront framing should have a powder-coated finish (consistent with the Planning Department’s Article 11 Storefront Guidelines). She also noted that the proposed parapet coping does not appear to extend beyond the plane of the façade, which the design team may want to study as part of the articulation of the crown and to avoid a weather/water infiltration issue. Commissioner Nageswaran asked if the proposed brick cladding was unit or veneer and wanted to see the material’s white-glazed appearance. She noted that finishes of some newer buildings (cladding and glazing) can appear too bright or reflective in contrast with the subtle tones of historic buildings that define a district. Commissioner Nageswaran requested additional information on the location and appearance of mechanical screens, and also asked for a rendering to be provided clarifying whether the penthouse would be visible from the street.

Commissioner So appreciated the proposed design’s parti and commented that the site is an especially challenging one to design for. She liked the proposed façades’ brick pattern and texture, as well as the proposed fenestration, and asked for staff to ensure that the final brick cladding and mullion details are consistent with the design intent expressed in the ARC presentation drawings. Commissioner So appreciated that the design picked up several datums from neighboring buildings. She noted that the focal point of the building is its radius corner, and asked for the project team to take some more time to study the design of the corner, which will be an iconic element of the building. Commissioner So noted that the horizontally oriented brick patterning used at the base of the building does not work as well when stacked floor-over-floor at the corner, causing the bricks to look somewhat like mechanical louvers. She felt that the team could keep the language of the base and corner
related, but that this particular detail should not be repeated so closely. She also noted that it can be tricky to address how a building meets the sky, and thought that a more successful crown element may be achieved by further exploring its proportions.

Commissioner Black concurred with the comments of her fellow Commissioners. She felt that the top of the building should be more distinctive. She noted that the nearby recent project at 100 Stockton Street, also designed by the same team, did a good job of incorporating the character-defining features of the KMMS district into a contemporary design. Commissioner Black commented that she would like to see the building take on more of a gateway role, like other flatiron buildings along Market Street.

ADJOURNMENT 12:55 PM
ADOPTED JULY 20, 2022