



November 5, 2024

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
Honorable Supervisor Stefani  
Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via email only

Re: **Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2024-001869DES**  
**Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street) Landmark Designation**  
BOS File No. TBD

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Stefani,

On October 16, 2024, the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter "HPC") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider a draft ordinance to landmark the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0471, Lot No. 003. At the hearing, the HPC voted to approve a resolution to recommend landmark designation pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

The proposed landmark designation is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a Class 8 Categorical Exemption.

Supervisor Stefani, at your earliest convenience, please let the Clerk know if you would like to take sponsorship of this landmark designation, which is located within your district.

Please find attached documents related to the HPC's action. Also attached is an electronic copy of the proposed ordinance and Legislative Digest, drafted by Deputy City Attorney Peter Miljanich. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Aaron D. Starr  
Manager of Legislative Affairs

Cc: Peter Miljanich, City Attorney's Office  
John Carroll, Office of the Clerk of the Board  
Rich Sucre, Planning Department, Deputy Director of Current Planning  
Pilar LaValley, Planning Department  
Lorenzo Rosas, Aide to Supervisor Stefani  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)  
[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org).

Attachments:

Draft Article 10 Landmark Designation Ordinance – 3400 Laguna Street (PDF)  
Planning Department Recommendation Executive Summary, dated October 16, 2024  
Article 10 Landmark Designation Report – 3400 Laguna Street  
CEQA Determination

Included with this electronic transmittal:

Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 1425 (Recommendation)  
Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 1416 (Initiation)  
Draft Article 10 Landmark Designation Ordinance – 3400 Laguna Street (Word)  
Legislative Digest for 3400 Laguna Street (Word)

1 [Planning Code - Landmark Designation - Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street)]

2  
3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate the Ladies' Protection and Relief**  
4 **Society, located at 3400 Laguna Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0471, Lot No. 003,**  
5 **as a Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning**  
6 **Code; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California**  
7 **Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare**  
8 **findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the**  
9 **General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

10 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.  
11 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.  
12 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.  
13 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.  
14 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.  
15 **Asterisks (\* \* \* \*)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code  
16 subsections or parts of tables.

17 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

18 Section 1. CEQA and Land Use Findings.

19 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this  
20 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources  
21 Code Sections 21000 *et seq.*). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of  
22 Supervisors in File No. \_\_\_\_\_ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board of  
23 Supervisors affirms this determination.

24 (b) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that the  
25 proposed landmark designation of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, located at 3400  
Laguna Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0471, Lot No. 003, will serve the public necessity,

1 convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation Commission  
2 Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_, recommending approval of the proposed designation, which is  
3 incorporated herein by reference.

4 (c) On \_\_\_\_\_, the Historic Preservation Commission, in Resolution No.  
5 \_\_\_\_\_, adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are  
6 consistent, on balance, with the City's General Plan and with the eight priority policies of  
7 Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts these findings as its own.

8  
9 Section 2. General Findings.

10 (a) On March 22, 2024, community members submitted a nomination for Article 10  
11 Landmark Designation under Planning Code Article 10 for the Ladies' Protection and Relief  
12 Society (3400 Laguna Street), Assessor's Parcel No. 0471, Lot No. 003 to the Planning  
13 Department.

14 (b) The Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet supporting the nomination was  
15 prepared by VerPlanck Historic Preservation Consulting and reviewed by Planning  
16 Department Preservation staff. All preparers meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional  
17 Qualification Standards for historic preservation program staff, as set forth in Code of Federal  
18 Regulations Title 36, Part 61, Appendix A. The report was reviewed for accuracy and  
19 conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

20 (c) On August 21, 2024, after holding a public hearing on the proposed initiation, the  
21 Historic Preservation Commission initiated landmark designation of the Ladies' Protection and  
22 Relief Society as a San Francisco Landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code  
23 by Resolution No. 1416. Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in  
24 Board File No. \_\_\_\_\_.

1 (d) Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, the Historic Preservation Commission has  
2 authority “to recommend approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations and  
3 historic district designations under the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors.”

4 (e) The Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of  
5 \_\_\_\_\_, reviewed Planning Department staff’s analysis of the architectural and  
6 historical significance of the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society set forth in the Landmark  
7 Designation Report/Fact Sheet, dated \_\_\_\_\_.

8 (f) On \_\_\_\_\_, after holding a public hearing on the proposed designation,  
9 and having considered the specialized analyses prepared by Planning Department staff, and  
10 the Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet, the Historic Preservation Commission  
11 recommended designation of the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society as a landmark under  
12 Article 10 of the Planning Code by Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_. Said resolution is on file with the  
13 Clerk of the Board in Board File No. \_\_\_\_\_.

14 (g) The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the Ladies’ Protection and Relief  
15 Society has a special character and special historical, architectural, and aesthetic interest and  
16 value, and that its designation as a Landmark will further the purposes of and conform to the  
17 standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code. In doing so, the Board hereby  
18 incorporates by reference the findings of the Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet.

19  
20 Section 3. Designation.

21 Pursuant to Section 1004.3 of the Planning Code, the Ladies’ Protection and Relief  
22 Society, located at 3400 Laguna Street, Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 0471, Lot No. 003, is  
23 hereby designated as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code.  
24 Appendix A to Article 10 of the Planning Code is hereby amended to include this property.

1 Section 4. Required Data.

2 (a) The description, location, and boundary of the Landmark site consists of the City  
3 parcel located at 3400 Laguna Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0471, Lot No. 003, in San  
4 Francisco's Marina District. Contributing elements of the property that support its architectural  
5 and historical significance are the 1925 Morgan Building, the 1929 Stone Cottage, and the  
6 landscape features of the Front Garden. The other buildings, courtyards, and landscape  
7 features on the site were constructed outside of the period of significance and do not  
8 contribute to the architectural or historical significance of the Landmark site.

9 (b) The characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation are described and  
10 shown in the Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet and other supporting materials  
11 contained in Planning Department Record Docket No. 2024-001869DES. In brief, the Ladies'  
12 Protection and Relief Society is eligible for landmark designation because it is associated with  
13 events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Francisco history  
14 (National Register of Historic Places Criterion A) and as an example that embodies the  
15 distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction and is  
16 representative of the work of an architect of merit (Criterion C). Specifically, the Ladies'  
17 Protection and Relief Society, is significant for association with the Ladies' Protection and  
18 Relief Society, San Francisco's second oldest charitable organization and the first established  
19 by and for women. Furthermore, the main building, constructed in 1925 by renowned architect  
20 Julia Morgan, is an excellent, rare, and well-preserved example of a commercial building  
21 designed in the Jacobethan Revival style by an architect of merit.

22 (c) The particular features that shall be preserved, or where the City determines it is  
23 necessary due to deterioration of the feature, repaired or replaced in-kind, are those shown in  
24 photographs and described in the Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet, which can be  
25 found in Planning Department Record Docket No. 2024-001869DES, and which are

1 incorporated in this designation by reference as though fully set forth. Specifically, the  
2 following buildings and landscape features are character-defining and shall be preserved,  
3 repaired in-kind, or replaced in-kind:

4 (1) Exterior facades, forms, massing, structure, architectural ornament, rooflines,  
5 and landscape features of the 1925 Morgan Building, 1929 Stone Cottage, and front  
6 lawn/landscaping:

7 (A) Exterior facades, forms, massing, structure, architectural ornament,  
8 roofline, and materials of the 1925 Morgan Building on all elevations, except  
9 obscured east and south facades of the north wing, identified as:

10 (i) Overall regular massing with intersecting hipped roof;

11 (ii) U-shaped plan consisting of a central north-south volume, rear  
12 wings at the east façade, and projections at the north and south façades;

13 (iii) Structural brick walls laid in five-course American bond with  
14 narrow blind niches and recessed diamond and square details;

15 (iv) Slate roof shingles;

16 (v) Symmetrical primary (west) façade design with central gabled  
17 parapet;

18 (vi) Symmetrical fenestration pattern consisting of evenly spaced  
19 window openings displaying a hierarchy among basement, first-floor,  
20 second-story, and attic windows;

21 (vii) Canted bay windows/oriels;

22 (viii) Hipped dormer windows on roof;

23 (ix) Operable divided-lite metal windows retaining their original  
24 sash profiles and pattern;

25

1 (x) Terra cotta ornamental detailing, including window surrounds  
2 with vegetal motifs in the segmental arches, decorative panels and  
3 entablatures at the canted bays, the belt course above the second-floor  
4 windows, projecting cornice with buttons at the eaves, coping and finial  
5 above the central parapet, and the door surround at the main entrance;

6 (xi) Arched openings at the main entrance;

7 (xii) Stained glass art windows at the chapel;

8 (xiii) Three brick replacement chimneys;

9 (xiv) Front exterior stairs with iron railings;

10 (xv) Sunroom and elevator overrides on roof of east façade;

11 (xvi) Rain catch baskets;

12 (B) Exterior facades, forms, massing, structure, architectural ornament,  
13 roofline, and materials of the 1929 Stone Cottage on all elevations, identified as:

14 (i) One-story massing;

15 (ii) L-shaped footprint;

16 (iii) Steeply pitched hipped roof;

17 (iv) Stone exterior cladding;

18 (vi) Punched window openings containing wood-sash casement  
19 and double-hung windows;

20 (C) Landscape features and layout of Front Garden in front of Morgan  
21 Building, identified as:

22 (i) Cast iron fence on brick plinth along the north, west, and south  
23 property lines;

24 (ii) Curvilinear pedestrian footpaths leading from the two gates on  
25 Laguna Street to the primary entrance and two paths curving north and



1 south from the primary entrance (paths have been resurfaced since the  
2 period of significance so paving materials are not character-defining);

3 (iii) Lawn panels in Front Garden;

4 (iv) Copse of trees at the northwest corner of the site.

5 (2) The character-defining interior features of the 1925 Morgan Building are  
6 those associated with portions of the first floor that have historically been accessible to  
7 the public, identified as:

8 (A) Tiled flooring in entrance vestibule;

9 (B) Two paired, eight-lite wood paneled doors under paired, four-lite wood  
10 casement transoms within now-enclosed entrance vestibule (original exterior  
11 doors);

12 (C) Central stairwell with trefoil railing;

13 (D) Fireplace mantel;

14 (E) Wood coffered and decorative plaster ceilings.

15  
16 Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after  
17 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the  
18 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board  
19 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

20  
21 APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
22 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

23 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich  
24 PETER R. MILJANICH  
25 Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2024\1800206\01791375.docx



# LANDMARK DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 16, 2024**

**Record No.:** 2024-001869DES

**Project Address:** 3400 Laguna Street (Ladies' Protection and Relief Society)

**Zoning:** RM-1 (RESIDENTIAL- MIXED, LOW DENSITY)  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
Family and Senior Housing Opportunity SUD

**Cultural District:** None

**Block/Lot:** 0471/003

**Project Sponsor:** Christopher VerPlanck, VerPlanck Historic Preservation Consulting  
530 Rockdale Drive  
San Francisco, CA 94127

**Property Owner:** San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society  
3400 Laguna Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

**Staff Contact:** Pilar LaValley (628-652-7372)  
pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org

**Environmental Review:** Categorical Exemption

**Recommendation:** Recommend Landmark Designation to the Board of Supervisors

## Property Description

3400 Laguna Street is an approximately 68,000-square-foot (approximately 1.6-acre) property located on a corner lot southeast of the Laguna and Bay Street intersection in the Marina neighborhood. The site is bounded by Bay Street to the north, Octavia Street to the east, Francisco Street to the south, and Laguna Street to the west. The property has operated as Heritage on the Marina, a private residential care retirement home, since the late 1950s. From 1925 to the late 1950s, the property housed the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, a convalescent and permanent care home for women.

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society moved to 3400 Laguna Street in 1925 following construction of the Julia Morgan-designed building commissioned for their new location. In the late 1950's, following the Society's merger with a co-ed retirement home, the facility at 3400 Laguna Street expanded through construction of several additions and new buildings. The irregularly shaped property currently contains five buildings – Morgan Building (1925), Stone or Caretaker's Cottage (1929), Perry Building (1957), Perry Building Connector (1957), and the Health Care Center (1963 with two 1986 additions) – with parking and landscaping occupying the rest of the site.

## Project Description

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) shall consider recommendation of landmark designation of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street) as a San Francisco landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code, Section 1004.2.

If the HPC decides to recommend designation of the subject property as an Article 10 landmark it will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. The nomination would then be considered at a future Board of Supervisors hearing for formal Article 10 landmark designation.

- **Background and previous actions:**

- On March 22, 2024, the Department received a Landmark Designation Application for the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, now known as Heritage on the Marina, at 3400 Laguna Street, prepared by Christopher VerPlanck/VerPlanck Historic Preservation Consulting.
- On May 15, 2024, following consideration of the community-sponsored landmark designation nomination, the Commission added 3400 Laguna Street to the Landmark Designation Work Program. The Commission commented that nomination should: consider the complex as a whole; provide additional information about architects Warren C. Perry and Gardner Dailey; and evaluate character-defining features of all facades of the contributing buildings.
- On August 21, 2024, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 1416 to initiate landmark designation of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society.
- On February 24, 2023, property owner, Heritage on the Marina, submitted to the Department to redevelop portions of the site (Case No. 2022-009819ENV). The proposed project would continue to operate as a residential care facility with an increase in the number of residential care suites. The proposed project would demolish two of the five existing buildings (Perry Connector and Health Care Center) and construct two new buildings at heights not to exceed 40 feet and in the same locations as the demolished buildings. The proposed project would renovate two of the other three existing buildings on the site and make improvements to the Julia Morgan Building.

The Department prepared and issued a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) in connection with this project. The Draft EIR finds that implementation of the proposed project would not lead to any significant and unavoidable project-level or cumulative impacts. Public comments on the DEIR will be accepted from August 28, 2024 to 5:00pm on October 15, 2024.

A public hearing on the Draft EIR was held by the Planning Commission on Thursday, September 26, 2024.

- **Contributing resources and period of significance:** The period of significance is 1925 to 1957, which corresponds with the initial construction of the Morgan Building and ends with the Society's merger with the co-ed Crocker Old People's Home. The contributing resources on the property are those that are associated with the significance and that date from the period of significance: the Morgan Building (1925), the Stone or Caretaker's Cottage (1929), and the landscape and hardscape elements of the Front Garden. The significance of the property does not extend to the Warren C. Perry or Gardner Dailey additions. These additions were constructed after the period of significance and have not attained their own significance.
- **Draft ordinance:** The draft ordinance, attached as Exhibit A, has been revised to reflect the Commission's actions per Resolution No. 1416 initiating landmark designation.

## Basis for Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors landmark designation of the **Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street)** as it meets the provisions of Article 10 of the Planning Code regarding Landmark Designation. The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, which operated the subject property as a convalescent and permanent care home for destitute or homeless women from 1925 to 1955, is significant for association with this Society, the second-oldest charitable organization and the first to be established by and for women. The property is also significant as an excellent, rare, and well-preserved example of Jacobethan Revival style architecture and for association with architect of merit Julia Morgan, one of the most important architects to work in California during the first half of the twentieth century. Further, the subject property meets the RSE goals and objectives outlined by the Historic Preservation Commission in Resolution No. 1127.

## ATTACHMENTS

Draft Resolution Recommending Landmark Designation  
Exhibit A – Draft Landmark Designation Ordinance  
Exhibit B – Landmark Designation Report/Fact Sheet  
Exhibit C – Executive Summary Initiating Landmark Designation  
Exhibit D – Resolution No. 1416 Initiating Landmark Designation  
Exhibit E – Maps and Context Images

# LANDMARK DESIGNATION REPORT



## Ladies' Protection and Relief Society

3400 Laguna Street

July 23, 2024

City and County of San Francisco  
London Breed, Mayor

Planning Department  
Rich Hillis, Director

Cover: Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society, 2023, Christopher VerPlanck

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) is a seven-member body that makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the designation of landmark buildings and districts. The regulations governing landmarks and landmark districts are found in Article 10 of the Planning Code. The HPC is staffed by the San Francisco Planning Department.

## CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>BUILDING DESCRIPTION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Neighborhood Context .....	2
Property Description: Site.....	9
Property Description: Morgan Building .....	12
Property Description: Stone Cottage .....	21
Property Description: Perry Building.....	22
Property Description: Health Care Clinic.....	24
<b>HISTORICAL CONTEXTS</b> .....	<b>26</b>
Marina District: 1855 to 2024 .....	26
Preconstruction Site History: 1899 to 1922 .....	33
Institutional History of the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society: 1853 to 1923 .....	37
Planning and Construction: 1922 to 1925.....	40
Operational History: 1925 to 2024 .....	41
Summary of Alterations: 1925 to 2024 .....	53
Julia Morgan: (1872-1957) .....	53
Warren C. Perry: (1884-1980).....	56
Gardner A. Dailey: (1895-1967).....	58
Jacobethan Revival Style.....	61
Retirement Homes in San Francisco.....	63
<b>ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK DESIGNATION</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>72</b>

# Ladies' Protection and Relief Society

## 3400 Laguna Street

**Built: 1925**

**Architect: Julia Morgan**

### OVERVIEW

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society occupies a 68,005-sf lot at the southeast corner of Laguna and Bay streets in the Marina District. The features proposed for designation include the two-story, brick residence hall (Morgan Building) designed by architect Julia Morgan and built in 1925; the one-story Stone Cottage built in 1929; as well as the Front Garden and other remaining historic landscaping. Founded in 1853, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (Society) was established by several prominent Protestant women to care for destitute women (and their children) who had either been widowed or abandoned by their spouses. Between 1853 and 1925, the Society, which operated a residential facility, a training school, and later, an orphanage, was based in several different locations. In 1924, the Society hired noted architect Julia Morgan to design a new facility at the corner of Laguna and Bay streets. Morgan's state-of-the-art brick residence hall reflected important changes in the organization's mission, signifying its transition from a home for destitute women into a convalescent facility for paying clients, as well as providing a home to a small number of retired women. The architecturally notable Morgan Building, which is designed in the Jacobethan style, occupies the western half of the site. The rest of the property was originally over an acre of landscaped gardens. In the mid-1950s, the Society merged with the co-ed Crocker Old People's Home. In need of additional square footage to house the residents of the combined institutions, the Society hired architect Warren C. Perry to design a new four-story residential wing on the east side of the property. In 1963, a one-story clinic designed by Gardner A. Dailey was built along the south side of the of the property. Although these additions displaced most of the gardens, they are designed in such a way that they do not detract from the Morgan Building or the Stone Cottage. 3400 Laguna Street qualifies as a San Francisco Landmark under National Register Criteria A and C, with a period of significance spanning from 1925 to 1957. It is significant under Criterion A for its associations with the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society – San Francisco's second-oldest charity and the first established by, and for, women. It is significant under Criterion C as an intact and very rare example of a commercial building designed in the Jacobethan Revival style in San Francisco. It is also an excellent and rare example of an early twentieth-century retirement home. Finally, the building is significant for its associations with Julia Morgan, one of California's most important architects and a trailblazer for women in the fields of both architecture and engineering.

# BUILDING DESCRIPTION

## Neighborhood Context

The Marina District is a predominantly residential neighborhood of flats, apartment buildings, and single-family dwellings. Built on the site of the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition, the Marina District developed quite rapidly between the wars as a middle-class residential neighborhood principally occupied by upwardly mobile Italian immigrants and their American-born progeny. Although there is still an Italian presence in the Marina District, during the last quarter of the twentieth century, the neighborhood became the preferred home of many young and affluent post-graduates from outside the Bay Area. Like their predecessors, the current residents of the Marina District are attracted to the neighborhood's beautiful setting overlooking San Francisco Bay and the Marin Headlands; its proximity to downtown; its thriving commercial/entertainment district; and its trove of high-end housing stock. The Marina District is also endowed with more parkland than many other neighborhoods, encompassing Moscone Park Playground, the Marina Green, the Palace of Fine Arts, and Fort Mason.

The directors of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society were undoubtedly attracted to the natural beauty of the site when they purchased Assessor Block 471 in 1922. In addition to enjoying views of the Golden Gate and the Marin Headlands, the site was located across the street from the undeveloped open spaces of Funston Playground (now Moscone Park Playground) and Fort Mason. The Marina District was already largely urbanized when the Morgan Building was completed in 1925, and the neighborhood has not changed all that much since then. The most notable changes are concentrated in the southern part of the neighborhood, where Lombard Street was widened in the late 1930s to access the newly completed Golden Gate Bridge. The incremental closure of three former military installations has also changed the neighborhood in a beneficial way by adding hundreds of acres of publicly accessible parklands, including Fort Mason and the Presidio.

The 3400 block of Laguna Street spans from Francisco to Bay Street. This block contains only the subject property on the east side of the street. On the west side is Moscone Park Playground (**Figure 1**). Also known as Moscone Recreation Center, this park comprises four city blocks bounded by Laguna, Bay, Webster, and Chestnut streets. Originally set aside as a public open space in 1855, the undeveloped park was long known as Lobos Square. In the early 1920s, it was renamed Funston Playground and developed as a recreational facility with sporting fields. In 1978, the park was renamed for Mayor George R. Moscone, who had recently been assassinated along with Supervisor Harvey Milk on November 27, 1978. Today, Moscone Park Playground consists of three softball diamonds, one baseball diamond, tennis and basketball courts, and two children's play areas. The playground also contains several buildings, including the Marina Branch Library, the Moscone Fieldhouse, and a maintenance building. Located directly across the street from 3400 Laguna Street is a public artwork called "Passage" by artist Kent Roberts. This piece sits in the middle of small grove of olive trees.





**Figure 1. Moscone Park Playground, looking southwest from Laguna Street.**

The 1400 block of Bay Street encompasses the north side of the subject property, as well as five residential properties, including 3355 Octavia Street – a three-story, 12-unit apartment building constructed in 1925; 1415 Bay Street – a two-story, single-family dwelling built in 1931; 1421 Bay Street – another two-story, single-family dwelling built in 1931; 1425-27 Bay Street – a two-story, two-family dwelling built in 1924; and 1435 Bay Street – a three-story, 12-unit apartment building (later converted into condominiums) that was built in 1924. All five buildings are designed in a blend of the Mediterranean and Classical Revival styles, which is quite common for the Marina District **(Figure 2)**. In contrast, the north side of the 1400 block of Bay Street is part of Fort Mason, a former military installation that is now a unit of Golden Gate National Parks – formerly the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Initially established as a Spanish military outpost in the late 1700s, Fort Mason became a U.S. Army installation during the Civil War. The U.S. Port of Embarkation, which was used to send troops and materiel to the Pacific Theater during World War II, comprises the northwest part of Fort Mason. The Port of Embarkation was abandoned in 1955 after the Korean War and Fort Mason became largely disused in the 1970s. In 1976, Fort Mason became part of the GGNRA. The portion of Fort Mason opposite the subject property is called Pyron Park. It is a large grassy meadow punctuated by informal groupings of trees and curvilinear footpaths **(Figure 3)**.



**Figure 2. South side of Bay Street, including, from left to right: 3355 Octavia Street and 1415, 1421, 1425-27, and 1435 Bay Street – all built between 1924 and 1931.**



**Figure 3. Pyron Park, Fort Mason, looking northwest from Bay Street.**



The 1500 block of Francisco Street contains five properties on the north side of the street, including the subject property. Adjoining 3400 Laguna Street to the east is 1536-38 Francisco Street – a two-story-over-basement, two-family dwelling constructed in 1927. This Mediterranean-style building has belonged to the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society since 1946. It is part of a row of three similarly styled multi-family buildings that also includes 1526 and 1530 Francisco Street (**Figure 4**). Both are two-story-over-basement, four-unit buildings constructed in 1924. The Society also purchased 1530 Francisco Street in 2008. The final building on the block is 1500 Francisco Street – a three-story-over-basement, Mediterranean-style apartment building (since converted into condominiums) containing 11 units (**Figure 5**). It was built in 1924.

Meanwhile, the south side of the 1500 block of Francisco Street contains 10 properties. The first property at 1503-07 Francisco Street is a two-story-over-basement, three-family dwelling designed in the Mediterranean style (**Figure 6**). It was built in 1925. The next two properties – 1531 and 1535 Francisco Street – are both two-story-over-basement, nine-unit apartment buildings constructed in 1924 and 1925, respectively. Both are designed in the Classical Revival style (**Figure 7**). The next six properties – 1547-49, 1553-55, 1557-59, 1561-63, 1567-69, and 1573-75 Francisco Street – comprise a row of related three-story-over-basement, Classical Revival, two-family dwellings built between 1925 and 1927 (**Figure 8**). This row is known locally as the “Painted Ladies of the Marina.” The last building on the block is 3360-62 Laguna Street. It is a two-story-over-basement, two-family dwelling designed in the Mediterranean style (**Figure 9**). It was built in 1924.



Figure 4. From right to left: 1526 (built 1924), 1530 (built 1924), and 1536-38 (built 1927) Francisco Street.



Figure 5. 1500 Francisco Street (built 1924).



Figure 6. 1503-07 Francisco Street (built 1925).





Figure 7. From left to right: 1531 (built 1924) and 1535 (built 1925) Francisco Street.



Figure 8. From left to right: 1547-49, 1553-55, 1557-59, 1561-63, 1567-69, and 1573-75 Francisco Street (all built between 1925 and 1927).



Figure 9. 3360-62 Laguna Street (built 1924).



## Property Description: Site

The subject property contains 68,005 square feet, or a little over an acre (**Figure 10**). The property comprises approximately half of the block bounded by Bay Street to the north, Octavia Street to the east, Francisco Street to the south, and Laguna Street to the west. The parcel itself is irregularly shaped, with the northwest corner having been clipped off in the 1930s as part of a road widening project. There is also a 75' x 75' plaza called the Rear Courtyard at the center of the block. The property contains four buildings: the 1925 Morgan Building at the west side, the 1957 Perry Building wrapping around the north and east sides, the 1963 Health Care Center along the south side, and the 1929 Stone Cottage at the northeast corner. These buildings occupy approximately two-thirds of the site, with parking and landscaping comprising the rest. 3400 Laguna Street is in an RM-1 (residential-mixed use, low density) zoning district and a 40-X height and bulk district.



**Figure 10. Aerial view of 3400 Laguna Street.**  
Source: Google Maps; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

When the Morgan Building was constructed in 1925, the rest of the property was largely dedicated to gardens. Over time, much of the landscaping was removed to construct the Perry Building, the Health Care Center, and various other improvements. Today the most intact portion of the original landscaping is the Front Garden (**Figure 11**). Enclosed within a historic wrought-iron fence set atop a low brick plinth, the Front Garden consists of carefully tended lawns and hedges. Curvilinear concrete footpaths provide circulation between the front gates and the main entrance. A flagpole is located in the southernmost part of the Front Garden. Near the corner of Laguna and Francisco streets is a smaller meditation garden enclosed within a high hedge (**Figure 12**). This garden, which appears to be associated with the Health Care Center, was likely built in the 1980s. Near the intersection of Laguna and Bay streets is a pair of mature Monterey pines and a black acacia. These three trees effectively shield the building from view along Bay Street (**Figure 13**). They were likely planted in the 1930s when Bay Street was widened. Continuing eastward along Bay Street, there is a surface parking lot accessed by a driveway (**Figure 14**). Likely built in 1957 as part of the Perry Building project, this parking lot has a circular planter containing a Ficus tree. There are also several

smaller trees and shrubs growing in a planting bed along the north side of the parking lot. At the east end of the parking lot is a mechanical enclosure, and beyond that is the 1929 Stone Cottage.



Figure 11. Front garden.



Figure 12. Garden in front of Health Care Center.



Figure 13. Landscaping at northwest corner of the property.





**Figure 14. Parking lot at north side of property.**

Other features of the property include the Central Courtyard and the Rear Courtyard, as well as a narrow band of landscaping consisting of a hedge and a decomposed granite walkway along the south side of the property. A wrought-iron fence matching those on Laguna and Bay streets lines the sidewalk along Francisco Street. There is also a row of evenly spaced London plane trees on Francisco Street (**Figure 15**). The Central Courtyard, as its name suggests, is located near the center of the property. It is defined by the interior-facing façades of the Morgan Building, the Perry Building, and the Health Care Center. Designed by Casey Kawamoto and built in 1963 (with later modifications completed in 1986), the Central Courtyard consists of a large brick patio with a pair of fountains at either end (**Figure 16**). The south side of the courtyard consists of several lawn panels demarcated by concrete walkways and stairs. The Rear Courtyard, which is accessed by a passageway beneath the Perry Building, sits at the middle of the block. Also designed by Kawamoto and built in 1963, the Rear Courtyard comprises a brick patio with an amoeba-shaped lawn panel containing a fountain at the center (**Figure 17**). The Rear Courtyard also has a trellis and a gazebo, as well as several planters containing shrubs and trees, including a mature Italian stone pine that likely dates back to the 1920s.



Figure 15. Landscaping along Francisco Street.



Figure 16. Central Courtyard.  
Source: Heritage on the Marina



Figure 17. Rear Courtyard.  
Source: Heritage on the Marina

## Property Description: Morgan Building

### General Description

The Morgan Building is a three-story-over-basement, steel and concrete-frame, brick building with a U-shaped plan consisting of a primary volume facing Laguna Street and a pair of intersecting wings at the rear. The building has a raised concrete foundation and a hipped roof clad in slate. The walls are unpainted red brick laid in five-course American bond. Fenestration consists of divided-lite metal casement windows stacked in pairs and triplets. Designed in the Jacobethan Revival style, the exterior is trimmed in English Renaissance-flavored terra cotta ornament, including door and window surrounds, belt courses, cornices, and sculptural detailing. Designed as a residential home for convalescent and retired women, the building presently functions as a retirement home.

July 23, 2024



## West (Primary) Façade



**Figure 18. West (primary) façade of the Morgan Building.**

The primary façade of the Morgan Building faces west toward Laguna Street (**Figure 18**). It is symmetrically arranged, consisting of seven bays from north to south, and it is three stories in height. The raised basement is articulated by six pairs of divided-lite, metal-frame windows. Protected behind metal security grilles, these windows are all but obscured behind thick foliage. The primary entrance is located in the central bay at the first-floor level (**Figure 19**). The entrance is accessed by a low brick stair consisting of a central rectangular platform with semi-circular runs to either side. The stair features wrought-iron balustrades and lampposts capped by carriage lanterns. The primary entrance itself was originally unenclosed, providing access to a loggia where the front doors were located. The paired arched openings are demarcated by Composite pilasters. The left opening now contains a non-historic anodized-aluminum window and the right bay has a single-panel door with sidelights. Both openings are capped by transoms. Above the main entrance is a prominent oriel. This oriel is visually supported by scrolled corbels. At the second-floor level the oriel is articulated by stacked divided-lite metal casement windows defined by terra cotta mullions and jambs. There is a grouping of three windows within the central facet and one each in the outer facets. The lower part of the oriel is defined by a pair of terra cotta moldings with a floral medallion at the center. There is another r medallion at the top of the oriel. Above the oriel at the third-floor level is a prominent dormer featuring a combination flat and gable roof outlined in terra cotta trim, with an urn-like finial at the apex of the gable. The dormer contains a grouping of five divided-lite metal casement windows with terra cotta surrounds.

The primary façade on either side of the primary entrance/oriel is mirrored, with the first, third, fifth, and seventh bays all being identical (**Figure 20**). These bays all have similarly detailed, paired metal casement windows at the first and second-floor levels. In contrast, the second and sixth bays both have a large canted bay window at the first-floor level. These bay windows match the previously described oriel above the main entrance except for the fact that they both reach the ground. In addition, they have continuous terra cotta friezes.

The main part of the primary façade terminates at the juncture between the second and third floor levels with the following elements: a continuous terra cotta belt course, a plain brick frieze, a terra cotta frieze embellished with floral buttons, a simple entablature, and a plain brick coping.

The third-floor level is articulated by six shed-roofed dormers clad in slate to match the adjoining roof. These dormers are all articulated by divided-lite metal casement windows. At either end of the roof are large brick chimneys. Heavily damaged during the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake and subsequently demolished, the existing chimneys are replicas of the originals.

In addition to the main part of the primary façade, there is a pair of narrow, hipped-roof extensions on the north and south sides of the building. These extensions each comprise one bay facing Laguna Street. Similar to the corner bays of the primary façade they are articulated by paired, divided-lite metal casement windows. These extensions are detailed the same as the rest of the primary façade, with molded terra cotta belt courses and cornices.



**Figure 19. Main entrance with oriel above.**





Figure 20. Detail of the primary façade – right (south) side.

### North (Secondary) Façade

The secondary façade of the Morgan Building faces north toward Bay Street (**Figure 21**). This façade, which originally faced a landscaped garden, is now the “back of house” area, where the loading dock is located, as well as garbage and recycling facilities. The north façade, which is six bays wide and detailed the same as the primary façade, is divided into three parts: the north wall of the rear wing at left, the north wall of the extension at center, and the north wall of the main volume at right. The north wall of the rear wing is articulated as a grid of paired, divided-lite metal casement windows with terra cotta surrounds. However, the windows in the left bay at the first-floor level are somewhat larger. In addition, there is a non-historic sheet metal duct attached to the façade in this area. In the fourth bay there is a loading dock at the first-floor level. This loading dock, which was built in 1993, is sheltered by a non-historic canopy supported by metal posts. The north wall of the north extension is one bay wide. It has a paired, divided-lite metal casement window at the first-floor level and a group of five matching windows at the second-floor level. The right bay features two paired, divided-lite metal casement windows at the first and second-floor levels. The north façade terminates with a cornice, frieze, and coping matching the primary façade. Above the coping are four hipped-roof dormers containing divided-lite metal casement windows, as well as a brick chimney.



**Figure 21. North (secondary) façade of the Morgan Building.**

### **South (Tertiary) Façade**

The tertiary façade of the Morgan Building faces Francisco Street (**Figure 22**). It is very similar to the north façade, although it has fewer openings. Six bays wide, the south façade is divided into three sections, including the south wall of the main building, the south wall of the south extension, and the south wall of the (south) rear wing. The first part is identical to the north façade, consisting of paired, divided-lite metal casement windows at the first and second-floor levels. The south wall of the extension features groupings of five divided-lite windows at the first and second-floor levels. At the east side of the extension there is a pedestrian entrance, consisting of paired French doors. Above it is a grouping of three windows at the second-floor level. The south wall of the rear wing features paired, divided-lite metal casement windows at the first and second-floor levels in the third, fourth, and sixth bays. Meanwhile, the fifth bay is not fenestrated, although there is a decorative diaper-patterned niche at the second-floor level. The south façade terminates with the same cornice as the primary façade. Mounted on the roof are four hipped-roof dormers matching those described previously. These dormers are all fenestrated with divided-lite metal casement windows.





Figure 22. South (tertiary) façade of the Morgan Building.

### East (Rear) Façade

The rear façade of the Morgan Building faces east toward the Central Courtyard and the Perry Building. It is the most complicated elevation due to the presence of two rear wings and the courtyard between them. The east façade is divided into three sections: the east wall of the (south) rear wing, the east wall of the courtyard elevation, and the east wall of the (north) rear wing. No part of the east façade is visible from any public right-of-way. It has undergone the largest number of alterations – especially the first-floor level of the north rear wing, which was significantly altered in 1957 to link the Morgan Building to the Perry Building.

The east wall of the south rear wing is three bays wide (**Figure 23**). At the first-floor level there is a Tudor-arched entrance at the center. It is flanked by two paired, divided-lite metal casement windows with terra cotta surrounds. The two outer bays are similarly expressed at the second-floor level. However, above the entrance at the second-floor level there is a paired, divided-lite window that is offset,



Figure 23. East wall of rear (south) wing.  
Source: Page & Turnbull

indicating where a stairwell is located inside the building. This part of the east façade terminates with a typical frieze and cornice. Above it on the roof is a hipped-roof dormer that matches those on the rest of the building.

The north wall of the (south) rear wing features two paired, divided-lite metal casement windows at either end. The space between is a blank expanse of brick. To the right of the lower window in the right bay is a divided-lite casement. This elevation terminates with the same frieze/cornice/coping seen elsewhere on the building. There is also a pair of hipped-roof dormers at the third-floor level that contain divided-lite metal casement windows.

The central portion of the east façade facing the Central Courtyard is five bays wide (**Figure 24**). Similar to the primary façade, there is a canted bay window at the center, although there is no entrance at the first-floor level. Fenestration consists of groups of three divided-lite metal casement windows in the central facet and paired windows in the side facets. To the left of the bay window, in the second bay, is a pedestrian door at the first-floor level and an offset window above, indicating the location of an internal stair. The first and fourth bays contain paired, divided-lite windows at the first and second-floor levels. The fifth bay is concealed behind the linking wing of the 1957 Perry Building. The central part of the rear façade terminates with a frieze and cornice ensemble matching those described previously on the primary façade and other parts of the building.



**Figure 24. East wall on central portion of east façade.**  
Source: Heritage on the Marina

The roof above this part of the east façade features a continuous dormer that is clad in slate and punctuated by groupings of divided-lite metal casement windows (**Figure 25**). Capping this dormer is a penthouse containing a sunroom at the center and a pair of elevator overrides at either end. This penthouse was added in 1928 – three years after the Morgan Building was constructed. According to permits, it was part of Julia Morgan’s original master plan. The entire penthouse is clad in slate to match the adjoining roof. The elevator overrides are both decorated with floral rosettes and simple entablatures. A metal fire escape provides a secondary means of egress from the penthouse to a flat portion of the roof above the bay window.





**Figure 25. Penthouse and dormer on east façade.**  
Source: Page & Turnbull

The final part of the east façade is the rear wall of the (north) rear wing. As previously mentioned, the first and second-floor levels of the north wing are both concealed behind the 1957 Perry Building, which adjoins the Morgan Building in this location (**Figure 26**). It was likely opened up to create corridors linking the two buildings and all of the windows were mostly likely removed. This part of the east façade terminates with the same frieze and cornice ensemble seen on other parts of the building. The roof features a hipped-roof dormer at the attic level that is similar to others seen on other parts of the building. The first-floor level of the south wall of the (north) rear wing is also concealed behind a section of the Perry Building, which extends out into the Central Courtyard. In contrast, the second-floor level of the (north) rear wing remains visible; it contains paired, divided-lite metal casement windows at either side, as well as a sliding glass door at the center which provides access to an open-air terrace that is on top of a portion of the Perry Building (**Figure 27**).



**Figure 26. Juncture of (north) rear wing of Morgan Building and 1957 Perry Building.**  
Source: Page & Turnbull



**Figure 27. East (rear) façade; view from building on Francisco Street.**

### Interior

The Morgan Building is part of a privately owned and managed retirement facility. It is impossible to enter without permission of a resident or a staff member. As a result, the author did not survey the interior. The following passage is excerpted from Page & Turnbull's 2023 Historic Resource Evaluation for 3400 Laguna Street:

Publicly accessible interior spaces are located close to the primary entrance at the first story of the 1925 building. Finishes are largely original and include glazed ceramic tile floors, smooth stucco (sic) walls, plastered beam or wood coffered ceilings, dropped-arch openings, wood trims and built-in shelving in the library, and carved stone fireplace surrounds and mantles (sic) with floral motifs. Bannisters at stairwells to upper floors include carved wood supports, and doors to private wings at the first story are multi-lite wood.<sup>1</sup>

The original floorplan of the Morgan Building appears to have been largely preserved intact, with the first-floor level largely reserved for public functions, including a reception area, a sitting room, a library, and a chapel. The second and third-floor levels consist of independent living rooms and suites. Most, if not all, of these living spaces have been upgraded in recent decades. Some have also evidently been combined into larger units.

<sup>1</sup> Page & Turnbull, *Historic Resources Evaluation, Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 19.



## Property Description: Stone Cottage

### General Description



**Figure 28. Stone Cottage from Bay Street.**

The 1929 Stone Cottage is located at the northeast corner of the property on Bay Street. Largely concealed behind a high hedge, the cottage is easy to miss (**Figure 28**). The Stone Cottage, which is now in use as an independent living unit, is situated in a garden surrounded by a painted metal fence. Designed and built in 1928-29 by Berkeley contractor Ernest Higgins as a residence for the on-site groundskeeper, the one-story, stone building has an L-shaped footprint and a steeply pitched hipped roof punctuated by a tapered chimney. The roof is clad in asbestos shingles designed to resemble slate.

Resembling an English Cotswold cottage, the walls appear to be made out of salvaged serpentine and basalt cobblestones. The oversized stucco chimney has a tapered profile that recalls the work of contemporary British architect Charles Voysey.

### South (Primary) Façade

The primary façade of the Stone Cottage faces south toward the Perry Building (**Figure 29**). It is composed of two sections: the main body of the house at left and a small extension, or ell, at right. The former section is articulated by two pairs of wood casement windows flanking a 1950s-era Dutch door. The south wall of the ell is similarly punctuated by a pair of wood casement windows.

### West (Secondary) Façade

The secondary façade of the Stone Cottage faces west toward the parking lot. It is composed of two sections: the main body of the house at left and the ell at right. The former is articulated by a large bay window containing divided-lite wood windows. The base of the bay window is wood-framed and clad in stucco, suggesting that it was added at a later date – probably in the late 1950s. Meanwhile, the west wall of the ell is a windowless expanse of stone.

### North (Rear) Façade

The rear façade of the Stone Cottage faces north toward Bay Street. This elevation is dominated by the large stuccoed chimney. There is only one window – a small vinyl casement – located toward the east end.



Figure 29. Stone Cottage, showing the west (left) and south (right) façades.  
Source: Page & Turnbull

#### East Façade

The east façade of the Stone Cottage faces the adjoining apartment building at 1435 Bay Street. Essentially a windowless expanse of stone, the east façade has a single wood casement window near the northeast corner of the building.

#### Interior

The author did not have access to the interior of the Stone Cottage. It is known however that it was remodeled into an income-producing residential unit in the late 1950s when the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society dispensed with the services of a full-time groundskeeper. It continues to serve this function.

### Property Description: Perry Building

#### General Description

Constructed in 1957, the Perry Building, including the linking wing connecting it to the Morgan Building, was built just after the end of the period of significance (1925 to 1957). As such, it does not contribute to the significance of the property. As a result, the section below presents just an abbreviated architectural description.

Built in 1957 to accommodate the influx of residents that occurred following the merger with the Crocker Old People's Home, the Perry Building was designed by architect Charles Perry in a utilitarian style that is reflective of its period of construction. The building is L-shaped in plan and composed of two sections: a four-story-over-basement

residential wing located toward the rear of the property, and a two-story-over-basement linking wing that connects it to the Morgan Building.

The four-story Perry Building is clad in board-formed concrete painted a reddish-orange to match the brick of the nearby Morgan Building (**Figure 30**). The building has a flat roof punctuated by a stair tower and an elevator override. The most interesting part of the building's otherwise functional design is the extruded stair tower at the southeast corner of the building, which is articulated by open voids at the second, third, and fourth-floor levels. At the first-floor level this building is attached to the 1963 Health Care Clinic. The other three façades of this wing are punctuated by an alternating pattern of smaller double-hung and larger anodized-aluminum slider windows. The building's entrances either contain glazed single-panel doors or hollow-core steel doors.



**Figure 30. Residential wing of the Perry Building; view from building on Francisco Street.**

The Perry Building's two-story linking wing is designed in a similar vocabulary to the residential wing. As mentioned, it butts up against the (north) rear wing of the Morgan Building, all but obscuring this elevation. In addition, there is a projecting section, clad in brick, that runs the length of the Central Courtyard. This part conceals the first-floor level of the south wall of the (north) rear wing of the Morgan Building. In contrast, the north façade of the linking wing is entirely board-formed concrete painted a reddish-orange color (**Figure 31**). The second-floor level of the linking wing cantilevers several feet out over the first-floor level. Similar to the rest of the Perry Building, it has a flat roof and the fenestration consists of small double-hung windows and larger anodized-aluminum sliders.





Figure 31. Linking wing of the Perry Building; view from Bay Street.

## Property Description: Health Care Clinic

### General Description

Constructed in 1963, the Health Care Clinic, including the two 1986 additions on the north and west sides, was built after the end of the period of significance (1925 to 1957). As such, it does not contribute to the significance of the property. Therefore, an abbreviated description has been substituted for the elevation-by-elevation exterior description.

Designed by noted architect Gardner Daily and built in 1963 as a clinic for The Heritage retirement home, the Health Care Clinic is one-story in height with a rectangular footprint. It is attached to the Perry Building at its east end (**Figures 32-33**). The building is clad in textured stucco that is painted reddish-orange to match the brick of the Morgan Building and it has a flat roof covered in tar and gravel. The irregularly spaced windows contain anodized aluminum sliders with fixed transoms above. The four exterior elevations terminate in a recessed band at the top of the wall, with a projecting soffit above.

Similar to the Perry Building, the Health Care Clinic is designed in a non-descript utilitarian mode that does not call attention to itself. This is in contrast to a pair of additions built in 1986 on the north and west façades of the Health Care Clinic. Both additions were designed by Spencer & Associates in the Postmodern style, explicitly referencing the Jacobethan Revival styling of the Morgan Building. The addition on the north side of the Health Care Clinic, which is known as Friendship Hall, is in use today as an activity room. The use of the other addition on the east side of the Health Care Clinic is unknown.



Figure 32. Health Care Clinic; view from Francisco Street.



Figure 33. Health Care Clinic; view from building on Francisco Street.



# HISTORICAL CONTEXTS

## Marina District: 1855 to 2024

### Marina District

The Marina District, an area bounded by the Presidio to the west, San Francisco Bay to the north, Van Ness Avenue to the east, and Lombard Street to the south, is one of San Francisco’s most desirable neighborhoods. This was not always the case. Throughout the nineteenth century, this area, which was then known as Harbor View, was a semi-rural enclave of truck farms, fisherman’s shacks, and industrial plants. Much of it was either underwater or on marshy ground. In addition, several large sand dunes cut the Harbor View District off from the rest of the city



Figure 34. George Goddard’s Official Map of the City and County of San Francisco, showing the contemporary boundaries of the Marina District in blue.

Source: David Rumsey Map Collection; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

The Marina District was initially laid out in 1855 in a conventional gridiron pattern as part of the Western Addition Survey. Early maps show the street grid indiscriminately overlaid on top of tidal marshes, towering sand dunes, and even open water (Figure 34). Lobos Square (now Moscone Park Playground) had been set aside in the same survey just south of the historical shoreline of San Francisco Bay. Fort Mason, which had been set aside in 1850 by President Fillmore as the Black Point Military Reservation, occupied a large portion of what is now the Marina. Its current (smaller) boundaries would not be formally established until the 1860s. In addition, a sandy barrier island called Strawberry Island (now Crissy Field Beach) occupied the northwest portion of the neighborhood. By the 1860s, several large landowners had acquired most of the land not claimed by the U.S. government or the City and County of San Francisco. In addition to the Rickett Tract, which occupied the southeast corner of the Harbor View District,



there was the North San Francisco Homestead Association, which claimed most of the marshy land and open water in the north-central part of the neighborhood.

The Harbor View District's isolation from the rest of the city, as well as its foul-smelling tidal marshes, discouraged residential development. As a result, the area remained rural throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. The only notable built landmarks in the area included a beer garden and picnic ground called Harbor View Park, which was located on Strawberry Island, as well as two industrial facilities, including Fulton Iron Works, which was also located on Strawberry Island, and the San Francisco Gas & Light Company, which operated a large power plant on two square blocks bounded by Beach, Laguna, Bay, and Buchanan streets. The company's ornate brick office building, which is a city landmark, still stands at the southeast corner of North Point and Buchanan streets. Meanwhile, the southernmost section of the neighborhood near Chestnut and Lombard streets consisted of several small truck farms operated by Italian and Chinese immigrants.<sup>2</sup>

During the early 1890s, famed "Silver Baron" James G. Fair began buying up the submerged water lots in the Harbor View District. By 1893, he controlled all but five of the 49 blocks bounded by Chestnut, Baker, and Webster streets and San Francisco Bay. In 1892, Fair started constructing a seawall along the northern edge of his holdings as a preparatory step to filling the "land" for industrial sites. In 1893, the City took over the project and hired the firm of Warren & Malley to finish building the seawall, as well as filling and grading streets in the area. Fill material was taken from sand dunes at Fort Mason as well as a large dune separating the Harbor View District from Cow Hollow. By the end of the project, most of the future Marina District had been filled apart from an oval lagoon roughly bounded by Divisadero Street, Marina Boulevard, Webster Street, and Bay Street.<sup>3</sup>

The semi-rural conditions prevalent in the Harbor View District began to change after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. Homeless San Franciscans displaced by the disaster streamed into the area in search of safety and a place to pitch a tent. Some took refuge in the Red Cross Relief Corporation refugee camp in Lobos Square or in one of several informal camps that sprang up throughout the area. Some of the refugees decided to stay, eventually building modest cottages sprinkled throughout the remaining sand dunes and marshes.

San Francisco's elite was anxious to demonstrate to the world that the city had recovered from the 1906 Earthquake, and what better way to do that than by hosting a world's fair? Although ostensibly organized to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal, the Panama Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) was actually intended to showcase San Francisco's remarkable recovery. On April 28, 1910, the newly founded Exposition Company collected over four million dollars in subscriptions to start planning the fair.<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, a site had still not been selected nearly a year later when President William Taft came to San Francisco for the February 15, 1911 groundbreaking. As a result, the ceremony was held in Golden Gate Park.

---

<sup>2</sup> Christopher VerPlanck, "From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood," *Heritage News* (Fall 2007).

<sup>3</sup> Robert Bardell, "What Lies Beneath the Marina?" *The Argonaut* (San Francisco: Winter 2003), p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. William Lipsky, *San Francisco's Marina District* (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 54-5.

Toward the end of 1911, the Exposition Company's Board of Directors, which included prominent businessmen and politicians such as Reuben Hale, William C. Crocker, Michael H. de Young, and Mayor James Rolph, Jr., announced that the fair would be built on 635 acres on the northern waterfront, including 330 acres in the Harbor View District, 287 acres in the Presidio, and 18 acres in Fort Mason.<sup>5</sup> The heirs of James Fair, who owned most of the submerged lots in the north-central part of the Harbor View, welcomed the exposition as a way to get the rest of their water lots filled at no cost to them. Between 1912 and 1914, the Exposition Company painstakingly assembled the fair site. In addition to negotiating a short-term leasehold with the Estate of James G. Fair, company directors, in partnership with the City, issued compulsory condemnation orders and initiated eviction proceedings against hundreds of small landowners and their tenants. The company's actions resulted in the destruction and displacement of the fast-growing community of earthquake refugees that had settled in the Harbor View District after the 1906 Earthquake.<sup>6</sup>

In 1912, the Exposition Company hired the operators of the suction dredges, *John McMullin* and *Oakland*, to pump silt and mud from the bay floor into the 70-acre lagoon enclosed behind the 1894 seawall. The dredges worked for 146 days, pumping over 1.3 million cubic yards of materials into the lagoon.<sup>7</sup> Once the lagoon was filled, the Exposition Company installed water, sewer, and electrical lines and began grading streets.<sup>8</sup> Construction of the grounds and buildings got underway in late 1912. Under the direction of Chicago architect Edward H. Bennett, the individual pavilions were awarded to local architects, including Bernard Maybeck (Palace of Fine Arts), Bakewell & Brown (Horticultural Palace), Louis C. Mullgardt (Court of Abundance), and Meyers & Ward (Machinery Hall). The pavilions were all temporary wood-frame structures finished in staff and lath and plaster to resemble more expensive masonry construction. Hemp was added to the high-quality gypsum stucco to make the walls look like travertine and 102,000 pieces of multi-colored cut glass pendants were hung from the 430-foot Tower of Jewels.<sup>9</sup>

The Panama Pacific International Exposition opened in February 1915. Despite opening during World War I, which prevented several European nations from participating, the PPIE was very successful, attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world. Fairgoers were greeted by a palm-studded landscape divided into a grid of streets and avenues that intersected a number of magnificent courts, including the Court of Four Seasons, the Court of the Universe, and the Court of Abundance (**Figure 35**). The eastern end of the main grounds was anchored by the Palace of Machinery, a tremendous wood-frame structure that measured 1,000 feet long by 367 feet wide. This building was bounded to the north by a landscaped greensward called the North Gardens (now the Marina Green). Transportation inside the grounds was provided by the narrow-gauge Overfair Railway. Access to

---

<sup>5</sup> Donna Ewald and Peter Clute, *San Francisco Invites the World: The Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1991).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Bardell, "What Lies Beneath the Marina?" *The Argonaut* (San Francisco: Winter 2003), 66.

<sup>8</sup> Dr. William Lipsky, *San Francisco's Marina District* (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 58.

<sup>9</sup> Donna Ewald and Peter Clute, *San Francisco Invites the World: The Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1991), 16.

the fair from Downtown was provided by MUNI's new "F" Line, whose terminal was at Chestnut and Laguna streets. In addition, the new "H" Line ran along Van Ness Avenue, connecting the fair to the Mission and points south.<sup>10</sup>

Throughout its 288 days of existence, the PPIE earned enough from admission fees paid by its 18 million visitors to amortize its 15-million-dollar cost. The earnings paid for the construction of Civic Auditorium in San Francisco's new Civic Center, as well as providing a profit of one million dollars to its investors.<sup>11</sup>



**Figure 35. Panama Pacific International Exposition, 1915**  
 Source: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection  
 San Francisco Public Library

The PPIE closed on December 4, 1915. As the clock neared midnight, the lights began to go out throughout the grounds, culminating with buglers playing "Taps" from the Tower of Jewels. The dismantling of the grounds began that following Monday. Anything that could be moved was offered up for sale, including furniture, automobiles, and sculpture. Whatever could not be salvaged or sold was demolished.<sup>12</sup> When the work was concluded, little was left from the PPIE, with the notable exception of the Column of Progress and the Palace of Fine Arts. The column, crowned by a sculpture called "The Adventurous Bowman," stood at the intersection of Marina and Cervantes boulevards until it was hit by one too many reckless motorists and taken down in the mid-1920s.

The restoration of the exposition grounds was completed by February 1917.<sup>13</sup> That same year, the owner of the largest section, Virginia Fair-Vanderbilt, filed a map for a proposed new subdivision called Marina Gardens.<sup>14</sup> Five years later, in 1922, a real estate speculator named George E. Bevel and his partners, the Rothschild Brothers, purchased 55 acres from Mrs. Fair-Vanderbilt and laid out streets in preparation for a new subdivision of half-acre "villa" lots within the area bounded by Marina Boulevard and Laguna, Bay, Fillmore, Chestnut, and Scott streets.<sup>15</sup> Taking advantage of the tract's magnificent views, the developers introduced several new diagonal and curvilinear streets, including Cervantes Boulevard, Casa Way, Prado Street, Toledo Way, Rico Way, Retiro Way, Mallorca Way, and Alhambra Street. The new street names hinted at the "romantic" Spanish theme of the subdivision, which would eventually be reflected in its architecture. The rest of the present-day Marina District, including the areas west of

<sup>10</sup> Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, *Fire Insurance Maps for San Francisco, 1915*.

<sup>11</sup> Donna Ewald and Peter Clute, *San Francisco Invites the World: The Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1991), 8.

<sup>12</sup> "Marina being Spoiled. Say S.F. Aviators," *San Francisco Examiner* (March 28, 1921).

<sup>13</sup> Dr. William Lipsky, *San Francisco's Marina District*, (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 105.

<sup>14</sup> "Marina Gardens Plan is Approved," *San Francisco Examiner* (April 19, 1917).

<sup>15</sup> "Marina being Spoiled. Say S.F. Aviators," *San Francisco Examiner* (March 28, 1921).

Scott Street, south of Chestnut Street, and east of Fillmore Street, were developed by other real estate speculators, and in these areas the original 1855 gridiron street pattern was retained in its entirety (**Figure 36**).

During the 1920s, the old Harbor View name was replaced by a new name: the Marina District. The new name derived from George Bevel and the Rothschild Brothers' name for their subdivision, the Marina-Vanderbilt Tract. Although this name only applied to roughly one-third of the neighborhood, it soon became attached to the whole area.<sup>16</sup>



**Figure 36. Aerial photograph showing the street plan of the Marina District, ca. 1922**  
 Source: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection  
 San Francisco Public Library

Despite being marketed by the Marina Company as a “residence park” for large homes similar to St. Francis Wood or Presidio Terrace, the realtors realized that most of the lots were being purchased by Italian families from nearby North Beach. For the most part these pragmatic immigrant investors re-subdivided their large “villa” lots into standard 25’ or 30’-wide house lots suitable for flats or rowhouses.<sup>17</sup> Some larger lots remained at the corners, but these were usually almost always developed with small to mid-sized apartment buildings.

Mainly developed during the 1920s-era building boom, the remarkably cohesive architectural character of the Marina District results from the fact that it was developed by a small number of contractors within a short period of time. Builders who were most active in the Marina during the 1920s and 1930s included the Meyer Brothers, William W. Rednall, the St. George Holden Realty Company, Irvine & Ebbets, the Stoneson Brothers, and Ben Liebman. Irvine & Ebbets was a partnership consisting of developer Lawrence O. Ebbets and architect Richard R. Irvine. Other architects who designed buildings in the Marina District included H.C. Baumann, Charles S. Strothoff, Albert H.

<sup>16</sup> J. Raymond DeLong, *The Marina District of San Francisco* (San Francisco: unpublished paper submitted to Dr. Moses Rischin, San Francisco State College, 1966), 4.

<sup>17</sup> Dr. William Lipsky, *San Francisco's Marina District*, (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 105.

Larsen, Louis Mastropasqua, Harold Stoner, Sidney Colton, and Pietro Canali. Nearly all of these individuals employed a consistent palette of materials and features, including textured stucco walls, red clay tile roofs and accents, and wrought iron window grilles and balconies to evoke an idealized Spanish, Mexican, or Mediterranean cityscape. By the early 1930s, the Art Deco style was in ascendance, but it was mainly used for the large corner apartment buildings and commercial buildings along Chestnut Street.

In 1925, the Rothschild Brothers reported that more than 80 percent of their Marina District lots had sold. Five years later, three-quarters of the lots in the tract had been developed, accommodating almost 25,000 people.<sup>18</sup> Although the Marina was heavily Italian, the neighborhood appealed to a cross-section of middle-class San Franciscans. However, what united these diverse residents was a fervent desire to maintain the residential character of their fledgling suburb. Although zoned residential in San Francisco's original 1917 zoning ordinance, industrialists coveted the Marina District's waterfront. In 1927, Marina property owners fought off a \$2.5 million wholesale produce terminal proposed for Gashouse Cove. This victory set important legal precedent and eventually led to the construction of the Marina Green on the northern waterfront instead of industrial plants or commercial buildings.<sup>19</sup>

The Chestnut Street commercial district developed somewhat later than the rest of the Marina District. Served by Muni's 30 Stockton streetcar line and the 22 Fillmore streetcar/cable car line, Chestnut Street was ideally located for commercial development because many residents passed through the area as part of their daily commute. By the early 1930s, most of Chestnut Street between Divisadero and Fillmore streets had been developed. Many of the new commercial buildings were designed in the Art Deco style, as exemplified by the Presidio Theater. Designed by John Ahnden and constructed in 1937 at a cost of \$75,000, the Presidio Theater remains a prominent local landmark at 2338-46 Chestnut Street. Some of the new buildings on Chestnut were mixed-use, consisting of stores at street level and flats or apartments above **(Figure 37)**.

Civic authorities did their part too, beginning with the construction of Winfield Scott School (now Claire Lilienthal Alternative School) at Divisadero and Beach streets in 1930. Marina Junior High School came next. Completed in stages between 1935 and 1939 on the block bounded by Chestnut, Fillmore, Bay, and Webster streets, Marina Middle School is one of the best Art Deco public buildings in the city.<sup>20</sup>

Parks were not neglected either. One of the first was the Marina Green, which was built along the waterfront between Scott and Laguna streets in 1929.<sup>21</sup> Various improvements to the Marina Yacht Harbor in the 1920s and 1930s led to the relocation of the St. Francis and the Golden Gate yacht clubs to the Marina District.<sup>22</sup> The Marina's other notable public park was Lobos Square. Originally set aside as a public space in 1855, the as yet undeveloped

---

<sup>18</sup> "Commercial Development of the Marina District," *California Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (January 20, 1933), 54.

<sup>19</sup> "O'Toole Backs Marina Ban," *San Francisco Chronicle* (August 10, 1928), 12.

<sup>20</sup> Frederick W. Jones, "Modern Design for San Francisco Schools," *Architect & Engineer* (June 1936), 9.

<sup>21</sup> "Marina Zoning Fight Renewed," *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 3, 1929).

<sup>22</sup> "Marina Home District Shows Big Increase in Residential Building," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 2, 1925).

park became a refugee camp in 1906. After the quake it lay fallow for another two decades, until finally being developed as a playground and recreation center in 1925. It was renamed Moscone Park Playground in 1978.

The completion of the Golden Gate Bridge in 1937 ended the Marina District's isolation from the rest of the city. Designated as the easterly approach to the Golden Gate Bridge, Lombard Street was widened to four lanes and made part of U.S. Highway 101 in the late



**Figure 37. Chestnut Street, looking west from Avila Way, 1947.**  
Source: OpenSFHistory / wnp14.1404

1930s. In 1941, Lombard was widened again to six lanes. During the postwar period, Lombard Street evolved into an auto-oriented strip development known as “Motel Row.” This low-density, linear commercial strip evolved to consist of more than a dozen hotels and motels, gas stations, coffee shops, and other businesses catering to motorists passing through San Francisco.

Since the 1950s, the Marina District has undergone few physical changes apart from some scattered infill development. One of the most notable changes was the demolition of the PG & E power plant at Bay and Laguna streets and its redevelopment with the Marina Safeway in 1959, and a decade later, the Marina Cove apartment complex. Other changes included the replacement of Muni's 22 and 30 streetcar lines with bus service and the construction of a new Marina Branch Library in 1954.<sup>23</sup> In 1989, the Loma Prieta Earthquake destroyed several apartment buildings as the filled ground liquified beneath them. Seven buildings collapsed and four people died in the Marina District. Another 63 buildings were yellow or red-tagged, resulting in extensive repairs and rebuilding in the years that followed.

The Marina District underwent a more substantial demographic makeover during the second half of the twentieth century. Historically a heavily Italian-American neighborhood, the Marina District began to attract affluent college graduates from across the nation in the 1980s. The newcomers, referred to in the popular culture of the day as “Yuppies,” completely transformed the culture of the neighborhood, as bars and expensive restaurants took the place of Italian delicatessens and lunch counters. During the tech boom of the early twenty first century, many tech executives and venture capitalists moved in, continuing the ongoing “gentrification” of the Marina District.

<sup>23</sup> Christopher VerPlanck, “From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood,” *Heritage News* (Fall 2007).



## Preconstruction Site History: 1899 to 1922




**Figure 38. 1899 Sanborn Maps showing Western Addition Block 184 (Assessor Block 471).**  
 Source: San Francisco Public Library; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

The earliest known buildings to occupy the site of 3400 Laguna Street were several temporary, wood-frame stables and sheds that appeared on the 1899 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (**Figure 38**). These structures were part of a work camp built by Warren & Malley, the contractors who built the seawall and filled in a large portion of the present-day Marina District during the late 1890s. The southern half of the site contained two stables and a store room and there was a carpenter's shop at the corner of Laguna and Bay streets. The rest of the camp was across the street in Lobos Square, and it consisted of a stable, a combination bunk house/kitchen/mess hall, a blacksmith's shop, and a hay enclosure.

Western Addition Block 184 (now Assessor Block 471) wholly belonged to a woman named Kate F. Austin. Kate Austin was a property investor who had been married to Henry S. Austin, a prominent businessman and a partner in the San Francisco mercantile firm of Austin & Phelps, as well as Austin Brothers in Stockton.<sup>24</sup> Henry died in 1890, leaving his estate to his wife. Kate invested much of the family fortune in San Francisco real estate, including Western Addition Block No. 184. She bought the block Ca. 1893, having it graded later that year.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> "Henry S. Austin's Estate," *San Francisco Morning Call* (June 14, 1890), 4.

<sup>25</sup> "House and Lot," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 19, 1893), 7.



**Figure 39. 1905 Sanborn Maps showing Western Addition Block 184 (Assessor Block 471).**  
**Source: David Rumsey Map Collection; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck**

According to the 1905 Sanborn Maps, Western Addition Block 184 contained no buildings (**Figure 39**). The temporary structures built by Warren & Malley had either been demolished or relocated after the company's work was completed Ca. 1900. After the 1906 Earthquake, Kate Austin had the block divided into a grid of tiny house lots, with a pair of alleys bisecting the block from east to west.<sup>26</sup> She then leased the block to a man named H.M. Wooley, who moved 75 refugee cottages from the Lobos Square Refugee Camp onto the site in late 1906 or early 1907. The community continued to thrive on this site for the next four or five years, until 1911, when the San Francisco Board of Health issued a resolution condemning the property on the basis that the cottages evidently lacked modern sanitary devices, i.e., running water and toilets. Austin and Wooley appealed the resolution, and on January 30, 1912, Judge Thomas F. Graham issued an order directing the Board of Health to show cause for the condemnation order, finding that the cottages were actually equipped with kitchens and bathrooms.<sup>27</sup>


The community of earthquake cottage dwellers did not last much longer, because as explained above, in late 1911, the Exposition Company began entering into negotiations with Harbor View property owners to secure the land for the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition. Accordingly, in early 1912, Kate Austin leased Western Addition

<sup>26</sup> None of these lots and streets appear to have ever been formally recorded at the City.

<sup>27</sup> "Owners of Refugee Cottages Go to Court," *San Francisco Call* (January 31, 1912), 6.



Block 184 to the Exposition Company. The 1913 Sanborn Maps note that the block was part of the future site of the PPIE but that it had no buildings on it (**Figure 40**).



**Figure 40. 1913 Sanborn Maps showing Western Addition Block 184 (Assessor Block 471).**  
Source: San Francisco Public Library; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

As described in the previous section, construction of the PPIE got underway in late 1912. Assessor Block 471 became part of the concession and amusement zone. The 1915 Sanborn Maps prepared for the fair show Block 471 straddling the main east-west promenade through “The Zone.” The northern third of the site was occupied by the “Incubator Babies” and a portion of the “Indian Pueblo” exhibits (**Figure 41**). The former was a small clinic housing newly invented incubators, uniformed nurses caring for premature babies, and real storks walking around the room.<sup>28</sup> Meanwhile, the latter exhibit was a reproduction of a Southwestern pueblo. Sponsored by the Santa Fe Railroad, the “Indian Pueblo” formed the entrance to the much larger “Grand Canyon of Arizona” attraction.<sup>29</sup> Meanwhile, the southern part of this block was occupied by a portion of “The Submarines” exhibit, as well as a small portion of “Toyland Grown Up.” “The Submarines” was a large attraction consisting of a lagoon at the center where patrons could “ride” in a stationary “submarine” with “suspiciously dry-looking wonders of the deep appear(ing) to move

<sup>28</sup> Laura Ackley, *San Francisco's Jewel City: The Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2015), 148-49.

<sup>29</sup> Ackley, 260-61.

past the portholes.” Other attractions included “Neptune’s Grotto” and a massive reproduction of Jonah and the whale.<sup>30</sup> “Toyland Grown Up” was an Alice in Wonderland-style fantasyland of “overgrown” toys and miniature fairy scenes intended for adults.<sup>31</sup>




Figure 41. 1915 Sanborn Maps showing Assessor Block 471 as part of the Panama Pacific International Exposition.  
Source: San Francisco Public Library; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

The Zone was one of the most popular parts of the PPIE, but it closed down along with the rest of the fair in December 1915. A little over a year later, the entire site had been cleared and the land returned to its owners. Unlike most other property owners in the area, Kate Austin does not seem to have been interested in developing her property after it was returned to her control in early 1917. Five years later, on March 15, 1922, Kate Austin sold the entire block (Lots 1 to 6) to the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Ackley, 250-1.

<sup>31</sup> Ackley, 254.

<sup>32</sup> San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder, Property records on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

## Institutional History of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society: 1853 to 1923

Established by a group of pioneer women, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society is San Francisco's second-oldest charitable organization and the first to be established by women. The organization was founded in 1853 by a group of women affiliated with Trinity Episcopal Church. Their initial cause was a young girl who had traveled around Cape Horn to San Francisco to meet her brothers. Unfortunately, they were nowhere to be found when she arrived. Stranded without friends, family, or money, the girl appealed for help at Trinity. Mrs. A.B. Eaton and an ad hoc group of women at the church raised money for the girl so she could find housing and get settled. Additional appeals for help led the group to formalize its operations, and in the fall of 1853, Mrs. Eaton took out articles of incorporation and established the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society. The group initially met at Trinity Church, which was at that time located on Pine Street between Kearny and Montgomery. However, within a year, the organization needed more space, leading it to open an office at 151 Sacramento Street.<sup>33</sup>

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society's stated mission was to "render protection and relief to strangers, (and) to sick and dependent women and children." Most of the group's earliest cases were young women –either with or without children – who had traveled to San Francisco to meet their husbands or other family members, only to find out that their loved ones had gone to the gold fields, died, or no longer wanted anything to do with them.<sup>34</sup> During the 1850s, San Francisco was a rough and tumble port city with a huge imbalance of male to female residents. As late as 1860, there were 12 men for every woman. Sadly, unscrupulous people frequently took advantage of desperate young women – especially pimps and madams working the cribs of the Barbary Coast. Members of the Society tried to help women avoid this fate by providing clothing, food, and temporary financial support, as well as helping them to find housing and "legitimate" employment.<sup>35</sup> Trinity Church was one of the wealthiest Episcopal parishes in San Francisco, and its members certainly provided a ready market for domestic workers.

In 1857, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society won a grant of \$3,000 from the California Legislature to expand its services. With this money, as well as an additional \$6,000 raised by the Society's board, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society opened the "Hospitality House" at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Tehama streets in the South of Market area.<sup>36</sup> In addition to providing residential quarters for homeless women and children, the facility included administrative offices, and an employment agency. As before, most of the jobs fell into the category of domestic work, such as maids, laundresses, babysitters, and governesses.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> "Ninety Years Service: The City's Second Oldest Charitable Institution to Hold Open House," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 17, 1944), 14.

<sup>34</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 52.


<sup>35</sup> June Hogan, "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.

<sup>36</sup> June Hogan, "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.

<sup>37</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 53.



The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society only remained in the South of Market area for a few years. In 1860, a local businessman named Horace Hawes donated an entire city block to the Society. This block, bounded by Van Ness Avenue, Geary Street, Franklin Street, and Post Street, had only recently been subdivided as part of the 1855 Western Addition Survey. Occupied by shifting sand dunes, the property was located far out on what was then the western edge of the city.<sup>38</sup> The Society hired architect Samuel C. Bugbee to design a new three-story, brick and stone building at the southeast corner of Franklin and Post streets. Completed in 1864, this Second Empire-style building contained administrative offices, the labor agency, and residential quarters for dozens of women and their children (**Figure 42**). A one-story industrial training school was later added to the site, as well as a freestanding bakery, a wood shed, a laundry facility, stables, and several storage sheds. The Society's training school offered a wide range of vocational services to its clients, including lessons in sewing, cooking, and hairdressing. Eventually the school added business training, including typing, shorthand, and filing.<sup>39</sup> In addition to caring for the children of its clients while they worked, the Society took in a number of orphans whose mothers were not affiliated with the Society.<sup>40</sup>



**Figure 42. Ladies' Protective and Relief Society building at Franklin and Post streets, 1866.**

Source; OpenSFHistory / wnp37.00619

Completed in 1864, this Second Empire-style building contained administrative offices, the labor agency, and residential quarters for dozens of women and their children (**Figure 42**). A one-story industrial training school was later added to the site, as well as a freestanding bakery, a wood shed, a laundry facility, stables, and several storage sheds. The Society's training school offered a wide range of vocational services to its clients, including lessons in sewing, cooking, and hairdressing. Eventually the school added business training, including typing, shorthand, and filing.<sup>39</sup> In addition to caring for the children of its clients while they worked, the Society took in a number of orphans whose mothers were not affiliated with the Society.<sup>40</sup>

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society remained at 1200 Franklin Street for well over half a century. For most of this time the Society's mission did not change. However, by the early twentieth century the board of directors began to acknowledge that some changes were in order. San Francisco was no longer a frontier town, and the ratio of men to women had become roughly equal. Although by no means enjoying the same access to education and employment as men, women had begun to enter the labor force in large numbers during the early twentieth century – in particular the clerical occupations, teaching, and retail sales. With employment opportunities expanding, women were no longer dependent on a man for financial support, which also meant that the demand for the Society's services was also diminishing.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> "Ninety Years Service: The City's Second Oldest Charitable Institution to Hold Open House," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 17, 1944), 14.

<sup>39</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 53.

<sup>40</sup> June Hogan, "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.


<sup>41</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 54.

Confronted with changing societal norms and employment patterns, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society commissioned a survey to determine how it could best benefit women in San Francisco. Following the survey, the board concluded that the greatest unmet needs were temporary housing for disabled/convalescent women and permanent housing for retired women. Accordingly, the board of directors decided to abandon its present home and build a new facility that would provide short-term care to women recovering from illnesses and/or acute medical care, as well as long-term housing for single retired women.<sup>42</sup>

In addition to changing its mission, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society was confronted with the increasing physical obsolescence of its long-time home. Constructed in the 1860s, the main building was cramped, old, and deteriorated. In addition, in the six decades that had passed since the Society had built its campus on Franklin Street the Van Ness Corridor had fully urbanized. After the 1906 Earthquake, many downtown businesses that had been displaced by the disaster opened temporary stores along Van Ness Avenue and its intersecting streets. Although most eventually returned downtown, the commercial character of Van Ness Avenue became firmly established after the quake. By the late 1910s, Van Ness Avenue had become San Francisco's "Auto Row." As real estate values skyrocketed, many of the remaining single-family homes were torn down and replaced by much larger hotels, apartment buildings, and auto dealerships.

As mentioned, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society owned its campus and the entire block free and clear. Seeing an opportunity to fund an entirely new facility elsewhere, the Society decided to lease its property to a commercial realty firm and build a new campus elsewhere. Accordingly, on March 15, 1922, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society purchased the entire block bounded by Bay, Octavia, Francisco, and Laguna streets (Assessor's Block 471/Lots 1-6) from Kate Austin.<sup>43</sup> A little over a year later, on April 23,

1923, the Society resurveyed the block, retaining the westernmost two-thirds (Lots 3, 4, 5, and 6). The Society then sold the rest of the block, apart from a 75' x 75' section at the center, to Romilda S. Musto (Lots 1 and 2) (Figure 43).



**Figure 43. 1935 San Francisco Block Map showing Assessor Block 471 and the property of the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society (outlined in red).**

Source: San Francisco Planning Department

<sup>42</sup> June Hogan, "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.

<sup>43</sup> San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder, Property records on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

## Planning and Construction: 1922 to 1925

It is not known what condition Block 471 was in when the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society purchased it, but it was probably devoid of buildings or landscaping. As mentioned in the previous section, the block had most recently been part of the PPIE, until late 1915, when the fair closed and the site was cleared. The Society's decision to purchase the property was likely motivated by several factors. The first was that the entire block was available for purchase, which allowed the Society to reserve as much space as it needed and then sell the rest to other parties. The Society also likely selected this site due to its proximity to undeveloped open space, including Lobos Square – the largest public park in the Marina District – and Fort Mason. Prior to the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge, the Marina District was a very quiet and peaceful corner of San Francisco, with views of the Golden Gate and the Marin Headlands to be had from much of the neighborhood. The site was also close to public transit and the Chestnut Street commercial district.

The board of directors of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society hired famed architect Julia Morgan to design their new campus. Although not mentioned by name, an article in the March 29, 1924 *San Francisco Chronicle* mentions that the Society had obtained plans for a three-story-over-basement brick building costing \$140,000.<sup>44</sup> Julia Morgan, one of California's foremost architects, was awarded dozens of commissions by women's institutions across the state, including the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society. Her design for the project involved constructing one large building along the Laguna side of the property with gardens occupying the eastern half of the roughly one-acre site. In addition to overlooking Lobos Square, siting the building on Laguna Street would help to shelter the gardens from the often harsh on-shore winds. The single building would contain all of the institution's functions, including a reception hall, administrative offices, a central kitchen, a dining hall, and individual guest rooms.

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society filed for a building permit on March 20, 1924. The permit was granted that very same day. The permit application provides the specifications for the building, which was to be built with a steel and concrete frame infilled with load-bearing brick walls laid in five-course American bond.<sup>45</sup> The \$140,000 building was paid for in part by a bequest of \$50,000 from the estate of the late Lizzie G. Hovey. Another \$2,500 was provided by Serena Goodall Keil to build the gardens, which were called Serena Court, behind the building. Construction got underway in the spring of 1924 and the building and gardens were completed one year later. The public was invited to inspect the property on May 16, 1925.<sup>46</sup> A photograph taken of the building around this time shows what it looked like (**Figure 44**). As can be seen, there have been almost no changes to the primary façade apart from infilling the main entrance loggia.

---

<sup>44</sup> "Work begins on Number of New Edifices," *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 29, 1924), 8.

<sup>45</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>46</sup> "Aid Society in New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 15, 1925), 13.





Figure 44. 3400 Laguna Street, 1925.

Source: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library, AAC-9988

## Operational History: 1925 to 2024

When it opened its new campus in 1925, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society was essentially operating what today would be called a short-term care home. However, in addition to admitting women who needed a safe place to recover from an illness or surgery (as well as their children), the Society also admitted "a few" single, retired women. The cost of nursing care and board was \$1 a day, "subject to modification for special need." Convalescent women were admitted for up to three weeks but retired women were admitted for the rest of their lives "if their conduct proves such as to make them adaptable to the general environment."<sup>47</sup>

In September 1928, three years after moving to 3400 Laguna Street, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society hired contractor N.F. Nielsen to construct a sunroom on the roof of the building, as well as a pair of elevator overrides to access it. This penthouse was designed by Julia Morgan and it was evidently part of the original master plan. The \$4,000 addition was clad in slate to match the roof and the adjoining dormers. Its location on the east (garden) side of the roof was likely to minimize its visual impact from the street.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> "Aid Society in New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 15, 1925), 13.

<sup>48</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

The gardens were a huge part of the Society's appeal. During the early twentieth century, medical professionals believed that access to fresh air, sunshine, and greenery was imperative for a full and healthy recovery from many diseases. With almost the entire site dedicated to landscaped gardens, patios, and walkways, residents could "take the air" and spend most of their days out-of-doors (**Figure 45**). An article in the October 15, 1933 *San Francisco Chronicle* provides some insight into the role that gardens were supposed to play in the healing process:



**Figure 45. Women relaxing in the garden at the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society, 1935.**

**Source: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library**

Nearly half an acre of land has been devoted to the garden. Fields and hedges of multi-colored flowers alternate with lawns of wild strawberries and the more than one hundred varieties of trees and shrubs act as windbreaks.<sup>49</sup>

The gardens and associated landscaping were designed by Arthur A. Smith, evidently with input from San Francisco Parks Superintendent, John McLaren.<sup>50</sup> McLaren's precise contributions to the landscape design are unknown, although his proven track record of landscaping the previously barren and windswept expanses of Golden Gate Park no doubt appealed to the Society.

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society employed several groundskeepers to maintain all of the landscaping, including a head groundskeeper. In December 1928, the board hired a Berkeley contractor named Ernest Higgins to design and build a cottage for the head groundskeeper and his family. The one-story stone cottage, which cost \$2,000 to build, is located at the northeast corner of the site, near Bay Street. The stones used to build the cottage appears to be repurposed street cobbles, which were then widely available as the city was in the process of removing the cobblestone streets from downtown San Francisco.<sup>51</sup>

3400 Laguna Street initially appears on the 1929 Sanborn Maps (**Figure 46**). These maps illustrate two buildings on the property: the two-story Morgan Building facing Laguna Street and the one-story Stone Cottage (labeled as a storehouse) facing Bay Street. Although not depicted or labeled on the maps, the rest of the site was still dedicated to gardens and landscaping. The rest of the parcels on the block, apart from one property facing Bay Street, had already been developed by this point.

<sup>49</sup> "Amid Healing Beauty," *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 15, 1933), 4.

<sup>50</sup> "New Home will be Opened by Old Society," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 10, 1925), 55.

<sup>51</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.




Figure 46. 1929 Sanborn Maps showing the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society at 3400 Laguna Street.  
Source: San Francisco Planning Department; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

In 1937, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society sold a portion of their property to the City and County of San Francisco for a Works Progress Administration (WPA) project that widened Bay Street from two to four lanes. The sale, which proceeded from a condemnation order, included a chunk of the northwest corner of the property.<sup>52</sup> The work entailed removing the landscaping on this part of the property, regrading the terrain, relocating the sidewalk, and rebuilding the fence to follow the new property line. It appears that the Society planted several fast-growing Monterey pine trees along the new property line near the intersection of Laguna and Bay streets to lessen the visual and auditory impacts of the project.

<sup>52</sup> "Real Estate," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 4, 1937), 29.





**Figure 47. 1938 aerial photograph showing the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society at 3400 Laguna Street.**  
**Source: David Rumsey Map Collection; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck**

A series of aerial photographs taken by Harrison Ryker in 1938 for the WPA show 3400 Laguna Street not long after the widening of Bay Street had taken place (**Figure 47**). The photographs show the newly reconfigured northern property line, with the relocated fence and newly planted street trees lining Bay, Laguna, and Francisco streets. The group of Monterey pines is also visible at the northwest corner of the site. In 1938 there were still only two buildings on the property: the Morgan Building facing Laguna Street and the Stone Cottage at the northeast corner of the property. The rest of the site was devoted to gardens, patios, walkways, and other landscaping. Tree-studded lawns wrapped around the north, south, and west sides of the property, with curvilinear walkways linking the main entrance on Laguna Street with gardens behind the Morgan Building. Vehicular access was on Bay Street, with a circular driveway located next to the Stone Cottage. A landscaped walkway behind the Morgan Building extended back to a midblock courtyard. A path also appears to connect Bay and Francisco streets near the rear of the property. Apart from the 1928 penthouse addition, no exterior alterations had occurred to the Morgan Building. Within the vicinity of the site, Lobos Square had been developed with baseball diamonds, tennis and basketball courts, and passive landscaped areas. The PG & E power plant is also visible catty-corner from the property, as well as a complex of warehouses across the street at Fort Mason.

In May 1944, the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society celebrated its ninetieth anniversary. By this point the Society had been in operation in the Marina District for nearly two decades. According to the article, the Society was still providing care to convalescent women of any age and permanent residency to retired women.<sup>53</sup>




Figure 48. 1950 Sanborn Maps showing the Ladies' Protective and Relief Society at 3400 Laguna Street.  
Source: San Francisco Public Library; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

The 1950 Sanborn Maps show no changes from the 1929 series published a little over two decades earlier (Figure 48). 3400 Laguna Street is still depicted as just having two buildings: the three-story-Morgan Building facing Laguna Street and the one-story Stone Cottage at the northeast corner of the site. The rest of the property was presumably still dedicated to gardens as shown on the 1938 aerials. Later that year, the Society built a one-story, wood-frame “garden house” costing \$3,000 somewhere on the property.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> “Ninety Years Service: The City’s Second Oldest Charitable Institution to Hold Open House,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 17, 1944), 14.

<sup>54</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

In April 1953, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society celebrated its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary. An article appearing in the April 12, 1953 *Chronicle* commemorated the event, noting that the Society was the second-oldest charitable institution in San Francisco, having been founded only two years after the Protestant Orphanage – the first charitable organization in the city. The article also noted that the Society was still providing convalescent care to women of any age and long-term residential care to women over the age of 65. The former were charged between \$2.25 and \$5 a day, depending on their ability to pay, and the latter were billed \$55 a month, which included room, board, and medical care. Any expenses in excess of the residents' income were paid for through the Society's endowment.<sup>55</sup>

By the early 1950s, the business model followed by the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society since 1925 had begun to falter. The first factor was the growth of for-profit short-term care homes for people recovering from illnesses and/or surgery. This type of business offered food, lodging, and medical care on a short-term basis, relying on a steady stream of insured patients to make money. The second factor was the growing popularity of retirement homes. Ever since the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, nearly every American had access to some sort of old age pension. In 1954, the Hill-Burton Act, which had offered federal subsidies to fund the modernization of medical facilities, was amended to support the construction of hospital-affiliated nursing homes.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to these economic and legislative changes, there were cultural shifts present in mid-century American society. Retired people of lesser means had traditionally lived with their grown children or other family members. This was especially true for immigrants and many rural working-class people. However, many people did not have this option, especially if they did not have children, their children did not live close by, or their children's homes were unsuitable for some reason. As American society became more urban, individualistic, and atomized during the middle of the twentieth century, nuclear families became the norm over intergenerational households. Finally, there was the issue of pride, which led many seniors to avoid becoming dependent on their children for help.

Along with growing prosperity, retirement homes offered a viable third option to those who could no longer live on their own and for whom living with family members was not an option. By the early 1950s, retirement homes began offering a range of services that were more appealing than the "old people's" homes of the past. In addition to offering private rooms, à la carte dining, and on-site medical care, retirement homes began to offer recreational facilities and enrichment programs that appealed to those who wanted to live out their "golden years" in a comfortable, pleasant, and convivial environment.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> June Hogan, "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.

<sup>56</sup> Laura Katz Olson, *The Not-So-Golden Years: Caregiving, the Frail Elderly, and the Long-Term Care Establishment* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 158.

<sup>57</sup> Olson, 158.



Whatever the reason(s), in 1955 the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society decided to eliminate its convalescent recovery programs and become a retirement home. Consequently, it entered into an agreement with the Crocker Old People's Home to merge the two institutions and consolidate their operations at 3400 Laguna Street.<sup>58</sup>

The Crocker Old People's Home was initially founded as the Scandinavian Benevolent and Relief Society in 1875 by Minnie Nelson. Originally located on Francisco Street between Stockton and Powell, in 1884, railroad magnate Charles Crocker's widow, Mary Crocker, offered the home a large lot at the corner of Pine and Pierce streets. After building a new "old people's home" at this address, the society changed its name to the Crocker Old People's Home. This co-ed retirement home remained at 2507 Pine Street for 65 years. However, by the mid-1950s, the neighborhood surrounding the home was declining and the building itself was increasingly deficient.<sup>59</sup>

As per the terms of the December 1955 agreement, the two organizations would assume the name of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, although men and women would be accepted henceforth. To accommodate the 100 or so residents of the combined institutions, a new building would be erected behind the Morgan Building.<sup>60</sup>

In May 1956, the president of the board of directors of the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, Joy Perry, announced that the Society had hired her husband, architect Warren Perry, to design the new building. Perry stated: "We're attempting to get the very best for the aged people both architecturally and financially." She added: "Their rooms will be comfortable and the new dining rooms and sheltered gardens will mean gracious living for them."<sup>61</sup> An article appearing in the May 27, 1956 *San Francisco Examiner* mentioned that the Morgan Building would be remodeled to accommodate occupational therapy space, as well as space for arts and crafts and a new woodshop. Joy Perry touted the home's location near the Yacht Harbor, Aquatic Park, and the proposed new Marina Branch Library, as well as nearby Muni lines.<sup>62</sup>

A photograph taken of the Morgan Building in 1956 shows what it looked like as the first substantial addition to the campus was being planned (**Figure 49**). Apart from the left entrance portal, which appears to have been infilled with a window, the primary façade appears unchanged from original conditions.

The Ladies' Protection and Relief Society applied for a permit to construct the new three-story addition on July 6, 1956. The permit application describes it as a reinforced-concrete building containing 10,500 sf of space. Warren C. Perry was the architect and Thomas E. Chace was the structural engineer. The \$510,000 addition was built by Erbentraut and Summers.<sup>63</sup> Several months later, in January 1957, the Society applied for a permit to add an

---

<sup>58</sup> "Two Homes for the Elderly Agree to Merge Here," *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 7, 1955), 5.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Sue Lichty, "Bright Outlook at Home for Aged," *San Francisco Examiner* (May 27, 1956), 6.

<sup>62</sup> Lichty, 6.

<sup>63</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

additional story to the building, which was already under construction. Also designed by Warren Perry, the addition raised the cost of the project to a little over a million dollars.<sup>64</sup>



**Figure 49. 3400 Laguna Street, 1956.**

**Source: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library, AAC-9989**

The construction of the new building required the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society to apply for a change in zoning from residential to commercial. On January 19, 1956, the San Francisco Planning Commission voted to approve the change in use "contingent upon observance by the owner or owners and by his or their successors (sic) interest of the conditions contained in the following stipulations:"

The commercial improvements on the above described parcel shall be as to make it suitable for a senior guest home as indicated on preliminary plans entitled "Additions to SF. Ladies' Protection and Relief Soc. 3400 Laguna St. Dated Jan. 12, 1956."<sup>65</sup>

In June 1957, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society applied for another permit to remodel the former groundskeeper's cottage (the Stone Cottage) into a residence for the superintendent. The \$2,000 remodel was designed by architect Hewitt C. Wells.<sup>66</sup>

The newly expanded and remodeled Ladies' Protection and Relief Society was formally dedicated on April 18, 1958. Described in the April 17 *Examiner* as "San Francisco's first big luxury "hotel" designed exclusively for persons over 70," the article stated that the luxurious appointments were made possible by leasing the Society's property at Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard to the developers of the Jack Tar Hotel for 50 years. The article said that income from the lease would help to subsidize residents who could not afford the monthly fees, which were as much as \$300 per person. The newly expanded home contained 100 private guest rooms spread across the original building and the addition, which later became known as the Perry Building. Many of these rooms, which all measured at least 13' x 15', had "picture windows overlooking the Bay and the Marin hills." In addition, the newly expanded facility

<sup>64</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>65</sup> San Francisco Planning Commission, Resolution No. 4506, dated January 19, 1956.

<sup>66</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

contained a 16-bed infirmary, a “great spotless kitchen,” two recreation and hobby rooms, a new chapel seating 50 persons, a library, sitting rooms with adjoining kitchenettes “for evening snacks,” a superintendent’s cottage, and a “large landscaped garden court.”<sup>67</sup> The president of the board of directors described the purpose of the new home:

(Our purpose is) to provide a nonprofit, non-sectarian residence for aged men and women of San Francisco within a familiar metropolitan setting, permitting them to live a free and independent life with easy access to cosmopolitan activities, and, at the same time, assuring vigilant care in the case of illness or need.<sup>68</sup>

As the passage above suggests, the requirement that residents of the home be adherents of the Protestant faith had been dropped. Founded by members of Trinity Church, the Ladies’ Protective and Relief Association had always been associated with San Francisco’s Episcopalian community. However, by the early 1950s, American society was rapidly secularizing, and the walls between different faiths were breaking down. Furthermore, the Crocker Old People’s home was non-sectarian, meaning that Catholics, Jews, and others were now residents of 3400 Laguna Street. An even bigger change was the introduction of men into the community. The Crocker Old People’s Home had long been co-ed, and the admission of men to the formerly all-female facility represented a major change for an organization that had been founded by, and for, women. Reflecting the changing demographics, the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society adopted the moniker “The Heritage” for the newly expanded and rededicated retirement home in 1959.<sup>69</sup> However, the organization that administers the home continues to retain its original name.

Less than four years after completing the Perry Building, the management of The Heritage decided to add another building to the complex – a 23-bed infirmary.<sup>70</sup> It is not known exactly why the board of directors wanted to construct a free-standing infirmary when there was already one in the Perry Building, but it appears to have been necessary to comply with state laws requiring retirement homes to provide on-site medical care to certain standards. Indeed, in 1960, The Heritage had been threatened with having its tax-exempt status revoked for charging more than \$150 a month without offering sufficient on-site medical care. If it provided such care, the board would be allowed to charge up to \$250 a month and keep its tax-exempt status.<sup>71</sup> However, the official reason given for building the new infirmary was the desire to free up space in the Perry Building to accommodate another 12 residents.<sup>72</sup>

The board of directors hired Gardner Dailey, a well-known architect, to design the proposed 32-bed infirmary. The reinforced-concrete building would be built on the gardens and lawn south of the Morgan Building, facing Francisco Street. It is not known whether The Heritage had originally intended to build a multi-story building on this site, but the San Francisco Planning Commission soon stepped in and imposed a series of conditions on the project:

1. The proposed facilities shall be constructed and installed in substantial conformity to the preliminary plans labeled “Proposed Infirmary Addition – The Heritage San Francisco Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society 3400 Laguna Street, San Francisco, Cal.” Filed with said application, providing for a one-story building only.

<sup>67</sup> “Home for Aged Opens Tomorrow,” *San Francisco Examiner* (April 17, 1958), 7.

<sup>68</sup> “Dedication Tomorrow: New \$1 Million Home for Aged,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 17, 1958), 9.

<sup>69</sup> San Francisco City Directories.

<sup>70</sup> “The Heritage Open House Tomorrow,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 8, 1962), 18.

<sup>71</sup> “Tax Challenge on S.F. Aged Home,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 30, 1960), 32.

<sup>72</sup> “The Heritage Extension Begins,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 21, 1962), 40.

2. Signs, if any, on the new infirmary shall be limited to one (1) flush identifying sign, non-illuminated, the perimeter of which shall encompass a total area no greater than twelve (12) square feet.
3. The proposed parking lot, exclusive of driveways, shall be landscaped and screened along its street frontage by an appropriate combination of solid or open fence, wall, compact evergreen hedge, or trees, shrubs, and ground cover.

Wheel stops or the equivalent shall be installed around the periphery of the lot, exclusive of driveways, not less than three feet from any landscaping features.

Signs, if any, on the parking lot shall be limited to directional signs.

Any artificial lighting on the parking lot shall be deflected downward and into said area.

Said parking lot shall be graded and paved so as to provide adequate drainage.

4. Final plans, including the plan for parking and for any signs, shall be subject to review by the City Planning Commission.<sup>73</sup>

The resolution passed unanimously on April 5, 1962.

With planning approvals in place, the San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society applied for a permit to construct the one-story infirmary. The cost was \$160,000. This was about half the original projected cost, strongly suggesting that the Society had originally planned to construct a larger building on the site. Construction got underway in late summer 1962 by the construction firm of Swinerton & Walberg. The building was finished in March 1963, with interior finishing and painting taking place over the spring and summer. The certificate of final inspection was issued on September 23, 1963.<sup>74</sup>

The construction of the new infirmary spurred on more than \$150,000 of additional work on the property. First, the construction of the infirmary had created a courtyard at the center of the property. In July 1963, the Society hired landscape architect Casey Kawamoto to landscape what became known as the Central Courtyard. At the same time, Kawamoto redesigned the Rear Courtyard. Kawamoto designed both of the courtyards in a modernist vocabulary that seems influenced by the work of Thomas Church.<sup>75</sup> Kawamoto also designed the new perimeter landscaping. Finally, the construction of the infirmary also triggered the completion of \$96,000 worth of interior alterations to the Perry Building due to the fact that the space that had formerly been occupied by the infirmary was converted into residential units. The project also included the installation of new bathrooms on the second and third floors of the Perry Building. Gardner Dailey designed the remodel of the Perry Building's interior.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>73</sup> San Francisco Planning Commission, "Resolution No. 5512," April 5, 1962.

<sup>74</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>75</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>76</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.



Following the completion of what is now known as the Health Care Center, the Central and Rear Courtyards, and the interior remodel of the Perry Building in 1963-64, The Heritage underwent very few changes over the next several decades. The number of residents remained at around 100, with a slightly higher ratio of women to men. In the 1970s, management began upgrading some of the older residential units with new finishes, as well as adding private bathrooms to some units. In 1974, a new sprinkler system was installed, as well as various other mechanical upgrades.<sup>77</sup>

In May 1978, the San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society celebrated its 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary. In that year, The Heritage housed 104 people. The average age was 85. Described in a contemporary article as "the plushiest old folks home this city has ever seen," The Heritage was praised for its "lavish interior, gardens, fountains and cloth napkins with every meal." The Heritage employed a large staff of 77, including one on-call physician, five nurses, two vocational nurses, a dietician, and 30 aides. In 1978, residents paid an up-front "life care" fee of \$25,000 when they moved in. On top of this, residents paid monthly dues of up to \$600.<sup>78</sup>

In the mid-1980s, the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society commissioned a pair of additions to the Health Care Clinic. Designed by Spencer & Associates, these two additions, which are both designed in the Postmodern style with nods to the 1925 Morgan Building, contain a social room and what appears to be a chapel or a waiting room.<sup>79</sup>

The Morgan Building sustained moderate damage in the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. As a result, management removed three heavily damaged masonry fireplaces and three chimneys in November 1989.<sup>80</sup> The chimneys were later replaced in early 1990 with replicas matching the originals. In 1993, management built a new steel-frame and corrugated metal loading dock on the north side of the Morgan Building.<sup>81</sup>

In the mid-1990s, the San Francisco Planning Department updated the 1950 Sanborn Map series to account for physical changes made since then. The Ca. 1995 Sanborn maps show 3400 Laguna Street with the 1958 and 1963 additions in place around the Central Courtyard (**Figure 50**). However, they do not show the 1993 loading dock on the north side of the Morgan Building. By this time much of the original landscaping had either been removed and/or heavily modified to make way for new buildings. The notable exception was the Front Garden, which remains intact. The Stone Cottage also appears on the Ca. 1995 Sanborn Maps. By this point this building was in use as a residence by occupants of The Heritage.

---

<sup>77</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>78</sup> Joseph Torchia, "Our Greatest Tradition is One of Love," *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 1, 1978), 16-17.

<sup>79</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 49.

<sup>80</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

<sup>81</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.




Figure 50. Ca. 1995 Sanborn Maps showing The Heritage at 3400 Laguna Street.  
 Source: San Francisco Public Library; annotated by Christopher VerPlanck

Since the early 2000s, The Heritage (renamed Heritage on the Marina in 2013) has embarked upon a long-term campaign to upgrade its facilities, beginning with the residents’ rooms, as well as public spaces and other amenities. This work has occurred incrementally over the last two decades as units are vacated. As part of this work, many of the smaller units have been combined to form larger units. As a result, the unit count has declined from 100 in 1958 to only 86 today. However, management has made up for this in part by purchasing two additional residential buildings on the block, including a three-unit building at 1530 Francisco Street that was purchased in 2008, and another three-unit building at 3325 Octavia Street, which was purchased in 2016.<sup>82</sup> The back-of-house spaces such as the kitchen have also been remodeled in recent years. Throughout all of this, management has taken care to preserve the exterior of the Morgan Building in close to its original condition.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>82</sup> San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder.

<sup>83</sup> San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building permits on file for 3400 Laguna Street.

## Summary of Alterations: 1925 to 2024

As described in the pages above, 3400 Laguna Street has undergone several substantial alterations in its nearly 100 years of existence. After undergoing relatively few changes during its first three decades, in 1957-58, the Society added a large two-and partial four-story building containing residential units, a kitchen, and a dining room. This building, known today as the Perry Building, wraps around the north and east sides of the property. Then, just five years later, in 1963, the Society added a one-story infirmary along the south side of the property. Known today as the Health Care Center, this utilitarian structure was expanded with a pair of smaller Postmodern additions in 1986. The construction of the Health Care Center necessitated the redesign and reconstruction of much of the landscaping, leading to the construction of the Central and Rear Courtyards in 1963-64. Since the 1980s, there have been few substantial exterior alterations apart from the addition of a loading dock on the north side of the Morgan Building in 1993. Since the early 2000s, the interiors of the Perry Building and parts of the Morgan Building have been incrementally remodeled as smaller residential units are combined into larger suites. Throughout this time, the exterior of the Morgan Building has been carefully preserved. The Stone Cottage and the Front Garden have also undergone few changes.

### Julia Morgan (1872-1957)

Julia Morgan was born January 20, 1872 in San Francisco to Charles and Eliza Morgan (**Figure 51**).<sup>84</sup> Two years after her birth, the Morgans moved to Oakland. Julia graduated from Oakland High School in 1890. Inspired by a childhood acquaintance, Julia decided to become an architect. Upon enrolling at the University of California in 1890, Julia studied engineering because there was no architecture program at the time.<sup>85</sup> She graduated with honors four years later with a B.S. in civil engineering – the first woman to do so at the university. While studying at Berkeley, Morgan was mentored by Bernard Maybeck, a leading light in the Bay Area architectural community. He encouraged her to continue her studies at the prestigious École des Beaux Arts in Paris. Julia became the first woman to enroll at the École. While in Paris she met Phoebe Apperson Hearst, which resulted in a longstanding connection with the ultra-wealthy Hearst family and a series of high-profile commissions from Phoebe, and later, her son William Randolph Hearst.<sup>86</sup> Julia Morgan graduated from the École des Beaux Arts in 1901 – becoming the first woman to receive a Certificate in Architecture from that institution.



**Figure 51. Julia Morgan, Ca. 1894.**  
Source: UC Berkeley College of Environmental Design Archives

<sup>84</sup> U.S. Find a Grave Index, 1600s-Current, for Julia Morgan.

<sup>85</sup> Sara Boutelle, *Julia Morgan Architect* (New York: Abbeville Press Publishers, 1995).

<sup>86</sup> Cary James, *Julia Morgan* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1990), 45.

In 1902, Julia Morgan returned to Oakland with her architecture degree and began working for UC Berkeley's campus architect, John Galen Howard. In 1904, after receiving her California architectural license – another first for a woman – Julia established her own practice. One of her first commissions was remodeling Phoebe Apperson Hearst's country estate, "Hacienda del Pozo de Verona," which was located near Pleasanton, California. Her first ground-up commission was a Mission-style campanile built for Mills College in Oakland (1904) (Figure 52). Over the next few years, Julia would design several more buildings on the campus of this pioneering California women's college. Morgan's Mills College work marked the beginning of her work for women's institutions, which comprised a substantial portion of her practice henceforth.<sup>87</sup>



**Figure 52. Mills College Campanile.**  
Source: Author's postcard collection

Similar to many of her counterparts, Julia Morgan's career thrived in the wake of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, which necessitated the reconstruction of San Francisco. One of her first post-quake jobs was the reconstruction of the Fairmont Hotel on Nob Hill. Much was made of the fact that such a big and important job was entrusted to a woman, but her success in rebuilding one of San Francisco's largest and most ornate hotels won her a far-ranging reputation for excellence.<sup>88</sup>

The Fairmont Hotel job launched Julia Morgan into the top echelon of San Francisco architects. Shortly thereafter, she moved her office into the Merchants Exchange on California Street, where she would work for the rest of her career. Julia Morgan earned a reputation for designing buildings that were both beautiful and practical. Although educated in the Neoclassical École system, she became skilled at designing in a variety of styles, including the Craftsman, Mission Revival, English Period Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, and many others.

Julia Morgan's opus magna is of course "La Cuesta Encantada" – better known today as Hearst Castle – near San Simeon, California. In 1919, she began working with William Randolph Hearst to design a rural retreat in the remote Santa Lucia Mountains overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The resulting complex, which takes its cue from several historical sources in Spain and Italy, occupied much of her attention for the next two decades, until it was "completed" in 1939.<sup>89</sup> Other projects for William Randolph Hearst included a remodel of the Hearst Building in San Francisco (1937), as well as the construction of a series of Bavarian-styled buildings at the family's Wynton Estate near Mt. Shasta in the late 1930s/early 1940s.

<sup>87</sup> Richard W. Longstreth, *Julia Morgan – Architect* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, 1986), 6.

<sup>88</sup> Jane Armstrong, "Woman Architect Who Helped Build the Fairmont Hotel," *The Architect and Engineer of California* Vol. X, No. 3 (October 1907).

<sup>89</sup> Sara Boutelle, *Julia Morgan Architect* (New York: Abbeville Press Publishers, 1995).



Throughout the time that she worked for the Hearst family, Julia Morgan's practice continued to thrive with a variety of other projects, including many for women's organizations. One category included clubhouses, including buildings for the Sausalito Women's Club (1916-18), the Berkeley City Club (1930), and the Monday Club in San Luis Obispo (1934).<sup>90</sup> Morgan was also heavily involved with the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), designing the Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove (1913), as well as YWCA facilities in Oakland (1915), San Francisco's Chinatown (1916), Harbor Area/San Pedro in Los Angeles (1918), Hollywood (1926), Honolulu (1926), Riverside (1929), and San Francisco's Japantown (1932). Although not a YWCA facility, Morgan designed a facility for the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society in 1925 in San Francisco.<sup>91</sup> This was her only building designed in the Jacobethan Revival style.

Julia Morgan designed several churches, mortuary chapels, and other religious and commemorative buildings during her career. Her churches include St. John's Presbyterian in Berkeley (1910), High Street Presbyterian in Oakland (1921), Ocean Avenue Presbyterian in San Francisco's Excelsior District (1922), and St. James Presbyterian in San Francisco's Visitacion Valley neighborhood (1923). Chapel of the Chimes hired Julia Morgan to design a new crematory and columbarium in Oakland, which was completed in 1928 (**Figure 53**).<sup>92</sup>



**Figure 53. Chapel of the Chimes, Oakland.**

In 1932, Julia Morgan underwent an operation to resolve an infected eardrum. Unfortunately, the procedure severed a nerve that affected her balance. Although this incident did not affect her performance as a designer, her unsteady gait made it difficult to move around construction sites. The Depression and World War II also affected her practice, leading to a drop in commissions. Julia Morgan's practice continued to decline after the war, a situation exacerbated by changing architectural tastes – in particular the growing acceptance of modernism. The death of her long-time client, William Randolph Hearst, in 1951 led Morgan to close her practice. She then ordered that her records be destroyed. In 1953, Julia was mugged in Oakland and subsequently hospitalized. A series of strokes that followed her hospitalization caused her to become reclusive, visiting only with close friends and family. Julia Morgan died in San Francisco on February 2, 1957 at the age of 85.<sup>93</sup> Largely forgotten at the time of her death, interest in Julia Morgan's remarkable career surged in the 1970s and 1980s. Since then, architectural historians have rehabilitated her reputation as a groundbreaking female architect as well as being one of California's top architects of all time.

<sup>90</sup> Boutelle.

<sup>91</sup> Boutelle.

<sup>92</sup> Boutelle.

<sup>93</sup> U.S. Find a Grave Index, 1600s-Current, for Julia Morgan.

## Warren C. Perry (1884-1980)

Warren Charles Perry was born May 12, 1884 in Santa Barbara, California to Charles and Martha Perry (**Figure 54**).<sup>94</sup> His parents, who were both natives of Ohio, moved to Berkeley in the 1890s after Charles took a job at the Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind (now the California School for the Blind). The family lived at 2636 Dwight Way in Berkeley.<sup>95</sup> Warren graduated from Berkeley High School in 1903 and subsequently enrolled in UC Berkeley's civil engineering program. While attending Berkeley, Perry took classes with John Galen Howard. Howard, who founded the School of Architecture at Berkeley in 1903, hired Perry to work in his San Francisco office. In 1907, Perry traveled to Paris to study at the prestigious École des Beaux Arts. He returned to the Bay Area in 1911, and that same year he joined the faculty of the School of Architecture at UC Berkeley.<sup>96</sup> Perry also went back to work for John Galen Howard. In 1913, he received his architectural license and opened his own practice.<sup>97</sup>



**Figure 54. Warren C. Perry, 1907.**  
Source: UC Berkeley

Warren continued teaching at UC Berkeley and working on his own account for the next five years. On July 28, 1918, he married Joy Wilson at St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Berkeley. The Perrys moved to San Francisco, taking up residence in an apartment house at 41 Arguello Boulevard in the city's prestigious Presidio Terrace neighborhood.<sup>98</sup> In 1927, following John Galen Howard's retirement, Warren Perry became chair of the School of Architecture at UC Berkeley. Two years later, he was appointed dean of the school, a position he held until 1950.<sup>99</sup> He also chaired the Art Department from 1935 until 1938. Perry participated in the design of several buildings and structures on the Berkeley campus, including the School of Law and the Art Deco-style George C. Edwards Track Stadium, which he co-designed with architect George Kelham (**Figure 55**). The stadium, which still stands, was completed in 1932.<sup>100</sup> His work at Berkeley kept Perry busy, but even with these existing commitments, he found time to design a number of houses – mostly in San Francisco's elite neighborhoods of Pacific Heights, Sea Cliff, and St. Francis Wood. Most of these were designed in the Italian Renaissance style. In addition to these high-end commissions, Perry served on a

<sup>94</sup> U.S. World War I Draft Registration Cards, 1917-1918, for Warren C. Perry.

<sup>95</sup> 1900 U.S. Census for Berkeley, California, Enumeration District 396, Sheet 2.

<sup>96</sup> "Warren Charles Perry, Architecture: Berkely," Online Archive of California: <http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb1j49n6pv;NAAN=13030&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00073&toc.depth=1&toc.id=&brand=oac4>, accessed July 22, 2024.

<sup>97</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 59.

<sup>98</sup> 1920 U.S. Census for San Francisco, California, Enumeration District 276, Sheet 13B.

<sup>99</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 60.

<sup>100</sup> Page & Turnbull, *3400 Laguna Street Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 – Revised* (San Francisco: February 16, 2023), 60.

team along with Frederick H. Meyer and John Bakewell, Jr. to design the Potrero Terrace defense workers housing project on Potrero Hill in San Francisco during World War II.<sup>101</sup>

Warren Perry was a well-regarded figure in the Bay Area architectural community. Although he was trained in the classical pedagogy of the École des Beaux Arts, he was open to new ideas and changing tastes, which meant that he was able to design in a variety of styles. Perry served as a member of the State Board of Architectural Examiners from 1931 to 1943, including a two-year stint as president. He was also appointed vice-



**Figure 55. George C. Edwards Track Stadium.**  
Source: Noe Hill

president of the San Francisco Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) for the year 1936-37. In 1938, he was made the chapter's president. In 1947, Perry was honored by being made a Fellow of the AIA. Warren C. Perry retired from UC Berkeley in 1954 at the age of 70.

Even after he retired, Warren Perry kept working on his own projects. His involvement with the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society occurred after his retirement from UC Berkeley. As mentioned previously, his wife Joy was president of the board of directors of the Society, and he likely got the job due to this connection. However, it is possible that he also agreed to design the building on a reduced fee.

Joy Perry died on December 20, 1978 at the couple's home at 2530 Vallejo Street in Pacific Heights. She was 90 years old.<sup>102</sup> Following Joy's death, Perry moved out of the house that he had designed and moved into The Heritage at 3400 Laguna Street. Warren lived there, in another building he designed, for another year and a quarter, dying at 3400 Laguna Street on March 25, 1980. He was 95 years old.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>101</sup> "Warren Charles Perry, Architecture: Berkely," Online Archive of California: <http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb1j49n6pv;NAAN=13030&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00073&toc.depth=1&toc.id=&brand=oac4>, accessed July 22, 2024.

<sup>102</sup> State of California, Certificate of Death: Joy Wilson Perry.

<sup>103</sup> State of California, Certificate of Death: Warren Charles Perry.

## Gardner A. Dailey (1895-1967)

Gardner Acton Dailey was born April 10, 1895 in Michigan and raised in St. Paul, Minnesota by Irish-American parents (**Figure 56**).<sup>104</sup> Little is known about his early life, but in 1915, at the age of 20, he moved to San Francisco. Gardner Dailey took a job in the landscape architecture firm of Donald McLaren, son of famed Golden Gate Park superintendent John McLaren. Dailey's first job was working on the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition. In 1917, Dailey signed up with the newly founded U.S. Army Air Corps. While flying a reconnaissance mission above Verdun, France, his plane took a shrapnel hit, forcing him to make an emergency landing. Injuries sustained in the incident left him blind in one eye and earned him a Purple Heart.<sup>105</sup>



**Figure 56. Gardner Dailey.**  
Source: UC Berkeley  
Environmental Design Archives

After the war, Gardner Dailey returned to the Bay Area and completed coursework at UC Berkeley and Stanford University. In need of money, in 1921, he enrolled in night courses at Heald's Business College in San Francisco to study engineering and architectural drafting. Studying off hours, Dailey worked as a nurseryman during the day to support himself. His job included designing gardens, but he also did much of the installation work as well. During the early 1920s, Dailey became interested in architecture and during this time he reportedly worked for both Bruce Porter and Julia Morgan.<sup>106</sup>

Gardner Dailey married Marjorie Dunne, daughter of a prominent San Francisco attorney, in Paris, on September 2, 1926.<sup>107</sup> Dailey and his wife returned to San Francisco in late 1926 or early 1927. In 1927, Dailey earned his architectural license. Through his father-in-law's social connections Gardner Dailey meet several prominent clients. His first big project was an estate for Julian Thorne in Woodside, California. This job won many accolades, leading to more commissions in Woodside, and also in San Francisco. Gardner Dailey's early work was not modern. Indeed, much of his early work was designed in traditional historicist styles, such as the Allied Arts Guild in Menlo Park (built 1930), which is designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Dailey greatly admired the Anglo ranch houses and Mexican adobes from California's pioneer days, and he mined these vernacular styles for his own work. His well-known William Lowe Jr. House in Woodside is designed in a blend of these two styles, which he called "Early California." Completed in 1936, the Lowe House won Dailey First Prize in *House Beautiful* magazine's Small House Competition.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>104</sup> U.S. Social Security Death Index, 1935-2014 for Gardner A. Dailey.

<sup>105</sup> UC Berkeley Environmental Design Archives, "Gardner Dailey" <https://archives.ced.berkeley.edu/collections/dailey-gardner>, Accessed August 7, 2019.

<sup>106</sup> *Joseph Esherick, An Architectural Practice in the San Francisco Bay Area 1938-1996*, Interview by Suzanne Riess. Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 1996.

<sup>107</sup> Architect, Wife to Repeat Marriage," *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 28, 1929), 12.

<sup>108</sup> "81 New Houses: West Coast, Two bedrooms, one bathroom, dining alcove, laundry, no basement," *Architectural Forum* (April 1941), 220-21.



Dailey's work remained fairly traditional until the late 1930s, when he designed the Coral Casino Beach Club in Montecito, California (**Figure 57**). This sprawling complex, which still stands, is designed in the International Style with influences of the contemporary Streamline Moderne and Hollywood Regency styles. From 1937 onward, most of Dailey's work was in the modernist vein, including the Herbert L. Sommer House at 2519 Broadway (1937), 2750 Scott Street (1938), the Brazil Pavilion at the Golden Gate International Exposition (1938), the Berliner House at 120 Commonwealth Avenue in San Francisco (1938), and the L.D. Owens House in Sausalito (1939). Most of Dailey's residential work was very unassuming, often featuring smooth



**Figure 57. Coral Casino and Beach Club.**

exteriors without any ornament. He also never lost his appreciation for wood construction, often using flush wood siding instead of stucco. His work was characterized by a desire to make sure that even the minutest detail was perfectly worked out. His interiors were always laid out in a functional yet elegant manner with little wasted space. He was ably assisted during the pre-war period by Joseph Esherick, a young graduate of University of Pennsylvania, who came to San Francisco in 1939.

The U.S. entry into the Second World War ended Dailey's private commissions, but he soon became involved with defense work, designing the U.S. Merchant Marine's Cadet Basic Training School at Coyote Point in San Mateo in 1942.<sup>109</sup>

After the war, Gardner Dailey hit his stride as one of San Francisco's "top-shelf architects," as Herb Caen called him. It was during this time that he designed several of his most important buildings, one of which was featured in a 1949 exhibit hosted by the San Francisco Museum of Art (now SFMOMA). Often described as the seminal event in the evolution of the Second Bay Region Tradition, the exhibit, titled "Domestic Architecture of the San Francisco Bay Region," featured projects by several architecture firms that would collectively define Bay Area Modernism after World War II, including Gardner Dailey, Campbell & Wong, Henry Hill, Warren Callister, Anshen & Allen, Ernest Born, William Wurster, Joseph Esherick, and several others. That same year, Dailey realized one of his best-known buildings, the American Red Cross West Coast Headquarters at 1550 Sutter Street (**Figure 58**). Designed in the International Style, this building, which won Dailey an Award of Honor for Distinguished Work in Architecture from the San Francisco Art Commission, featured a landscaped forecourt and interior courtyard. In spite of its significance and outcry from advocates across the globe, the building was unceremoniously demolished to make way for condos in 2001.

<sup>109</sup> PCAD, "Gardner Acton Dailey" <http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/44/>, Accessed August 7, 2019.

Gardner Dailey took on more institutional work during the 1950s and 1960s as his fame continued to grow. Some early institutional projects include Luther Burbank Junior High School (now June Jordan High School) at 327 La Grande Avenue in San Francisco (1953), May T. Morrison Hall at UC Berkeley (1957-58), Alfred Hertz Memorial Hall of Music at UC Berkeley (1957-58), and the Russell H. Varian Physics Lecture Hall at Stanford University (1962). Dailey also prepared a Master Plan for UC Davis and designed several new buildings for this university's fast-growing campus in the Sacramento Valley.<sup>110</sup>



**Figure 58. American Red Cross West Coast Headquarters.**  
Source: UC Berkeley Environmental Design Archives

At the height of his career, Gardner Dailey's office had 70 employees. In addition to his institutional work, Dailey teamed up with developers in the 1960s to design several massive redevelopment projects, including Golden Gateway Plaza in San Francisco. Nonetheless, Dailey, unlike many of his contemporaries, was also interested in historic preservation, and in the early 1960s he became a founding member and spokesperson for the Committee to Save Chinatown, whose aim was to prevent the loss of the famous ethnic enclave to the high-rise building boom.<sup>111</sup> His involvement in urban planning issues led to his appointment to the San Francisco Planning Commission. In 1963, Dailey was also appointed to the board of the San Francisco Museum of Art. He also served as the president of Strybing Arboretum for several years and a bench inscribed with his name is installed in what is now known as the San Francisco Botanical Garden.

Some of Gardner Dailey's later projects include an addition to the M.H. de Young Museum in Golden Gate Park to house the Avery Brundage collection of Oriental Art (1965-demolished), Visitacion Valley Jr. High School in San Francisco (1965), the KRON television studio at Van Ness Avenue and O'Farrell Street (1965), and the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Headquarters in Oakland (1967).

Gardner Dailey underwent brain surgery in the mid-1960s to treat an undisclosed illness. According to employee Russ Levikow, Dailey recovered quickly and was back to work, but then within a year his health again began to decline. One day, on October 24, 1967, Dailey left his office, drove to the Golden Gate Bridge and jumped to his death in the waters below. He was 71 years old.<sup>112</sup> Gardner Dailey left behind his second wife, Lucille Dailey. He had

<sup>110</sup> PCAD, "Gardner Acton Dailey" <http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/44/>, Accessed August 7, 2019.

<sup>111</sup> "Chinatown in Danger," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 5, 1962), 34.

<sup>112</sup> Dave Weinstein, "Signature Style, Gardner A. Dailey," *San Francisco Chronicle* (September 4, 2004).

no children. After his death, Dailey's employees finished the projects in his office at the time, including Evans Hall at UC Berkeley (1968-71) and St. Luke's Hospital in San Francisco (1969). The firm, later known as Yuill-Thornton, Warner & Levikow, continued Gardner Dailey's modernist vision in their own projects, including the McLaren Park (now the Jerry Garcia) Amphitheater (1970) and the Helen Crocker Russell Library at Strybing Arboretum (1972).

## Jacobethan Revival Style

The Jacobethan Revival style is part of the larger Period Revival movement that characterized American residential design between the First and Second World Wars. Coined by English poet John Betjemen in 1933, the term "Jacobethan" is a portmanteau of the words "Jacobean" and "Elizabethan." It refers to the English domestic architecture prevalent during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) and King James I (1603-1625). Jacobethan buildings represent a hybrid of Renaissance planning principles combined with mediaeval forms and detailing. The Jacobethan Revival style is closely related to the earlier Tudor Revival style, which references the more overtly mediaeval buildings of the Tudor period. The Jacobethan term was later appropriated by architectural historian Henry Russell Hitchcock to describe all English-influenced domestic architecture produced on both sides of the Atlantic during the interwar period. However, for the purposes of this case report, the term Jacobethan Revival applies only to architecture that deliberately recalls the architecture of Jacobean and Elizabethan Britain.

Signature elements of the Jacobethan Revival style include symmetrically massed plans and compositions taken from Renaissance Italian architecture. However, unlike Italian Renaissance buildings, Jacobethan buildings typically incorporate late mediaeval forms, including steeply pitched gable roofs that are punctuated by stepped gables and dormers, brick cladding and terra cotta detailing, ornamental balustrades and parapets, drip moldings over doors and windows, Tudor arches, divided-lite casement windows, and faceted chimneys capped by chimney pots. Art glass accent windows are sometimes used.



Figure 59. Sandringham House.

Many Jacobethan Revival buildings have slate roofs as well. The Jacobethan Revival style emerged in the early nineteenth century in England. Many of the large baronial homes of the British royal family and other noble families were designed in this style, including Harlaxton Manor in Lincolnshire (1831-37) and Sandringham House in Norfolk (1870-92) (Figure 59).



The Jacobethan Revival style flourished in England throughout the rest of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. The style first appeared in the U.S. in the middle of the nineteenth century in the writings of architectural tastemaker Andrew Jackson Downing, who favored what he called the “Elizabethan” style for grand country houses. Later on in the nineteenth century, the style became popular for American college campuses, as embodied



**Figure 60. University of Pennsylvania, University Archives.**

by Cope & Stewardson’s University of Pennsylvania (**Figure 60**).<sup>113</sup> Perhaps the best-known example of Jacobethan collegiate buildings is the Ivy Club at Princeton University, which was also designed by Cope & Stewardson and built in 1897.

Jacobethan Revival buildings are comparatively rare in California. When used in the state, the style is typically reserved for opulent single-family dwellings. Almost always wood-frame structures, they are typically finished in brick or stucco and ornamented with terra cotta or tile trim. Jacobethan Revival houses are typically surrounded by lushly landscaped gardens to evoke the atmosphere of England. Difficult to



**Figure 61. 456 Wildwood Avenue, Piedmont (built 1918).**

achieve in semi-arid California, Jacobethan Revival houses are only truly convincing in large-lot suburban subdivisions where owners have the resources to irrigate a lush garden. Perhaps one of the best examples is 456 Wildwood Avenue, an elaborate mansion designed by architect Albert Farr (**Figure 61**). It was built in 1918 in Piedmont, an affluent suburban enclave surrounded by Oakland. Another example closer to 3400 Laguna Street is the Sheldon Potter Residence at 1 Cherry Street in San Francisco’s exclusive Presidio Heights neighborhood. Designed by architect Houghton Sawyer and built in 1914, 1 Cherry Street is clad in brick with terra cotta trim. It also has high peaked gables and tall brick chimneys (**Figure 62**).

<sup>113</sup> Marcus Whiffen, “The Jacobethan Revival,” *American Architecture since 1780* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1969), 178-83.





Figure 62. 1 Cherry Street, San Francisco (built 1914).

## Retirement Homes in San Francisco

3400 Laguna Street is one of the best surviving examples of a historic retirement home in San Francisco. As a building type, retirement homes emerged in the United States during the late nineteenth century as the country transitioned from its rural agrarian origins into an industrialized and highly urbanized society. Before the middle of the nineteenth century, most Americans were farmers. They would work for as long as they could, and when they could no longer work, they were typically cared for at home by their children, who often lived in the same home. As American society urbanized during the late nineteenth century, older people were less able to support themselves because they often did not possess the necessary job skills in a fast-changing environment. In addition, as families became smaller, there were fewer children around to care for the elderly. Houses were also smaller and families had often dispersed across the country. In addition, many of the immigrants who came to the U.S. in the nineteenth century did not have family members around to take care of them. To make matters worse, there was no public social safety net, including old age pensions or other means of public support for low-income elderly Americans.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> Abe Bortz, *Old Age Pensions: A Brief History*: The Social Welfare History Project: [www.socialwelfarehistory.com](http://www.socialwelfarehistory.com), accessed January 16, 2024.

During the nineteenth century, poor elderly people were often compelled to seek refuge in publicly operated institutions of last resort variously called poorhouses, asylums, or almshouses. San Francisco's Laguna Honda Hospital started out as the San Francisco Almshouse in 1866. Its "inmates" were largely single, elderly immigrants who had no family or other resources to sustain them once they could no longer work. If able, residents were expected to work to help pay for their keep. Many men worked on the farm operated by the Almshouse, whereas women were typically assigned to sewing, mending, and cooking tasks. Although preferable to a life on the streets, life in the San Francisco Almshouse was harsh and frequently unpleasant, with residents sleeping in large open wards with little or no heat, poor food, and no organized social diversions.<sup>115</sup>

As the nineteenth century wore on, more upscale privately owned homes for retired people emerged as alternatives to families caring for their elders. Many of the residents of these early "old people's" homes were female, including women who had never married or whose husbands had predeceased them. The first known institution of this type in San Francisco was the University Mound Old Ladies' Home, which opened in 1884 in the city's then-rural Portola District. This institution was modeled on the Indigent Widows' and Single Women's Society in Philadelphia, which had opened in 1817. Both institutions only accepted "respectable" applicants who were used to middle-class lifestyles. Women were provided private rooms but they were expected to take their meals with their fellow residents and help out with sewing, knitting, quilting, etcetera. Prospective members were placed on one-year probationary periods to ensure that they were a good "fit" for the community.<sup>116</sup>

In addition to private charitable organizations such as the University Mound Old Ladies' Home, some labor and ethnic groups established retirement homes for community members. One such group in San Francisco was the Hebrew Home for the Aged, which built a retirement home for elderly Jewish San Franciscans at the corner of Mission Street and Silver Avenue in 1891. However, institutions such as this were few and far between, and most elderly people had to rely on their own savings, as well as assistance from family members or charitable groups, to get by.

Old age pensions began to be instituted in Europe in the late nineteenth century. However, the U.S. lagged far behind, with the decision on whether to institute pensions left up to individual states. California instituted its Old Age Pension Law in 1930. Thanks to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal, the U.S. initiated the first nationwide old age pension in 1935 with the passage of the Social Security Act. Although Social Security pensions were small, they helped many people get by with little financial help from their families. Beginning in the 1930s, retirement homes began to open across the country to take advantage of the increased demand for private accommodations for retired people. Of course, the quality of these homes varied, with homes for wealthier seniors containing much better accommodations, including private rooms (some with their own bathrooms), organized activities, and on-call medical care.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> Christopher VerPlanck, *Laguna Honda Notes* (San Francisco: unpublished report, 2007), 2.

<sup>116</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Landmark Designation Report: University Mound Old Ladies' Home* (San Francisco: 2015), 21.

<sup>117</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, 22.

The heyday of the retirement home boom in the U.S., as well as San Francisco, followed the Social Security Act, with an additional boom following the passage of the Medicare and Medicaid programs of the 1960s. Whereas retirement facilities built after the 1960s tend to resemble small hospitals, older ones dating to the early twentieth century tend to resemble hotels or oversized private homes. The most comparable examples to The Heritage remaining today include the 1923 wing of the Hebrew Home for the Aged (now the San Francisco Campus for Jewish Living) at 302 Silver Avenue, which was designed by Samuel Heyman in the Georgian Revival style; the Christian Science Benevolent Association on the Pacific Coast (now known as Arden Wood) at 445 Wawona Street, which was designed by Henry Gutterson in the French Chateausque style and built in 1930; and the University Mound Old Ladies' Home at 350 University Avenue, which was designed by Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey in the Georgian Revival style and built in 1932.

## ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK DESIGNATION

This section of the case report provides an analysis and summary of the applicable criteria for designation, integrity statement, statement of significance, period of significance, inventory of character-defining features, and additional Article 10 requirements.

## CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

Check all criteria applicable to the significance of the property that are documented in the report. The criteria checked are the basic justifications for *why* the resource is important.

Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Association with the lives of persons significant in our past.

Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

## Statement of Significance

3400 Laguna Street is significant for its associations with the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society – San Francisco's second-oldest charity, and the first established by, and for, women. Founded in 1853 to sustain and protect destitute women, the Society provided financial and material relief to its clients, including money, food, a place to live, and job training/placement services. The Society also cared for the children of its clients. After moving to 3400 Laguna Street in 1925, the Society shifted its mission toward providing temporary care to women recovering from illness or surgery and permanent care to a handful of elderly retired women. Their new Julia Morgan-designed building provided residential quarters for these women, as well as a kitchen, a dining room, a library, a sitting room, a sun room, and other amenities for the residents, who also enjoyed half an acre of meticulously tended gardens. In 1955, the Society merged with the co-ed Crocker Old People's Home, leading it to dispense with its women-only convalescent care program. After that, it admitted men and retired its women-centered mission. 3400 Laguna Street

July 23, 2024

is also significant as an intact and very rare example of a commercial building designed in the Jacobethan Revival style in San Francisco. It is also an excellent example of a retirement home dating to the early part of the twentieth century. Finally, the building is significant for its associations with Julia Morgan. The first female graduate of the prestigious École des Beaux Arts and California's first licensed female architect, Julia Morgan broke new ground in almost everything she did. Best-known for her work at Hearst Castle in San Luis Obispo County, Morgan designed hundreds of other buildings, including several women's organizations.

3400 Laguna Street qualifies as a San Francisco Landmark under National Register Criteria A and C with a period of significance of 1925 to 1957. Although the entire parcel is being nominated, the only contributing elements include the 1925 Morgan Building, the 1929 Stone Cottage, and the Front Garden and other original landscape features such as the fence surrounding the site. The nomination also includes intact interior spaces such as the vestibule, reception area, stair, sitting room, library, and chapel.

**Characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation:**

*Events*

3400 Laguna Street is significant under National Register Criterion A (Events) at the local level for its association with the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society. San Francisco's second-oldest charitable organization and the first to be established by, and for, women, the Society was established in 1853 to "render protection and relief to strangers, (and) to sick and dependent women and children." The organization continued to operate in line with this mission for the rest of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century – first on Tehama Street in the South of Market, and later at its campus at Post and Franklin streets. In 1925, the organization moved to a new building at 3400 Laguna Street. Not coincidentally, the Society significantly changed its mission, admitting women in need of temporary convalescent care following illness or surgery instead of destitute women. The Society also began admitting retired women who would live there for the rest of their lives. The Society's focus on women's social welfare carried on until the mid-1950s when the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society merged with the Crocker Old People's Home and transitioned into a high-end, co-ed eldercare facility – a function that it retains to this day. Although the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society continues to operate the facility, it changed its name to "The Heritage" after the merger in acknowledgement of the fact that it no longer had a woman-centered mission. Only the Morgan Building, the Stone Cottage, and the Front Garden contribute to the significance of the property under this criterion because they were all built during the period of significance.

*Design/Construction*

3400 Laguna Street is significant under National Register Criterion C (Design/Construction) at the local level as an excellent, rare, and well-preserved example of a retirement home designed in the Jacobethan Revival style. Designed by Julia Morgan, one of the Bay Area's top architects, the Morgan Building – as it is known today – embodies many of the characteristics of the Jacobethan Revival style, including its symmetrical composition and massing, brick cladding with terra cotta ornament, Elizabethan ornamental detailing, canted bay windows and oriels, divided-lite



casement windows, triangular attic gables, and faceted brick chimneys. The interiors of the publicly accessible rooms also retain many of their original finishes, materials, and detailing, including wood paneling, decorative plaster ceilings, and decorative mantelpieces. 3400 Laguna Street is an extremely rare example of the Jacobethan Revival style in San Francisco – especially as a commercial building. Finally, 3400 Laguna Street is significant under Criterion C for its associations with architect Julia Morgan. Morgan, the first woman to graduate from the École des Beaux Arts in Paris, as well as California’s first licensed female architect, is widely recognized as being one of the most important architects to work in California during the first half of the twentieth century. Although best-known for her work for William Randolph Hearst at Hearst Castle and Wynton, the biggest category of work came from women’s groups, including the YWCA, various women’s clubs, and the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society. Only the Morgan Building, the Stone Cottage, and the Front Garden contribute to the significance of the property under this criterion.

### **Period of Significance**

The period of significance for 3400 Laguna Street is 1925 to 1957. This period begins with the building’s initial construction. The end of the period of significance corresponds to the conclusion of the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society’s exclusive focus on women. Indeed, following the merger with the Crocker Old People’s Home, the Society changed the name of the institution to “The Heritage,” in acknowledgement of the facility’s co-ed population.

### **Integrity**

The seven aspects of integrity used by the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and Article 10 of the Planning Code are location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association. The following sections analyze 3400 Laguna Street under each of the seven aspects of integrity.

#### Location:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of location because it has never been moved.

#### Design:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of design because the Morgan Building has undergone comparatively few changes over time. The most substantial alterations include the addition of a sunroom and two elevator overrides on the rear slope of the roof in 1928. However, these were also designed by Julia Morgan and they were part of the original design. The most substantial change occurred in 1957 when the new Perry Building was attached to the Morgan Building by a two-story linking wing. This wing obscures several small portions of the Morgan Building, but it does not overwhelm the older building and it is not visible from the street. Finally, the addition of a covered loading dock on the north side of the Morgan Building in 1993, though somewhat disruptive, is diminished by the fact that it occupies only a small portion of this façade and it is concealed by landscaping.

#### Materials:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of materials because there have been virtually no changes to the Morgan Building’s exterior, meaning that its original brick and terra cotta cladding remain intact, as well as the divided-lite

windows. The Stone Cottage retains its original stone cladding and some original fenestration and detailing. The Front Garden has also not been appreciably changed.

#### Workmanship:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of workmanship. Architect Julia Morgan worked closely with skilled European craftspeople on many of her projects, and the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society is no exception. The exterior of the Morgan Building is clad in red brick laid in five-course American bond with molded terra cotta trim, including several belt courses, a frieze, a cornice, and door and window trim. Several of the publicly accessible parts of the interior retain their original wood flooring and paneling, decorative wood and plaster ceilings, and cast stone mantelpieces.

#### Setting

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of setting. The surrounding neighborhood has not changed very much since the Morgan Building and the Stone Cottage were built in 1925 and 1929, respectively. The rest of the block is occupied by compatible 1920s and 1930s-era houses, flats, and apartment buildings that are characteristic of the Marina District. Originally built on a little over an acre of meticulously landscaped grounds, much of the formerly open space has been lost to new construction, including to the 1957 Perry Building and the 1963 Health Care Center. The four-story Perry Building is, however, sited toward the rear of the lot so that it does not overwhelm the Morgan Building, and the Health Care Center is only one-story in height. In addition, the Front Garden remains almost entirely intact, as well as several other landscaped buffers between the Morgan Building and the later additions, which allows the Morgan Building to read as an independent building, thereby preserving integrity of setting.

#### Feeling:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of feeling because when viewed from Laguna Street or Francisco Street, the Morgan Building appears to have undergone no major changes. The north façade along Bay Street has undergone a few changes, but the landscaping in that part of the property helps to hide these alterations. The largest intrusions, the four-story 1957 Perry Building and the one-story 1963 Health Care Center, are both set back from the Morgan Building and they are designed in a non-descript style that is subordinate to the Morgan Building. These factors, combined with the fact that the Morgan Building is surrounded on most of its four sides by open space, allows the building to continue reading as an independent building on a generously landscaped site.

#### Association:

3400 Laguna Street retains the aspect of association because the Morgan Building looks essentially the way it did during the period of significance.

In conclusion, 3400 Laguna Street retains all seven aspects of integrity, including location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association.

## Article 10 Requirements Section 1004 (b)

### Boundaries of the Landmark Site

The boundaries of the landmark site include the entirety of Assessor Parcel 471/003. These boundaries encompass the eligible Morgan Building, the Stone Cottage, and the Front Garden. These boundaries also encompass the non-contributing 1957 Perry Building, the 1963 Health Care Clinic (including its two 1986 additions), the Central Courtyard, the Rear Courtyard, and the parking lot along the north side of the property.

### Character-defining Features

#### Morgan Building

- Overall regular massing with intersecting hipped roof;
- U-shaped plan consisting of a central north-south volume, rear wings at the east façade, and projections at the north and south façades;
- Structural brick walls laid in five-course American bond;
- Slate roof shingles;
- Symmetrical primary façade design with central gabled parapet;
- Symmetrical fenestration pattern consisting of evenly spaced window openings displaying a hierarchy among basement, first-floor, second-story, and attic windows;
- Canted bay windows/oriels;
- Hipped dormer windows on roof;
- Operable divided-lite metal windows retaining their original sash profiles and pattern;
- Terra cotta ornamental detailing, including window surrounds with vegetal motifs in the segmental arches, decorative panels and entablatures at the canted bays, the belt course above the second-floor windows, projecting cornice with buttons at the eaves, coping and finial above the central parapet, and the door surround at the main entrance;
- Arched openings at the main entrance;
- Stained glass art windows at the chapel;
- Additional historic design details such as the blind niches and recessed diamond and square details;
- Historic glazed wood doors within the entrance vestibule;
- Three brick replacement chimneys;
- Front exterior stair with iron railing;
- Sunroom and elevator overrides on roof of east façade;
- Rain catch baskets;
- Historic features in publicly accessible interior spaces:
  - Tiled flooring in entrance vestibule;
  - Central stairwell with trefoil railing;

- Fireplace mantel
- Wood coffered and decorative plaster ceilings.

#### Stone Cottage

- One-story massing;
- L-shaped footprint;
- Steeply pitched hipped roof;
- Stone exterior cladding;
- Punched window openings containing wood-sash casement and double-hung windows.

#### Front Garden/Landscaping

- Cast iron fence on brick plinth along the north, west, and south property lines;
- Curvilinear plan of pedestrian footpaths leading from the two gates on Laguna Street to the primary entrance;
- Lawn panels and other plantings in Front Garden;
- Group of trees at the northwest corner of the site;
- Landscaped area round Stone Cottage.

At the time of designation, non-character-defining interior features include changes made to the property after 1957, including the 1957 Perry Building, the 1963 Health Care Clinic, the 1963 Central and Rear Courtyards; the 1986 additions to the Health Care Clinic, and the 1993 loading dock, and the parking lot and associated mechanical equipment along the north side of the property.

According to Article 10, Section 1004(c) of the Planning Code, only those interiors that were historically publicly accessible are eligible for listing in Article 10. Article 10, Section 1004(c) of the Planning Code states:

(c) The property included in any such designation shall upon designation be subject to the controls and standards set forth in this Article 10. In addition, the said property shall be subject to the following further controls and standards if imposed by the designating ordinance:

1. For a publicly-owned landmark, review of proposed changes to significant interior architectural features.
2. For a privately-owned landmark, review of proposed changes requiring a permit to significant interior architectural features in those areas of the landmark that are or historically have been accessible to members of the public. The designating ordinance must clearly describe each significant interior architectural feature subject to this restriction.

It is strongly recommended that the most important publicly accessible parts of the interior of the Morgan Building be preserved under Article 10, including the vestibule, reception area, stair, sitting room, library, and chapel.



## PROPERTY INFORMATION

**Historic Name:** Ladies' Protection and Relief Society

**Popular Name:** Heritage on the Marina

**Address:** 3400 Laguna Street

**Block and Lot:** 0741/003

**Owner:** Ladies' Protection and Relief Society

**Current Use:** Retirement Home

**Zoning:** RM-1 – Residential-Mixed, Low Density

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Published Works

- Ackley, Laura. *San Francisco's Jewel City: The Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2015.
- "Aged Homes Hint Merger." *San Francisco Examiner* (May 17, 1955), 1.
- "Aid Society in New Home." *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 15, 1925), 13.
- "Amid Healing Beauty." *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 15, 1933), 4.
- Armstrong, Jane. "Woman Architect Who Helped Build the Fairmont Hotel." *The Architect and Engineer of California* Vol. X, No. 3 (October 1907).
- Bardell, Robert. "What Lies Beneath the Marina?" *The Argonaut* (San Francisco: Winter 2003), p. 57.
- Boutelle, Sara. *Julia Morgan Architect*. New York: Abbeville Press Publishers, 1995.
- Charity Bodies Unite to Build Two Big Homes." *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 23, 1922), 6.
- "Commercial Development of the Marina District." *California Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (January 20, 1933), 54.
- "Dedication Tomorrow: New \$1 Million Home for Aged." *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 17, 1958), 9.
- Delehanty, Randolph. *In the Victorian Style*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1991.
- DeLong, J. Raymond. *The Marina District of San Francisco*. San Francisco: unpublished paper submitted to Dr. Moses Rischin, San Francisco State College, 1966.
- Ewald, Donna and Peter Clute. *San Francisco Invites the World: The Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1991.
- Gelernter, Mark. *A History of American Architecture: Buildings in their Cultural and Technological Context*. Hanover, NH and London: University Press of New England, 1999.
- "Henry S. Austin's Estate." *San Francisco Morning Call* (June 14, 1890), 4.
- "The Heritage Extension Begins." *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 21, 1962), 40.
- "The Heritage Open House Tomorrow." *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 8, 1962), 18.
- Hogan, June. "A Gold Rush Society is Still Going Strong." *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 12, 1953), 12S.
- "Home for Aged Opens Tomorrow." *San Francisco Examiner* (April 17, 1958), 7.
- Issel, William and Robert W. Cherny. *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Power, Politics and Urban Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- James, Cary. *Julia Morgan*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1990.
- Jones, Frederick W. "Modern Design for San Francisco Schools." *Architect & Engineer* (June 1936), 9.
- Junior League of San Francisco. *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. San Francisco: San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1968.
- Lichty, Sue. "Bright Outlook at Home for Aged." *San Francisco Examiner* (May 27, 1956), 6.
- Lipsky, Dr. William. *San Francisco's Marina District*. San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2004.
- Longstreth, Richard W. *Julia Morgan – Architect*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, 1986.
- "Marina being Spoiled. Say S.F. Aviators." *San Francisco Examiner* (March 28, 1921).
- "Marina Gardens Plan is Approved." *San Francisco Examiner* (April 19, 1917).

- "Marina Home District Shows Big Increase in Residential Building." *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 2, 1925).
- "Marina Zoning Fight Renewed." *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 3, 1929).
- "New Home will be Opened by Old Society." *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 10, 1925), 55.
- Nidala, Thomas. *The Great Houses of San Francisco*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.
- "Ninety Years Service: The City's Second Oldest Charitable Institution to Hold Open House." *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 17, 1944), 14.
- Olson, Laura Katz. *The Not-So-Golden Years: Caregiving, the Frail Elderly, and the Long-Term Care Establishment*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- "O'Toole Backs Marina Ban." *San Francisco Chronicle* (August 10, 1928), 12.
- "Owners of Refugee Cottages Go to Court." *San Francisco Call* (January 31, 1912), 6.
- Page & Turnbull. *Historic Resources Evaluation, Part 1 – Revised*. San Francisco: February 16, 2023.
- San Francisco City Directories: 1865 to 1982.
- Shepard, Susan. *In the Neighborhoods: A Guide to the Joys and Discoveries of San Francisco's Neighborhoods*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1981.
- "Tax Challenge on S.F. Aged Home." *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 30, 1960), 32.
- Torchia, Joseph. "Our Greatest Tradition is One of Love." *San Francisco Chronicle* (May 1, 1978), 16-17.
- Trachtenberg, Marvin and Isabelle Hyman. *Architecture from Prehistory to Post-modernism*. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1986.
- "Two Homes for the Elderly Agree to Merge Here." *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 7, 1955), 5.
- VerPlanck, Christopher. "From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood." *Heritage News* (Fall 2007).
- Waldhorn, Judith Lynch and Carol Olwell. *A Gift to the Street*. San Francisco: Antelope Island Press, 1976.
- Waldhorn, Judith Lynch and Sally B. Woodbridge. *Victoria's Legacy: Tours of San Francisco Bay Architecture*. San Francisco: 101 Productions, 1978.
- Whiffen, Marcus. *American Architecture since 1780*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1988.
- "Work begins on Number of New Edifices." *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 29, 1924), 8.

## Government Records and Repositories

- California Death Index, 1940-1997.
- California Marriage Index, 1949-1959.
- San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. Permit applications on file for 3400 Laguna Street.
- San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder. Property records on file for 3400 Laguna Street.
- San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Historic Photograph Archives.
- San Francisco Public Library. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for San Francisco.
- United States Census Records for San Francisco.
- United States Social Security Administration. Social Security Death Index, 1935-2014.



## CEQA Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<b>Project Address</b>		<b>Block/Lot(s)</b>
3400 LAGUNA ST		0471003
<b>Case No.</b>		<b>Permit No.</b>
2024-001869PRJ		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Addition/ Alteration</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>New Construction</b>
<p><b>Project description for Planning Department approval.</b>  Historic Landmark Designation: Ladies' Protection and Relief Society</p>		

### EXEMPTION TYPE

<b>The project has been determined to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 1 - Existing Facilities. (CEQA Guidelines section 15301)</b> Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 3 - New Construction. (CEQA Guidelines section 15303)</b> Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Class 32 - In-Fill Development. (CEQA Guidelines section 15332)</b> New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:</p> <p>(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.</p> <p>(c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.</p> <p>(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.</p> <p>(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Other _____</b>  Class 8 - Actions by Regulatory Agencies for Protection of the Environment (CEQA Guidelines section 15308)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Common Sense Exemption (CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)).</b> It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment.



## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING ASSESSMENT

Comments:

Planner Signature: Don Lewis

## PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category A:</b> Known Historical Resource.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category B:</b> Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category C:</b> Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age).

## PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

Check all that apply to the project.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Change of use and new construction.</b> Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Regular maintenance or repair</b> to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Window replacement</b> that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Garage work.</b> A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Deck, terrace construction, or fences</b> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Mechanical equipment installation</b> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dormer installation</b> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Addition(s)</b> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; or does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure, or does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Façade or storefront alterations</b> that do not remove, alter, or obscure character -defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Restoration</b> based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<b>Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves scope of work listed above.

## ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

Check all that apply to the project.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Reclassification of property status.</b> (<i>Attach HRRER Part I relevant analysis; requires Principal Preservation Planner approval</i>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Lacks Historic Integrity</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Lacks Historic Significance</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves a <b>known historical resource (CEQA Category A)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not substantially impact character-defining features of a historic resource (see Comments)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is compatible, yet differentiated, with a historic resource.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties
<b>Note: If ANY box above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project can proceed with EXEMPTION REVIEW.</b> The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with exemption review.
<p><b>Comments by Preservation Planner:</b> landmark designation, no physical changes</p>	
<p><b>Preservation Planner Signature:</b>          Pilar Lavalley</p>	

## EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>No further environmental review is required. The project is exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.</b></p>	
	<p><b>Project Approval Action:</b> Board of Supervisor approval of landmark designation</p>	<p><b>Signature:</b> Pilar Lavalley 10/03/2024</p>
	<p>Supporting documents are available for review on the San Francisco Property Information Map, which can be accessed at <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>. Individual files can be viewed by clicking on the Planning Applications link, clicking the "More Details" link under the project's environmental record number (ENV) and then clicking on the "Related Documents" link.</p> <p>Once signed and dated, this document constitutes an exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Per chapter 31, an appeal of an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors shall be filed within 30 days after the approval action occurs at a noticed public hearing, or within 30 days after posting on the planning department's website (<a href="https://sfplanning.org/resource/ceqa-exemptions">https://sfplanning.org/resource/ceqa-exemptions</a>) a written decision or written notice of the approval action, if the approval is not made at a noticed public hearing.</p>	