Supervisor Receives Honor at Annual Meeting

Heritage's annual meeting, on June 8, drew a healthy turnout. Among the attractions was the opportunity for members to view the Omni Hotel, recently opened in the former Financial Center Building after a 19-month rehabilitation and seismic upgrade of the historic structure.

Featured on the agenda was the presentation of the Heritage 2002 Award. An independent jury selected the recipient from a group of nominees that included projects and organizations, as well as individuals, that demonstrated excellence in historic preservation. And the winner was: San Francisco District 3 Supervisor, Aaron Peskin.

In presenting the award, Heritage board member Alice Ross Carey cited the supervisor’s “intelligence, determination and sheer grit,” in his dedicated pursuit of preservation, appropriate land use and improved quality of life in San Francisco. As president and an active member of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers prior to his election to the Board of Supervisors in 2000, Aaron Peskin promoted high preservation standards on the hill and in neighboring Jackson Square, Northeast Waterfront and North Beach. His presence on the Board of Supervisors these past 18 months has contributed to a heightened awareness of preservation values in city government.

Aaron Peskin’s achievements include leading the successful fight to save the historic Colombo Building from demolition and to have it designated a city landmark. He also promoted the updating and expansion of the North Beach Historic Survey and its adoption by the City.

In accepting the Heritage Award, Supervisor Peskin graciously acknowledged that it rightly belonged to everyone who has been involved with preservation in San Francisco. Alluding to the less-than-friendly attitude toward preservation in the current and the previous city administrations, Peskin credited the return to district election of supervisors with helping to rectify the imbalance. In the last 18 months, he noted, there have been more new landmark nominations than in any previous 18-month period. The supervisor concluded his remarks with an expression of confidence in Heritage’s leadership to carry on the organization’s vital work into the new century.

In other business, Heritage members heard an assessment of the overall state of the organization from the board president, Mark Pierce, and a financial report from the new board treasurer, Dennis Richards. Charles Chase delivered the executive director’s report, in which he both reviewed highlights of Heritage’s activities during the previous 12 months and looked forward into the coming year.

In the advocacy arena, Heritage remains involved with community members and City College to find a design solution for the Mission campus that preserves the New Mission Theater. Meanwhile, as a result of our nomination, the theater entered the National Register last fall. Two other National Register candidacies with which Heritage has assisted are in the works: the Northern Waterfront and the Swedenborgian Church.

The Planning Commission has adopted the findings of the Heritage-initiated Dogpatch Survey, and Supervisor Maxwell is proposing a historic district designation for the area. A survey of the adjacent Central Waterfront begun by the Planning Department two years ago with Heritage’s encouragement, has also received Commission endorsement. With technical support from us and with grants from the State Office of Historic Preservation, the Planning Department continues its survey work, in the North Mission District.

Among other larger issues, we continue to be involved with the Old U.S. Mint as an advocate for sound preservation practices and public access in planning for reuse of this National Historic Landmark. Heritage joined with neighbors to ensure that Veterans Administration planning for development at Fort Miley

—continued on page 8
Comments from the President

When I was elected to be the president of Heritage in June, one of the questions I had of Charles Chase, our executive director and of Don Andreini, editor of this journal, was, “Can I have an opportunity to share my thoughts with Heritage members in the newsletter?” After a couple of raised eyebrows and some appropriate questions about my national security clearances, they allowed as how we could experiment with the idea. So, here goes.

For years, I resisted the urge to consider the possibility of being president of San Francisco Architectural Heritage. I worried about being the leader of all our members and the limitations it might have on my ability to speak my mind. I hadn’t given consideration to the potential this column presents. Now, I’m really excited about the possibilities this role affords me to discuss preservation with others, both within our ranks and outside, and to encourage both the advocacy and the educational missions of Heritage.

Readers will find an article in this issue of Heritage News about the Planning Department’s program to revive surveys of historic resources. I’m really pleased the Planning Commission and the Department have decided to put renewed efforts into this important endeavor. It seems that surveys have had little attention recently—ever since the Downtown Plan was approved back in 1985. I think there is nothing more important in the cause of preservation than the completion of historic surveys, so we can have a comprehensive and well maintained city-wide inventory of building resources. Information is power.

Survey data would provide every building owner/purchaser the information needed to determine the importance of their property to the community. City staff people would have access to comprehensive evaluations of the significance of each building or structure surveyed. Historic Districts could be designated based on this information. Landmarks would become self-evident and rise to the attention of both advocates and the Landmarks Board for consideration.

Eleventh hour heated discussions about the value of existing buildings that we currently have when debating demolition plans, developed without the benefit of architectural surveys, would become a thing of the past. Developers would know ahead of time whether parcels they may consider buying contain rated buildings, and they would reflect that consideration in establishing the size of their offers.

With completed surveys, our land use, property development and building conservation decisions would be much easier for all parties involved, and San Francisco Heritage would not have to be in the unfortunate position of carrying urgent news to project sponsors and the Planning Commission about the importance of targeted buildings and, ultimately, to our members (when we’re unsuccessful) that yet another building has to be torn down because the City didn’t have the necessary information at the right time in order to decide to preserve it.

We need to support historic resource surveys. They make sense.

Bruce V.A. Bonacker, AIA
President
Upgrade of Veterans Building Opens Door to New Uses

Although over 900 people attend each of the more than 240 events in Herbst Theater every year, the Veterans Building does not enjoy the high public profile of its glamorous neighbor across the courtyard. Like the Opera House, its architect was Arthur Brown, Jr., who also designed City Hall.

In May, at a SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research) lunchtime Brown Bag Forum, Thom Horn, President of the War Memorial Board, presented the case for the seismic upgrade of the Veterans Building and for rethinking the facility’s use. The historic 1932 structure, architectural companion to the Opera House, is one of just two major municipal buildings in the Civic Center (the Health Department being the other) that have not undergone rehabilitation under the City’s seismic program.

The structure survived the 1989 earthquake but not entirely without damage. Piles of plaster debris in the stairways impeded the building’s evacuation. Furthermore, the building lacks a fire safety system. Accordingly, the War Memorial Trustees are proposing to place before the voters in November a funding plan that combines general obligation bonds with lease revenue bonds.

General obligation bonds, repaid from property tax revenue, would finance repair of earthquake damage and the seismic upgrade of the Veterans Building, as well as provide for improvements to mechanical and electrical systems and disabled access. Lease revenue bonds, retired from revenue the building generates, would pay for improvements intended to increase public use of the facility and make the Veterans Building a more integral part of the performing arts center.

Currently, most of the floor space houses administrative offices for the many veterans’ groups that were party to the original War Memorial trust agreement under which the Opera House and the Veterans Building were built, as well as for the War Memorial Board. Relocating offices from the first floor to the second and third floors would allow developing uses that invite much more lively public participation.

These uses may include museum or gallery space along the McAllister Street corridor. The corridor facing the Memorial Court shared with the Opera House could house a central box office for all events in the Civic Center performing arts venues: the Opera House, Davies Symphony Hall and Herbst Theater. A performing arts shop and bookstore combined with a cafe with outside tables on the court are other contemplated main floor uses. Except for some badly needed backstage improvements, Herbst Theater itself would remain essentially unchanged. These improvements include upgraded lighting and ventilation and better accommodations for artists and performers, who now lack even adequate dressing rooms. These changes would enhance the theater’s revenue potential.

The historic features of the Herbst’s interior would undergo refurbishing, as would the grand, classically appointed Green Room, which opens to the outdoor gallery on the second floor overlooking Van Ness Avenue. Installation of a first class catering kitchen would better serve that facility’s use for events and receptions that can take full advantage of its ceremonial character.

As there is currently no place in the building for performers to rehearse, the plan calls for construction of an orchestra rehearsal room and smaller multi-purpose rehearsal rooms in the basement. Storage facilities for tenants and users of the building would also be located there.

The vision for the fourth floor includes additional museum and gallery space. PALM, the Performing Arts Library and Museum, currently operates on this floor, and may be a prime candidate for expanded facilities in the building. Citing the need expressed by many arts groups for smaller theaters, the War Memorial Trust is also proposing a new multi-purpose performance and events space on the fourth floor that could accommodate up to 350 seats.

Veterans’ groups would occupy smaller but newly outfitted modern and more efficient offices and meeting spaces with small shared kitchens, suited to their current needs, on the second and third floors. Other offices on the third floor would be available for the War Memorial Board and other tenants and users of the building.

As the Veterans Building is contributory to both the City and the National Register Civic Center Historic Districts, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards would govern all work affecting historic features.
Dedication of Warehouse as Labor History Landmark

It was a San Francisco event that drew a disparate crowd of preservationists, labor leaders and politicians. The occasion was the 68th anniversary of the “battle of the waterfront,” which began July 3, 1934. The place was where that labor struggle began, the Garcia & Maggini Warehouse, at 128 King Street, recently designated San Francisco Landmark #229.

Tim Kelley, president of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, announced the placement of a plaque, which is being struck, that will recall the events of that time and place. Shipping companies, with the support of a coalition of San Francisco business interests, called the Industrial Association, tried to break a 3-month waterfront strike and reopen the port. When they tried to transfer goods from Pier 38 to the warehouse at 128 King Street, using non-union drivers under heavy police guard, fighting broke out with striking workers and raged on for five hours.

The July 4th holiday was quiet on the waterfront. The struggle resumed on the 5th, known as Bloody Thursday, and when it was over two strikers were dead. The public outrage over the deaths and the violence employed by the Industrial Association led to a three-day general strike (July 16-19) that virtually shut down San Francisco. Soon after, the employers settled on terms favorable to the workers.

Long-term consequences of these events included the acceptance of collective bargaining on the West Coast waterfronts, the emergence of Harry Bridges as leader of the International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union, and the establishment of San Francisco as a union town.

Archie Green, labor historian, speaking for the Fund for Labor Culture and History, described 128 King Street as the city’s first official labor landmark. Photo: Rick Claymore

Although the warehouse is already protected as a contributory structure in the South End Historic District, its designation as an individual landmark, as well, specifically acknowledges its significance in the city’s labor history. It also reflects the current Landmarks Board’s interest in enlarging the concept of a landmark by giving greater weight to historical, alongside architectural, factors.

Windmill Head to Netherlands for Restoration

This seems to be the year for the ceremonial lift off. On June 26, for the second time this year, the City’s Recreation and Park Department pressed a crane into service in the cause of preservation. In the spring it was to remove the finial at the Conservatory of Flowers; this time it was to remove the 40-ton iron gears and shaft from the Murphy Windmill in Golden Gate Park.

Don Propstra, chairman of the Campaign to Save the Golden Gate Park Windmills, described the act as the first step in the restoration of both of the iconic giants at the western end of the park—the Murphy and the Dutch windmills. Netherlands-based windmill designer Lucas Verbij was clearly delighted that a project which he first approached nearly ten years ago was “finally, finally” on its way.

Specifically, the windmill cap and the machinery were removed for shipment to the Netherlands, where Verbij’s 135-year old family business will carry out their restoration and rebuilding. The target date for returning the mechanism is September 2003. By that time the structures of the Murphy (with its millwright’s cottage) and the Dutch windmills, and the landscaping of the grounds surrounding and connecting them, will be undergoing a restoration and revitalization that is expected to last through 2004.

The Campaign to Save the Golden Gate Park Windmills, to date, has raised $1.9 million of the $3.9 million goal for restoration of the Murphy Windmill. The City has pledged $1 million. The campaign will raise an additional $2.7 million for restoration of the Dutch Windmill, for landscape improvements and to develop educational programming for the site.

To volunteer, to donate to the Windmill Campaign, or for general information, call Paula March, at 415-668-0763, or e-mail the campaign at marchpartners@hotmail.com. You may also visit the web site at www.goldengateparkwindmills.org.
Preparing for Old Mint Development

The City of San Francisco recently retained Architectural Resources Group (ARG) to produce a Historic Structure Report (HSR) for the United States Old Mint. The Programmatic Agreement among the General Services Administration (GSA), the City of San Francisco (City), and other parties, upon transfer of the Old Mint from the GSA to the City, stipulated preparation of the study.

As a National Historic Landmark, the Old Mint enjoys the highest level of federal designation. Because the structure has a high degree of integrity, it is critical to consider the implications of future use. In June, seeking a developer with demonstrated historic preservation and development experience, the City released a Request for Proposal to Lease, Rehabilitate, Develop, and Operate the Old Mint. Any successful candidate must also demonstrate the financial capacity to reuse the building in a manner that is sensitive to its historic features.

Designed in 1869 by Alfred B. Mullett, supervising architect of the U.S. Treasury Department, the second United States Mint in San Francisco, now known as the Old Mint, occupies its own block bounded by 5th, Mission, Mint, and Jessie Streets. Completed in 1874 at a cost of $2 million, this rare monumental example of the late Greek Revival period is significant as the work of a recognized master architect and as the last major example of classical revival architecture built in America.

From the outset, the Old Mint combined the diverse functions of foundry and fortress with highly ornamented interior spaces worthy of ceremonial public use. The building’s impressive granite and brick construction and extensive use of cast iron as a building material conveyed the image of a secure stronghold. Its original construction epitomizes late 19th century “fire-proof” building technologies, construction techniques, and noteworthy craftsmanship, and displays an innovative use of materials, especially ornamental and structural cast and wrought iron.

Nationally significant for its role in government and economics, the Old Mint was pivotal in the financial history of the United States during a 63-year period, from 1874 until 1937. The second San Francisco Mint opened, not as a subsidiary to the Philadelphia Mint as originally planned, but, rather, independent of it, and soon became the most productive mint in the nation. By 1877, three years after its inauguration, it struck about $50 million of the total $83.9 million in gold and silver coins produced that year. As a repository, the San Francisco Mint protected the nation’s wealth; in 1934, it held one-third of the gold reserve.

On the local level, the Old Mint is significant as a survivor of the 1906 earthquake, and as one of the oldest buildings in San Francisco, a stone structure from an era of wood-framed construction. Symbolically, the Mint has been a source of pride to San Franciscans, who from the start saw the monumental and elegant federal building as an affirmation that the city had come of age and the State of California, then only 25 years old, was truly part of the nation.

The building has not incurred any exterior additions, and a comparison of an original 1874 floor plan with the existing-conditions plans indicates that the building’s interior has changed very little with regard to circulation and primary room configurations. Interior changes have occurred over time, the result of regular maintenance, ongoing modifications and rehabilitation programs, both during its life as a mint and as host to a variety of federal tenants since 1937.

Although some significant spaces have acquired non-contributing individual elements as a result of those alterations, there remains a surprisingly large amount of intact original historic fabric of varying levels of significance throughout the Old Mint. This is especially true at the north, south, and west wings of the first and second floors where former work and industrial spaces underwent conversion to office use and modern materials cover some historic fabric. Some restoration has occurred in the front half of the building.

In addition to the historic analysis, the HSR discusses potential future uses of the Old Mint and related code issues, together with the best design opportunities for the building. It also outlines a philosophy for any proposed work that—continued on page 9.
On Saturday, May 18th, the Northern California Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians (NCCSAH) and Heritage hosted a day-long event entitled “Revisiting Splendid Survivors.” The focus of the program was a review of Heritage’s downtown survey, begun in 1977, and carried out over two years by a large corps of dedicated people. In 1979, in collaboration with architectural historian Michael Corbett and Charles Hall Page & Associates (now Page & Turnbull), Heritage published the survey under the title Splendid Survivors: San Francisco’s Downtown Architectural Heritage.

The book has served many purposes. It is a valuable guide to San Francisco’s old downtown buildings—surviving and not. But perhaps its most important role has been the dissemination of information about the city’s downtown architecture among preservationists, architects, historians, and the general public, as well.

At a time when many cities, including San Francisco, were tearing down buildings, “redeveloping” their downtowns, and wooing corporate giants to build new skyscrapers, Splendid Survivors assisted Heritage and other groups in lobbying the city’s decision makers regarding urban design issues and treatment of historic buildings. Six years after publication, the survey was a factor in impelling the Planning Department to formulate a strong preservation element in its Downtown Plan.

In the morning session of the two-part program, Bridget Maley, NCCSAH president, led a panel discussion on the survey’s methodology and how various parties have used the survey data through the years. Panelists were Michael Corbett; Adam Light, planner for the City of San Francisco; Tim Kelley, president of the Landmarks Board; and Chris VerPlank, architectural historian at Page & Turnbull.

Following lunch, Michael Crowe, —continued on page 11
Cultural Resource Surveys: The Building Blocks of Preservation

One of the most important historic preservation tools is the cultural resource survey—a process of identifying and gathering data on a community’s historic resources. Such surveys allow better planning for the preservation and development of areas with historic resources by understanding the type of resources that make up that environment.

Often referred to as the “building blocks” of historic preservation, cultural resource surveys have resulted in the inclusion of more than 5,000 historic districts across the country in the National Register of Historic Places. However, surveys have not always played such an important role in the preservation movement.

Before the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, most preservation efforts involved the restoration of individual landmarks and “Washington-slept-here” type of houses as living history museums. In recent years, cultural resource surveys have gained in importance as communities no longer limit preservation efforts to a single resource or site but, instead, consider the context or neighborhood in which resources are located.

Passage of the National Preservation Act encouraged state governments to develop statewide historic preservation programs that included identification of historic resources through comprehensive surveys. This, in turn, led to the introduction of local survey work. When Congress amended the National Historic Preservation Act in 1980, it formally recognized local efforts by mandating increased assistance to local governments, such as the City of San Francisco, whose preservation programs are “certified” as meeting high professional standards.

In general, two levels of cultural resource surveys exist: reconnaissance and intensive level surveys. While both types involve research into a community’s history, archaeology and architecture, they differ in the level of effort involved. Reconnaissance level surveys are typically referred to as “windshield surveys,” which analyze descriptive information about the architecture and age of buildings, structures, sites or objects. An intensive level survey generally involves detailed research, thorough site inspection and documentation of all historic properties within the survey boundaries. Intensive level surveys also provide an assessment as to the eligibility of the resource for the National Register of Historic Places.

A number of cultural resource surveys have occurred in San Francisco—often a combined effort between local government and special interest groups. Of note are the survey by the Junior League of San Francisco, published as Here Today (1968), and the Architectural Quality Survey by the San Francisco Planning Department (1974-1976). Heritage commissioned a number of surveys, such as the Inner Richmond Survey, and a survey of resources identified in the book Splendid Survivors, which led to the City’s Downtown Plan and Article 11 of the Planning Code.

While these efforts resulted in the documentation of thousands of resources, San Francisco had no structured system in place to identify and document cultural resources throughout the city. In response, in 1999, the Planning Department, in consultation with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), unveiled its multi-year Citywide Cultural Resource Survey Program. All surveys in this program follow the OHP’s Instructions for Recording Historic Resources and evaluate resources using the National Register criteria.

Receiving a $15,000 grant from OHP in 2000, the Planning Department began its program with an intensive level cultural resource survey in the Central Waterfront/Pier 70 area. One of San Francisco’s earliest industrial complexes, the site is nationally important for production of military vessels for the Spanish American War and the two World Wars. As part of that project, Heritage and consultant Christopher VerPlanck completed an intensive survey of the Dogpatch neighborhood, significant as the city’s oldest and most intact concentration of Victorian-era workers’ housing.

In 2001, the Planning Department began a reconnaissance level survey in the North Mission area. The OHP supported that effort with a $25,000 grant, and has just awarded the City a $20,000 grant to move that survey on into the “intensive” phase.

The Planning Department will use cultural resource survey information when reviewing building permit applications, projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), —continued on page 11.
Heritage & Friends of 1800 Sponsor Lecture

The Friends of 1800, in collaboration with San Francisco Architectural Heritage, will sponsor a fund-raising event and lecture entitled Who is Mary Colter? The Best Known Unknown Woman Architect & Pioneer. The speaker will be Arnold Berke, writer and senior editor of Preservation magazine and author of the recently published biography, Mary Colter: Architect of the Southwest.

A graduate of the California School of Design, in San Francisco, Mary Colter (1869-1958) was an architect and interior designer who drew upon Native American and Hispanic roots, contemporary Arts and Crafts sources, and desert landscape and materials in her quest for a truly American architecture. Her design of notable structures at Grand Canyon National Park influenced development in other park settings, in a style described as “National Park Service Rustic.”

In addition, Mary Colter worked for the Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company, for many years. In her designs for hotels and for restaurants and shops in train stations, all operated by Harvey for the Santa Fe, she created an image of the Southwest that attracted leisure travelers from across the country.

The Colter lecture will take place on Friday, October 25, 6:00 - 9:00 pm, in the Ceremonial Room at the new San Francisco Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Community Center, 1800 Market Street. A reception with refreshments will follow Mr. Berke’s presentation. Tickets are $10. For more information or to make reservations, visit www.friendsof1800.org. Proceeds of the event will benefit Heritage and Friends of 1800.
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Board Changes

After two years as vice president, Bruce Bonacker, AIA, became president of Heritage at the June board meeting. Bruce began his association with us as a volunteer in 1974. He is a licensed architect and owner of Bonacker Associates, a San Francisco firm specializing in contextual design. Active with SPUR and the Glen Park Neighborhood Association, he has served on the boards of the AIA San Francisco and the National Association of Remodeling Industry.

J. Gordon Turnbull, FAIA, succeeded Bonacker as vice president. An architect and principal of the firm Page & Turnbull, Inc., Jay is currently chairman of the board of trustees of the Maybeck Foundation and a member of the California Preservation Foundation, the National Trust and the California Historical Society.

Andrew J. Ball and Roger O. Walther recently joined the Heritage board. Mr. Ball is president of Webcor Builders, a commercial contractor. He came to Northern California, with a BA in architecture from the University of Utah, to open an office for Koll Construction. Soon after, he founded his own company, A.J. Ball Construction, which merged with Webcor in 1994.

Mr. Walther holds an MBA from the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. Co-founder, in 1985, of the First Republic Bank, where he remains chairman of the board, he is currently also chairman and CEO of the Tusker Corporation, a real estate and business management company. He serves on many other boards, including those of Charles Schwab & Company, Chapman University and the UCSF Foundation.

Fall Symposium Goes to the Movies

Last year, the National Trust for Historic Preservation placed the historic American movie theater on its list of the nation’s 11 most endangered historic places. San Francisco has been particularly hard hit in the loss of this classic American icon. According to the Trust’s local office, 35 single-screen movie houses have closed in the city since 1980.

Heritage is interested in the conservation of movie theaters as a building type, whether by continuing their existing use, by adapting them to live performance and entertainment venues, or by sensitive adaptation to entirely new uses. Our fall symposium proposes to explore the problem in its various facets, including the economic and other factors that make it difficult to sustain the operation of single-screen theaters, while seeking imaginative and workable solutions.

Scheduled for Saturday morning, October 5, the half-day event will feature three speakers and a panel discussion. The program will open with a brief keynote address by Supervisor Gavin Newsom, who last year held hearings on single-screen theaters. Michael Buhler, of the National Trust’s San Francisco office, will provide a historical overview of movie houses in San Francisco. At press time, we were lining up other speakers, including someone who will look at the issue of adaptive reuse in connection with the possible conversion of the New Mission Theater as part of the City College Mission District campus, and a representative of the San Francisco Neighborhood Theater Association to present the argument for preserving movie theaters in their original use.

The program is shaping up as one that is timely and appealing to a wide audience. Heritage members will receive details in the mail, soon. The $25 cost of the event will be $25 for members. The $35 cost for the general public includes a one-year Heritage membership. The mid-morning break will feature a light buffet.

For underwriting opportunities, call Heritage at 415-441-3000; or e-mail info@sfheritage.org.

U.S. Mint

continued from page 5

follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Standards offer the best guarantee that this nationally significant historic and architectural treasure will retain its integrity in the conversion to a new use.

—Katherine Petrin, Architectural Resources Group
Bay Area Tours

Allied Arts Guild
Menlo Park, 650-322-2405

Camron-Stanford House
Oakland, 510-836-1976

City Guides Walks
San Francisco, 415-557-4266

Cohen-Bray House
Oakland, 510-532-0704

Cypress Lawn Cemetery
Colma, 650-550-8810

Dunsmuir House & Gardens
Oakland (April - September) 510-615-5555

Falkirk Victorian Estate
San Rafael, 415-485-3328

Lathrop House
Redwood City, 650-365-5564

Luther Burbank
Home & Gardens
Santa Rosa, 707-524-5445

McConaghy House
Hayward, 510-276-3010

Meyers House & Garden
Alameda, 510-521-1247

Oakland Tours Program
510-238-3234

Octagon House
San Francisco, 415-441-7512

Palo Alto-Stanford Heritage
650-299-8878 or 324-3121

Pardee Home Museum
Oakland, 510-444-2187

San Francisco City Hall
415-554-5780

Strybing Arboretum
Golden Gate Park, San Francisco 415-661-1316, ext. 312

Continuing Heritage Events

Haas-Lilienthal House Tours
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:00 pm
Saturdays 12 noon to 3:00 pm
Sundays 11 am to 4:00 pm. $5

Pacific Heights Walking Tour
Sundays 12:30 pm. $5

All regular Heritage tours are free to Heritage members and their guests

Group Tours by Arrangement
Call Natasha Glushkoff, 415-441-3000

For information about current Heritage events Call 415-441-3004

Heritage programs supported in part by City of San Francisco Grants for the Arts.

September

September 10, 8:00 pm Slide lecture: America’s Earliest Garden Rooms: Painted Furniture Inside and Out. American Decorative Arts Forum. 415-249-9234

Through October 19
Exhibition: California in Time CHS. 415-357-1848
www.californiastorialsociety.org

Through October 20

Through December 20
Exhibition: Points of Interest. Society of California Pioneers, 415-957-1849
www.californiapioneers.org

November

November 16 - March 23
Exhibition: Architecture + Water SFMOMA, 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

November 16 - March 23
Exhibition: Body Design SFMOMA 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

November 21, 7:30 pm Lecture: A Year of Mud and Gold: San Francisco in Letters and Diaries, 1849-1850. S.F.H.A. 415-750-9986
Survey continued from page 7

or projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Survey findings will also increase property owners’ potential eligibility for tax credits, grants and other preservation incentives, such as the Mills Act (reduction in property taxes), by facilitating nomination of significant resources to local, state and national historic registers.

Survey data will allow property owners to request application of the State Historical Building Code. Certified historic structures qualify for use of this code, which promotes a more sensitive approach to rehabilitation and to the preservation of both interior and exterior character-defining features.

The Planning Commission validated the Citywide Cultural Resource Survey effort when it endorsed the Central Waterfront and Dogpatch surveys, in June. San Francisco Supervisor Sophie Maxwell has introduced legislation to designate most of the Dogpatch neighborhood a historic district. If successful, it will be the first locally designated historic district in 8 years!

For more information on the Planning Department’s Citywide Cultural Resource Survey program, call Jeffrey Tully, Survey Manager, at 415-558-6372.

—Jeffrey Tully, Survey Manager, San Francisco Planning Department

Architecture Fragments

House-tour season is approaching, and there are a number of events scheduled in San Francisco. Pacific Heights Residents Association is sponsoring a tour of the Webster Street Historic District, Sunday, September 22. It will include characteristic Italianate Victorians by The Real Estate Associates and Henry Hinkel, built in 1878. Houses just outside the district, and possibly some small gardens, will also be open. For information call 415-929-5201. On Sunday, October 20, the Victorian Alliance offers its annual house tour, this year featuring homes in the Duboce Triangle. For information and to order tickets, call 415-826-1437. The San Francisco Museum and Historical Society holds its 8th annual home tour on Saturday, October 12. For details contact Deanna Kastler at 415-775-1111, or visit www.sfhistory.org.

For the third year in a row, students from the College of Environmental Design and the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, have won the Bank of America Low-Income Housing Challenge. Comprising the Berkeley team, winning out over teams from Cal Poly, Stanford and UC Davis, were Krisztina Tokes, Sean Charpentier and Steven Shum from the City and Regional Planning; Wade Vorley, Architecture; and Steven Wolmark and Juan Carlos Wallace from the Haas. Their winning entry was a proposal for a 138-unit low income housing development on the former site of St. Paulus Lutheran Church, Eddy and Gough Streets, a San Francisco landmark destroyed in a 1995 fire.

The National Japanese American Historical Society has undertaken a conceptual study for Presidio Bldg. 640, where Japanese American men underwent Army intelligence training during World War II, while there families were in internment camps. The proposal for adaptive use of the building as an interpretive center will be aired on September 14, at Crissy Field Center, the Presidio, 1:00-3:00 pm. For details call 415-921-5007; www.njahs.org.

Elsewhere in the Bay Area, Heritage Homes of Petaluma is offering a tour of private residences and commercial buildings in the former “World’s Egg Basket,” September 15. Call 777-273-8258 for information. Also on September 15, Alameda Preservation Society and the Alameda Museum will host the Alameda Legacy Home Tour. Houses include a Queen Anne that is undergoing a major restoration. Call 510-523-5907, or go to www.alamedahometour.org. On the 28th of September, the Landmark Heritage Foundation is sponsoring a Julia Morgan House Tour featuring six homes in North Berkeley designed by the distinguished Bay Area architect. Lunch included with the price of the tour. Space is limited. Call 510-883-9710.

Humanities West has announced its 2002-2003 season of multi-disciplinary lecture/performance programs. Typically encompassing the fine arts, social history, music, politics and philosophy of the arts, this season’s schedule of three two-day programs begins with The Pleasures of Versailles, October 18-19; continues with Beethoven, Resonant Genius, February 7-8, 2003; and concludes next April 11-12, with The First Flowering of Byzantium. Visit www.humanitieswest.org for more information.

At the end of last year, the Victorian Alliance made a gift of $2,200 in memory of Vikki-Marie Powers, long-time president of the Alliance, to the Campaign to Restore the Conservatory of Flowers, in Golden Gate Park. Following upon that, in the spring of this year, the Alliance donated $2,000 to St. Matthew’s Lutheran Church, in the Mission District, for restoration of stained glass windows. These most recent gifts bring the total of contributions by this public-spirited organization to worthy civic causes, including preservation, to nearly $77,000, over the past 25 years. Grant applications are available from Michael Hammond, 415-824-2666.
Recruiting Members for Committees

Heritage is seeking members of the organization to serve on three committees of the board of directors. These are the House Committee, which deals with issues that directly affect the Haas-Lilienthal House; the Education Committee, which plans and organizes educational events and programs; and the Membership Committee, which deals with membership relations and membership development.

If you are interested in becoming more involved with Heritage and want to learn more about this opportunity, contact the office: 415-441-3000; info@sfheritage.org.