

File No. 211021 Committee Item No. 2
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date February 28, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date _____

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN Transmittal 083021</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>HPC Reso No. 1196 080421</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice 111521</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN PPT 111521</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice 022822</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Erica Major Date February 24, 2022
Completed by: Erica Major Date _____

1 [Planning Code - Landmark Designation - 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee
2 Company Building)]

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-**
4 **Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002,**
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. Findings.

19 (a) CEQA and Land Use Findings.

20 (1) The Planning Department has determined that the Planning Code
21 amendment proposed in this ordinance is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the
22 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
23 seq., hereinafter "CEQA") pursuant to Section 15308 of California Code of Regulations, Title
24 14, Sections 15000 et seq., the Guidelines for implementation of the statute for actions by
25 regulatory agencies for protection of the environment (in this case, landmark designation).
Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 211021 and
is incorporated herein by reference. The Board of Supervisors affirms this determination.

1 (2) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that
2 the proposed landmark designation of 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee
3 Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, will serve the public
4 necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation
5 Commission Resolution No. 1196, recommending approval of the proposed designation.

6 (3) The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed landmark designation of
7 447 Battery Street is consistent with the General Plan and with Planning Code Section
8 101.1(b) for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 1196.

9 (b) General Findings.

10 (1) On January 12, 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No.
11 009-21, initiating landmark designation of 447 Battery Street as a San Francisco Landmark
12 pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. On January 22, 2021, the Mayor approved
13 the resolution. Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
14 201298.

15 (2) Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, the Historic Preservation Commission
16 has authority "to recommend approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations
17 and historic district designations under the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors."

18 (3) The Landmark Designation Fact Sheet was prepared by Planning
19 Department Preservation staff. All preparers meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional
20 Qualification Standards for historic preservation program staff, as set forth in Code of Federal
21 Regulations Title 36, Part 61, Appendix A. The report was reviewed for accuracy and
22 conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

23 (4) The Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of August 4,
24 2021, reviewed Planning Department staff's analysis of the historical significance of 447
25 Battery Street set forth in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet dated July 28, 2021.

1 (5) On August 4, 2021, after holding a public hearing on the proposed
2 designation and having considered the specialized analyses prepared by Planning
3 Department staff and the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet, the Historic Preservation
4 Commission recommended designation of 447 Battery Street as a landmark with
5 modifications to Planning staff's recommendation, consistent with the standards set forth in
6 Section 1004 of the Planning Code, by Resolution No. 1196. Said resolution is on file with the
7 Clerk of the Board in File No. 211021.

8 (6) The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that 447 Battery Street has a special
9 character and special historical, architectural, and aesthetic interest and value, and that its
10 designation as a Landmark will further the purposes of and conform to the standards set forth
11 in Article 10 of the Planning Code. In doing so, the Board hereby incorporates by reference
12 the findings of the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet.

13
14 Section 2. Designation.

15 Pursuant to Section 1004 of the Planning Code, 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-
16 Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, is hereby
17 designated as a San Francisco Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Section
18 1004. Appendix A to Article 10 of the Planning Code is hereby amended to include this
19 property.

20
21 Section 3. Required Data.

22 (a) The description, location, and boundary of the Landmark site consists of the City
23 parcel located at 447 Battery Street, Assessor's Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, in San
24 Francisco's Financial District neighborhood.

1 (b) The characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation are described and
2 shown in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet and other supporting materials contained in
3 Planning Department Record Docket No. 2021-002874DES. In brief, 447 Battery Street is
4 eligible for local designation as it is associated with events that have made a historically
5 significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Francisco history and it embodies the
6 distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Specifically, designation
7 of 447 Battery Street is proper given its association with the San Francisco coffee industry
8 and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires.

9 (c) The particular features that should be preserved, or replaced in-kind as determined
10 necessary, are those generally shown in photographs and described in the Landmark
11 Designation Fact Sheet, which can be found in Planning Department Record Docket No.
12 2021-002874DES, and which are incorporated in this designation by reference as though fully
13 set forth herein, except for the property's three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint.
14 Specifically, all those physical features of the exterior of 447 Battery Street should be
15 preserved or replaced in-kind, including:

16 (1) Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;

17 (2) Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;

18 (3) Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant
19 Street only), second and third stories; positioning of the westernmost two bays on
20 Merchant Street slightly closer together;

21 (4) Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings;

22 and

23 (5) Brick cornice consisting of, from bottom to top, a projecting bandcourse, a
24 flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

25

1 Section 4. Effective Date.

2 This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs
3 when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not
4 sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the
5 Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

6

7

8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

9

10 By: /s/ Victoria Wong

10

11 VICTORIA WONG
12 Deputy City Attorney

11

12

13 n:\legana\as2021\1800206\01551563.docx

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Planning Code - Landmark Designation - 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building)]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, as a Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Existing Law

Under Article 10, Section 1004 of the Planning Code, the Board of Supervisors may, by ordinance, designate an individual structure that has special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value as a City landmark. Unless prohibited by state law, once a structure has been named a landmark, any construction, alteration, removal or demolition for which a City permit is required necessitates a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission. (Planning Code § 1006; Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, § 4.135.) Thus, landmark designation generally affords a high degree of protection to historic and architectural structures of merit in the City. There are currently 290 individual landmarks in the City under Article 10, in addition to structures and districts in the downtown area that are protected under Article 11. (See App. A to Article 10.)

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance amends the Planning Code to add a new historic landmark to the list of individual landmarks under Article 10: 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building).

The ordinance finds that 447 Battery Street is eligible for designation as it is associated with events that have made a historically significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Francisco history. Specifically, designation of 447 Battery Street is proper given its association with the San Francisco coffee industry and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires.

As required by Section 1004, the ordinance lists the particular features that shall be preserved, or replaced in-kind as determined necessary.

n:\egana\as2021\1800206\01551565.docx



August 30, 2021

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Honorable Supervisor Peskin
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: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

Re: **Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2021-002874DES**
447 Battery Street (Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building) Landmark Designation
BOS File No. 201298

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Peskin,

On August 4, 2021, the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter “HPC”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider Supervisor Peskin’s ordinance (Board File No. 201298) to landmark 447 Battery Street (Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building). On January 12, 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 009-21 initiating landmark designation of the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building.

At the hearing, the HPC voted to approve with modifications a resolution to recommend landmark designation pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code. The HPC proposed the following modifications:

1. Amend findings related to architectural significance as the subject property does not appear to be a particularly representative or historically significant example of a brick store-and-warehouse building type nor does it appear to retain sufficient physical integrity to convey architectural significance; and,
2. Remove “Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint” from list of character-defining features.

The proposed amendments have been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15060(c)(2).

Please find attached documents related to the HPC’s action. Also attached is an electronic copy of the proposed ordinance, drafted by Deputy City Attorney Vicki Wong. 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: Vicki Wong, City Attorney's Office
Lee Hepner, Legislative Aide
Erica Major, Office of the Clerk of the Board
Frances McMillan, Planning Department, Acting P-IV Landmarks
Pilar LaValley, Planning Department
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
bos.legislation@sfgov.org

Attachments:

HPC-reviewed Draft Article 10 Landmark Designation Ordinance
Planning Department Executive Summary dated July 28, 2021 Article 10
Landmark Designation Fact Sheet – 447 Battery Street
Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 1196
Correspondence to HPC
Amended Draft Article 10 Landmark Designation Ordinance
Legislative Digest

1 [Planning Code - Landmark Designation - 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee
2 Company Building)]

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-**
4 **Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002 as**
5 **a Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code;**
6 **affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental**
7 **Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under**
8 **Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the**
9 **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. Findings.

19 (a) CEQA and Land Use Findings.

20 (1) The Planning Department has determined that the Planning Code
21 amendment proposed in this ordinance is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the
22 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
23 seq., hereinafter "CEQA") pursuant to Section 15308 of California Code of Regulations, Title
24 14, Sections 15000 et seq., the Guidelines for implementation of the statute for actions by
25 regulatory agencies for protection of the environment (in this case, landmark designation).
Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.

1 _____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board of Supervisors affirms
2 this determination.

3 (2) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that
4 the proposed landmark designation of 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee
5 Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, will serve the public
6 necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation
7 Commission Resolution No. _____, recommending approval of the proposed
8 designation.

9 (3) The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed landmark designation of
10 447 Battery Street is consistent with the General Plan and with Planning Code Section
11 101.1(b) for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No.
12 _____.

13 (b) General Findings.

14 (1) On January 12, 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No.
15 009-21, initiating landmark designation of 447 Battery Street as a San Francisco Landmark
16 pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. On January 22, 2021, the Mayor approved
17 the resolution. Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
18 201298.

19 (2) Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, the Historic Preservation Commission
20 has authority "to recommend approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations
21 and historic district designations under the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors."

22 (3) The Landmark Designation Fact Sheet was prepared by Planning
23 Department Preservation staff. All preparers meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional
24 Qualification Standards for historic preservation program staff, as set forth in Code of Federal
25

1 Regulations Title 36, Part 61, Appendix A. The report was reviewed for accuracy and
2 conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

3 (4) The Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of August 4,
4 2021, reviewed Planning Department staff's analysis of the historical significance of 447
5 Battery Street set forth in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet dated July 28, 2021.

6 (5) On August 4, 2021, after holding a public hearing on the proposed
7 designation and having considered the specialized analyses prepared by Planning
8 Department staff and the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet, the Historic Preservation
9 Commission recommended designation of 447 Battery Street as a landmark consistent with
10 the standards set forth in Section 1004 of the Planning Code, by Resolution No. _____.
11 Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. _____.

12 (6) The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that 447 Battery Street has a special
13 character and special historical, architectural, and aesthetic interest and value, and that its
14 designation as a Landmark will further the purposes of and conform to the standards set forth
15 in Article 10 of the Planning Code. In doing so, the Board hereby incorporates by reference
16 the findings of the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet.

17
18 Section 2. Designation.

19 Pursuant to Section 1004 of the Planning Code, 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-
20 Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, is hereby
21 designated as a San Francisco Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Section
22 1004. Appendix A to Article 10 of the Planning Code is hereby amended to include this
23 property.

24
25 Section 3. Required Data.

1 (a) The description, location, and boundary of the Landmark site consists of the City
2 parcel located at 447 Battery Street, Assessor's Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, in San
3 Francisco's Financial District neighborhood.

4 (b) The characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation are described and
5 shown in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet and other supporting materials contained in
6 Planning Department Record Docket No. 2021-002874DES. In brief, 447 Battery Street is
7 eligible for local designation as it is associated with events that have made a historically
8 significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Francisco history and it embodies the
9 distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Specifically, designation
10 of 447 Battery Street is proper given its association with the San Francisco coffee industry
11 and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires.
12 447 Battery Street is also architecturally significant as a surviving example of the brick store-
13 and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,
14 but that has become increasingly rare particularly in the broader North of Market area.

15 (c) The particular features that should be preserved, or replaced in-kind as determined
16 necessary, are those generally shown in photographs and described in the Landmark
17 Designation Fact Sheet, which can be found in Planning Department Record Docket No.
18 2021-002874DES, and which are incorporated in this designation by reference as though fully
19 set forth herein. Specifically, all those physical features of the exterior of 447 Battery Street
20 should be preserved or replaced in-kind, including:

- 21 (1) Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint;
- 22 (2) Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;
- 23 (3) Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;

1 (4) Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant
2 Street only), second and third stories; positioning of the westernmost two bays on
3 Merchant Street slightly closer together;

4 (5) Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings;
5 and

6 (6) Brick cornice consisting of, from bottom to top, a projecting bandcourse, a
7 flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

8
9 Section 4. Effective Date.

10 This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs
11 when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not
12 sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the
13 Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

14
15 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
16 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

17 By: /s/ Victoria Wong
18
19 VICTORIA WONG
20 Deputy City Attorney

21 n:\legana\as2021\1800206\01542232.docx
22
23
24
25



LANDMARK DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HEARING DATE: AUGUST 4, 2021

Record No.: 2021-002874DES

Project Address: 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company)

Zoning: C-3-O (Downtown-Office)
200-S Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot: 0206/002

Project Sponsor: Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Property Owner: Montgomery Realty Group, Inc.
447 Battery Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111

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

Recommendation: Recommend Landmark Designation to the Board of Supervisors

Property Description

447 Battery Street, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, sits on a rectangular lot with frontage along Battery and Merchant streets. The building is three stories with exterior load-bearing walls of exposed brick masonry construction and a heavy timber internal structural framework. The subject building fills its rectangular lot except for a notch at the northwest corner that creates a narrow light court at the rear. Along its primary Battery Street elevation, the subject building contains two large storefront openings and a recessed building entry at the ground story. These openings currently contain modern metal and glass storefront systems and are covered at the lintel-level with fabric-clad box awnings. At both the second and third stories on the primary facade, there are seven identical window openings, with projecting brick sills and segmental arch lintels. Each opening contains a pair of metal casement windows under a single fixed sash. The secondary Merchant Street façade is similar to the Battery facade, except that it contains eight bays of windows. Along Merchant, at the ground story, six of the façade's eight bays feature short segmental arch openings containing metal casements under fixed lights while the westernmost two bays at the ground story feature a bricked-in door opening. At the second- and third-story openings, the metal windows have multi-light configurations. Above the third story, the subject building is capped

with a brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping. There is a flat roof behind raised parapets.

447 Battery Street is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Battery and Merchant Streets, within San Francisco's Financial District neighborhood. (Merchant Street, which does not conform to the North of Market area's predominant 50-foot grid, is more of a midblock alley.) The subject block is built on landfill that sits beyond the natural shoreline of San Francisco, in the middle of the historical Yerba Buena Cove. Currently considered part of the Financial District, until the mid-twentieth century this area hosted a wide range of stores, warehouses, and other mercantile establishments associated with the nearby produce market and working waterfront. Starting in 1959, much of this historic marketplace neighborhood was razed in connection with the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project, a massive urban renewal scheme that was completed over the course of the subsequent decades. The results of this project are visible today as the collection of apartment towers, townhouses, office buildings, hotels, parks, plazas, parking garages, and shopping areas that occupy the blocks to the immediate east of the subject property.

Project Description

The Historic Preservation Commission is requested to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding Landmark designation of 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building). The pending Landmark designation was initiated by the Board of Supervisors.

On November 10, 2020, Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Resolution under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File No. 201298 to initiate the Landmark designation process for the former Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company building at 447 Battery Street. At hearing of the Land Use Committee of the Board on January 4, 2021, the committee voted unanimously to recommend to the full Board approval of the Resolution to initiate Landmark Designation. On January 12, 2021, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Resolution, and on January 22, 2021, with the Mayor's signature, Resolution No. 009-21 initiating landmark designation of 447 Battery Street became effective.

Compliance With Planning Code

Article 10 of the Planning Code.

The executive summary and analysis under review was prepared by Department preservation staff, who meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications. The Department has determined that the subject property meets the requirements for eligibility as an individual landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code. The justification for its inclusion is explained in detail in the attached Landmark Designation Fact Sheet, and briefly in this Executive Summary.

Significance: 447 Battery Street, occupied by the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company from 1907 to 1967, designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees and constructed in 1907, is eligible for designation as a San Francisco Landmark for association with significant historic events, specifically with the San Francisco coffee industry and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires. 447 Battery Street is also architecturally significant as a surviving example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common

during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare, particularly in the broader North of Market area. The period of significance is 1907 to 1967.

Underrepresented Landmark Types: The proposed landmark designation does not address any of the underrepresented landmark types that have been previously identified by the Commission.

Integrity: 447 Battery Street maintains a moderate level of integrity. See Page 3 of attached Landmark Designation Fact Sheet for further analysis.

Character-Defining Features: Exterior character-defining features of 447 Battery Street are identified in the attached Landmark Designation Fact Sheet on Pages 4.

Boundaries of the Landmark: The proposed Landmark encompasses 447 Battery Street (Assessor's Block No. 0206, Lot 002).

General Plan.

The Urban Design Element of the San Francisco General Plan contains the following relevant objectives and policies:

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES THAT PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

Policy 4

Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

Designating significant historic resources as local landmarks will further continuity with the past because the buildings will be preserved for the benefit of future generations.

Planning Code Section 101.1 – establishes the Eight Priority Policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the proposed designation is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies, and furthers Policy Number 7, which states that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

Landmark Designation Procedures

Action by Historic Preservation Commission.

The Historic Preservation Commission on February 4, 2009, by Resolution No. 001, adopted the National Register Criteria as its methodology for recommending landmark designation of historic resources. Under the National Register Criteria, the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, materials, workmanship, and association, and that are associated with events that have made a

significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or properties that have yielded, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Article 10 of the Planning Code.

Section 1004 of the Planning Code authorizes the landmark designation of an individual structure or other feature or an integrated group of structures and features on a single lot or site, having special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value, as a landmark. Section 1004.1 also provides that landmark designation may be initiated by the Board of Supervisors or the Historic Preservation Commission and the initiation shall include findings in support. Section 1004.2 states that once initiated, the proposed designation is referred to the Historic Preservation Commission for a report and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve, disapprove or modify the proposal.

Pursuant to Section 1004.2 of the Planning Code, if the Historic Preservation Commission approves the designation, a copy of the resolution of approval is transmitted to the Board of Supervisors without referral to the Planning Commission. The Board of Supervisors shall hold a public hearing on the designation and may approve, modify or disapprove the designation.

Section 1004(b) requires that the designating ordinance approved by the Board of Supervisors shall include the location and boundaries of the landmark site, a description of the characteristics of the landmark which justify its designation, and a description of the particular features that should be preserved.

If the Historic Preservation Commission approves the proposed designation recommendation, a copy of the resolution of approval is transmitted to the Board of Supervisors, which holds a public hearing on the designation and may approve, modify or disapprove the designation (Section 1004.3). If the Historic Preservation Commission disapproves the proposed designation, such action shall be final, except upon the filing of a valid appeal to the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (Section 1004.4).

Public / Neighborhood Input

To date, staff has not received any public communications regarding the landmark designation.

Issues & Other Considerations

- **Historic and Conservation Districts:** Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 009-21, initiating Landmark designation, states that the subject property “shares a historic context and many architectural characteristics with contributors to surrounding historic districts including the Jackson Square Landmark District, the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, and the Front-California Conservation District, each of which represents an intact collection of post-1906 commercial buildings that remain embedded within a more recent urban fabric.

The City of San Francisco has identified a number of buildings in the North of Market area as historically significant for their associations with pre-World War II history and commercial warehouses. The Northeast Waterfront and South End Historic Districts both contain collections of masonry warehouse buildings constructed in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Closer to the subject property, the Commercial-Leidesdorff and Front-California Conservation Districts have been recognized under Article 11 of the Planning Code for their "concentration of early 20th Century architecture" (Commercial-Leidesdorff) and retention of their "post-fire appearance, [with] most of the architecturally significant buildings constructed in the short period from 1907 through 1918" (Front-California). The Jackson Square Historic District, designated under Article 10 of the Planning Code, represents a generally earlier phase of development. While the subject building shares characteristics with buildings in nearby historic districts that have been found significant for their associations with post-1906 reconstruction, staff does not believe that the subject property is capable of contributing to these districts' historical significance due to intervening swaths of more recent development that create a physical barrier between the subject building and the districts.

Further, the block on which the subject building is located (which, for the purposes of this analysis, classifies Merchant Street as a mid-block alley and therefore takes in the area bounded by Battery, Clay, Sansome, and Washington Streets) does contain a number of other buildings that date to the post-1906 period of reconstruction. However, this block does not appear to contain a sufficiently high concentration of historically or architecturally significant buildings with physical integrity to qualify as a district that can be found significant for its association with historic events or with a period of architecture.

- **Proposed Project and CEQA review:** The project sponsor, 447 Partners, LLC, proposes to redevelop the subject property with a large hotel and ground-floor retail. The 447 Battery Street Project (proposed project) would involve demolishing the existing building while retaining the existing building façade, as seen by the public; replacing the internal structure to bring it up to building and structural codes; and adding an addition to create a new 18-story, 200-foot tall hotel with a ground-floor lobby and restaurant. The hotel would have a total of 198 hotel rooms on 16 floors, with another restaurant on the 18th floor. Four below-grade basement levels would contain conference rooms, mechanical equipment, a loading area, and vehicle and bicycle parking.¹

An initial study and DEIR have been prepared for the proposed project. In preparing the EIR, the subject property was evaluated to determine whether it was eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources and therefore a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA review. This analysis included:

- Page & Turnbull, Inc., *447 Battery Street, San Francisco, Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1 (HRE)* (October 6, 2017 Revised)
- Architectural Resources Group, *Historic Resource Evaluation Peer Review* (June 2017)
- Planning Department, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER)* (July 13, 2020)

During this review, both Page & Turnbull and Architectural Resources Group concluded that the Property should not be considered a historic resource for the purpose of CEQA. The Planning Department disagreed and found the subject property eligible for listing on the California Register under criterion 1 (events) and 3

¹ Planning Department, *Public Notice: Availability of Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, 447 Battery Street, Case No. 2014.1036ENV* (August 7, 2019).

(architecture). The Department also determined that while the building had been altered with removal of stucco cladding and replacement of storefront and windows, it retained sufficient integrity to convey its significance as a rare surviving example of a Reconstruction-era brick commercial-warehouse building in the North of Market.

The Project has also undergone two hearings at the HPC, first to review the preservation alternatives for the EIR, and second to review and comment on the DEIR. After the second hearing on November 4, 2020, the HPC provided written comments.

- **Property owner input:** Jody Knight, attorney at Rueben, Junius & Rose, LLC, on behalf of the property owner, submitted a letter, dated March 17, 2021, stating that the property owner does not support designation of the subject property. The letter (attached) enumerates several reasons why the property owner opposes Landmark designation, including the following:
 - landmarking was never discussed during the approximately six years when the pending project was under review (CEQA and project) by the Planning Department;
 - conflicting opinions of preservation professionals regarding the subject property's historical significance and level of physical integrity; and,
 - the subject property does not contribute to either the Jackson Square Landmark District nor the Front-California Conservation District or Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District.

On July 15, 2021, the Department sent mailed notice to the property owner regarding the landmark designation recommendation hearing scheduled for August 4, 2021.

Environmental Review Status

The Planning Department has determined that actions by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment (specifically in this case, landmark designation) are exempt from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15308 (Class Eight - Categorical).

Basis for Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend the landmark designation of 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building) as it is historically and architecturally significant for association with significant historic events, specifically with the San Francisco coffee industry and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires and is also architecturally significant as a surviving example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare, particularly in the broader North of Market area.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Resolution Recommending Landmark designation
- Exhibit A – Draft Landmark Designation Ordinance
- Exhibit B – Landmark Designation Fact Sheet
- Exhibit C – Maps and Context Images
- Exhibit D – Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 009-21
- Exhibit E – Letter from Jody Knight, Reuben Junius & Rose, LLC. on behalf of property owner



ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK DESIGNATION FACT SHEET



447 Battery Street, view northwest
Source: Heller Manus Architects, 2019

Historic Name:	Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company; Thierbach & Company
Address:	447 Battery Street
Block/ Lot(s):	0206/002
Parcel Area:	7,178 sq. ft.
Zoning:	C-3-O (Downtown-Office) 200-S
Year Built:	1907
Architect:	Frank S. Van Trees
Prior Historic Studies/Other Designations:	Planning Department, <i>Draft Environmental Impact Report, 447 Battery Street Project, Case No. 2014.1036E</i> (October 21, 2020) Planning Department, <i>Historic Resource Evaluation Response for 447 Battery Street</i> (December 28, 2017), Case No. 2014.1036E

	<p>Page & Turnbull, Inc., <i>Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1 for 447 Battery Street</i> (October 6, 2017 Revised).</p> <p>National Register of Historic Places: 447 Battery Street is rated “3S” as appearing eligible for the National Register as an individual property through a survey evaluation.</p> <p><i>Here Today: San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage</i> (1968): Documented on page 251 of the book with the same title. The documentation stated that the exterior façades of the building were “sandblasted.” The small photograph attached to the report shows the brick façades generally as they appear today. The report also notes that there was a “moderate amount of exterior desecration of the original design” and that the building was “recently modernized, keeping only its style – but plate glass windows on front.”</p> <p>Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey (1976): given a rating of ‘1,’ indicating that it contains a degree of contextual importance.</p> <p>San Francisco Architectural Heritage <i>Splendid Survivors</i> (1977-1979): given a rating of ‘B’ (major importance). The documentation states: Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co., 1907, architect unknown A handsome post-fire brick warehouse building indistinguishable from much earlier buildings of the same type. Originally the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co. and recently refurbished as office space. In composition, a two-part small commercial block with a strictly structural expression. A cornice has evidently been removed, and the walls may have been stuccoed originally (Corbett, 1978).</p> <p>Unreinforced Masonry Building (UMB) Survey (1990) UMB Survey evaluated the 447 Battery Street property and determined it to be a Prototype G (2- and 3-story, small area, office and commercial building) with a rating of ‘9’, which indicated that it had been listed in the DCP 1976 Survey.</p>
<p>Prior HPC Actions:</p>	<p>Review and comment on Draft Environmental Impact Report for 447 Battery Street (Case No. 2014.1036E) at hearing on November 4, 2020.</p> <p>Review and Comment on the adequacy of the proposed preservation alternatives for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for 447 Battery Street (Case No. 2014.1036E) at hearing on October 2, 2019.</p>

<p>Significance Criteria:</p>	<p><u>Events:</u> Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</p> <p><u>Architecture/Design:</u> Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, and/or represents the work of a master.</p>
<p>Period of Significance:</p>	<p>The period of significance for 447 Battery Street (the former Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company) is 1907-1967. The subject building's period of significance extends from the time of its original construction in 1907 until 1967, when it ceased to be used for the manufacture and warehousing of coffee.</p>
<p>Statement of Significance:</p>	<p>447 Battery Street, occupied by the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company from 1907 to 1967, designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees and constructed in 1907, is eligible for designation as a San Francisco Landmark for its association with significant historic events, specifically with the San Francisco coffee industry and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires. 447 Battery Street is also architecturally significant as a surviving example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare, particularly in the broader North of Market area.</p>
<p>Assessment of Integrity:</p>	<p>The seven aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service (NPS) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association.¹</p> <p>447 Battery Street retains integrity. The subject building lacks the quality of "setting" due to the redevelopment of the surrounding neighborhood; and it partially lacks the quality of "materials" due to the removal of the stucco, the windows, and the storefronts. Regarding "materials," Planning staff notes that all of the removed elements are features that are often repaired and replaced over the course of a building's lifespan. Stucco in particular may be regarded as an almost sacrificial material, such as paint, that is expected to steadily wear away as it is exposed to the elements, requiring reapplication. Windows have a similarly limited lifespan.</p> <p>Overall, the Department has determined that 447 Battery Street retains sufficient integrity to convey its architectural and historical significance.</p>

¹ "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," *National Register Bulletin*, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1995, 44.

Character-Defining Features:	<p>The character-defining features of the subject property include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint;• Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;• Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;• Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant Street only), second and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together;• Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings; and,• Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.
-------------------------------------	---

Statement of Significance Summary

447 Battery Street, occupied by the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company from 1907 to 1967, designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees and constructed in 1907, is eligible for designation as a San Francisco Landmark for its association with significant historic events, specifically with the San Francisco coffee industry and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires. 447 Battery Street is also architecturally significant as a surviving example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare, particularly in the broader North of Market area.

Property Description and Neighborhood Context

The following neighborhood and building descriptions are taken from the Planning Department's *Historic Resource Evaluation Response* for 447 Battery Street (December 28, 2017), which also relied on a *Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1 for 447 Battery Street* prepared by Page & Turnbull (Revised October 6, 2017):

447 Battery Street is located at the northwest corner of Battery Street and Merchant Street. (Merchant Street, which does not conform to the North of Market area's predominant 50-vara grid, is more of a midblock alley.) The subject block is built on landfill that sits beyond the natural shoreline of San Francisco, in the middle of the historical Yerba Buena Cove. Currently considered part of the Financial District, until the mid-twentieth century this area hosted a wide range of stores, warehouses, and other mercantile establishments associated with the nearby produce market and working waterfront. Starting in 1959, much of this historic marketplace neighborhood was razed in connection with the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project, a massive urban renewal scheme that was completed over the course of the subsequent decades. The results of this project are visible today as the collection of apartment

towers, townhouses, office buildings, hotels, parks, plazas, parking garages, and shopping areas that occupy the blocks to the immediate east of the subject property.

The blocks on the west side of Battery Street, including the subject block, have been absorbed into the Financial District, and include many buildings constructed in the late twentieth century, although there is nothing on the massive urban scale of the Golden Gateway Project to the east. The Transamerica Pyramid, San Francisco's tallest building from the time of its construction in 1972 until 2017, stands less than two blocks west of the subject building. The subject block and the block to the south across Merchant Street include several buildings constructed in the aftermath of the 1906 earthquake and fires (447 Battery Street, 1907; 439 Washington Street, 1906-7; 425 Washington Street, 1906-7 (altered); 432 Clay Street, 1912), a 1920s office building (500 Sansome Street, 1929), a modernist fire station (530 Sansome Street, 1975), and a contemporary hotel building (425 Battery, early 2000s). Nearby historic buildings include the 1911 U.S. Customs House (555 Battery Street), the 1944 U.S. Appraisers Building (630 Sansome Street), and 545 Sansome Street, built in 1930. The identified historic district that is closest to the subject building is the Article 10 Jackson Square Historic District, known for its nineteenth century commercial buildings. Other nearby historic districts include the Article 11 Commercial-Leidesdorff and Front-California Conservation Districts, which contain masonry commercial buildings from the early twentieth century.

Sitting on a rectangular lot measuring 74 feet along Battery Street and 97 feet along Merchant Street, 447 Battery Street, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, is three stories and 48 feet tall, with exterior load-bearing walls of exposed brick masonry construction and a heavy timber internal structural framework. The subject building fills its rectangular lot except for a notch at the northwest corner that creates a narrow light court at the rear.

Along its primary Battery Street elevation, the subject building contains two large storefront openings and a recessed building entry at the ground story. These openings currently contain modern metal and glass storefront and door systems and are covered at the lintel-level with fabric-clad box awnings. Dimensional letter signage advertising the storefront tenant has been installed in the spandrel area between the ground and second stories. At both the second and third stories on the primary facade, the subject building features seven identical window openings, with projecting brick sills and segmental arch lintels. Each opening contains a pair of metal casement windows under a single fixed sash. Above the third story, the subject building is capped with a brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

The secondary Merchant Street facade is similar to the primary facade, with the following differences: the secondary facade contains eight bays of windows compared to the primary facade's seven; all bays are evenly spaced except for the two westernmost bays, which are closer together; at the ground story, six of the secondary facade's eight bays feature short segmental arch openings containing metal casements under fixed lights; the westernmost two bays at the ground story feature a bricked-in door opening and an altered door opening into which a wooden entry door has been installed; a small rectangular metal door has been installed to the west of the westernmost bay; in the second- and third-story window openings, the metal windows have multi-light configurations that differ from the primary facade's simple casement-under-fixed-sash design. The subject building's brick west elevation looks

onto a narrow light court and is not visible from the public way. Behind the raised parapets, the subject building has a flat roof.

Though there are no publicly-accessible areas of the building interior, the following is a brief description of that which was visible during the site visit or described by the owner. The interior of the upper-level offices consists of exposed brick walls and internal wood columns. They feature drop acoustic ceilings with contemporary light fixtures and flooring in a primarily open floor plan layout. The elevator entry lobby, visible from the Battery Street sidewalk, is a contemporary remodel containing drywall and acoustic ceilings

Property History

The following historic information is excerpted from the *Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1 for 447 Battery Street* prepared by Page & Turnbull (October 6, 2017):

The earliest available Sanborn Fire Insurance Company map, dating from 1887, indicates that the 447 Battery Street lot was developed at least by 1887 for a variety of commercial and light industrial commercial and warehouse uses, including produce shops, cigar manufacturers, construction- and industry-related uses, such as wood yards, and other businesses. The buildings on the surrounding city blocks were typically one to three stories in height and densely developed; each block face accommodated ten or more separate commercial establishments. Other businesses visible on the map in the immediate vicinity included tobacco drying, printing and lithography, as well as coffee and spice milling. The narrow alleyway, Merchant Street, cut through the center of the western block, providing access to secondary market stalls and rear access loading areas, while a similar backstreet named Cedar Street connected Clay and Washington streets through the eastern side of the block. The 1887 map shows a row of five small stores or manufacturing facilities on the Battery Street side of the subject parcel between Washington and Merchant streets. . . .²

The 1906 earthquake and fires destroyed the buildings on the 447 Battery Street site and on the surrounding blocks. The importance of the neighborhood to the City's wholesale economy as well as its geographic centrality along the waterfront resulted in nearly immediate reconstruction of the neighborhood. The majority of reconstructed properties in the neighborhood consisted of

... two to three-story, industrial/commercial brick masonry-constructed buildings [with timber framing], including the 1907 construction of the subject building and two west-adjacent extant buildings at 425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street. Adjacent to the Financial District to the south and west, 447 Battery Street was located at the western edge of the bustling produce market district, especially following the district boundaries' expansion during reconstruction.³

Designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees in a simple store-and-warehouse style typical of late nineteenth

² Page & Turnbull, Inc., *447 Battery Street, San Francisco, Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1* (October 6, 2017 Revised), 27.

³ Ibid.

and early twentieth century industrial and commercial buildings, 447 Battery Street was constructed in 1907 on a lot that the 1906 earthquake and fires had cleared of earlier buildings. The building was owned and occupied by Charles Thierbach as a coffee roasting and wholesale company called Thierbach & Co. from 1907-1912 and assumed the name of the Jones-Thierbach Co., from 1912-1966 following merger with Jones-Paddock Company.

... Like other similar buildings of this period, the subject building originally contained at least one storefront and an office at the street level, while the upper floors were engineered to withstand heavy loads, ideal for manufacturing, storage, and roasting machinery, as well as flexible, open warehouse space for the wholesale coffee, tea, and spice business housed there when the building opened in 1907. The 1913 Sanborn map first indicates that three of the five stores previously on the subject parcel were replaced with the current three-story brick building and labeled 'Coffee roasting'.... It appears that a store on the ground level ran the length of the Merchant Street façade, while a small office was centered on the Battery Street side. An awning extended from the facade over the far north storefronts as early as 1917. ... At that time, the building adjacent on the north at the corner of Battery and Washington streets was a two-story building with stucco siding containing a restaurant and five storefronts. The 1913 map also shows newly constructed, reinforced concrete buildings across from the subject property's Merchant Street side containing a candy factory and a creamery. Across Washington Street to the north is the United States Customs House.⁴

Historic photos taken approximately ten years after initial construction show the subject building's street-facing facades clad in a light-colored coating—likely painted stucco—and featuring painted wall signage, with awnings installed over the street-level storefronts. Later photos show traditional wood-frame storefront infill in the ground-story openings and one-over-one windows in the upper-story openings.

In the 1950 Sanborn map, the building is labeled as 'Coffee Roasting, Teas, Coffee & Spices' and the store along the Merchant Street side of the building and the office on Battery Street still existed. Most of the surrounding buildings, including the two-story building to the immediate north and buildings on west end of block, are still shown, containing several commercial establishments, including two restaurants, a cigar factory, and several small retail stores.

... A police record negative capturing the scene of a crash at Battery and Washington Streets in March 1956 shows, when inverted, the painted stucco on the primary façade with the "Jones-Thierbach Co." name painted in dark lettering across the center of the façade. As with the image from 1917, the difference in cladding material and tone is evident between the brick masonry of the north façade and the stucco of the east façade. ... two Assessor's negatives of the property, taken the following year in July 1957, confirm the existence of the stucco, at least up until this date. These views from 1957, both from Battery Street, were taken closer to the subject building and depict most clearly the smooth texture of the stucco and reasonable condition of both the south and primary façades. As in the 1917 photograph, the visible portion of the north façade reads as brick masonry. Both of these 1957 photographs also show the recessed storefronts of the primary façade, with bases similarly clad in stucco, but which are painted a darker color.⁵

⁴ Ibid, 27-28.

⁵ Ibid, 32-33.

While the subject property was spared during the post-war urban renewal of the 1950s and 1960s, much of the surrounding area substantially changed due to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's Golden Gateway project, just east of the subject property. Other substantive changes to the character of the surrounding buildings and block were due to the expansion of the Financial District:

By the mid-1960s, the block and surrounding neighborhood were transformed as it was incorporated into the Financial District. Wholesale warehouse and manufacturing space, such as at 447 Battery Street, was no longer economically viable in such valuable real estate, and most similar businesses relocated to the warehouses in the SOMA district. In the specific case of 447 Battery Street, the building was converted to retail and office use; the exterior significantly altered, and the interior fully remodeled.⁶

In 1967, the coffee warehouse was converted to office space for the owners Kahn, Kaufman, & Oshrow (later Ron Kaufman Company). Permit records confirm this change of use and associated interior alterations. ... Additional interior alterations occurred in 1968 to provide sufficient support for a computer consulting and data processing company, known as Recording and Statistical Data Processing, Inc. and later the Burroughs Corporation. Further seismic reinforcements were required in the 1980s and 1990s, especially of the foundation and parapet, as well as an addition of another ground floor entrance.⁷

The subject building's permit history contains very few records of significant exterior alterations. However, an analysis of historic photos and narrative descriptions from historic surveys indicate that between 1957 and 1968 the stucco cladding was removed (possibly through sandblasting) and the windows and storefronts were replaced. These and other unrecorded alterations (e.g., the doorway alterations at the westernmost end of the Merchant Street facade) may be linked to the building's 1967 conversion from warehouse to office space. Subsequent exterior alterations include parapet reinforcement (1986, 1997), the installation of the existing tenant signage (1998), and the undated installation of the existing storefront, building entry, and awnings on Battery Street. The current building owner states that, in addition to the ca. 1967 campaign, the building was sandblasted again in the 1990s, but that the treatment was determined to be harmful to the building and was halted after having completed the entire Battery Street facade and the easternmost ten feet of the Merchant Street facade. The extent of this more recent treatment is said to correspond to the repointing with alight-colored mortar that has occurred on the Battery Street facade and part of the Merchant Street facade. [Jorgen]

... The mixture used for sandblasting more recently contained salt which caused the bricks to disintegrate, especially at the cornice, and so the operation was halted on the Merchant Street façade about ten feet back from the building corner. It also appears that the original bricks were not fired properly (procured more cheaply) and so the sandblasting only exacerbated their already poor condition. Moreover, it was typical during the rapid reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake that salt water was mixed in with the mortar, which further contributed to the original bricks' deterioration. As a result, the building contains a patchwork of bricks of different types, qualities, and time periods, as

⁶ Ibid, 31.

⁷ Ibid, 32-33.

well as concrete and wood patching in areas of spalling and cracks. Grout was added haphazardly in the sandblasted areas to further prevent or mask the deterioration.⁸

The property has been owned by several different management companies since the 1960s, including the Ron Kaufman Company and then Bedford Properties. The building was owned by Charles Thierbach as a coffee roasting and wholesale company called Thierbach & Co. from 1907-1912 and assumed the name of the Jones-Thierbach Co., from 1912-1966. The following information about Charles Thierbach and Jones-Thierbach Company is from Page & Turnbull (2017) report:

Charles F. Thierbach and the Jones-Thierbach Company⁹

Born in Germany in 1847, Charles Frederick Thierbach immigrated to San Francisco around 1867. According to census records, he married a German woman who had also recently immigrated, Emma Kuhlmeier (1866-1927). Thierbach spent his first years in the city working as a salesman; city directories have record of him working at Ghirardelli in 1875 and living at 930 Folsom Street. Thierbach and his wife had two sons, Charles F. Thierbach, Jr. and George Thierbach.

The first record of Thierbach's involvement in the coffee industry was in 1881 when he began to work for an established importing and wholesale company that started its life as Randall & Jones (1856), with whom he would later merge to form the Jones-Thierbach Co.¹⁰ The firm's [Randall & Jones] president at that time, Michael P. Jones, was known as one of the pioneer merchants of San Francisco. He began an importing business in 1858 at which time he partnered with Frank Randall. Randall retired shortly after and Jones continued the business under the name of Jones & Co. The business began as one of the first and largest importers of sugar from Hawaii, owning several vessels before steamship lines were established. By the early 1880s, when Thierbach joined, the company had shifted its focus to the import and manufacturing of tea, spice, and coffee under the name of the Jones-Paddock Company, located at 28 Fremont Street before the earthquake and 230 Fremont Street by 1910.¹¹

...[T]he coffee import and wholesale business was one of San Francisco's earliest and most profitable industries in the late nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries. While many of the city's earliest coffee companies did not survive the economic turmoil following the 1906 earthquake and fire, Charles Thierbach was fortunate enough to be involved in one of the few coffee companies that remained afloat and resumed business following the destruction in a nearby location also in the South of Market district. City directories show that Thierbach left the Jones-Paddock Co. in 1907 and began his own coffee wholesale business and roastery at 447 Battery Street called Thierbach & Co. Though M.P. Jones had died in 1899, records indicate that Thierbach's new company and the Jones-Paddock Co. merged by 1912, changing the name of Thierbach's company to the Jones-Thierbach Co.¹² No further information

⁸ Personal communication, Rob Canepa, 447 Battery, LLC, with Cassie Rogg, Page & Turnbull, July 22, 2016. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 34.

⁹ Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 36-39.

¹⁰ Ancestry.com, accessed July 2016 and The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1935. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 36.

¹¹ "Death of M.P. Jones." San Francisco Call. September 2, 1899. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 36.

¹² "Two Large Firms Consolidate." California Grocers Advocate, Volume 17, Issues 1-26. 1912. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 37.

about the merger was found, such as whether one of Jones's sons, Webster or Milton, may have also been involved in the company at that time.

While it appears that the Jones-Thierbach Co. was not known to pioneer new techniques or products in the early years of the industry, the company maintained a profitable mid-size roastery and manufacturing facility out of which they produced several popular wholesale brands of canned coffee. Records indicate only a few companies were industry competitors in the immediate post-fire years, including the Ceylon Tea Company (1909 Mission Street), Columbia Coffee and Spice Company (423 Jackson Street), and Eagle Coffee and Spice Mills (520 Washington Street). Other larger companies, such as Folger's (520 Washington Street) and Hill's Brothers Coffee also continued to operate in downtown San Francisco in their multi-story manufacturing and roasting facilities.¹³ In 1915, the year of the Panama Pacific Exposition, city directories identify Charles Thierbach as the Vice President of the Jones-Thierbach Co.

Several articles from the 1910s advertise the Jones-Thierbach Co. for their high-quality coffees and teas. However, one article from 1912 (the year of the company merger) describes a legal case in which the Jones-Thierbach Co. was reported by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture for misbranding a shipment of coffee beans. According to the case summary, a quantity of bags was inaccurately labeled "Arab Coffee with Chicory" (including a picture of an Arab man at center) with a description of the contents containing ground coffee and chicory. In reality, the coffee was found to contain 90 percent South American coffee, about 10 percent chicory, and none of the higher quality Arabic coffee. Thierbach pleaded guilty and the company was fined \$25 for deceiving the purchaser.¹⁴

Despite this negative press, the Jones-Thierbach Co. was selected a few years later to exhibit in the Food Products Building at the 1915 PPIE, in addition to other well-known consumer brands, including Folgers, Ghirardelli (chocolate), McCormick (spices), Heinz (ketchup), and Morton's (salt).¹⁵ Though Jones-Thierbach was known principally for its 'Alta' brand of coffee by this time, the company had branched out its product base to include spices, extracts, tea, and baking powder. The photos below of the PPIE portray the interior with the typical coffee bean grinding equipment used at that time. They also marketed the brand by giving out free samples of the Alta coffee with its 'Gold Medal' award. A trade journal in 1915 remarked that the company had received the award at the PPIE for their entire Alta line, "a line of exceptional merit as far as quality is concerned" (Figures 39 to 41).¹⁶

Census records list Thierbach as a San Francisco "merchant" and "importer of wholesale coffee," and later of tea and spices (likely expanded product base following the merger though no exact record was found), for every decade from 1907 through 1930. Little additional information was found about Charles or the company after the 1930s. Thierbach continued working until the age of 83, soon before he died in

¹³ San Francisco city directories, 1905 – 1908. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 37.

¹⁴ U.S. National Library of Medicine. Case Number #4815 "Misbranding of coffee. U.S. v. The JonesThierbach Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Date issued, September 18, 1917. <https://ceb.nlm.nih.gov/fdanj/handle/123456789/39796> Accessed July 17, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 37.

¹⁵ Moore, Charles C. Official Catalogue of Exhibitors, Panama-Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco, California, 1915. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 37.

¹⁶ Phyfe, James, Simmon's Spice Mill, Devoted to the Interests of the Coffee, Tea, and Spice Trades, Vol. 38, January 1915. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 37.

1931, at the age of 84. One of Thierbach's sons, George, assumed ownership of the company following his father's death, where he had [been] working as superintendent, according to city directories, since the 1920s. George Thierbach was also the head of the National Coffee Association for several years, particularly during the 1930s through mid-1940s.¹⁷ George traveled often to promote the brand, including at an event in Indiana with Joe DiMaggio, performing a "cupping" flavor test.

George Thierbach died in 1952, after which time it is not clear who assumed ownership of the company, though it remained listed in city directories as the Jones-Thierbach Co. until 1967. At this time, the subject building was sold and the company ceased to exist. No other employees were discovered in public records or articles to have made particular contributions to the company over its nearly 60-year tenancy at 447 Battery Street.

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

447 Battery Street is historically significant for its association with the San Francisco coffee industry and is the only building used for coffee roasting and warehousing known to remain in the industry's former hub north of Market Street. From 1907 to 1967, the subject building housed the coffee roastery, storage warehouse, offices, packaging, and manufacturing facility of the Jones-Thierbach Company, a medium-sized coffee roasting and wholesaling company. First established during the Gold Rush-era, the coffee (and tea) industry represented a significant commercial sector in San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century, most coffee roasters were located along California Street in the Financial District. While the Folgers multi-story brick masonry building survived the 1906 earthquake and fires, most of the city's other coffee roasteries and manufacturing facilities were forced to relocate and rebuild, including Jones-Thierbach's parent company, the Jones-Paddock Co., Hills Brothers, MJB, and many other smaller operations. During reconstruction, most of these businesses relocated to commercial warehouse buildings going up rapidly in the South of Market District, while others, including the Jones-Thierbach Co. at the subject property, relocated to buildings in the expanding produce market district and Financial District. 447 Battery Street is the only known building with the original use of coffee roasting and warehousing to remain in what was the historic center of this highly important local industry.

Further, 447 Battery Street is significant for its association with reconstruction of the Downtown/Produce District (later Financial District) following the 1906 earthquake and fires. The produce district was an epicenter of mercantile activity with constant deliveries and transactions of foodstuffs to markets and warehouses that supplied the city. 447 Battery Street is a relic of the industrial and mercantile history of San Francisco and illustrative of the massive efforts to reconstruct downtown San Francisco following the widespread destruction caused by the 1906 earthquake and fires.

In the wake of the Gold Rush, a number of different importers and manufacturers of coffee established themselves in San Francisco. Some of these businesses—e.g., Folger's, Hills Brothers, MJB—eventually grew into large firms with a significant presence in regional and national markets. By the second half of the twentieth century, such firms employed armies of laborers and office workers in large, modern facilities that were centrally

¹⁷ "Coffee Unit Reelects." The Salt Lake Tribune. October 17, 1943. Pg. 13. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 38.

located in or near San Francisco's downtown. According to the 1996 National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the Folger Coffee Company Building (101 Howard Street, extant),

as early as 1882 San Francisco was the largest importer and processor [of coffee] on the West Coast, and with the advent of World War I and the opening of the Panama Canal, became the third largest in the United States after New York and New Orleans; by the late 1940s, coffee was San Francisco's fourth largest industry.¹⁸

In addition to the larger companies listed above, San Francisco also hosted dozens of small and medium-sized roasters—such as that which operated out of the subject building—that contributed to the industry's prominence. The subject building is located in an area that was the center of the San Francisco coffee industry for the entire nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century.

San Francisco's first major coffee producer was William Bovee, who set up his first mastery near the intersection of Broadway and Stockton Street upon his arrival in 1850. By 1860 Bovee had relocated to 123 Front Street (and had taken on James Folger as a junior partner). The City Directory at this time lists three other "Coffee Factories." One, like Bovee's firm, was located in the North of Market area; the remaining two were located just south of Market. By the early 1870s, however, the industry had concentrated in the North of Market area: Of the seventeen coffee "importers" and "factories" listed in the 1873 directory, ten are located in the North of Market area, four are located in the South of Market (SoMa) area, and the locations of four are unknown.¹⁹ This trend accelerated through the 1880s: of the 33 firms listed in the 1880 directory, all but seven were located north of Market. And although many coffee businesses had established themselves in SoMa by 1905, more than half were still located north of Market. The proportion of coffee-related businesses in the North of Market area steadily declined in the years following the 1906 earthquake and fires, although as late as 1920 the area still contained twelve separate firms. By 1955, however, on the eve of the implementation of the Golden Gate Redevelopment project, the industry was concentrated almost entirely in SoMa.²⁰

The City of San Francisco has identified two other buildings associated with the coffee industry as historically significant: the Hills Brothers Coffee Plant at 2 Harrison Street (1924-2b; San Francisco Landmark No. 157), and the J.A. Folger & Company Building at 101 Howard Street (1904-06; Article 11 Category I Significant Building). Both buildings are quite large and are located in SoMa. The subject building, on the other hand, is comparatively small and is located to the north of Market, in an area that served as the center of the coffee manufacturing business through the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century. Although the industry had begun

¹⁸ National Register of Historic Places, The Folger Coffee Company Building, San Francisco, California, National Register #96000679, Section 8, Page 6.

¹⁹ Starting in the late nineteenth century, directories distinguish between coffee "importers" and coffee "factories" or "mills." Later directories further divide the industry into "wholesalers," "roasters," "brokers," etc. Although in some cases the addresses for the "importers" or "brokers" clearly refer to offices that were separate from the industrial operations, at other times the organization is less obvious. The 1920 directory, for instance, lists the business in the subject building as an "importer;" even though it is known to have housed other functions such as warehousing and roasting. Therefore, unless a listing clearly refers to a non-industrial office use, it was counted as the location of a coffee-related business.

²⁰ Directories consulted to determine the historical distribution of coffee businesses include: A.W. Morgan & Co.'s San Francisco City Directory, 1852; Langley's San Francisco Directory, 1860; Langley's San Francisco Directory, 1873; Langley's San Francisco Directory, 1880; Crocker-Langley San Francisco Directory, 1905; Crocker-Langley San Francisco Directory, 1908; Crocker-Langley San Francisco City Directory, 1920; Polk's San Francisco City Directory, 1955-56.

to shift slowly into SoMa around the time of the subject building's construction in 1907, the North of Market area remained important to the coffee industry for decades to come. The subject building appears to be the only remaining building in this area with the original use of roasting and warehousing coffee. Furthermore, the subject building's smaller size—relative to the large industrial complexes that are preserved in SoMa—helps to convey the fact that this highly significant local industry comprised many smaller concerns in addition to the massive corporations with recognizable names.

The following historic context for the San Francisco Coffee industry is taken from the Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report:

SAN FRANCISCO COFFEE INDUSTRY²¹

Coffee, originally harvested and produced in Yemen in the 1400s, is one of the world's most exported commodities. After achieving popularity in Europe in the seventeenth century, coffee spread to America, soon replacing beer as the preferred breakfast beverage. By the Mexican-American war, it was included as a ration for soldiers. By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, traders spread coffee production to other hot climate fertile areas, including Central America and the East and West Indies, from which it was shipped to the United States and Europe. By the 1840s, San Francisco had become the center of the commercial coffee roasting business in the country, and California Street was "something of a coffee row," due to the city's largest port on the West Coast. In addition, for much of the twentieth century, coffee was the highest value import into the city, and two of the largest national coffee brands of the century were established in San Francisco – Folger's and Hills Brothers.²²

William Bovee, who ran a coffee roasting business in New York, decided to join the Gold Rush in 1849 after his business was destroyed in a fire. After settling in San Francisco in 1850, he noticed there were no coffee businesses and decided to build a coffee mill called the Pioneer Steam Coffee and Spice Mill, located on Powell Street between Broadway and Pacific streets. Bovee's hand-ground coffee rapidly gained popularity and one of his early employees was James Folger, originally from the island of Nantucket off the coast of Massachusetts. Folger began selling coffee to miners in small California towns and soon bought out Bovee's brand and changed the name by 1872. Folger's son, James, assumed ownership after his father's death and created one of the earliest premium coffee brands in the city, Golden Gate Coffee.²³

In 1863, the Hills brothers, Austin Herbert and Reuben Wilmarth, arrived in San Francisco from the East Coast and purchased the Arabian Coffee Mills on Fourth Street. While selling butter during the Spanish American Civil War, the brothers were disappointed with the unpleasant aftertaste. Reuben borrowed a vacuum packing technique from a Chicago coffee distributor to use instead, which significantly improved the flavor and sealed moisture out of ground-coffee-filled cans to improve shelf life. By 1900, the Hills brothers were credited as the first to use this method for packaging coffee in San Francisco,

²¹ Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 17-19.

²² "Coffee" a history of San Francisco coffee from the podcast, Containers. Available <https://medium.com/containers/episode-4-coffee-78ac6571caea> Accessed July 17, 2017. Also sourced from a book by William H. Ukers, All About Coffee published in 1920. New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1922. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 17.

²³ "A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. Edible East Bay. February 12, 2016. <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 17.

which allowed for the rapid expansion of national brands selling coffee in tins, a packaging method that would dominate the coffee industry in the twentieth century. The Hills Brothers were also thought to pioneer the “cupping” technique, the process of tasting the coffee multiple times throughout the production and distribution process in order to ensure the consistency of quality (previously the beans were eyeballed to assess quality, though bean size does not influence the taste of the coffee).²⁴

In 1899, Max Brandenstein, the son of a Gold Rush immigrant, arrived in San Francisco at age seventeen to avoid the German military draft, and founded the city’s third most prominent early coffee business, the M.J. Brandenstein Company (later MJB Coffee). The 1906 earthquake and fires destroyed many of the city’s coffee roasteries, including MJB’s warehouse and others on Market Street and in the South of Market district. The Folger building, however, survived. The Hills Brothers constructed a new factory in 1926 and MJB continued to operate out of the South of Market District. The city’s Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915 was organized to celebrate the city’s post-disaster successes and growing industries, of which coffee was central.²⁵ Several emerging successful roasteries emerged during reconstruction and were showcased at the Exposition, including the Jones-Thierbach Co., with its roastery and manufacturing warehouse at 447 Battery Street in the city’s produce market district.

Following World War I and the disruption of global trade trends, San Francisco bankers and importers began financing smaller Guatemalan coffee producers, as opposed to the more traditional Brazilian varieties. In 1906, at the time of the earthquake, approximately 250,000 bags of coffee beans were being imported into the city. By 1914-15, imports had risen to 400,000 bags. By 1918, San Francisco’s coffee industry was exploding – nearly one million bags were being imported and sold in the city, or roughly 150 million pounds of coffee for a net population of around 500,000 people.²⁶ As the result of such significant growth, the San Francisco Green Coffee Association was organized in 1918, which joined the already established National Coffee Roasters Association. The two groups merged by 1932 and included 25 of San Francisco’s earliest and most established roasteries at that time as members, including Wellman Peck & Co. (1849), J.A. Folger & Co. (1850), the Jones-Thierbach Co. (originally Jones-Paddock Co. in 1856), the Hills Bros. Coffee, Inc. (1878), and MJB Co. (1881). Folgers, Hills, and MJB companies were continuously family-owned until the latter half of the twentieth century, at which time the Hills Brothers was purchased by Proctor and Gamble in 1962 and then by Nestle, which also later bought MJB Coffee. Folger’s was sold to Proctor and Gamble in 1963 and then to the J.M. Smucker Co. Production for each brand was moved outside of San Francisco by the early 1990s.

Considered the second largest industry in the city after printing/publishing, the coffee business continued to innovate during the 1950s when Alfred Peet, son of a coffee roaster from Holland, arrived in the Bay Area and continued in the trade of coffee importing.²⁷ Disappointed with the standard quality of

²⁴ Lenihan, V.M. “San Francisco Fills Nation’s Coffee Cup.” Sausalito News, Number 12, March 22, 1951. Available <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=SN19510322.2.56> Accessed July 14, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 17.

²⁵ “San Francisco’s Coffee History,” Timeline News in Context. <https://m-staging.timeline.com/stories/sanfrancisco-coffee> November 2015. Accessed July 17, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 18.

²⁶ Ibid. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 18.

²⁷ Lenihan, V.M. “San Francisco Fills Nation’s Coffee Cup.” Sausalito News, Number 12, March 22, 1951. Available <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=SN19510322.2.56> Accessed July 14, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

beans arriving from Brazil and Central America, and proud of his unique roasting techniques, Alfred Peet opened Peet's Coffee & Tea in Berkeley in 1966, which was one of the first to influence modern micro roasting culture (Peet also initially trained the founders of Starbucks). Peet's coffee shop, the attention to the quality and source of the product, and his specialized knowledge of the business paved a new path in the coffee industry nationwide during the 1960s through 1990s.²⁸ Coffee's "third wave" began in the early 2000s outside of San Francisco (including Stumptown and Intelligentsia in Chicago), but the City today has caught up and remains a hub of the industry's continued growth and evolution. Specialty coffee has become a valuable commodity worldwide and the roasting process an art form, much in the way of fine wine, with companies sourcing and importing exceptionally high-quality coffee beans from "micro-lots" and building relationships with small farmers around the world. Roasters such as Flying Goat, Equator, Sightglass, Blue Bottle, Philz, and Ritual, among many others, have led this wave in San Francisco, where a proliferation of small cafes and micro-roasteries have emerged and are continuing to succeed in an ever-changing economic climate.²⁹

SAN FRANCISCO TEA INDUSTRY³⁰

The history of tea begins in China in c. 1500 B.C., likely as a medical drink. It became a daily drink in China by c. 300 A.D. Tea was first introduced to Portuguese priests and merchants in China during the sixteenth century and drinking tea had become popular in Britain and the British colonies by the seventeenth century. The British introduced tea production and consumption to India, in order to compete with China's established monopoly on the tea market. The drinking of tea in the U.S. was largely influenced by the passage of the Tea Act and its subsequent boycott during the American Revolution, causing a significant decrease in tea consumption nationwide during and after the Revolution. As a result, many Americans switched from drinking black tea to coffee, considering tea to be unpatriotic.³¹ Following the Revolution, tea sales steadily increased again. As early as the mid-nineteenth century in San Francisco, tea from China was one of the most common imported goods into the city, along with tobacco from Cuba and coffee from Central and South America.³²

Tea remained a major imported commodity in San Francisco, given the port's size and access to Chinese and other Asian suppliers. Large tea-packing and storage warehouses were constructed in the early twentieth century to manage the large quantities of tea arriving from overseas. For example, a San Francisco Examiner article from May 1918 stated that a large tea-packing plant was going to be built for Lipton that year, and mentioned that the company's relocation of its western hemisphere business and distribution facilities to San Francisco at [the] time was due to a major growth in sales.³³ Based on advertisements and labels from the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it appeared fairly common for coffee wholesale suppliers, such as the Jones-Thierbach Co., to also purchase and distribute teas, since such large quantities were imported into the city and resale value was high. The

²⁸ Ibid. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

²⁹ "A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. Edible East Bay. February 12, 2016. <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

³⁰ Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19-20.

³¹ "History of Tea." Available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_tea Accessed July 26, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

³² "San Francisco's Culinary History: Part 1 of 12." Available <https://tableagent.com/article/san-franciscosculinary-history-part-1-of-12/> Accessed July 26, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

³³ "Tea Packing Plant to be Built in S.F." San Francisco Examiner, May 4, 1918, pg. 4. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 19.

increase in the national popularity of tea-drinking as an alternate to coffee continued steadily through the mid-twentieth century. By World War II, however, the worldwide tea trade changed significantly. In the name of “modern convenience,” the tea bag was ubiquitously accepted throughout postwar America and overall quality decreased. A few firms continued to supply the old-style loose tea leaves, including Freed Teller Freed in San Francisco; however, few businesses of this kind survived past the late 1950s and 1960s. Tea at this point was typically mass-distributed and merchandised as an indistinct brown beverage called “black tea” and the market leaders of the tea industry of the time, including Tetley, Lipton, and Red and White Rose, lost sight of any differences that may have once set them apart from one another.³⁴

The produce market district was an epicenter of mercantile activity with constant deliveries and transactions of foodstuffs to markets and warehouses that supplied the city. Although decimated in the 1906 earthquake and fires, this area of the city was quickly rebuilt due to its importance to the mercantile economy and to support reconstruction efforts across the city. During reconstruction, the produce market district expanded and the new or replacement industrial/commercial buildings constructed in the district during this period typically had wide, publicly accessible merchant stalls, shop windows, or loading areas on the street level. 447 Battery Street is located just within the western boundary of the former produce district. Although it is somewhat atypical of market buildings of the period as it did not feature open stalls at ground floor, it remains one of the very few buildings in the neighborhood that remains from the produce market era. Therefore, 447 Battery Street is associated with the period of post-earthquake redevelopment in the city and specifically with that of the produce market district and redevelopment of the wholesale coffee and roasting industries in San Francisco.

The following contextual histories of downtown San Francisco and of the produce market district (now subsumed by the Financial District) are from the Page & Turnbull report:

GROWTH OF DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO³⁵

By the early 1900s, San Francisco was the fourth largest city in the United States, with a number of skyscrapers that rivaled those in New York and Chicago, per capita.³⁶ The downtown business district had continued its shift south and southwest of Portsmouth Square; the Financial District was concentrated around Montgomery and California streets, with the shopping district on Grant Avenue and produce market district along the Embarcadero south of Market.

The 1906 earthquake and subsequent fires interrupted a downtown building boom and devastated the entire city. Within hours of the initial shock, eleven fires sparked by broken gas mains swept first through the South of Market district, and later through the downtown Financial and produce market districts, consuming nearly everything the earthquake had spared. The fires raged for three days, and after the catastrophe, most of downtown San Francisco lay in ruins. Only a few buildings survived mostly intact, including the Old Mint, the U.S. Post Office, the upper floors of the Kohl Building, the U.S. Customs House (on the block north-adjacent of the subject property), as well as a portion of nearby Jackson

³⁴ Pratt, James. “The U.S. Tea Renaissance and How It Happened.” The Atlantic. August 5, 2010. Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2010/08/the-us-tea-renaissance-and-how-it-happened/60895/> Accessed July 26, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 20.

³⁵ Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 10-15.

³⁶ Charles Hall Page, Splendid Survivors, 23-30. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 10.

Square. In addition, although their interiors burned, the shells of a small number of office buildings in the Financial District survived as well, including the Call Building, the Folgers Building, the Mills Building, the Aronson Building, and the Mutual Savings Bank Building.³⁷

Following the disaster, San Francisco's produce market and Financial District faced the need for rapid reconstruction. Hefty insurance settlements, combined with an influx of Eastern capital and architects, made the post-1906 era the most important period of construction in downtown San Francisco until the 1960s. Certain areas of the city were rebuilt more rapidly than others, including the expanded produce market district, the Italian quarter of North Beach, the fire's western boundary at Van Ness Avenue, the working waterfront along the Embarcadero, and the Financial District, which was substantially rebuilt by 1909. Many of the new buildings closer to Market Street were high-rises: large, steel-frame, masonry office buildings over ten stories in height, while new buildings closer to the produce market district were three- to four-story, brick masonry buildings, such as the subject property and two extant west-adjacent commercial buildings, all constructed in the year following the earthquake.³⁸ During the recovery period, San Francisco's shopping district developed around Union Square, while manufacturing and warehouses concentrated south of Market Street. Many businesses moved to East Bay cities or west to the Fillmore District. The business district had continued its shift south and southwest of Portsmouth Square; the financial district was concentrated around Montgomery and California streets, and the produce market district around Jackson Square (with its western boundary at Battery Street).

By 1915, the rebuilt downtown covered fifty percent more area than it had before the fire, concentrated in enclaves of commercial office buildings on New Montgomery Street in SOMA and further north on Montgomery Street around California Street. The majority of new downtown buildings broke with their predecessors' Victorian-era styles in favor of the Beaux-Arts style espoused by the City Beautiful movement, of which the subject property was a modest example.³⁹ ...

... Dense downtown development continued into the early 1930s with the construction of new office blocks and large office towers. By the time the Depression halted construction in 1931, downtown San Francisco had extended from the Embarcadero to west of Union Square. In the immediate post-World War II period, construction in downtown San Francisco did not pick up dramatically; nevertheless, those buildings that did rise in the downtown landscape at this time began to show the influence of modernism, particularly the International Style. ...

... These early International Style office towers were harbingers of a downtown building boom that took place between 1963 and 1973, during which time a series of new skyscrapers successively assumed the title of the city's tallest building: the Bank of America Center (1969), the Hartford Building at 650 California (1965), 44 Montgomery Street (1967), One Maritime Plaza (1968) directly east across Battery Street, and finally the Transamerica Pyramid (1972), just one block to the west of the subject property. The corner buildings on the subject block, including 423 Washington Street and 530 Sansome Street, in addition to the south-adjacent building at 425 Battery Street across Merchant Street, were all built in the

³⁷ Jackson Square Historic Context, Page & Turnbull Historic Context, last revised 2016. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 11.

³⁸ "1906 Fire and Aftermath, Historical Essay." Accessed at Foundsf.org. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 11.

³⁹ Charles Hall Page, *Splendid Survivors*, 32-33. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 12.

1980s through early 2000s. The substantial redevelopment of the subject block and adjacent blocks created a detached cluster of post-earthquake reconstruction buildings that are visually and physically separated from similar-era and style buildings further north on Battery Street and to the southeast on Front Street. These isolated buildings include the subject property at 447 Battery Street, west-adjacent 425 Washington Street and 339-445 Washington Street, as well as the south-adjacent block's two-story 432 Clay Street, constructed in 1912. By the 1980s, the immense scale and thoroughly modern architectural styles of the new high-rise buildings heralded the ascendancy of San Francisco's financial sector in the place of its traditional industry- and maritime-based economy.

Produce Market District

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the rising towers in San Francisco's business core stood in stark contrast to the city's sprawling wholesale produce market that was located immediately to the northeast, alongside the Embarcadero and the city's active waterfront piers. The market district had its roots in Italian-American communities that settled in this part of San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century. Many Italian immigrants worked the farms that surrounded the city, and they brought wagons loaded with their produce to Sansome Street between Washington and Clay streets to sell to grocers and hotel owners, among others (one block to the immediate west of the subject block). In 1874, the San Francisco and San Mateo Ranchers' Association (a Genoese organization) constructed the Colombo Market, which supplanted the earlier open-air marketplace. This enclosed market contained over 70 stalls and filled an entire city block between Front and Davis north of Jackson Street. Independent sellers rented the stalls and hawked their produce to consumers. Within the course of the following decades, the Colombo Market became one of the city's commercial landmarks.⁴⁰

The district's immediate access to the waterfront supported many additional one- and two-story brick masonry market buildings and storage warehouses, which received perishable goods directly from ships that docked at the piers. When rebuilt after the 1906 earthquake, the produce district (also known as the commission district, for the organization that oversaw the market activities and certified merchants) retained its earlier function.⁴¹ Moreover, it extended its boundaries, expanding from the waterfront to fill the area between the Embarcadero on the east, Jackson Street on the north, Clay Street on the south, and Battery Street on the west. Its many one- to three-story brick buildings, including the subject property, contained open stalls and awning-covered storefronts at street level (Figure 22).⁴² Originally part of the Barbary Coast, the neighborhood was known to contain bustling markets during the early part of the day and a mix of bars, dance halls, prostitution houses, and crime at night, until the neighborhood was substantially rebuilt and cleaned up in 1911.⁴³ The subject building was constructed originally in 1907 as a warehouse, coffee roastery, and wholesale supply company on the western border

⁴⁰ Gary Kamiya, "Odd Arch is Last Remnant of Bustling Produce Market Built in 1874," San Francisco Chronicle, February 27, 2015, accessed November 17, 2015, <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Odd-arch-is-last-remnant-of-bustling-produce-6106142.php>. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 13.

⁴¹ "Produce Market." http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Produce_Market. Accessed July 12, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 14.

⁴² Michael R. Corbett, Port City: The History and Transformation of the Port of San Francisco, 1848-2010 (San Francisco: San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 2011), 196. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 14.

⁴³ "Thieves' Highway – Produce Market." Citysleuth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010, Accessed July 12, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 14.

of the produce district. The company expanded and assumed its long-term name of the 'Jones-Thierbach Co.' in 1912, around the time of the neighborhood's revitalization.

During the 1910s through 1940s, the district's daily schedule and bustling character were described in the following manner:

A district of narrow streets lined with roofed sidewalks and low brick buildings, it is the receiving depot for the fresh produce that finds its way into the kitchens, restaurants, and hotels of the city. Long before daybreak—in the summer, as early as one o'clock—trucks large and small begin to arrive from the country with fruits and vegetables (Figure 23). From poultry houses come the crowing and cackling of fowls aroused by the lights and commotion. The clatter of hand-trucking and a babel of dialects arise. About six o'clock the light delivery trucks of local markets begin to arrive. By this time a pedestrian can barely squeeze past the crates, hampers, boxes, and bags along the sidewalks. The stacks of produce dwindle so rapidly that by nine o'clock the busiest part of the district's day is over. [...] By afternoon this district is almost deserted.⁴⁴

Although the produce market district was economically active well into the twentieth century, many policy makers viewed the entire area as a longtime chaotic urban nuisance: cramped, unsanitary, crime-ridden, and full of unpleasant smells. Given this perspective, the market simply did not live up to the economic potential of its central location. The district's negative reputation was not helped by its proximity to manufacturing and distribution areas near the port, along with a large population of transient longshoremen and other laborers who sought lodging throughout the area. By the 1940s, the area was beginning to show signs of decay, especially as many wholesalers moved to less expensive areas south and east of the city. The Jones-Thierbach Co. was one of a few food product wholesale suppliers to remain in the district until the mid-1960s. Also during the late 1940s, the industrial waterfront began to experience a reduction of shipping, which also moved elsewhere in the Bay where storage space and land was cheaper. Though still dense and active in the mid-1950s, areas of the old produce market district appeared congested and blighted and became the focal point for urban redevelopment and Financial District expansion. The mayor and other municipal officials began to actively discuss how—and to where—the district could be moved in order to allow the Financial District to further expand its boundaries.⁴⁵ By 1963, the market was moved to Islais Creek to make way for the expansive Golden Gateway Redevelopment project, which modernized and transformed the whole neighborhood into an extension of the city's Financial District.⁴⁶

Historical photographs and maps confirm that the area surrounding the subject property was devastated in the 1906 earthquake and fires. In the subsequent frenzy of activity, developers reconstructed these blocks with generally low-scale buildings devoted to the manufacture, warehousing, and sale of commercial goods. During this redevelopment period, numerous two- to three-story, industrial/commercial brick masonry-constructed buildings, including the 1907 construction of the subject building and two west-adjacent extant buildings at 425

⁴⁴ Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, *San Francisco in the 1930s: The WPA Guide to the City by the Bay* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 262. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 14.

⁴⁵ "Christopher Announces His Program," *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 2, 1951, 9; "Relocation of S.F. Produce Market is Recommended," *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 9, 1953, 9. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 15.

⁴⁶ "Thieves' Highway – Produce Market." Citysleuth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010, Accessed July 12, 2017. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 15.

Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street, were constructed across the fire zone.

Sanborn maps from 1913-1915 show most of the area surrounding the subject property rebuilt, with only a few isolated vacant lots. Nearby businesses trafficked in a wide range of products, including barrels, brooms, candy, cigars, flour, liquor, milk, paint, paper, printed material, paste, spices, and syrup. Also present were the numerous open stalls and marketplaces dedicated to the sale of produce, for which the larger district was [then] known.

Maps dating to 1950 show few changes to the largely commercial and industrial character of the area to the east of Battery Street, where produce sales remained prominent. West of Battery Street, more offices and banks had spread north from the Financial District core around California Street. The larger North of Market district also hosted a number of small- to medium-scale coffee masteries at this time: in addition to the subject building, masteries were present at 901 Battery Street (the mastery, warehouse, and offices for the popular Manning's cafeteria chain; extant) and 306 Sacramento Street (demolished).

However, within ten years of the publication of the 1950 map, the blocks to the west of Battery Street were razed in connection with the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project. Historical concept drawings indicate that at least one version of the project included a "panhandle" that extended between Washington and Clay Streets up to Montgomery Street, connecting the redevelopment area to the present site of the Transamerica Pyramid. Had this concept been realized, the subject building would have been demolished. In addition to the Golden Gateway project, other changes taking place in this district in the mid- to late-twentieth century included the slow decline of the nearby working waterfront and the construction of the Embarcadero Freeway. Taken together, these changes erased much of the physical fabric linking this area to its industrial and blue-collar past, and effectively integrated it into the expanding Financial District. Within this context, the subject building stands as one of the last surviving connections to this earlier history.

Architecture/Design: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values.

Built in 1907 based on design by architect Frank S. Van Trees, 447 Battery Street has a simplified architectural scheme that is aligned with the building's utilitarian warehouse function: subject building housed the coffee roastery, storage warehouse, offices, packaging, and manufacturing facility of the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company from 1907 to 1967. 447 Battery Street has the relatively straightforward design of an industrial warehouse, with a minimal level of external architectural ornamentation and is an example of a multi-story, brick masonry-constructed industrial/commercial building typical in San Francisco during the post-earthquake period of reconstruction. With its original three-story and two-part vertical massing, brick and timber construction, arched openings, and three-course brick belt line, 447 Battery Street is architecturally significant as a representative example of an industrial/commercial style building of the early-twentieth century. Further, the building at 447 Battery Street is architecturally significant because of it is a rare remaining example of a brick commercial building and warehouse in the present-day Financial District. Although altered, 447 Battery Street continues to embody the distinctive characteristics of a post-1906 commercial building.

The following context is taken from Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report:

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL BUILDING TYPOLOGY IN SAN FRANCISCO⁴⁷

Warehousing involves the storage, processing and distribution of goods, as well as occasional light manufacturing. For most of its history as a building type, the warehouse functioned primarily as a storeroom for surplus material. Even before the Industrial Revolution, large Victorian-style warehouse structures were increasingly constructed in mercantile cities of Northern Europe, such as London or Rotterdam. By the Industrial Revolution, the warehouse began to evolve into more of a commercial necessity as increasing amounts of regional and international trade transformed local independent economies into components of the larger world economy. By 1900, the largest ports in the world were mostly located in Europe and North America and included: London, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Marseilles, New York, Boston, and San Francisco, to name a few.⁴⁸

As a building type in San Francisco, the industrial/commercial warehouse dates back to the years immediately following the Gold Rush, when the increasing amounts of imported manufactured goods coupled with growing domestic agricultural output caused a need for these goods to be segregated from trading and retail functions. Warehouses, originally large, wood-frame, barn-like buildings, were constructed along the piers and wharves of the waterfront just to the east of Portsmouth Square in what would become the city's produce market district. Physical proximity to the waterfront and the cost of the land were the primary considerations behind the location of early warehouses but as the cost of prime waterfront land began to increase, warehouses were dispersed away from the original core area to North Beach, the expanded produce market district, and as far south as Steamboat Point. This pattern of development led to the formation of two separate warehouse districts – the Northeast Waterfront and the South End.⁴⁹

Both districts continue to contain examples from every period of construction in San Francisco. These buildings, which range in height from one to seven stories, were designed in a variety of styles and employed different structural systems. The earliest warehouses in San Francisco were built between 1848 and 1870, and were usually of wood-frame construction and consequently often destroyed by fire. Those built between 1870 and 1912, and especially in the reconstruction years (1906-1912) were typically one- to three-story brick buildings with load-bearing brick walls, heavy timber frames and open-web wood truss roofs. Due to the use of load-bearing masonry construction, openings were usually deeply set and small.⁵⁰ The design of these buildings was largely determined by the economics, advances in construction technology, and fire insurance ratings, especially after the earthquake and

⁴⁷ Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 20-21.

⁴⁸ "Commercial Building Typology." Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 20.

⁴⁹ Ibid. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 20.

⁵⁰ "Commercial Building Typology." Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 21.

fires.⁵¹ Other important factors included the amount of storage area per square foot and the structural strength of a building designed to hold many tons of goods or produce.

The defining features of the style are heavy load-bearing brick masonry walls with flat parapets and roofs and facades defined largely by evenly spaced, wood or steel sash fenestration. Other design characteristics typically include large loading docks or openings for commercial stalls in a center or corner bay, hoists, and typically two or more floors, in order to take advantage of high land values. Often constructed with red or blonde-colored brick, these buildings featured little ornamentation other than some decorative brickwork along a beltline, cornice, or parapet. Detailing was typically limited to that which could be easily executed in brick and later, concrete, including Neoclassical and Renaissance Revival-style brick corbelling, jack arches, dentil course moldings and pilasters. These buildings also often retained some elements more typical of nineteenth century commercial buildings, including recessed entrances, clerestories, and transoms.⁵²

Many of the reconstruction-era buildings in San Francisco's Financial District, produce market district, and South of Market district went up quickly in the period following the earthquake and fires and needed to serve a dual commercial and industrial purpose to accommodate displaced offices, retail, and warehouse spaces. Many of these buildings contained storefronts, open stalls, offices, and loading on the ground level, while storage, offices, warehouse, and/or manufacturing space was housed in the upper stories. Brick masonry construction allowed for the heavy loading potential of these floors. These building interiors typically featured a rectilinear floorplate, a symmetrical arrangement of columns, and interiors as unobstructed as possible, in order to allow for maximum storage and large machinery capacity.

By the early twentieth century, the introduction of steel framing, as well as the widespread adoption of the mechanized elevator, allowed buildings to be constructed taller, and with larger window openings and fewer interior supports. By the time of the opening of the Panama Canal in August 1914, advancing concrete construction techniques led to larger buildings with larger window and door openings, thinner walls and greater spans, which allowed more light into the buildings, as well as larger areas of unobstructed space.⁵³

As San Francisco emerged as the United States' principal West Coast port in the years following the Gold Rush, the number of buildings devoted to the production, refinement, and warehousing of bulk trade goods proliferated along the waterfront and in developing industrial areas. Originally constructed of wood, post-1870 warehouse buildings had load-bearing masonry walls and heavy timber internal structural frameworks. These features were intended both to prevent (or at least slow) the spread of fires and also to carry heavy loads. As the limited amount of property became more expensive, the economic imperative to house more floor area on smaller plots of land became stronger, and warehouse buildings accordingly grew taller, occasionally appearing with as many as seven stories. Other character-defining features of this type include storefronts or loading bays

⁵¹ San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "South End Historic District," Draft Case Report, 1990, p. 5. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 21.

⁵² Ibid. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 21.

⁵³ "Commercial Building Typology." Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016. Quoted in Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017), 21.

at the ground story, upper floors with a regular rhythm of window openings, and restrained ornamentation that emphasizes the buildings' utilitarian function.

The subject building was constructed in 1907 to the designs of architect Frank S. Van Trees. Although Van Trees was a prominent Bay Area architect responsible for several notable buildings,⁵⁴ the subject building is not reflective of his academic training, conforming more closely to the simpler, vernacular style of warehouse architecture typical of the mid- to late-nineteenth century. Referring to it as "[a] handsome post-fire brick warehouse building," architectural historian Michael Corbett described the subject building as "indistinguishable from much earlier buildings of the same type." Although this may seem incongruous now, adapting a simpler stylistic expression for a warehouse commission would have made sense architecturally and economically in the immediate reconstruction period. As noted in the Northeast Waterfront Designation Report, "...warehouse architecture did not undergo profound stylistic changes until the introduction of reinforced concrete" so the "...pre- and post-fire brick warehouses embody the original appearance and spirit of [earlier] warehouse districts."⁵⁵ The design of the subject building is therefore a continuation – albeit a notably late example – of an architectural tradition that extends far back into the nineteenth century.

Further, in the haste to rebuild after the 1906 earthquake and fires, many academically trained and well-known architects, such as Van Trees, undertook commissions for warehouse or similar utilitarian-types of buildings as part of the reconstruction efforts, as noted in the following:

Warehouses are among the most utilitarian buildings left in San Francisco, lacking stylistic references common to other building types. If nineteenth century warehouses can be viewed as vernacular structures, this was not the case in the years following the 1906 earthquake and fire. With few exceptions, warehouse owners hired academic architects whose work extended to commercial, industrial and residential buildings, and who participated in the rebuilding of both the downtown and other sections of the city. As shall be pointed out later, the increased reliance on architects had significant effects on the design of industrial architecture in San Francisco during the first two decades of the twentieth century.⁵⁶

As noted above, within Northeast Waterfront and South End, which, like the produce market district, were warehouse districts that were rebuilt following the 1906 earthquake and fires, a number of San Francisco's most well-known, prolific, and academically-trained architects designed utilitarian buildings. These architects included Henry Geilfuss, Willis Polk, Meyer & Ward, T. Patterson Ross, William H. Crimm, Jr., Louis Hobart, Albert Farr, George A. Dodge, William Koenig, MacDonald & Applegarth, Meyer & Ward, Frederick H. Meyer, Reghetti & Headman, Sahlfield & Kohlberg, Sylvain Schnittaker, Henry A. Schultze, and William D. Shea. Similar to Frank S. Van Trees' work on the subject building for many of these architects warehouse design would not have been their specialty so many may have resorted to replicating a simple design with a proven track record of adequately performing its intended industrial purpose.

⁵⁴ Koshland residence at 3800 Washington Street; the National Register-listed Hearst Free Library in Anaconda, MT; numerous residences and other buildings throughout San Francisco and the Bay Area.

⁵⁵ Jeremy Naploma on behalf of The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, Northeast Waterfront Designation Report (September 9, 1982).

⁵⁶ Planning Department, South End Historic District Case Report (February 5, 1990), 3

Relatively few buildings, particularly in the broader North of Market area, can match the subject building's minimalist aesthetic and simple, repetitive pattern of fenestration.⁵⁷ Within the subject building's immediate context, dominated as it is by mid- to late-twentieth century redevelopment, there is nothing similar. Therefore, the subject building is a rare example of a late nineteenth/early twentieth century store-and-warehouse building in downtown San Francisco.

Bibliography

PUBLISHED WORKS

Brandi, Richard. A Reevaluation of Urban Renewal in San Francisco (MA thesis, Goucher College, 2008).

Corbett, Michael R. and Page, Charles Hall. Splendid Survivors, San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage (Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, 1979).

Corbett, Michael R. Port City: The History and Transformation of the Port of San Francisco, 1848-2010 (San Francisco: San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 2011).

Fogelson, Robert M. Downtown: Its Rise and Fall, 1880-1950. 3rd Edition. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

Hays, Allen R. The Federal Government & Urban Housing (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012).

Ken Lastufka, Redevelopment of Sacramento's West End, 1950-1970: A Historical Overview with an Analysis of the Impact of Relocation (MA thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1985).

Page & Turnbull, Historic Context Statement, South of Market Area, Prepared for the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, June 2009.

Page & Turnbull, Historic Context Statement, Jackson Square, Internal database, last revised 2016.

Rand Richards, Historic San Francisco. A Concise History and Guide (San Francisco: Heritage House Publishers, 2001).

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," National Register Bulletin, 1995.

PUBLIC RECORDS

Department of City Planning (DCP), San Francisco Architectural Quality Survey, 447 Battery Street, 400-410 Merchant Street (Block 206/Lot 2), 1976.

⁵⁷ The Legallet Building at 601 Battery Street is one other example of such a building, although even here the detailing is less restrained.

Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, San Francisco in the 1930s: The WPA Guide to the City by the Bay (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

Junior League of San Francisco, Here Today, San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, Recorded by Mary Franck in March, 1968. San Francisco Public Library History Room, accessed April 2016.

Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for San Francisco County, 447 Battery Street, 2012.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, San Francisco, California: 1887, 1905, 1913, 1950.

San Francisco Assessor's Negatives Collection. Battery Street and Jones-Thierbach Co. July 1957.

San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.

San Francisco Department of Public Works Historic Photograph Collection. 447 Battery Street. February 1917 & September 1918. San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.

Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 447 Battery Street Revised San Francisco, California October 6, 2017 Page & Turnbull, Inc.

San Francisco Planning Department, Historic Preservation Commission, San Francisco Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey and Historic Context, 1990.

San Francisco Police Records Historic Photograph Archive. Battery Street. March 1956. San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.

San Francisco Property Information Map (PIM), Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co., 431-447 Battery Street, Assessor's Block 206/Lot 2, Accessed online at <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/> July, 2016.

San Francisco City Directories, California Marriage Index 1960-1985, 1944 California Voters Registration, 1910-1940 U.S. Census, Stanford Yearbook.

San Francisco Planning Department, Northeast Waterfront Historic District Case Report (September 9, 1982).

San Francisco Planning Department, South End Historic District Case Report (February 5, 1990).

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

"Christopher Announces His Program," San Francisco Chronicle, October 2, 1951.

"Coffee Unit Reelects." The Salt Lake Tribune. October 17, 1943.

"Death of M.P. Jones." San Francisco Call. September 2, 1899.

Gary Kamiya, "Odd Arch is Last Remnant of Bustling Produce Market Built in 1874," San Francisco Chronicle, February 27, 2015.

Lenihan, V.M. "San Francisco Fills Nation's Coffee Cup." Sausalito News, Number 12, March 22, 1951.

Moore, Charles C. Official Catalogue of Exhibitors, Panama-Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco, California, 1915.

Phyfe, James, Simmon's Spice Mill, Devoted to the Interests of the Coffee, Tea, and Spice Trades, Vol. 38, January, 1915.

"Relocation of S.F. Produce Market is Recommended," San Francisco Chronicle, September 9, 1953.

The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company. All About Tea, William H. Ukers, Editor, Vol. II, 1935.

"Two Large Firms Consolidate." California Grocers Advocate, Volume 17, Issues 1-26. 1912.

INTERNET SOURCES

"A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. Edible East Bay. February 12, 2016. Available <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017.

Ancestry.com, Charles Frederick Thierbach, 1847 – 1931. Referencing US Census records and San Francisco city directories. Accessed by ESA on May 24, 2016.

"Coffee" a history of San Francisco coffee from the podcast, Containers. Available <https://medium.com/containers/episode-4-coffee-78ac6571caea> Accessed July 17, 2017.

Also sourced from a book by William H. Ukers, All About Coffee published in 1920. New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1922.

"PPIE: The City That Knows How." Available at <https://sfpl.org/?pg=2000141201> Accessed July 12, 2017.

"Produce Market." Available http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Produce_Market Accessed July 12, 2017.

"San Francisco's Coffee History," Timeline News in Context. Available <https://mstaging.timeline.com/stories/san-francisco-coffee> November 2015. Accessed July 17, 2017.

"Thieves' Highway – Produce Market." Available at citysleuth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010, Accessed July 12, 2017.


UC Davis, Special Collections, <http://oac.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/c8d21zvj/?brand=oac4> Accessed by ESA May, 2016, and www.ebay.com, accessed by ESA May, 2016).

U.S. National Library of Medicine. Case Number #4815 "Misbranding of coffee. U.S. v. The JonesThierbach Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Date issued, September 18, 1917. Available at <https://ceb.nlm.nih.gov/fdanj/handle/123456789/39796> Accessed July 17, 2017.

Photos



447 Battery Street primary (east) façade, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Upper level windows, east elevation, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report




Storefront, east elevation, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Merchant Street (south) elevation, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Upper level windows, south elevation, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Close-up showing variations in brick and mortar, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Close up of patched bricks at cornice, 2017. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Battery Street, looking north, 1918. Subject property with TEAS painted on corner of Merchant Street elevation. Source: San Francisco Public Works, *Photograph Collection*, Album 23, Image 5605, accessed from Western Neighborhoods Project, <http://opensfhistory.org/Display/wnp36.0.1933.jpg>.




View of primary façade at Battery Street, July 1957. Source: San Francisco Office of Assessor, Record Photographs, San Francisco Public Library




View at Battery & Washington Streets, March 1956. Source: City Police Records Negatives. San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk. From Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report.



View of corner at Washington Street, July 1957. Source: City Assessor's Negatives. San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk. From Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report.



Annotated Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1913. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Annotated Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1950. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report



Top left and bottom: Jones-Thierbach Showroom Interior and Advertising Letterhead (1917). Top right: Typical vacuum-packed Alta coffee grounds jar (1920). Source: UC Davis, Special Collections (photographs), Ebay (letterhead and jar). From Page & Turnbull, Inc. (2017) report.

street address 447 Battery 206 2 1
 block number lot number summary

building type/use/number of floors C.B. 400-410 MERCHANT landmark number

RELATIONSHIP WITH SURROUNDING BUILDINGS

Relationship of setting to building -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Importance as contribution to a cluster/streetscape -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN EVALUATION

Facade proportions -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Richness/Excellence of detailing/decoration -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Unique visual feature of interest 0 1 2 3 4 5

Example of a rare or unusual style or design 0 1 2 3 4 5

Overall architectural quality -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

PROPOSED FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

CORNICE, PARAPET, APPENDAGE

Importance of cornice to building design -1 -2 0 1 2 3 4 5

Cornice contribution to streetscape -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

FACADE CONDITION

Physical condition -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Paint/Material color -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

REMODELING

Appropriateness of improvements -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

San Francisco 11-30-76 date

Field Notes

Review Notes

Junior League Listing
 text index file
 Northern California Guide
 Other Listing _____


photo 279-8 F1



Department of City Planning (DCP), San Francisco Architectural Quality Survey, 447 Battery Street, 400-410 Merchant Street (Block 206/Lot 2), 1976.

111 547
431-447 Battery Street
Wakefield-Telegraph Hill

HISTORIC BUILDING DATA SHEET
 Junior League of San Francisco, Inc. AREA #3
 Section

1. Street and Number BATTERY 431-447	Block 206	Lot 2	Zoning C-3	Year Built 1917
2. Present Owner and/or Occupant <i>Wakefield-Telegraph Hill</i>		Present Use		
3. Interim Owner (s)		Interim Use (s)		
4. Original Owner		Original Use		
5. Architect		Builder		
6. Architecture: A. Construction Material B. Number Stories 3 C. Style of Architecture D. Physical Condition Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> E. Exterior Deterioration of Original Design None or Little <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate Amount <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Considerable <input type="checkbox"/>		F. Notable Features (Continue, Second Sheet) G. Architectural Significance as example of its style Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> H. Future Secure <input type="checkbox"/> Desperate <input type="checkbox"/> Holding <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Threatened <input type="checkbox"/>		
7. Neighborhood Information: A. Compatibility With Neighborhood Structure Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Use Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> B. Importance to Neighborhood Great <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/>		C. Architecturally Strong Neighborhood Entire Block <input type="checkbox"/> Both Sides of Street <input type="checkbox"/> Row of Houses <input type="checkbox"/> Number in Row <input type="checkbox"/> Comments:		
8. Historical Information: A. Significance National or State <input type="checkbox"/> Community <input type="checkbox"/>		E. Facts (Continue, Attach Second Sheet) <i>Wakefield-Telegraph Hill</i>		
9. Open to Public/Hours		12. Cross Street Reference		
10. Special Research Sources Name/Item Where				
11. Screening (Date) Community Consultants: Accept <input type="checkbox"/> Comments Reject <input type="checkbox"/>		13. Number of Photos Attached 1		
Revised 2/25/64 10/20/54 - 8th Printing		14. Surveyor Signature		

Junior League Property Survey Form for 431-447 Battery Street. Recorded by Mary Franck. 1968.
 Page 2. San Francisco Public Library History Room Archives.

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

March 17, 2021

Via Email and Hard Copy (pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org)

Pilar LaValley
San Francisco Planning Department
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
Environmental Planning Division
49 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

**Re: Opposition to Proposed Landmark Designation
of 447 Battery Street
Board of Supervisors File No.: 201298
Planning Case No.: 2014-1036ENV
Our File No.: 7877.01**

Dear Pilar:

As you know, this office represents 447 Battery Partners, LLC (“**Owner**”), which seeks to develop a 198-room, 200-foot-tall, 143,449 square-foot, 4-star hotel at its property at 447 Battery Street (the “**Property**”). The Owner objects to the recent effort to designate the Property as a local landmark under the Planning Code. Given the history of the building, and the extensive research and analysis into the historic nature of the Property, it is difficult to understand the justification for such an action. The facts here simply do not add up to landmark status.

The Project proposes to retain the existing public facing façades on Battery and Merchant Streets, demolish the interior of the existing building, and build a 15-story addition above. The hotel would include a full-service restaurant on the ground floor and mezzanine, and an 18th-floor Rooftop Bar/Lounge. The hotel would also contain below-grade conference and meeting space, mechanical equipment, loading, fitness center, bicycle parking and vehicle parking areas (the “**Project**”). The Project’s 2,203 square-foot Privately Owned Public Open Space (“**POPOS**”) requirement would be met by providing a 2,720 square-foot sidewalk seating area adjacent to the hotel’s Merchant Street entrance and ground floor bar/restaurant. Project plans are attached as **Exhibit A**.

In addition to the hotel itself, the Project proposes a voluntary revitalization of the full block of Merchant Street between Battery Street and Sansome Street into a pedestrian-friendly, landscaped, partially-shared street. The work on Merchant Street represents a major investment in the neighborhood that far exceeds the Project’s POPOS requirement. Plans for Merchant Street are attached as **Exhibit B**.

San Francisco Office
One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104
tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office
492 9th Street, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94607
tel: 510-527-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

The Project has undergone six and a half years of extensive review. Preservation analysis for the Project has included the following hearings and documents (“**Preservation Documents**”):

- October 6, 2017 Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1 by Page & Turnbull (“**HRE**”) (**Exhibit C**);
- June 2017 Historic Resource Evaluation Peer Review by Architectural Resources Group (“**Peer Review**”) (**Exhibit D**);
- July 31, 2020 Planning Department HRER (**Exhibit E**);
- October 2, 2019 Historic Preservation Commission hearing on preservation alternatives for Environmental Impact Report (“**EIR**”);
- November 4, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission hearing on the Draft EIR (“**DEIR**”);
- November 6, 2020 HPC written comments on the DEIR (**Exhibit F**).

During preservation review, both Page & Turnbull (“**P&T**”) and Architectural Resources Group (“**ARG**”) concluded that the Property should not be considered a historic resource for the purpose of CEQA. Because the Planning Department disagreed with the two independent consultant opinions and concluded that the Property is a resource, albeit a minor one, the Project Team modified the Project to retain the street-facing façades of the building. The Project also incorporated a two-story setback over the existing building and masonry materials and a design that reflects the architecture of the existing building. With these changes, the Planning Department is supportive of the design.

The Project has also undergone two hearings at the HPC, first to review the preservation alternatives for the EIR, and second to review the DEIR. After the second hearing on November 4, 2020, the HPC provided written comments stating that: “The HPC was generally supportive of the proposed project and satisfied with the design of the new building.” (Exhibit E, p. 1-2.)

At no point during more than six years of review was it suggested by P&T, ARG, Planning staff, or the HPC that the Property could or should be a listed City landmark. However, on November 12, 2020, after publication of the DEIR, when the Project was nearly complete, legislation to landmark the Property was introduced by Supervisor Aaron Peskin. The legislation, attached as **Exhibit G** in its final form, asserts that 447 Battery Street is architecturally significant: “because of its status as a rare remaining example of a brick commercial building and warehouse in the present-day Financial District and shares a historic context and many architectural characteristics with contributors to surrounding historic districts including the Jackson Square Landmark District, the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, and the Front-California Conservation District, each of which represents an intact collection of post-1906 commercial buildings that remain embedded within a more recent urban fabric.” (Exhibit F, p. 3.)

This building is not appropriate for landmarking. As discussed below, the brick façade of the building, which was constructed with multiple types of bricks and is in poor condition after being sandblasted by prior owners and deteriorating over time, was not visible at the time of construction when the building was covered with stucco and wood cornices, as well as painted signage that was later sand blasted off. Based on the condition of the building, both P&T and ARG determined that the Property is not a historic resource under CEQA, much less a landmark. Moreover, P&T, ARG, and the Planning Department all agree that the Property is not a contributor to a historic district. The Planning Department determined that: “Due to the highly compromised integrity of the subject property’s historic setting, the project is not expected to have an impact on offsite historic resources.” (HRE, p. 4.)

The Preservation Documents, including the HRE and Peer Review, support a finding that the Property is not a resource under CEQA, much less a landmark. Landmarking the Property as proposed would not only make the current Project impossible, it would eliminate most of the value of the building and prevent any future project at the Property – a drastic and disastrous measure not justified by the building or supported by the Preservation Documents.

I. Property History and Architecture

The Property contains a three-story brick and timber commercial building with a rectangular plan and a flat roof. It is located on a 7,180 square-foot lot at the southeast corner of Battery and Merchant streets. Constructed in 1907, the building replaced a storage warehouse that burned down in the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The building is not representative of a specific architectural style. It features vernacular design elements of a typical industrial/commercial-style building of the period, including a two-part vertically-oriented façade and repetitive fenestration pattern. (HRE, p. 5.) A stepped, triple-course of brick, which is a remnant of the original cornice, and which was torn out in the 1970’s, runs the length of the façade beneath the parapet, where deteriorated brick, steel rods, and concrete patching are now visible.

The Property was originally built with stucco cladding, so the brickwork that is currently visible was never meant to be seen. The building was later sandblasted, leaving the exterior brick in poor condition (see HRE, pp. 7-9 for photos of the existing deteriorated brickwork). In addition, sections of the still-discernible brick cornice corbeling were heavily damaged when the stucco cladding was removed. (HRE, p. 7.)

The Property was originally occupied by a small Bay Area coffee and tea wholesale supplier and roastery from 1907 through 1966. The company changed its name from Thierbach & Co. to the Jones-Thierbach Co. in 1912 and continued to operate as such until its closing in 1966. The Property was converted to an office building in 1967 and was occupied by a variety of tenants and retailers from 1968 until the present. (HRE, p. 1.)

The corner buildings on the subject block, including 423 Washington Street and 530 Sansome Street, in addition to the south-adjacent building at 425 Battery Street across Merchant Street, were all built in the 1980s through early 2000s. The substantial redevelopment of the block and adjacent

blocks created a detached cluster of post-earthquake reconstruction buildings that are visually and physically separated from similar-era and style buildings further north on Battery Street and to the southeast on Front Street. (HRE, p. 13.)

II. The HRE and Peer Review Concluded that the Property is not a Resource

The HRE evaluated the historic status of the Property based on numerous resources, including previous historical surveys and ratings, site description, historic context statement, and an evaluation of the Property's individual eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. The HRE used research collected by previous historic evaluation reports and surveys, as well as various local repositories, including the San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Assessor's Office, San Francisco Public Library and History Room/Photo Desk, Online Archive of California, and various other online sources. The Property has been evaluated in six listings and surveys, including the California Historical Resource Status Code Information (CHRIS), the Junior League of San Francisco Architectural Survey (1968), Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey (1976), San Francisco Architectural Heritage Survey, (1977-78), the Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey (1990), and the San Francisco Planning Department's Parcel Information Map.

The HRE concludes that while the Property was evaluated in previous surveys and rated as a Category 'A' resource (historic resource present) by the San Francisco Planning Department, a preponderance of new evidence regarding past alterations to the exterior façade leads to a different conclusion regarding significance under the National Register of Historical Places and California Register of Historical Resources. The HRE finds, and the Peer review concurs, that the building lacks significance under the four California Register criteria; Criterion 1 (event); Criterion 2 (persons); Criterion 3 (architecture/design); and Criterion 4 (information potential, typically archeological resources). Additionally, both reports conclude that the building lacks integrity due to several modifications, including the following:

- removal of the original exterior stucco cladding, signage, and cornice on the east and south façades;
- modification of storefronts on the east façade facing Battery Street and door openings on the south façade facing Merchant Street;
- replacement of the original wood-sash windows;
- damage of original masonry material due to sandblasting; and
- replacement of portions of the original masonry material with new brick, pieces of wood, concrete, and grout.

Finally, both P&T and ARG conclude that the building does not qualify for inclusion in a historic district, including the Front-California Downtown Conservation District and the Commercial-

Leidesdorff Conservation District.

A. The Property Lacks Significance in Association with an Event

Although 447 Battery is associated with the period of post-earthquake redevelopment of the produce market district and redevelopment of the wholesale coffee and roasting industries in San Francisco, it is not particularly representative of the redevelopment period and appears to lack significance in association with San Francisco's coffee roasting and tea wholesale industries. (HRE, pp. 40-41.) The Property was located within the boundary of the produce market district, but is not a particularly representative example of a typical commercial/industrial building that characterized the market district with open merchant stalls or loading areas on the street level. (HRE, p. 40.) Therefore, the building does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 1. (HRE, p. 41.)

B. The Property is not Associated with Persons important to the History of San Francisco

There is no indication that Jones-Thierbach Co., which occupied the building from 1907 to 1966, was known to be particularly unique or innovative in the coffee and tea roasting and wholesale supply industries. (HRE, p. 41.) Therefore, the building does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 2. (HRE, p. 42.)

C. The Property is not Individually Significant based on Architecture or Design

While 447 Battery is an example of a multi-story, brick masonry-constructed industrial/commercial building typical in San Francisco during the post-earthquake period of reconstruction, 447 Battery Street is not a rare example of this type of building. Nearby properties built between 1906 and 1911 are better representatives of the typology. (HRE, p. 42.) Buildings with a similarly restrained, yet higher level of architectural merit include: 405 Sansome Street, 407 Sansome Street, 568 Sacramento Street, 843-851 Montgomery Street, 298 Pacific Avenue, and 705 Sansome Street. These buildings feature more refined ornamental Neoclassical-style brickwork, arched openings, highly decorative cornices, beltlines, dentils, and pilasters at the primary and secondary façades. The buildings at 200 Jackson Street, 601-615 Front Street, and 705 Sansome Street appear to feature original windows and/or doors, intact brickwork and other architectural detailing, and less compromised surrounding environments than 447 Battery. Each of the other properties feature an overall higher level of architectural merit and/or to exhibit more character-defining features of the industrial/commercial building typology. Of the above buildings, only 568 Sacramento has been individually landmarked. Therefore, 447 Battery Street does not appear individually significant in association with the brick building typology from the post-earthquake period.

447 Battery Street is also not a noteworthy example of its building typology due to alterations that have occurred over time. Aside from the building's original three-story and two-part vertical massing, brick and timber construction, arched openings, and three-course brick belt line, the

building contains no original features or characteristics that would make it architecturally significant as an example of an industrial/commercial style building of the early-twentieth century, nor as an example of any observable architectural style. Overall, the building does not appear to be a representative example of the type, period, or method of construction, nor does it feature high artistic merit. Therefore, the building does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 3. (HRE, p. 42.)

D. The Building does not Retain Historic Integrity

In order to qualify for listing in the National Register or the California Register, a property must possess significance under one of the aforementioned criteria and have historic integrity. 447 Battery was not perceived as a brick masonry building during its existence as the Jones-Thierbach Co. building through the mid-60s, but instead as a stucco-clad building with painted signage. Given the extensive exterior alterations and an interior remodel in 1967 to convert the original use of the Property, the building has significantly compromised integrity of feeling and association. It no longer conveys its original commercial and warehouse uses significant to the produce market district or any visible remnants of the Jones-Thierbach Co. (HRE, p. 43.)

Although no permits or plans were found which identified changes to the exterior walls as part of the 1967 remodel when the coffee warehouse was converted to office space, it is believed that the removal of the original stucco and paint on the east and south façades, the damage to the cornice, sandblasting, and doorway alterations on the Merchant Street façade likely occurred during that remodel. It is also probable that at that time the original wood frame windows on Battery Street and Merchant Street façades were replaced with poor quality metal frame windows. (HRE, pp. 33-34.)

Additional interior alterations and reinforcement occurred in 1968 and 1975, and further seismic reinforcement was required in the 1980s and 1990s, especially of the foundation and parapet, as well as an addition of another ground floor entrance. Potentially the 1986 “add entrance on ground floor” is when the storefront windows and doors were replaced on the Battery Street façade, as well as the parapet anchor bolts. It is believed that the Battery Street exterior façade and a portion on the Merchant Street (east) façade had been sandblasted both at the time of the 1967 remodel, as well as more recently in the 1990s. The mixture used for sandblasting more recently contained salt which caused the bricks to disintegrate, especially at the cornice, and so the operation was halted on the Merchant Street façade about ten feet back from the building corner. It also appears that the original bricks were inexpensive, low quality, and not fired properly, so the sandblasting exacerbated their already poor condition. Moreover, it was typical during the rapid reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake that salt water was mixed in with the mortar, which further contributed to deterioration of the bricks.

As a result, the building contains a patchwork of bricks of different types, qualities, and time periods, as well as concrete and wood patching in areas of spalling and cracks. Grout was added haphazardly in the sandblasted areas to further prevent or mask the deterioration. Photos of the current condition of the bricks are attached as **Exhibit H**. (see also photos in HRE, p. 34.)

Moreover, 447 Battery Street does not retain overall integrity of setting given that the surrounding neighborhood is no longer characterized by one- to three story industrial/commercial buildings. Beginning as early as the mid-1960s, the expansion of the Financial District led to the construction of several high-rise modern office buildings directly adjacent to the Property on the north, west and south sides, as well as the Golden Gate Redevelopment project across the street. (HRE, p. 43.)

E. The Property Does not Warrant Inclusion in a Nearby Conservation District

The Planning Department determined that “due to the highly compromised integrity of the subject property’s historic setting, the project is not expected to have an impact on offsite historic resources.” (HRER, p. 4.) This conclusion is supported by the HRE and Peer review which find that the Property is not a contributor to the Front-California Downtown Conservation District, three blocks to the southeast, and the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, two blocks to the southwest. (HRE, p. 45.)

The Front-California Downtown Conservation District consists of one- to eleven-story commercial office buildings, many of which date from the post-earthquake period of reconstruction (completed by the 1930s) and were built to serve the produce market district, with offices and retail on the street level and storage on the upper stories. (HRE, p. 44.) The Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District consists of narrow parcels and small-scale, two- to six-story buildings (excluding one high-rise), largely reconstructed in the post-earthquake years and completed in the early 1920s. It traditionally contained a wide variety of businesses which enjoyed proximity to the Financial District. (HRE, p. 44.)

As part of the HRE, P&T conducted a survey to determine if the Property should be included in an extension of the Front-California Conservation District. (HRE, pp. 47-55.) The buildings in the survey area were built during a wide range of construction periods between 1907 and the early 2000s. Based on information available in San Francisco’s Property Information database, including available permits, seven buildings (41%) were constructed during the early twentieth century (1907-1922), five buildings (29%) were constructed during the mid-twentieth century (1946-1970), and four buildings (24%) were constructed during the late twentieth century (1983-c.2000). Several of the properties constructed during the period of reconstruction following the earthquake appear to have been significantly altered, including 220 and 292 Battery Streets, while the other properties date from a wide range of periods in the second half of the twentieth century, resulting in the neighborhood’s lack of architectural cohesion and compromised integrity of setting. (HRE, p 55.)

The contributing buildings of the Front-California Conservation District are generally larger in scale than the Property, and many of them were constructed more slowly, not reaching completion until the 1930s. Furthermore, one of the character-defining features is the “coherent entity of the district.” 447 Battery Street is separated from the Front-California Conservation by several blocks of intervening modern redevelopment, such that there is no physical connection with the District. Therefore, 447 Battery does not appear to be an eligible contributor to the Front-California Conservation District. (HRE, p 56.)

Although the subject building's date, scale, and historic use as a coffee roastery and wholesale supplier align with the building type and variety of commercial uses of the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District's contributors, the primary features of this District are its orientation around one street intersection and a relatively high level of architectural merit exhibited by the buildings. The Property would not be considered an eligible contributor to the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District given its two-and-one-half block distance from the intersection and pedestrian alleyway, as well as its compromised integrity of design and setting, and relatively lower level of architectural merit. (HRE, p 56-57.) Therefore, the Property does not warrant inclusion in the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District.

The landmark legislation also references the Jackson Square Landmark District, which is a District made up of a compact area in Jackson Square. The District contains virtually the sole surviving commercial buildings from the 1850's and 1860's and "has an identifiable scale and common architectural features. Narrow interior streets, street trees, quiet alleys, pedestrian orientation and intimacy of view in most of the District also contribute to its visual unity, as does the contrast with surrounding areas." (Appendix B to Article 10 of the Planning Code.) 447 Battery is distinct from the contributing buildings in Jackson Square, and is not located adjacent to the District such that an extension of the District might be justified if the architecture was compatible with the District. Therefore, the Property does not warrant inclusion in the Jackson Square Landmark District.

III. Conclusion

The Property has been fully evaluated during a more than six-year entitlement process, which now finally nears completion. At no time during that process did P&T, ARG, the Planning Department, or the HPC propose that the building justified landmark status. In fact, both P&T and ARG determined that the Property was not even a historic resource under CEQA, much less a landmark. This is not an architecturally rare or well-preserved building. Nor is it one associated with historically significant people or events. It is not unique in any way that would justify landmark status.

There is no documentary support for the landmarking legislation, which it appears would not only make the current Project impossible, but also prevent future beneficial use of the Property. Moreover, the Planning Department and HPC are both supportive of the existing design, which retains the street-facing facades and incorporates an addition designed for compatibility with the existing building. It also proposes a street level POPOS and revitalization of Merchant Street that would improve both the street and the neighborhood. The landmark legislation is not supported by the condition of the building or the history of the Property and should not move forward.

We would be happy to provide any further information or analysis if requested to do so. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP



Jody Knight


Attachments

- cc: Claudine Asbagh, Principal Planner, NorthEast Current Planning, San Francisco Planning
(Via Email; claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org)
- Marcelle Boudreaux, Principal Planner, Survey & Designation, San Francisco Planning
Department (Via Email; marcelle.boudreaux@sfgov.org)
- Aaron Starr, Principal Planner, Legislative Affairs (Via Email; aaron.starr@sfgov.org)
- Rachel Schuett, Senior Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department (Via
Email; rachel.schuett@sfgov.org)
- Allison Vanderslice, Principal Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning
Department (Via Email; allison.vanderslice@sfgov.org)
- Michael Li, Senior Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department (Via
Email; michael.j.li@sfgov.org)
- Christy Alexander, Senior Planner, San Francisco Planning Department (Via Email;
christy.alexander@sfgov.org)
- Rich Hillis, Planning Director, San Francisco Planning Department (Via Email;
rich.hillis@sfgov.org)
- Historic Preservation Commission, Commission Affairs,
CPC.commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Exhibit A

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2016 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"



03.01.2019

447 Battery Street

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111



SITE PLAN - VICINITY

Page 1

HELLER MANUS
ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SITE AREA = 7,178 SQ.FT.
EXTERIOR PERIMETER BUILDING AREA AT GROUND LEVEL = 6,660± SQ.FT.

LEGEND

- CLP CLEAR OF PROPERTY LINE
- OV OVER PROPERTY LINE
- BLDG BUILDING
- (D) BUILDING DIMENSION
- R/W RIGHT OF WAY
- P.O.B POINT OF BEGINNING
- C.M. CONDOMINIUM MAPS
- CONC CONCRETE
- HR HANDICAP RAMP
- TC TOP OF CURB
- FL FLOW LINE
- SWP BACK OF WALK
- RP ROOF PARAPET
- DV GAS VALVE
- SVB SEWER VENT
- WM WATER METER
- HVE HIGH VOLTAGE ELECTRIC
- VAULT COVER
- PM PARKING METER
- PM(D) PARKING METER (DOUBLE)
- HP HANDICAP PARKING SIGN
- NSP NO PARKING SIGN
- ELP ELECTROLITER
- MBULB BULLBOX MARKED "SHELTER"
- MP METAL POLE 9" HIGH
- SB SATCH BASIN

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
ALL THAT REAL PROPERTY SITUATED IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE NORTHERLY LINE OF MERCHANT STREET AND THE WESTERLY LINE OF BATTERY STREET; RUNNING THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID LINE OF BATTERY STREET 74 FEET; THENCE AT A RIGHT ANGLE WESTERLY 97 FEET; THENCE AT A RIGHT ANGLE SOUTHERLY 74 FEET TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF MERCHANT STREET; AND THENCE AT A RIGHT ANGLE EASTERLY ALONG SAID LINE OF MERCHANT STREET 87 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
BEING A PART OF 50 VARA BLOCK NO. 35.
ASSESSOR'S LOT 002, BLOCK 0200

SURVEY REFERENCE
OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY PRELIMINARY REPORT NO. 0222015836-HD DATED MARCH 14, 2016

BASIS OF SURVEY
1. CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO MONUMENT MAP NOS. 4 AND 5 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
2. "MONUMENT MAP OF THE FIFTY VARA DISTRICT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO" APPROVED BY ORDINANCE NO. 1028 (NEW SERIES) DECEMBER 20, 1909 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
3. BLOCK DIAGRAM OF 50 VARA BLOCK 35 DATED APRIL 24, 1908 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

BENCHMARK
4" CUT GRANITE BASE TO BUILDING 22 FEET NORTH OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BATTERY AND WASHINGTON STREETS; ELEVATION = 5.16 FEET HISTORIC SAN FRANCISCO CITY DATUM

GENERAL NOTES
1. DETAILS NEAR PROPERTY LINES MAY NOT BE TO SCALE.
2. ALL PROPERTY LINE ANGLES ARE 90 DEGREES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
3. DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.

ZONING (PER SAN FRANCISCO PROPERTY INFORMATION MAP)
C-3-O = DOWNTOWN OFFICE DISTRICT
HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT 200-S 200 FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT.
THE MEASURED HEIGHT FROM THE TOP OF CURB AT THE MIDDLE OF THE LOT ALONG BATTERY STREET TO THE ROOF PARAPET IS 45 FEET PLUS OR MINUS.
NOTE: THE CLIENT HAS NOT PROVIDED A ZONING REPORT. THE SURVEYOR TAKES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE ABOVE ZONING INFORMATION.

PARKING NOTE
THERE ARE NO PARKING SPACES WITHIN THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

FLOOD NOTE
THE SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY AS A SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA. THERE IS NO FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE
TO MY PARTNERS, LLC AND OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY:
THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OR PLAN AND THE SURVEY ON WHICH IT IS BASED WERE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS, JOINTLY ESTABLISHED AND ADOPTED BY ALTA AND NSPS, AND INCLUDES ITEMS 2-4, 6(a), 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 8, 9, 11 (OBSERVED EVIDENCE ONLY), 13 AND 14 OF TABLE A THEREOF. THE FIELD WORK WAS COMPLETED ON MAY 26, 2016.
DATE: MAY 26, 2016

B. B. R.
BENJAMIN B. RON
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 50115

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY
OF A PORTION OF ASSESSOR'S BLOCK NO. 0206
FOR
447 PARTNERS, LLC
SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 9'	SURV. RE.
DATE: 5/26/16	DRAWN BY
SHEET: 1	CHECKED BY
DATE: 5/26/16	REV. NO.
JOB NO. S-9182	
MARTIN M. RON ASSOCIATES LAND SURVEYORS 859 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 200 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 (415) 543-8500	



SCALE:
0

447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111


SITE PLAN - EXISTING PLOT PLAN

03.08.2019

Page 2

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"

03.01.2019

447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

SITE PLAN - EXISTING



447 Battery Street

Heller Manus Architects

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Level	Use	Building GSF	Restaurant	Hotel	Residential	FAR Exclusions	FAR	Commerical/FAR Occupied	Hotel Rooms	Diagonal Dimension	Floor Heights	Cum. Heights	Tower Zone
	Mechanical Pent.	477				477	0				20.00		
18	Hotel	2,829	2,829				2,829	2,431		40.50	11.00	200.0	Upper Tower
17	Hotel	3,506		3,506			3,506	3,108	4	46.33	11.00	189.0	Upper Tower
16	Hotel	4,456		4,456			4,456	4,058	8	52.25	10.80	178.0	Upper Tower
15	Hotel	5,539		5,539			5,539	5,141	11	57.00	9.80	167.2	Upper Tower
14	Hotel	6,644		6,644			6,644	6,246	14	59.67	9.80	157.4	Lower Tower
13	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	14	59.67	9.66	147.6	Lower Tower
12	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	14	59.67	9.66	137.9	Lower Tower
11	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	14	59.67	9.66	128.3	Lower Tower
10	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	14	59.67	9.66	118.6	Lower Tower
9	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	14	59.67	9.66	109.0	Lower Tower
8	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13	59.67	9.66	99.3	Lower Tower
7	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		9.66	89.6	Base
6	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		9.66	80.0	Base
5	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		9.66	70.3	Base
4	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		9.66	60.7	Base
3	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		9.80	51.0	Base
2	Hotel	6,820		6,820			6,820	6,422	13		13.80	41.2	Base
M	Restaurant	4,091	4,091				4,091	4,509			11.40	27.4	Base
1	Lobbies/Restaurant	6,707	566	6,141		5,362	1,345	1,345			16.00	16.0	Base
B1	Conference	6,840		6,536		304	6,536	6,237			-16.00	-16.0	Basement
B2	Mechanical	6,840				6,840	0	0			-11.30	-27.3	Basement
B3	Loading / Parking	6,840				6,840	0	0			-11.30	-38.6	Basement
B4	Parking	6,840				6,840	0	0			-11.30	-49.9	Basement
TOTALS		143,449	7,486	114,662	0	19,823	116,786	110,139	198				

FAR 16.3 52.184 TDRs needed

PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	
Zone: C-3-0	Height: 200-S
UPPER TOWER:	
Maximum length:	130'
Maximum avg. diagonal:	160'
Maximum floor sf:	17,000 sf
Maximum avg. floor sf:	12,000 sf
LOWER TOWER:	
Maximum lower tower height:	3/5 (actual building height) + 10 = 130' or 160'
Maximum length:	160'
Maximum diagonal:	190'
Maximum floor sf:	20,000 sf
Maximum avg. floor sf:	17,000 sf
BASE:	
Battery Street:	76 x 1.25 = 95'
No length or diagonal dimension limitations	
SITE AREA:	7,178 sq. ft.
Occupied Area of Hotel & Restaurant	110,139 sq. ft.
OPEN SPACE:	
1:50 for Hotel & Restaurant- must be a POPOS	
Hotel and Restaurant POPOS:	2,203 sq. ft. required (within 900 feet from site) - 2,720 SF OPEN SPACE PROVIDED
LOADING: Required Spaces = 1	
PARKING:	
Total	24 Spaces 22 Stacker Spaces + 2 Accessible Spaces
Hotel & Restaurant:	7,710 sq. ft. ALLOWED > 4,690 SF PROVIDED
Car Share	Not required as we are under 25 parking spaces for the hotel and retail
BICYCLES	
Planning Code Section 155.2 requires:	
One class 1 space for every 30 hotel rooms	
One class 1 space for every 7,500 square feet of occupied floor area for eating and drinking uses.	
One class 2 spaces for every 30 Hotel rooms plus one Class 2 for every 5,000 square feet of occupied floor area of conference, meeting or function rooms, and one Class 2 for every 750 square feet of occupied floor area of eating and drinking uses.	
Therefore the Project proposes the following bike parking:	
Hotel: 198 Hotel Rooms	(7) Class 1 and (7) Class 2 Bike Parking Spaces
Retail: 7,486 SF Eating and Drinking Uses	(1) Class 1 and (10) Class 2
Conference: 6,840 SF	(2) class 2
Total:	(8) Class 1 and (19) Class 2


NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS

447 BATTERY STREET

AREA AND HEIGHT SUMMARY

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS




447 BATTERY STREET

BULK REDUCTION DIAGRAM

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET

TOWER SEPARATION DIAGRAM - N/S SECTION


03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 6

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET


TOWER SEPARATION DIAGRAM - W/E SECTION












1 WINDOW AXON


SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




04.19.2019



2 WINDOW PLAN DETAIL
3/4" = 1'-0"



3 WINDOW ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"




4 WINDOW SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

ENLARGED WINDOW DETAILS

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS



REFER TO LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR FURTHER SITE INFORMATION NOT PRESENT ON THIS PLAN (PAGE 3 OF LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS)

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PROVIDED: 2,720 SF

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

SITE PLAN - VICINITY

04.19.2019

Page 13



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS

(E) 2 FLOOR BUILDING

440
MERCHANT ST.

(E) 3 FLOOR BUILDING

424
MERCHANT ST.

(E) 7 FLOOR BUILDING
423 WASHINGTON ST.

NOTE: ALL LANDSCAPING, STREET TREES, SITE FURNISHINGS, AND SPECIAL PAVING SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH GUIDELINES IN THE SF BETTER STREETS PLAN

TOTAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PROVIDED: SEE VICINITY SITE PLAN

NOTE: REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR SITE ALL SITE INFORMATION NOT SHOWN, INCLUDING MATERIALS, LIGHTING, TREE PLACEMENT, ETCETERA.


10'x25'
TRUCK
LOADING SPACE -
12' MIN. CLEAR ABOVE



PROPOSED PASSENGER LOADING, 'WHITE ZONE', 3 PASSENGER SPACES, 1 COMMERCIAL LOADING SPACE

BATTERY STREET

- DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL STREET
- VISION ZERO CORRIDOR
- BIKE ROUTE
- 76'-0" R.O.W.




BIKE PARKING (12) CLASS 2

ALL STREET TREES TO BE MIN. 25' FROM INTERSECTION

ALL STREET TREES TO BE MIN. 5' FROM WATER MAINS, LATERALS, AND FACILITIES. REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFO

TRANSFORMER VAULT BELOW
ACCESS LIFTOUT
STREET LIGHTING

BIKE PARKING (7) CLASS 2



MERCHANT ST.
(ALLEY)

LOADING ENTRY



SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET


SITE PLAN - PROPOSED

06.05.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



STRUCTURAL WALL,
FULL HT OF BLDG

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



03.01.2019

447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

BASEMENT LEVEL 04 FLOOR PLAN


Page 15

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

BASEMENT LVL 03 PLAN - LOADING LEVEL

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 16

HELLER MANUS
ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

BASEMENT LVL 02 PLAN -MECHANICAL LEVEL

08.26.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

HELLER MANUS
ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

BASEMENT LVL 01 PLAN - CONFERENCE LEVEL

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 18

HELLER MANUS
ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



NOTE: REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR SITE ALL SITE INFORMATION NOT SHOWN, INCLUDING MATERIALS, LIGHTING, TREE PLACEMENT, ETCETERA.

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET

1ST LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

06.05.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 19

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET


MEZZANINE FLOOR PLAN

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 20

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

HOTEL PLAN LEVEL 02

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 21

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS

ROOM COUNT: (KEEPING HISTORIC BLDG OPTION)

LEVEL	# ROOMS	# SUITES	# TOTAL KEYS
3-4	11	2	26
2, + 5-8	11	2	65
9-13	12	2	70
14	13	1	14
15	9	2	11
16	6	2	8
17	2	2	4
18	RESTAURANT + BAR		
TOTAL =			198 KEYS



EXISTING BUILDING BELOW



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

TYPICAL HOTEL PLAN - LEVELS 3-4

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 22



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

HOTEL PLANS LEVEL'S 5-8

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 23

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

HOTEL PLANS LEVELS 9-13

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 24

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

14TH FLOOR PLAN - SETBACK LVL 1

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 25

HELLER MANUS
ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

15TH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN - SETBACK LVL 2

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 26

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

16TH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN - SETBACK LVL 3

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 27

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET

17TH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN - SETBACK LVL 4

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111


Page 28

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**



NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

18TH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN - BAR / LOUNGE LEVEL

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 29

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

ROOF PLAN

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 30

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

1 2 3 4 5

MECH PENT ROOF
220' - 0"

GLAZING AT ROOF SCREEN IS TO BE LESS THAN 24 SQ. FT. IN SIZE AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A BIRD HAZARD

MECH PENTHOUSE LEVEL
200' - 0"

LEVEL 18 - S5
189' - 0"

LEVEL 17 - S4
178' - 0"

LEVEL 16 - S3
167' - 2"

LEVEL 15 - S2
157' - 4"

LEVEL 14 - S1
147' - 6"

LEVEL 13
137' - 10"

LEVEL 12
128' - 2"

LEVEL 11
118' - 6"

LEVEL 10
108' - 10"

LEVEL 9
99' - 2"

LEVEL 8
89' - 6"

LEVEL 7
79' - 10"

LEVEL 6
70' - 2"

LEVEL 5
60' - 6"

LEVEL 4
50' - 10"

LEVEL 3
41' - 0"


LEVEL 2
27' - 4"

MEZZANINE
16' - 0"

LEVEL 1
0' - 0"

CURTAIN WALL

STONE PANEL



LOADING

RES.

RESTAURANT

MERCHANT STREET

447 BATTERY STREET

SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE 1/16" = 1'-0"

02.27.2020

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS HM

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS

D C B A

MECH PENT ROOF
220' - 0"

METAL MECHANICAL
SCREEN, 50% OPEN

GLASS RAIL SEGMENTS
ARE LESS THAN 24 SQ.
FT. IN SIZE AND DO NOT
CONSTITUTE A BIRD
HAZARD

HOUSE LEVEL
200' - 0"

LEVEL 18 - S5
189' - 0"

LEVEL 17 - S4
178' - 0"

LEVEL 16 - S3
167' - 2"

LEVEL 15 - S2
157' - 4"

LEVEL 14 - S1
147' - 6"

LEVEL 13
137' - 10"

LEVEL 12
128' - 2"

LEVEL 11
118' - 6"

LEVEL 10
108' - 10"

LEVEL 9
99' - 2"

LEVEL 8
89' - 6"

LEVEL 7
79' - 10"

LEVEL 6
70' - 2"

LEVEL 5
60' - 6"

LEVEL 4
50' - 10"

LEVEL 3
41' - 0"

LEVEL 2
27' - 4"

MEZZANINE
16' - 0"


LEVEL 1
0' - 0"

STONE
PANELS

CURTAIN
WALL

GLASS
AND MTL
MULLIONS

EXISTING
BUILDING



BATTERY STREET

447 BATTERY STREET

EAST ELEVATION

SCALE 1/16" = 1'-0"

02.27.2020

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

SOUTH ELEVATION AT BASE - ENLARGED

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 33

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



03.01.2019

447 BATTERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111


EAST ELEVATION AT BASE - ENLARGED

Page 34

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

SECTION @ BASE LOOKING NORTH

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 35

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET


N/S SECTION THROUGH LOBBY - LOOKING WEST

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 36

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS
© 2018 HELLER MANUS



REFER TO MERCHANT ST. SECTIONS AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR MERCHANT ST. IMPROVEMENTS

HOTEL LEVEL

RESTAURANT BEYOND

HOTEL LOBBY + RESTAURANT

DOUBLE HEIGHT OPEN SPACE ALONG FRONTAGE

STREET IMPROVEMENTS

RESTAURANT ENTRY

LIFT OUT

19' - 10"

12' - 2"

12' - 6"

TRANSFORMER ACCESS AREA

TRANSFORMER ROOM

AMENITY SPACE

447 BATTERY STREET

ACCESS LADDER W/ MANHOLE IN SIDEWALK ABOVE

TRANSFORMER

PROPERTY LINE

MERCHANT ST.

425 BATTERY STREET

LEVEL 2
27' - 4"

MEZZANINE
16' - 0"

LEVEL 1
0' - 0"

LEVEL B1
-16' - 0"

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

ENLARGED SECTION @ MERCHANT STREET w/ TRANSFORMER

03.01.2019


SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 37

HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"



447 BATTERY STREET

ENLARGED SEC @ MERCHANT STREET W/O TRANSFORMER


03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 38

NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE USED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF HELLER MANUS

© 2018 HELLER MANUS



SCALE 1" = 20'-0"

447 BATTERY STREET

SECTION FACING NORTH

03.01.2019

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

Page 39


HELLER MANUS ARCHITECTS **HM**




Exhibit B



MFLA





Pedestrian-Only Zone

ADA-compliant unit pavers at pedestrian path



Feature Strip

Designated zone for furniture, public art, tree planting, drainage, fire station loading etc.




Shared Zone

Vehicular-rated paving with chevron pattern design enhances visual interest on Merchant Street towards Transamerica Pyramid



Tactile Strip

Provides **70% visual contrast** to adjacent paving between pedestrian-only and shared zone



PEDESTRIAN-ONLY
SMOOTH PAVING

FEATURE STRIP
CONTRASTING PAVING

SHARED ZONE
VEHICULAR-RATED PAVING

PEDESTRIAN-ONLY
SMOOTH PAVING

LIGHT BOLLARD


TACTILE STRIP

FEATURE BENCH

MOVEABLE FURNITURE

P.4 MERCHANT ST SECTION





0' | 1' | 2' | 4' | 8'
 SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"




Exhibit C

447 BATTERY STREET, SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION (HRE), PART I [16074]

PREPARED FOR:
447 PARTNERS LLC



PAGE & TURNBULL

imagining change in historic environments through design, research, and technology

OCTOBER 6, 2017


REVISED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODOLOGY	1
II. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS	2
NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES	2
CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES	2
CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE (CHRIS)	2
JUNIOR LEAGUE OF SAN FRANCISCO ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY, 1968 (HERE TODAY).....	3
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY SURVEY, 1976.....	3
SAN FRANCISCO ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE SURVEYS, 1977-78	3
UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDING SURVEY (UMB), 1990	4
SAN FRANCISCO PROPERTY INFORMATION MAP	4
III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION	5
DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO – SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.....	5
SITE CONTEXT	5
EXTERIOR OF 447 BATTERY STREET	6
IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT	10
EARLY SAN FRANCISCO HISTORY	10
GROWTH OF DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO	10
SAN FRANCISCO COFFEE INDUSTRY.....	17
SAN FRANCISCO TEA INDUSTRY	19
INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL BUILDING TYPOLOGY IN SAN FRANCISCO	20
V. PROJECT SITE HISTORY	27
CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY	31
OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS	35
VI. EVALUATION.....	40
NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES	40
INTEGRITY	42
HISTORIC DISTRICT ANALYSIS.....	44
VII. CONCLUSION	58
VIII. REFERENCES CITED.....	59
PUBLISHED WORKS	59
NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS	60
INTERNET SOURCES.....	60
IX. APPENDIX	62

I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) Part 1 has been prepared for Rob Canepa at 447 Partners LLC to inform the proposed demolition of the subject property and development of a 19-story hotel at 447 Battery Street (APN 0206/002) in San Francisco's Financial District. The subject property is located on the west side of Battery Street across from One Maritime Plaza, between Washington Street on the north and Merchant Street alleyway on the south (**Figure 1**). Originally constructed by an unknown architect in 1907, following the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire, the city water department's listing for 431-447 Battery Street has record of its tap hook-up in 1865, signed by J.B. Stewart.¹ The building was originally occupied by a small Bay Area coffee and tea wholesale supplier and roastery from 1907 through 1966; the company changed its name from Thierbach & Co. to the Jones-Thierbach Co. in 1912 and continued to operate as such until its closing in 1966.² After this company vacated, the property was converted to an office building in 1967 and occupied by a variety of tenants and retailers from 1968 until the present. Evaluated in previous surveys and rated as a Category 'A' resource (historic resource present) for the San Francisco Planning Department, a preponderance of new evidence regarding past alterations to the exterior façade of 447 Battery Street has led to a different conclusion regarding significance under the National Register of Historical Places and California Register of Historical Resources criteria.



**Figure 1. Parcel map of 447 Battery Street (outlined in red). Edited by Page & Turnbull, July 2016.
Source: San Francisco Planning, Assessor's block map (last revision 1995).**

METHODOLOGY

This Historic Resource Evaluation provides a summary of previous historical surveys and ratings, site description, historic context statement, and an evaluation of the property's individual eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research collected by previous historic evaluation reports and surveys, as well as various local repositories, including the San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Assessor's Office, San Francisco Public Library and History Room/Photo Desk, Online Archive of California, and various other online sources. A number of historical materials such as maps, newspaper articles, and photographs were provided by ESA, who conducted historic research and prepared preliminary reports in 2015. Page & Turnbull conducted a site visit in July 2016 to review the existing conditions of the property and formulate the descriptions and assessments included in this report.

¹ Junior League Property Records. Recorded by Mary Franck. SFPL History Room, pg. 2, March 1968.

² San Francisco city directories.

II. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state, and local historical ratings currently assigned to the building at the 447 Battery Street. The property has been evaluated in six listings and surveys, including the California Historical Resource Status Code Information (CHRIS), the Junior League of San Francisco Architectural Survey (1968), Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey (1976), San Francisco Architectural Heritage Survey, (1977-78), the Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey (1990), and the San Francisco Planning Department's Parcel Information Map.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation's most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

The property at 447 Battery Street has been rated "3S" as appearing eligible for the National Register as an individual property through a survey evaluation. It is not currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places individually or as part of a registered historic district.³

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

The property at 447 Battery Street has not been evaluated under the California Register criteria and is therefore not currently listed in the California Register of Historical Resources individually or as part of a registered historic district.

CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE (CHRIS)

Properties listed by, or under review by, the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) between "1" and "7" to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register or NR) or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register or CR). Properties with a Status Code of "1" or "2" are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of "3" or "4" appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally do not require additional research or evaluation to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of "5" have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of "6" are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of "7" means that the resource either has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

The property at 447 Battery Street has not been assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRIS) in the database.

³ Office of Historic Preservation, 2012.

JUNIOR LEAGUE OF SAN FRANCISCO ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY, 1968 (HERE TODAY)

The Junior League of San Francisco, a volunteer women's organization, conducted one of San Francisco's first architectural surveys during the mid to late 1960s, known as *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. The survey was published in a book of the same title in 1968. Although the survey did not assign specific ratings to buildings, it generally described building conditions and historic significance, based on what the authors believed from visual observation and minimal historical research. The findings of this survey were adopted by the Board of Supervisors in the San Francisco on May 11, 1970 (Resolution No. 268-70).

The property at 447 Battery Street was evaluated in the survey. The documentation stated that the exterior façades of the building were "sandblasted." The small photograph attached to the report shows the brick façades generally as they appear today. The report also notes that there was a "moderate amount of exterior desecration of the original design" and that the building was "recently modernized, keeping only its style – but plate glass windows on front."⁴ (**Appendix**).

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY SURVEY, 1976

In 1976, the Department of City Planning in San Francisco embarked on a "reconnaissance" or "windshield" survey to evaluate City and County buildings and identify which were thought to be the top 10% of historically and architecturally significant resources. Approximately 10,000 buildings and structures were evaluated and ranked on a scale of -2 (detrimental to urban fabric) to +5 (extremely significant), along with summary ratings of 0 to 5 that were assigned overall. Those buildings that were graded 3 or higher in this survey were thought to represent the top 2% of San Francisco's built environment in terms of architectural significance. Ratings of 0-1 were used to indicate a building's contextual importance, such as to a neighborhood, adjacent building, or historic district.

The property at 447 Battery Street has a Department of City Planning's Architectural Quality Survey rating of '1,' indicating that it contains a degree of contextual importance (**Appendix**).

SAN FRANCISCO ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE SURVEYS, 1977-78

San Francisco Architectural Heritage is the oldest not-for-profit organization with the intention to increase awareness about the city's architectural heritage in the city and advocate for continued preservation of its unique architecturally historical resources. The city commissioned the organization to conduct surveys of several districts, including the Downtown District. This survey was completed in 1977-78 by Michael Corbett and published in 1979 in *Splendid Survivors*. This survey was one of the earliest and most influential, contributing significantly to the formation of San Francisco's Downtown Plan. The survey's methodology was more thorough than past surveys of the district, including both intensive fieldwork and in-depth archival research. A group of impartial, outside reviewers analyzed the survey forms and findings, and assigned ratings to each pre-1945 property under the following criteria: 'A' (highest importance), 'B' (major importance), 'C' (Contextual Importance), and 'D' (minor or no importance).

The property at 447 Battery Street has a San Francisco Architectural Heritage rating of 'B' (major importance). The publication *Splendid Survivors* includes this historical information about the building:

⁴ Junior League Property Records. Recorded by Mary Franck. San Francisco Public Library History Room. Pg. 1, March, 1968.

Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co., 1907, architect unknown

A handsome post-fire brick warehouse building indistinguishable from much earlier buildings of the same type. Originally the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co. and recently refurbished as office space. In composition, a two-part small commercial block with a strictly structural expression. A cornice has evidently been removed, and the walls may have been stuccoed originally (Corbett, 1978).

UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDING SURVEY (UMB), 1990

The Unreinforced Masonry Building (UMB) Survey and accompanying Context Statement was undertaken by the San Francisco Planning Department (1990) in response to the destruction following the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. The goal of the survey was to record the existence of all unreinforced masonry buildings that are considered historical resources, and therefore should be eligible for seismic retrofit work. This survey categorized buildings by type A (small area) through O (assembly), and designated ratings of 1 (landmark) to 16 (not rated).⁵

The UMB Survey evaluated the 447 Battery Street property and determined it to be a Prototype G (2- and 3-story, small area, office and commercial building) with a rating of '9', which indicated that it had been listed in the DCP 1976 Survey.

SAN FRANCISCO PROPERTY INFORMATION MAP

The San Francisco Property Information Map, maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department, catalogues a variety of current and historical information about every property in San Francisco. The Preservation tab of this online directory indicates that the 447 Battery Street property has been identified as a Category 'A' resource (historic resource present), which was determined as a result of its age (1907), as well as from the survey evaluations described above. The map indicates that the property is not located in an Article 10 designated historic district or landmark. In San Francisco Municipal Code's Article 11, the property was assigned a Category V "Unrated building" designation.⁶

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Historic Preservation Commission, *San Francisco Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey and Historic Context*, 1990.

⁶ San Francisco Planning Dept. Property Information Map. 447 Battery Street Historic Resource Status. October 6, 2017

III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO – SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

The subject property is located in San Francisco’s downtown Financial District on the west side of Battery Street between Washington Street on the north and Merchant Street alleyway on the south. This downtown area north of Market Street consists primarily of multi-story commercial buildings, hotels, restaurants, and city government buildings (**Figure 2**). Directly east of the subject property across Battery Street are the large multi-use commercial complexes known as One Maritime Plaza, constructed in 1967, and the Embarcadero Center, of which construction began in 1971. The historic U.S. Customs and Border Protection building, constructed in 1900, is located across Washington Street to the north of the property. The subject block, like others in the area, is fully developed with commercial and mixed-use buildings, most with zero lot-lines.

Across Clay Street to the south is 425 Battery Street (street level retail and hotel at the upper stories), which was constructed to resemble its current form in the early 2000s, based on historic aerial photographs. The north-adjacent commercial building, 423 Washington Street, was constructed in 1983. The two west-adjacent buildings, 425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street, were both constructed the same year as the subject property, in 1907, during the city’s post-fire reconstruction period. The blocks in this area also feature mid-block service alleys, such as Merchant Street, paralleling the east-west streets (**Figure 3**). Street trees line Battery Street on the east side, and the area has wide sidewalks. Several buildings feature awnings that extend over the sidewalk.



Figure 2. Adjacent office building to north and Customs building, view looking northwest. (Page & Turnbull, May 2016.)



Figure 3. Merchant Street alleyway, view looking west. (Page & Turnbull, May 2016.)

SITE CONTEXT

The subject property contains a three-story brick and timber commercial building with a rectangular plan and a flat roof. It is located on a 7,180 square-foot lot at the southeast corner of Battery and Merchant streets (**Figure 4**). Constructed in 1907, the building replaced a storage warehouse that burned down in the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. Though it is not particularly representative of a specific architectural style, 447 Battery features vernacular design elements of a typical industrial/commercial-style building of the period, including its two-part vertically-oriented façade and repetitive fenestration pattern. The building contains ground level retail (furniture store) with primary access off Battery Street, a bar called the Hidden Vine on ground level in the rear, as well as office space on the upper levels (access from Battery Street). The following section provides a brief architectural description of the exterior façades of the property at 447 Battery Street, which were

surveyed during a site visit on July 22, 2016. Exterior conditions of the property were confirmed to remain unchanged since this visit and photographs provided below were taken, unless otherwise noted. Visible alterations to the property are also discussed. A brief description of the visible interior from the sidewalk was included from the most recent site visit and the previous evaluation by ESA.




Figure 4. 447 Battery Street is shown shaded in red.
Source: Bing Maps, 2016; edited by Page & Turnbull.

EXTERIOR OF 447 BATTERY STREET

Primary (east) Façade

The primary, Battery Street-fronting façade features a symmetrical composition consisting of three openings at the ground level and seven, evenly spaced windows on each of the upper levels (**Figures 5 & 6**). From left to right, the ground level contains a recessed, anodized black aluminum framed storefront with full-height windows flanking a fully glazed double door, followed by a storefront opening containing three full-height windows set on a brick base (**Figure 7**). The rightmost storefront, recessed about six feet from the wall plane, contains the main entrance to the second and third level offices. It features full-height sidelites flanking a fully glazed double door, similar to the other storefronts. Both of the entry storefronts are paved with square stone tiles. All three openings feature contemporary, vertical cloth awnings supported by a metal frame, and the rightmost awning projects out over the sidewalk a few feet (**Figure 8**). The storefront windows on the street level feature square lintels, while the upper level windows feature arched brick lintels and slightly projecting brick sills. The upper level windows consist of fixed and casement steel sashes, each consisting of three lites (single horizontal lite above two vertical lites). A stepped, triple-course of brick, a remnant of the original cornice, runs the length of the façade beneath the parapet, where deteriorated brick, steel rods, and concrete patching are now visible (**Figures 9 & 10**). The cornice corbeling is still discernible on both façades, but sections of the brick were heavily damaged when the stucco cladding was removed.



Figure 5. 447 Battery Street primary (east) façade,
View from Battery Street looking northwest.



Figure 6. 447 Battery Street primary (east) façade,
View from Battery Street looking west.



Figure 7. 447 Battery Street retail storefronts (south side),
View from sidewalk looking southwest.



Figure 8. 447 Battery Street office storefront (north side),
view from sidewalk looking southwest.



Figure 9. 447 Battery Street, primary façade upper level windows.



Figure 10. Close-up of brick and grout variation.



Figure 11. 447 Battery Street primary façade, close-up of street level brick variation and patching.




Figure 12. 447 Battery Street, corner of primary façade and north façade which abuts the adjacent building. Patched concrete and former painted sign visible.

Side/Rear (south) Façade

The south façade continues the same rhythm of evenly spaced windows from the primary façade. However, the ground level here also contains windows with arched lintels. They are partial height and feature fixed, tri-lite windows similar to those of the primary façade (single horizontal lite above two vertical lites). The upper level windows each consist of steel-sash casement windows (12-lites) below fixed steel sash windows (9-lites) (**Figures 13 & 14**). The triple-course brick belt line and parapet also continue around from the primary façade. Here as well, steel anchor bolts are visible at the cornice level, but they do not follow a straight line across on the Merchant Street side, and instead descend gradually to the level of the belt line on the west end of the façade. The western side of the façade at ground level features one brick infilled door and one more recently widened doorway (**Figures 16 & 17**). This widened entry contains a recessed contemporary fully glazed, wood frame door with transom and a right sidelite. On the far left, another opening appears to have been cut in the brick wall and contains a steel door. Overall, the brick cladding on this façade, even more than the Battery Street side, is mismatched and appears to be in varying states of deterioration (**Figures 11-16**). The grouting was reapplied on the east side of the Merchant Street façade but discontinued after the first line of windows.

The exterior north and west façades of 447 Battery Street are not visible since they abut the adjacent buildings and are therefore not described in this report.



Figure 13. Rear/side (south) façade, View from Merchant Street looking northeast.




Figure 14. Rear/side (south) façade, View of upper level windows on the west side.



Figure 15. 447 Battery Street, close-up of brick belt line and steel-sash windows.



Figure 16. Close-up view of filled-in brick doorway.



Figure 17. Rear/side (south) façade,
View of doorways on west side.



Figure 18. Rear/side (south) façade widened doorway.

INTERIOR OF 447 BATTERY STREET

Though there are no publicly-accessible areas of the building interior, the following is a brief description of that which was visible during the site visit or described by the owner. The interior of the upper-level offices consist of exposed brick walls and internal wood columns. They feature drop acoustic ceilings with contemporary light fixtures and flooring in a primarily open floor plan layout. The elevator entry lobby, visible from the Battery Street sidewalk, is a contemporary remodel containing drywall and acoustic ceilings (**Figure 8**).

IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

EARLY SAN FRANCISCO HISTORY

European settlement of what is now San Francisco occurred in 1776, with the simultaneous establishment of the Presidio of San Francisco by representatives of the Spanish Viceroy and the founding of Mission San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores) by Franciscan missionaries. The Spanish colonial era lasted until 1821, after Mexico earned its independence from Spain, taking with it the former Spanish colony of Alta California. During the Mexican period, the region's economy was based primarily on cattle ranching, and a small trading village known as Yerba Buena grew up around a plaza (today known as Portsmouth Square) located above Yerba Buena cove in San Francisco Bay. The cove was a small inlet that extended from Clarks Point on the north to Rincon Hill on the south. In 1839, a few streets were laid out around the plaza and cove, and the settlement began to gradually expand up the slopes of current Nob Hill.

During the Mexican-American War in 1846, the village of Yerba Buena was occupied by U.S. military forces and was renamed San Francisco the following year. Around the same time, a surveyor named Jasper O'Farrell extended the original street grid, while also laying out Market Street from what is now the Ferry Building to Twin Peaks. Blocks north of this line were laid out in small 50-*vara* square blocks, whereas blocks south of Market were laid out in larger 100-*vara* blocks.⁷

The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in 1848 brought explosive growth to San Francisco, with thousands of would-be gold-seekers making their way to the isolated outpost on the edge of the North American continent. Between 1846 and 1852, the population of San Francisco mushroomed from less than one thousand people to almost 35,000. The lack of level land for development around Portsmouth Square soon pushed development south to Market Street, eastward onto filled tidal lands, and westward toward Nob Hill. At this time, most buildings in San Francisco were concentrated downtown near Market Street and the Bay, and the outlying portions of the peninsula remained unsettled throughout much of the late nineteenth century.

Initially San Francisco's central business district pushed north from Portsmouth Square to Jackson Square, but within a few years this trend reversed as commercial development spread southward toward Market Street, along Montgomery, Kearny and Sansome Streets. By the late 1850s, the intersection of Montgomery, Post, and Market Streets had become one of the most important intersections in the city. With the decline of gold production in 1855, San Francisco's economy diversified to include agriculture, manufacturing, shipping, construction, and banking.⁸ Prospering from these industries, a new elite class of merchants, bankers, and industrialists arose to shape the development of the city as the foremost financial, industrial, and shipping center of the West.

GROWTH OF DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO

By the early 1900s, San Francisco was the fourth largest city in the United States, with a number of skyscrapers that rivaled those in New York and Chicago, per capita.⁹ The downtown business district had continued its shift south and southwest of Portsmouth Square; the Financial District was concentrated around Montgomery and California streets, with the shopping district on Grant Avenue and produce market district along the Embarcadero south of Market.

⁷ *Vara* is derived from an antiquated Spanish unit of measurement.

⁸ Rand Richards, *Historic San Francisco. A Concise History and Guide* (San Francisco: Heritage House Publishers, 2001), 77.

⁹ Charles Hall Page, *Splendid Survivors*, 23-30.

The 1906 earthquake and subsequent fires interrupted a downtown building boom and devastated the entire city. Within hours of the initial shock, eleven fires sparked by broken gas mains swept first through the South of Market district, and later through the downtown Financial and produce market districts, consuming nearly everything the earthquake had spared (**Figures 19 & 20**). The fires raged for three days, and after the catastrophe, most of downtown San Francisco lay in ruins. Only a few buildings survived mostly intact, including the Old Mint, the U.S. Post Office, the upper floors of the Kohl Building, the U.S. Customs House (on the block north-adjacent of the subject property), as well as a portion of nearby Jackson Square. In addition, although their interiors burned, the shells of a small number of office buildings in the Financial District survived as well, including the Call Building, the Folgers Building, the Mills Building, the Aronson Building, and the Mutual Savings Bank Building.¹⁰



Figure 19. Battery Street, looking north from California Street, 1906. San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.



Figure 20. Northeast corner of Battery and Clay; former eight-story building at 447 Battery Street in background, left of center, 1906. San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.

Following the disaster, San Francisco's produce market and Financial District faced the need for rapid reconstruction. Hefty insurance settlements, combined with an influx of Eastern capital and architects, made the post-1906 era the most important period of construction in downtown San Francisco until the 1960s. Certain areas of the city were rebuilt more rapidly than others, including the expanded produce market district, the Italian quarter of North Beach, the fire's western boundary at Van Ness Avenue, the working waterfront along the Embarcadero, and the Financial District, which was substantially rebuilt by 1909. Many of the new buildings closer to Market Street were high-rises: large, steel-frame, masonry office buildings over ten stories in height, while new buildings closer to the produce market district were three- to four-story, brick masonry buildings, such as the subject property and two extant west-adjacent commercial buildings, all constructed in the year following the earthquake.¹¹ During the recovery period, San Francisco's shopping district developed around Union Square, while manufacturing and warehouses concentrated south of Market Street. Many businesses moved to East Bay cities or west to the Fillmore District. The business district had continued its shift south and southwest of Portsmouth Square; the financial district was concentrated around Montgomery and California streets, and the produce market district around Jackson Square (with its western boundary at Battery Street).

¹⁰ Jackson Square Historic Context, Page & Turnbull Historic Context, last revised 2016.

¹¹ "1906 Fire and Aftermath, Historical Essay." Accessed at Foundsf.org

By 1915, the rebuilt downtown covered fifty percent more area than it had before the fire, concentrated in enclaves of commercial office buildings on New Montgomery Street in SOMA and further north on Montgomery Street around California Street. The majority of new downtown buildings broke with their predecessors' Victorian-era styles in favor of the Beaux-Arts style espoused by the City Beautiful movement, of which the subject property was a modest example.¹² In 1915, the Panama Pacific International Exposition took place, celebrating the opening of the Panama Canal. The completion of the Canal was significant for San Francisco both in that it created a much shorter water route to the city from the East Coast, rather than sailing around the southern tip of South America, and that it gave the city an opportunity to showcase its recovery from the disaster nine years prior and its emerging successful industries, earning San Francisco the moniker of "The City That Knows How."¹³ For example, the subject property housed a successful coffee and tea roastery and wholesale supply company, known as the Jones-Thierbach Company, at the time of the 1915 Exposition, which was invited to showcase at the "Palace of Food Products" (**Figure 21**). Further information about the company's history is provided in the following section. City-wide preparations for the Exposition included considerable upgrades in city transit, and architects raced to complete iconic additions to the downtown skyline. Over 18 million visitors came over the course of ten months to see the 630-acre wonderland, which was located in today's Marina District.¹⁴



Figure 21. Jones-Thierbach Exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition (1915),
Source: San Francisco Public Library.

Dense downtown development continued into the early 1930s with the construction of new office blocks and large office towers. By the time the Depression halted construction in 1931, downtown San Francisco had extended from the Embarcadero to west of Union Square. In the immediate post-World War II period, construction in downtown San Francisco did not pick up dramatically; nevertheless, those buildings that did rise in the downtown landscape at this time began to show the influence of modernism, particularly the Interinternational Style. By the late 1950s, new construction clearly signalled a shift towards modern architectural styles and urban planning principles, with several office towers introduced to the city's downtown that deviated from established development patterns. The John Hancock Building (255 California Street), Bethlehem Steel Building (100 California Street), and the Crown Zellerbach Building (1 Bush Street) were high-profile examples of

¹² Charles Hall Page, *Splendid Survivors*, 32-33.

¹³ "PPIE: The City That Knows How." Accessed <https://sfpl.org/?pg=2000141201> July 12, 2017.

¹⁴ Ibid.

radically simplified designs that were largely new to the commercial core. As described in *Splendid Survivors*:

[F]or the first time in San Francisco's history, new buildings were not built to lot lines, and the traditional street walls created by buildings built shoulder-to-shoulder over the previous 50-odd years were lost. While previous post-war buildings had been just as Modern, these were the first to abandon the lot lines and follow the newly stylish, anti-urban image of the tower-in-the-park which had been put forth by Le Corbusier in the 1920s and first executed in New York only in 1958 with Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson's Seagram Building.¹⁵

These early International Style office towers were harbingers of a downtown building boom that took place between 1963 and 1973, during which time a series of new skyscrapers successively assumed the title of the city's tallest building: the Bank of America Center (1969), the Hartford Building at 650 California (1965), 44 Montgomery Street (1967), One Maritime Plaza (1968) directly east across Battery Street, and finally the Transamerica Pyramid (1972), just one block to the west of the subject property. The corner buildings on the subject block, including 423 Washington Street and 530 Sansome Street, in addition to the south-adjacent building at 425 Battery Street across Merchant Street, were all built in the 1980s through early 2000s. The substantial redevelopment of the subject block and adjacent blocks created a detached cluster of post-earthquake reconstruction buildings that are visually and physically separated from similar-era and style buildings further north on Battery Street and to the southeast on Front Street. These isolated buildings include the subject property at 447 Battery Street, west-adjacent 425 Washington Street and 339-445 Washington Street, as well as the south-adjacent block's two-story 432 Clay Street, constructed in 1912. By the 1980s, the immense scale and thoroughly modern architectural styles of the new high-rise buildings heralded the ascendancy of San Francisco's financial sector in the place of its traditional industry- and maritime-based economy.

Produce Market District

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the rising towers in San Francisco's business core stood in stark contrast to the city's sprawling wholesale produce market that was located immediately to the northeast, alongside the Embarcadero and the city's active waterfront piers. The market district had its roots in the Italian-American communities that settled in this part of San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century. Many Italian immigrants worked the farms that surrounded the city, and they brought wagons loaded with their produce to Sansome Street between Washington and Clay streets to sell to grocers and hotel owners, among others (one block to the immediate west of the subject block). In 1874, the San Francisco and San Mateo Ranchers' Association (a Genoese organization) constructed the Colombo Market, which supplanted the earlier open-air marketplace. This enclosed market contained over 70 stalls and filled an entire city block between Front and Davis north of Jackson Street. Independent sellers rented the stalls and hawked their produce to consumers. Within the course of the following decades, the Colombo Market became one of the city's commercial landmarks.¹⁶

The district's immediate access to the waterfront supported many additional one and two-story brick masonry market buildings and storage warehouses, which received perishable goods directly from ships that docked at the piers. When rebuilt after the 1906 earthquake, the produce district (also known as the commission district, for the organization that oversaw the market activities and

¹⁵ Charles Hall Page, *Splendid Survivors*, 43.

¹⁶ Gary Kamiya, "Odd Arch is Last Remnant of Bustling Produce Market Built in 1874," *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 27, 2015, accessed November 17, 2015, <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Odd-arch-is-last-remnant-of-bustling-produce-6106142.php>.

certified merchants) retained its earlier function.¹⁷ Moreover, it extended its boundaries, expanding from the waterfront to fill the area between the Embarcadero on the east, Jackson Street on the north, Clay Street on the south, and Battery Street on the west. Its many one- to three-story brick buildings, including the subject property, contained open stalls and awning-covered storefronts at street level (**Figure 22**).¹⁸ Originally part of the Barbary Coast, the neighborhood was known to contain bustling markets during the early part of the day and a mix of bars, dance halls, prostitution houses, and crime at night, until the neighborhood was substantially rebuilt and cleaned up in 1911.¹⁹ The subject building was constructed originally in 1907 as a warehouse, coffee roastery, and wholesale supply company on the western border of the produce district. The company expanded and assumed its long-term name of the 'Jones-Thierbach Co.' in 1912, around the time of the neighborhood's revitalization.



Figure 22. Subject property with stalls and awning at street level (TEAS on south façade).
September 1918. San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk, DPW # 5606.

During the 1910s through 1940s, the district's daily schedule and bustling character were described in the following manner:

A district of narrow streets lined with roofed sidewalks and low brick buildings, it is the receiving depot for the fresh produce that finds its way into the kitchens, restaurants, and hotels of the city. Long before daybreak—in the summer, as early as one o'clock—trucks large and small begin to arrive from the country with fruits and vegetables (**Figure 23**). From poultry houses come the crowing and cackling of fowls aroused by the lights and commotion. The clatter of hand-trucking and a babel of dialects arise. About six o'clock the light delivery trucks of local markets begin to arrive. By this time a pedestrian can barely squeeze past the crates, hampers, boxes, and bags along the sidewalks. The stacks of produce dwindle so rapidly that by nine o'clock the busiest part of the district's day is over. [...] By afternoon this district is almost deserted.²⁰

¹⁷ "Produce Market." http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Produce_Market Accessed July 12, 2017.

¹⁸ Michael R. Corbett, *Port City: The History and Transformation of the Port of San Francisco, 1848-2010* (San Francisco: San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 2011), 196.

¹⁹ "Thieves' Highway – Produce Market." Citysleuth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010, Accessed July 12, 2017.

²⁰ Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, *San Francisco in the 1930s: The WPA Guide to the City by the Bay* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 262.



Figure 23. Typical view of streets and market buildings within the produce district, 1945.
Source: San Francisco Public Library Historical Photograph Collection, AAC-0526

Although the produce market district was economically active well into the twentieth century, many policy makers viewed the entire area as a longtime chaotic urban nuisance: cramped, unsanitary, crime-ridden, and full of unpleasant smells. Given this perspective, the market simply did not live up to the economic potential of its central location. The district's negative reputation was not helped by its proximity to manufacturing and distribution areas near the port, along with a large population of transient longshoremen and other laborers who sought lodging throughout the area. By the 1940s, the area was beginning to show signs of decay, especially as many wholesalers moved to less expensive areas south and east of the city. The Jones-Thierbach Co. was one of a few food product wholesale suppliers to remain in the district until the mid-1960s. Also during the late 1940s, the industrial waterfront began to experience a reduction of shipping, which also moved elsewhere in the Bay where storage space and land was cheaper. Though still dense and active in the mid-1950s, areas of the old produce market district appeared congested and blighted and became the focal point for urban redevelopment and Financial District expansion. The mayor and other municipal officials began to actively discuss how—and to where—the district could be moved in order to allow the Financial District to further expand its boundaries.²¹ By 1963, the market was moved to Islais Creek to make way for the expansive Golden Gateway Redevelopment project, which modernized and transformed the whole neighborhood into an extension of the city's Financial District.²²

Postwar Urban Renewal and The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

During the post-World War II era in the United States, governmental urban development policies brought about a series of sweeping changes in cities throughout the country. As suburbanization accelerated in American metropolitan areas in the years after World War II, urban cores drastically diminished in importance as commercial, residential, and business centers. Crowded and unsanitary housing conditions of central neighborhoods in most American cities from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century galvanized progressive reformers to push for “slum clearance,” and the situation worsened with the lack of investment and neglect during the Great Depression and World War II.²³ In California, the state legislature passed the California Redevelopment Act in 1945 to provide state funds for local improvement projects. The Act allowed a municipality to acquire property deemed “blighted,” clear it, and sell or lease it to a private developer to create new uses that

²¹ “Christopher Announces His Program,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 2, 1951, 9; “Relocation of S.F. Produce Market is Recommended,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 9, 1953, 9.

²² “Thieves’ Highway – Produce Market.” Cityslouth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010, Accessed July 12, 2017.

²³ R. Allen Hays, *The Federal Government & Urban Housing* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012), 166-167.

complied with the community's general plan and remained in the public interest.²⁴ Cities throughout the state subsequently established municipally affiliated agencies to oversee large-scale redevelopment projects. This act occurred simultaneous to a wave of activities—such as housing surveys and master planning—that led city governments to identify economically underperforming, or “blighted,” neighborhoods where redevelopment appeared necessary.²⁵

These developments set the stage for California municipalities, including San Francisco, to act quickly following the passage of the Housing Act of 1949, a major federal catalyst for governmental intervention in American cities. Given the availability of the federal “urban renewal” funds, policymakers quickly began to make plans to transform neighborhoods near city cores—particularly areas that had been identified as “blighted,” such as the produce market district in San Francisco. Residents and commercial tenants of these “blighted” central neighborhoods were predominantly poor and/or racial minorities. Historians have argued that bias against minority residents motivated officials’ plans to redevelop particular neighborhoods of the city—and that the presence of racial minorities itself invited a “blighted” designation. The Housing Act required that relocation plans be developed for existing residents, but this provision was not always enforced.²⁶ Despite the large-scale displacement of these inner-city minority populations and businesses, municipal officials largely felt that the more critical goal was to redesign areas of their cities by introducing new and in vogue urban planning schemes.

The agency that oversaw redevelopment projects in the city was the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA), which had formed a few years after World War II as the first such municipally affiliated agency in California. The SFRA began the process of designating redevelopment areas throughout the city, securing funds, and receiving approvals from the Board of Supervisors. Pushed forward by support from the city's Planning Department, the first redevelopment plans to take shape were the Western Addition—where thousands of African-American and Japanese-American lived—the industrial South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood, and the produce market district adjacent to downtown. Yet, by the late 1950s, none of the projects had broken ground, and observers warned that without quick action blighted areas would only spread into adjacent neighborhoods—including into the commercial core.²⁷

In an effort to provide momentum to urban renewal projects, Mayor George Christopher named M. Justin Herman executive director of the SFRA in 1959. During his tenure, which lasted until 1971, Herman oversaw the use of more than \$120 million in federal redevelopment money. Projects that were completed or that advanced under his leadership include the following: the Western Addition (multiple phases); the Diamond Heights residential development in central San Francisco; the Yerba Buena Project in SoMa; the Chinese Cultural Center and hotel located across from Portsmouth Square; and the Golden Gateway project, which was adjacent to the Financial District and extended to the east side of Battery Street.²⁸ These completed projects testified to the SFRA's large-scale and enduring impact on San Francisco's urban landscape and the setting of the subject property.²⁹

²⁴ Ken Lastufka, *Redevelopment of Sacramento's West End, 1950-1970: A Historical Overview with an Analysis of the Impact of Relocation* (MA thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1985), 24-25.

²⁵ Richard Brandi, *A Reevaluation of Urban Renewal in San Francisco* (MA thesis, Goucher College, 2008), 26-28.

²⁶ Fogelson, *Downtown*, 377-378.

²⁷ Brandi, *A Reevaluation of Urban Renewal*, 31-47.

²⁸ Brandi, *A Reevaluation of Urban Renewal*, 47-52.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

SAN FRANCISCO COFFEE INDUSTRY

Coffee, originally harvested and produced in Yemen in the 1400s, is one of the world's most exported commodities. After achieving popularity in Europe in the seventeenth century, coffee spread to America, soon replacing beer as the preferred breakfast beverage. By the Mexican-American war, it was included as a ration for soldiers. By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, traders spread coffee production to other hot climate fertile areas, including Central America and the East and West Indies, from which it was shipped to the United States and Europe. By the 1840s, San Francisco had become the center of the commercial coffee roasting business in the country, and California Street was "something of a coffee row," due to the city's largest port on the West Coast. In addition, for much of the twentieth century, coffee was the highest value import into the city, and two of the largest national coffee brands of the century were established in San Francisco – Folger's and Hills Brothers.³⁰

William Bovee, who ran a coffee roasting business in New York, decided to join the Gold Rush in 1849 after his business was destroyed in a fire. After settling in San Francisco in 1850, he noticed there were no coffee businesses and decided to build a coffee mill called the Pioneer Steam Coffee and Spice Mill, located on Powell Street between Broadway and Pacific streets. Bovee's hand-ground coffee rapidly gained popularity and one of his early employees was James Folger, originally from the island of Nantucket off the coast of Massachusetts. Folger began selling coffee to miners in small California towns and soon bought out Bovee's brand and changed the name by 1872. Folger's son, James, assumed ownership after his father's death and created one of the earliest premium coffee brands in the city, Golden Gate Coffee.³¹

In 1863, the Hills brothers, Austin Herbert and Reuben Wilmarth, arrived in San Francisco from the East Coast and purchased the Arabian Coffee Mills on Fourth Street (**Figure 24**). While selling butter during the Spanish American Civil War, the brothers were disappointed with the unpleasant aftertaste. Reuben borrowed a vacuum packing technique from a Chicago coffee distributor to use instead, which significantly improved the flavor and sealed moisture out of ground-coffee-filled cans to improve shelf life. By 1900, the Hills brothers were credited as the first to use this method for packaging coffee in San Francisco, which allowed for the rapid expansion of national brands selling coffee in tins, a packaging method that would dominate the coffee industry in the twentieth century. The Hills Brothers were also thought to pioneer the "cupping" technique, the process of tasting the coffee multiple times throughout the production and distribution process in order to ensure the consistency of quality (previously the beans were eyeballed to assess quality, though bean size does not influence the taste of the coffee).³²

³⁰ "Coffee" a history of San Francisco coffee from the podcast, Containers. Available <https://medium.com/containers/episode-4-coffee-78ac6571caea> Accessed July 17, 2017.

Also sourced from a book by William H. Ukers, *All About Coffee* published in 1920. New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1922.

³¹ "A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. *Edible East Bay*. February 12, 2016. <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017.

³² Lenihan, V.M. "San Francisco Fills Nation's Coffee Cup." *Sausalito News*, Number 12, March 22, 1951. Available <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=SN19510322.2.56> Accessed July 14, 2017.




Figure 24. Customers pose in front of the Hills Bros. original store, c.1880s.
Source: "San Francisco's Coffee History: Timeline." *News in Context*. 2015.

In 1899, Max Brandenstein, the son of a Gold Rush immigrant, arrived in San Francisco at age seventeen to avoid the German military draft, and founded the city's third most prominent early coffee business, the M.J. Brandenstein Company (later MJB Coffee). The 1906 earthquake and fires destroyed many of the city's coffee roasteries, including MJB's warehouse and others on Market Street and in the South of Market district. The Folger building, however, survived. The Hills Brothers constructed a new factory in 1926 and MJB continued to operate out of the South of Market District. The city's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915 was organized to celebrate the city's post-disaster successes and growing industries, of which coffee was central.³³ Several emerging successful roasteries emerged during reconstruction and were showcased at the Exposition, including the Jones-Thierbach Co., with its roastery and manufacturing warehouse at 447 Battery Street in the city's produce market district.

Following World War I and the disruption of global trade trends, San Francisco bankers and importers began financing smaller Guatemalan coffee producers, as opposed to the more traditional Brazilian varieties. In 1906, at the time of the earthquake, approximately 250,000 bags of coffee beans were being imported into the city. By 1914-15, imports had risen to 400,000 bags. By 1918, San Francisco's coffee industry was exploding – nearly one million bags were being imported and sold in the city, or roughly 150 million pounds of coffee for a net population of around 500,000 people.³⁴ As the result of such significant growth, the San Francisco Green Coffee Association was organized in 1918, which joined the already established National Coffee Roasters Association. The two groups merged by 1932 and included 25 of San Francisco's earliest and most established roasteries at that time as members, including Wellman Peck & Co. (1849), J.A. Folger & Co. (1850), the Jones-Thierbach Co. (originally Jones-Paddock Co. in 1856), the Hills Bros. Coffee, Inc. (1878), and MJB Co. (1881). Folgers, Hills, and MJB companies were continuously family-owned until the latter half of the twentieth century, at which time the Hills Brothers was purchased by Proctor and Gamble in 1962 and then by Nestle, which also later bought MJB Coffee. Folger's was sold to Proctor and Gamble in 1963 and then to the J.M. Smucker Co. Production for each brand was moved outside of San Francisco by the early 1990s.

³³ "San Francisco's Coffee History," Timeline *News in Context*. <https://m-staging.timeline.com/stories/san-francisco-coffee> November 2015. Accessed July 17, 2017.

³⁴ *Ibid*.

Considered the second largest industry in the city after printing/publishing, the coffee business continued to innovate during the 1950s when Alfred Peet, son of a coffee roaster from Holland, arrived in the Bay Area and continued in the trade of coffee importing.³⁵ Disappointed with the standard quality of beans arriving from Brazil and Central America, and proud of his unique roasting techniques, Alfred Peet opened Peet's Coffee & Tea in Berkeley in 1966, which was one of the first to influence modern micro roasting culture (Peet also initially trained the founders of Starbucks). Peet's coffee shop, the attention to the quality and source of the product, and his specialized knowledge of the business paved a new path in the coffee industry nationwide during the 1960s through 1990s.³⁶

Coffee's "third wave" began in the early 2000s outside of San Francisco (including Stumptown and Intelligentsia in Chicago), but the City today has caught up and remains a hub of the industry's continued growth and evolution. Specialty coffee has become a valuable commodity worldwide and the roasting process an art form, much in the way of fine wine, with companies sourcing and importing exceptionally high-quality coffee beans from "micro-lots" and building relationships with small farmers around the world. Roasters such as Flying Goat, Equator, Sightglass, Blue Bottle, Philz, and Ritual, among many others, have led this wave in San Francisco, where a proliferation of small cafes and micro-roasteries have emerged and are continuing to succeed in an ever-changing economic climate.³⁷

SAN FRANCISCO TEA INDUSTRY

The history of tea begins in China in c. 1500 B.C., likely as a medical drink. It became a daily drink in China by c. 300 A.D. Tea was first introduced to Portuguese priests and merchants in China during the sixteenth century, and drinking tea had become popular in Britain and the British colonies by the seventeenth century. The British introduced tea production and consumption to India, in order to compete with China's established monopoly on the tea market. The drinking of tea in the U.S. was largely influenced by the passage of the Tea Act and its subsequent boycott during the American Revolution, causing a significant decrease in tea consumption nationwide during and after the Revolution. As a result, many Americans switched from drinking black tea to coffee, considering tea to be unpatriotic.³⁸ Following the Revolution, tea sales steadily increased again. As early as the mid-nineteenth century in San Francisco, tea from China was one of the most common imported goods into the city, along with tobacco from Cuba and coffee from Central and South America.³⁹

Tea remained a major imported commodity in San Francisco, given the port's size and access to Chinese and other Asian suppliers. Large tea-packing and storage warehouses were constructed in the early twentieth century to manage the large quantities of tea arriving from overseas. For example, a *San Francisco Examiner* article from May 1918 stated that a large tea-packing plant was going to be built for Lipton that year, and mentioned that the company's relocation of its western hemisphere business and distribution facilities to San Francisco at this time was due to a major growth in sales.⁴⁰ Based on advertisements and labels from the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it appeared fairly common for coffee wholesale suppliers, such as the Jones-Thierbach Co., to also purchase and distribute teas, since such large quantities were imported into the city and resale value

³⁵ Lenihan, V.M. "San Francisco Fills Nation's Coffee Cup." *Sausalito News*, Number 12, March 22, 1951. Available <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=SN19510322.2.56> Accessed July 14, 2017.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ "A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. *Edible East Bay*. February 12, 2016. <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017.

³⁸ "History of Tea." Available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_tea Accessed July 26, 2017.

³⁹ "San Francisco's Culinary History: Part 1 of 12." Available <https://tableagent.com/article/san-franciscos-culinary-history-part-1-of-12/> Accessed July 26, 2017.

⁴⁰ "Tea Packing Plant to be Built in S.F." *San Francisco Examiner*, May 4, 1918, pg. 4.

was high. The increase in the national popularity of tea-drinking as an alternate to coffee continued steadily through the mid-twentieth century. By World War II, however, the worldwide tea trade changed significantly. In the name of “modern convenience,” the tea bag was ubiquitously accepted throughout postwar America and overall quality decreased. A few firms continued to supply the old-style loose tea leaves, including Freed Teller Freed in San Francisco; however, few businesses of this kind survived past the late 1950s and 1960s. Tea at this point was typically mass-distributed and merchandised as an indistinct brown beverage called “black tea” and the market leaders of the tea industry of the time, including Tetley, Lipton, and Red and White Rose, lost sight of any differences that may have once set them apart from one another.⁴¹

The U.S. tea industry persisted in this way which had been established in the 1940s through the 1980s. One of the first companies to kickstart a new wave of tea in the country was a leading importer of fine teas based in the Bay Area, known as the G.S. Haly Company. This company, in addition to a handful of others nationwide, were typically dismissed by the National Tea Association as dealers in “specialty tea,” comprising about one or two percent of the U.S. tea industry. Snapple is credited as the first to have produced a “ready to drink” tea that caught on nationwide by 1985.⁴² The American tea market quadrupled from the early 1990s through 2008, and similar to the trend of micro-coffee roasting, consumers today appreciate refined varieties of tea and are willing to pay more for higher quality products. Similar to coffee shops, specialty tea houses and retailers have become increasingly popular during the 2000s and 2010s.⁴³

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL BUILDING TYPOLOGY IN SAN FRANCISCO

Warehousing involves the storage, processing and distribution of goods, as well as occasional light manufacturing. For most of its history as a building type, the warehouse functioned primarily as a storeroom for surplus material. Even before the Industrial Revolution, large Victorian-style warehouse structures were increasingly constructed in mercantile cities of Northern Europe, such as London or Rotterdam. By the Industrial Revolution, the warehouse began to evolve into more of a commercial necessity as increasing amounts of regional and international trade transformed local independent economies into components of the larger world economy. By 1900, the largest ports in the world were mostly located in Europe and North America and included: London, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Marseilles, New York, Boston, and San Francisco, to name a few.⁴⁴

As a building type in San Francisco, the industrial/commercial warehouse dates back to the years immediately following the Gold Rush, when the increasing amounts of imported manufactured goods coupled with growing domestic agricultural output caused a need for these goods to be segregated from trading and retail functions. Warehouses, originally large, wood-frame, barn-like buildings, were constructed along the piers and wharves of the waterfront just to the east of Portsmouth Square in what would become the city’s produce market district. Physical proximity to the waterfront and the cost of the land were the primary considerations behind the location of early warehouses but as the cost of prime waterfront land began to increase, warehouses were dispersed away from the original core area to North Beach, the expanded produce market district, and as far south as Steamboat Point. This pattern of development led to the formation of two separate warehouse districts – the Northeast Waterfront and the South End.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Pratt, James. “The U.S. Tea Renaissance and How It Happened.” *The Atlantic*. August 5, 2010. Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2010/08/the-us-tea-renaissance-and-how-it-happened/60895/> Accessed July 26, 2017.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ “Commercial Building Typology.” Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

Both districts continue to contain examples from every period of construction in San Francisco. These buildings, which range in height from one to seven stories, were designed in a variety of styles and employed different structural systems. The earliest warehouses in San Francisco were built between 1848 and 1870, and were usually of wood-frame construction and consequently often destroyed by fire. Those built between 1870 and 1912, and especially in the reconstruction years (1906-1912) were typically one- to three-story brick buildings with load-bearing brick walls, heavy timber frames and open-web wood truss roofs. Due to the use of load-bearing masonry construction, openings were usually deeply set and small.⁴⁶ The design of these buildings was largely determined by the economics, advances in construction technology, and fire insurance ratings, especially after the earthquake and fires.⁴⁷ Other important factors included the amount of storage area per square foot and the structural strength of a building designed to hold many tons of goods or produce.

The defining features of the style are heavy load-bearing brick masonry walls with flat parapets and roofs and facades defined largely by evenly-spaced, wood or steel sash fenestration. Other design characteristics typically include large loading docks or openings for commercial stalls in a center or corner bay, hoists, and typically two or more floors, in order to take advantage of high land values. Often constructed with red or blonde-colored brick, these buildings featured little ornamentation other than some decorative brickwork along a beltline, cornice, or parapet. Detailing was typically limited to that which could be easily executed in brick and later, concrete, including Neoclassical and Renaissance Revival-style brick corbelling, jack arches, dentil course moldings and pilasters. These buildings also often retained some elements more typical of nineteenth century commercial buildings, including recessed entrances, clerestories, and transoms.⁴⁸

Many of the reconstruction-era buildings in San Francisco's Financial District, produce market district, and South of Market district went up quickly in the period following the earthquake and fires and needed to serve a dual commercial and industrial purpose to accommodate displaced offices, retail, and warehouse spaces. Many of these buildings contained storefronts, open stalls, offices, and loading on the ground level, while storage, offices, warehouse, and/or manufacturing space was housed in the upper stories. Brick masonry construction allowed for the heavy loading potential of these floors. These building interiors typically featured a rectilinear floorplate, a symmetrical arrangement of columns, and interiors as unobstructed as possible, in order to allow for maximum storage and large machinery capacity.

By the early twentieth century, the introduction of steel framing, as well as the widespread adoption of the mechanized elevator, allowed buildings to be constructed taller, and with larger window openings and fewer interior supports. By the time of the opening of the Panama Canal in August 1914, advancing concrete construction techniques led to larger buildings with larger window and door openings, thinner walls and greater spans, which allowed more light into the buildings, as well as larger areas of unobstructed space.⁴⁹

Comparative Industrial/Commercial Building Survey

Page & Turnbull noted several similar-scale, two to four-story brick masonry industrial/commercial buildings in the vicinity of the subject property, which appear to be representative examples from the immediate period of post-fire reconstruction (1906-1912), based on exhibiting higher levels of historic integrity, architectural merit, and character-defining features of the typology described above. These buildings are discussed more specifically in the Criterion C/3 Evaluation section of this report.

⁴⁶ "Commercial Building Typology." Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016.

⁴⁷ San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "South End Historic District," Draft Case Report, 1990, p. 5.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ "Commercial Building Typology." Page & Turnbull Historic Context database. Last updated 2016.

The following table also includes images, construction dates, and survey ratings of these buildings (Figure 25).




Figure 25. Map of properties in the vicinity of 447 Battery Street (labeled) that are examples of commercial/industrial buildings from the post-1906 reconstruction period (shaded red with numbers).
Source: Bing Maps, 2017; edited by Page & Turnbull.

Address	Photograph & Character Defining Features	Property Information
<p>1 405 Sansome Street “National Building”</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, arches, decorated spandrels, projecting cornices and belt courses, pilasters, and rustication ▪ Ornament is derived from Renaissance sources 	<p>APN: 0228/004 Year Built: 1906 Style: Renaissance Revival Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>NR: 2S2 SF Heritage: C – Contextual Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 3</p>
<p>2 407 Sansome Street</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, projecting cornices and belt courses, pilasters, and rustication 	<p>APN: 0228/003 Year Built: 1909 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: A – Historic Resources Present</p> <p>CR/NR: 2S2 SF Heritage: C – Contextual Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 1</p>

<p>3 568 Sacramento Street “PG&E Substation”</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, projecting cornices and belt courses, pilasters, and rustication, wide bay 	<p>APN: 0228/011 Year Built: c.1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: A – Historic Resources Present; Contributor to Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District</p> <p>NR/CR: 3S SF Heritage: B – Major Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 1</p>
<p>4 200 Jackson Street/ 601 Front Street</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, projecting cornices and belt courses, pilasters, and rustication 	<p>APN: 0173/006 Year Built: 1911 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Renaissance Revival features Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible</p> <p>SF Heritage: C – Contextual Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 2</p>

<p>5 298 Pacific Ave “Old Ship Saloon”</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, arched windows, projecting ornamented cornice 	<p>APN: 0166/005 Year Built: 1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>SF Heritage: B – Major Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 1</p>
<p>6 601-615 Front Street “Legallet Building”</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade ▪ Façade details include brickwork, arched windows, projecting ornamented cornice and beltline 	<p>APN: 0174/001 Year Built: 1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>CR/NR: 5S2 SF Heritage: C- Contextual importance</p>
<p>7 843-851 Montgomery Street “Hotel European”</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition ▪ Exposed brick façade with stone accents ▪ Façade details include brickwork, projecting ornamented parapet, cornice, belt line, concrete ornamental features 	<p>APN: 0176/030 Year Built: 1910-11 Style: Renaissance Revival Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>SF Heritage: C- Contextual importance DCP 1976 Survey: 1 Contributor to Jackson Square Historic District</p>

<p>8 705 Sansome Street</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Two to four stories, three-part composition▪ Exposed brick façade with accents▪ Façade details include brickwork, projecting ornamented cornice, belt line, arched paired windows, pilasters, corbelling, wide bays	<p>APN: 0175/003 Year Built: 1906 Style: Renaissance Revival Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>SF Heritage: B – Major Importance DCP 1976 Survey: 3 Contributor to Jackson Square Historic District</p>
-------------------------------------	--	---




Figure 27. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1905. 447 Battery Street outlined in red.
Edited by ESA and Page & Turnbull, 2016.

The architect of 447 Battery Street is unknown. Like other similar buildings of this period, the subject building originally contained at least one storefront and an office at the street level, while the upper floors were engineered to withstand heavy loads, ideal for manufacturing, storage, and roasting machinery, as well as flexible, open warehouse space for the wholesale coffee, tea, and spice business housed there when the building opened in 1907. The 1913 Sanborn map first indicates that three of the five stores previously on the subject parcel were replaced with the current three-story brick building and labeled 'Coffee roasting' (Figure 28). It appears that a store on the ground level ran the length of the Merchant Street façade, while a small office was centered on the Battery Street side. An awning extended from the facade over the far north storefronts as early as 1917 (Figures 29 to 31). By this time, the street addresses were labeled as 431 through 447 on Battery Street and 400 on Merchant Street. At that time, the building adjacent on the north at the corner of Battery and Washington streets was a two-story building with stucco siding containing a restaurant and five storefronts. The 1913 map also shows newly constructed, reinforced concrete buildings across from the subject property's Merchant Street side containing a candy factory and a creamery (not shown on in Figure 27). Across Washington Street to the north is the United States Customs House.




Figure 28. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1913. 447 Battery Street outlined in red.
Edited by ESA and Page & Turnbull, 2016.

While the maps indicate the brick and timber construction of the subject building, it is clear from historic photographs that 447 Battery Street originally featured painted stucco siding on the primary east and south façades. The photographs included below are dated from the period of Jones-Thierbach Co.'s tenancy in the building (1912-1966), and thus prior to the Junior League's evaluation in 1968 and other surveys on record. The earliest photograph found of the building at 447 Battery Street was part of the Department of Public Works (DPW) collection documenting road and other infrastructure improvements in the city (Figure 29). The view was taken in February 1917, nearly a decade after the building's construction, looking south on Battery Street between Jackson and Washington streets. The subject property is visible on the right side, across the intersection from the Customs Building and adjacent to the two-story corner building at Washington Street. The difference in cladding between the north façade (the name 'Chase' is visible) and the Battery-facing primary façade is evident despite the image's overexposure, as the primary façade appears nearly white in contrast with the side façade's darker coloring.



Figure 29. DPW # 4086 Road repair at Battery Street and Washington Street; subject property faintly visible right of center and indicated with arrow, view looking south. February 1917.
San Francisco Public Library History Room Photo Desk. Edited by Page & Turnbull.



Figure 30. DPW # 5606 at Battery & California Streets,
View looking north. Subject property marked. Sept. 1918.
San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.
Edited by Page & Turnbull.



Figure 31. DPW # 5606 at Sacramento Streets,
View looking north. September 1918.
San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.
Edited by Page & Turnbull.

The DPW archives also contain two photographs taken the following year in September 1918, each showing the subject property to the left of center (**Figures 30 & 31**). While the building is most visible in the photograph taken at Sacramento Street looking north, it is faintly visible in the other image taken at California Street, also looking north. The building's east and south façades are visible and the southeast corner features "TEAS" in large painted lettering down the side, an advertisement for the Jones-Thierbach Co., which also distributed teas. Additional information about the company and owners is provided in the following section. Here again, the contrast is distinct between the darker tones of the painted belt line and lettering with the lighter tone of the painted stucco façade.

The 1950 Sanborn map labels the subject property as 'Coffee Roasting, Teas, Coffee & Spices.' By 1950, the store along the Merchant Street side of the building still existed, and the office on Battery Street still remained at primary façade center. The two-story building to the immediate north is still shown, labeled as having two restaurants and three storefronts on the ground floor (**Figure 32**). The west side of the block also illustrates the same buildings as the 1913 map, showing several commercial establishments, including two restaurants, a cigar factory, and several small retail stores.




Figure 32. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1950. Subject property outlined in red.
Edited by Page & Turnbull, 2016.

Given that the western boundary of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's area extended only to the eastern side of Battery Street, the subject property was spared in the post-war round of urban renewal during the late 1950s and 1960s. However, by the mid-1960s, the block and surrounding neighborhood were transformed as it was incorporated into the Financial District. Wholesale warehouse and manufacturing space, such as at 447 Battery Street, was no longer economically viable in such valuable real estate, and most similar businesses relocated to the warehouses in the SOMA district. In the specific case of 447 Battery Street, the building was converted to retail and office use; the exterior significantly altered, and the interior fully remodeled to accommodate a computer consultant firm and their heavy equipment in 1967.

CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY

As previously mentioned, the earliest architectural evaluation on record of the property at 447 Battery Street by the Junior League (1968) described the exterior façades of the building as "sandblasted." The small photograph attached to the survey shows the brick façades, generally as they appear today. The report notes that there was a "moderate amount of exterior desecration of the original design" and that the building was "recently modernized, keeping only its style – but with plate glass windows on front."⁵⁰ However, the alterations associated with the modernization are not described. Furthermore, there are no corroborating building permits to illustrate the exact level of work involved in the subject property's modernization, or what caused the significant deviation from its original exterior design. The San Francisco Architectural Heritage Survey (1977-78) similarly mentioned exterior alterations, specifically the "removal of the cornice" and potential removal of original stucco siding.

⁵⁰ Junior League Property Records. Recorded by Mary Franck. San Francisco Public Library History Room. Pg. 1, March 1968.

A review of buildings permits on file at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection identified no original building permits or plans for 447 Battery Street prior to 1967. The available information is shown in the table below.

447 Battery Street: Building Permit Construction Chronology

Date	Permit #	Architect/Builder	Work
2/20/1967 5/1/1967	339923 342618	Plant Bros. Corp.	Construct offices on 3rd floor; install suspended ceilings, partitions, lighting, flooring, and steel-framed wire glass windows in public lobby
6/19/1968	354806	Plant Bros. Corp.	First and second floors- Install interior partitions, floating floors, raise acoustical ceilings, electrical for computers
8/7/1975	449709	Plant Builders, Inc.	Repair damage to slab and brick walls caused by broken water main; replace bricks sections where mortar weakened
7/29/1977	7707412	Anderson/Culley Plant Builders, Inc.	Reinforce 45' of first floor joists with 8" x 8" posts and 8" x 10" beams
9/21/1982	8206577	Fee+Munson Herrero Bros.	Foundation underpinning at NW corner of building
3/18/1986	8603094	Plant Builders, Inc.	Parapet reinforcement
10/24/1986	8613481	Adersey	Interior remodel; add additional entrance to ground floor space
4/17/1988	8906297	Lawson Roofing	Remove excess roofing down to original; new asphalt and gravel roof
4/15/1997	09610935	Unknown	Seismic retrofit, anchor bolts, window bracing, cross wall extension, parapet bracing
5/4/1998	9807960	NA	Install Cort Furniture sign 2' x 16'/\$3,000
2/17/1999	9824233	Vendani Co.	Seismic retrofit, moment frame east wall
6/6/2011	201011154938	Narrowback Constr.	Bar and prep kitchen, rebuild exterior deck, HVAC, sprinkler work

In lieu of early building permits, the construction chronology prior to 1967 relies on observations from the aforementioned Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and the historic photographs. In addition to the 1917 and 1918 photographs of the subject properties, three additional photographic negatives were found that illustrate the original stucco cladding. A police record negative capturing the scene of

a crash at Battery and Washington Streets in March 1956 shows, when inverted, the painted stucco on the primary façade with the “Jones-Thierbach Co.” name painted in dark lettering across the center of the façade (**Figure 33**). As with the image from 1917, the difference in cladding material and tone is evident between the brick masonry of the north façade and the stucco of the east façade. Similar to this police record negative, two inverted Assessor’s negatives of the property, taken the following year in July 1957, confirm the existence of the stucco, at least up until this date (**Figures 34 to 35**). These views from 1957, both from Battery Street, were taken closer to the subject building and depict most clearly the smooth texture of the stucco and reasonable condition of both the south and primary façades. As in the 1917 photograph, the visible portion of the north façade reads as brick masonry. Both of these 1957 photographs also show the recessed storefronts of the primary façade, with bases similarly clad in stucco, but which are painted a darker color.



Figure 33. City Assessor’s Negatives. View of primary façade at Battery Street, July 1957.
San Francisco Public Library History Room Photo Desk.
Negative inverted by Page & Turnbull.



Figure 34. City Police Records Negatives. View at Battery & Washington Streets, March 1956.
San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.



Figure 35. City Assessor’s Negatives. View of corner at Washington Street, July 1957.
San Francisco Public Library Photo Desk.

In the 1967 remodel (Permits #339923 and #342618) the coffee warehouse was converted to office space for the owners Kahn, Kaufman, & Oshrow (later Ron Kaufman Company). No permits or plans were found which identified any changes to the exterior walls, such as the removal of the stucco and paint on the east and south façades, the damage to the cornice, sandblasting, or the

doorway alterations on the Merchant Street façade. These changes likely occurred during the transition to an office building in 1967. It is also probable that the original wood frame windows on the Battery Street façade, and most likely Merchant Street façade, were replaced with the metal frame windows at this time, though it is not explicitly stated in the permit. Additional interior alterations occurred in 1968 (Permit #354806) to provide sufficient support for a computer consulting and data processing company, known as Recording and Statistical Data Processing, Inc. and later the Burroughs Corporation. By nature of the building's solid brick and timber construction, it was already nearly sufficient to carry the load of the heavy computer equipment typical of the late 1960s through 1970s. In 1975, Permit #44709 indicates that repairs were necessary due to water damage and reinforcement of the first floor joints was requested by then owners, the Burroughs Corporation. Further seismic reinforcements were required in the 1980s and 1990s, especially of the foundation and parapet, as well as an addition of another ground floor entrance. Potentially the 1986 "add entrance on ground floor" is when the storefront windows and doors were replaced on the Battery Street façade, as well as the parapet anchor bolts.

According to the property owner (2007-current), the Battery Street exterior façade and a portion on the Merchant Street (east) façade had been sandblasted both at the time of the 1967 remodel, as well as more recently in the 1990s. The mixture used for sandblasting more recently contained salt which caused the bricks to disintegrate, especially at the cornice, and so the operation was halted on the Merchant Street façade about ten feet back from the building corner (**Figure 36**). It also appears that the original bricks were not fired properly (procured more cheaply) and so the sandblasting only exacerbated their already poor condition. Moreover, it was typical during the rapid reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake that salt water was mixed in with the mortar, which further contributed to the original bricks' deterioration. As a result, the building contains a patchwork of bricks of different types, qualities, and time periods, as well as concrete and wood patching in areas of spalling and cracks. Grout was added haphazardly in the sandblasted areas to further prevent or mask the deterioration.⁵¹ This division between the two areas of the Merchant Street façade is visible below in **Figure 37**.



Figure 36. Close-up of patched bricks at belt course where cornice was damaged.



Figure 37. Close-up of bricks showing areas that were recently sandblasted (right) and not (left).

⁵¹ Personal communication, Rob Canepa, 447 Battery, LLC, with Cassie Rogg, Page & Turnbull, July 22, 2016.
October 6, 2017

OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS

Owners

The following owner information was accessed through available records at the San Francisco Assessor's Office, ranging from 1967 to 2007. According to the information listed, the building was owned by Charles Thierbach as a coffee roasting and wholesale company called Thierbach & Co. from 1907-1912 and assumed the name of the Jones-Thierbach Co., from 1912-1966. At this point, it was purchased by the Ron Kaufman Company in 1967, who later sold it to the Bedford Properties in 1986. This company, as well as other property management companies, owned the building from this point on. The most recent owner of 447 Battery Street is the Montgomery Realty Group, who purchased the building in 2007.

Date	Owner	Notes
1907-1912	Thierbach & Co.	Coffee wholesale business
1912-1966	Jones-Thierbach Company	Charles Thierbach partnered with M.P. Jones to start the new company
1967-1978	Kahn, Kaufman & Oshrow	
1978-1986	Ron Kaufman Company	
1986-1994	Bedford Properties	
1994-1998	Pine-Battery Properties, Inc.	
1998-2006	Richcom, Inc.	
2006-2007	Woodflame, Inc.	
2007-current	Montgomery Realty Group	


Occupants

The following information for 447 Battery Street was accessed through available records in the San Francisco city directories, ranging from 1907-1982. The original and long-time tenant of the building was Charles Thierbach, who later partnered with the Jones-Paddock Co. to form the Jones-Thierbach Co. A coffee roastery and wholesale business operated out of the building when it opened in 1907 and remained in operation in the building for nearly 60 years (1912-1966), at which point the business ceased to exist and the building was sold and remodeled to become office space for a computer consulting company. Several data consulting companies occupied the building in the ensuing decades, including the Recording and Statistical Co., Information Management, Inc., and the Burroughs Corporation. No additional company history or ownership information was found about these technology consultancies occupying the property in the 1970s through early 1980s. The building currently contains the Cort Furniture store on the Battery-facing street level, the Hidden Vine wine bar on the Merchant Street side, and offices on the upper floors.

Date	Occupant	Notes
1907-1912	Charles F. Thierbach	Coffee Wholesale
1912-1967	Jones-Thierbach Co.	Coffee, Teas & Spices
1968-1970	Recording and Statistical Co.	Computer Consultants
1970-1972	Recording and Statistical Co. and Information Management, Inc.	Computer Consultants
1972 - 1974	Information Management, Inc. Burroughs Corporation Information Equities, Inc.	Computer Consultants & Business Machines Data Processing
1975 - 1982	Burroughs Corporation	Business Machines
1982-c.2000	Unknown	
c. 2000-current	Cort Furniture	

Charles F. Thierbach and the Jones-Thierbach Company

Born in Germany in 1847, Charles Frederick Thierbach immigrated to San Francisco around 1867. According to census records, he married a German woman who had also recently immigrated, Emma Kuhlmeier (1866-1927). Thierbach spent his first years in the city working as a salesman; city directories have record of him working at Ghirardelli in 1875 and living at 930 Folsom Street. Thierbach and his wife had two sons, Charles F. Thierbach, Jr. and George Thierbach. The first record of Thierbach's involvement in the coffee industry was in 1881 when he began to work for an established importing and wholesale company that started its life as Randall & Jones (1856), with whom he would later merge to form the Jones-Thierbach Co.⁵² The firm's president at that time, Michael P. Jones, was known as one of the pioneer merchants of San Francisco. He began an importing business in 1858 at which time he partnered with Frank Randall. Randall retired shortly after and Jones continued the business under the name of Jones & Co. The business began as one of the first and largest importers of sugar from Hawaii, owning several vessels before steamship lines were established. By the early 1880s, when Thierbach joined, the company had shifted its focus to the import and manufacturing of tea, spice, and coffee under the name of the Jones-Paddock Company, located at 28 Fremont Street before the earthquake and 230 Fremont Street by 1910 (Figure 38).⁵³



Figures 38. Illustration of the Jones-Paddock Co. Importers office building at 26-28 Fremont Street, 1900.
Source: Receipt at <http://www.coinmine.com/inventory/Ephemera/JonesPaddockBillHead.htm>

As described in the previous section, the coffee import and wholesale business was one of San Francisco's earliest and most profitable industries in the late nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries. While many of the city's earliest coffee companies did not survive the economic turmoil following the 1906 earthquake and fire, Charles Thierbach was fortunate enough to be involved in one of the few coffee companies that remained afloat and resumed business following the destruction in a nearby location also in the South of Market district. City directories show that Thierbach left the Jones-Paddock Co. in 1907 and began his own coffee wholesale business and

⁵² Ancestry.com, accessed July 2016 and The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1935.

⁵³ "Death of M.P. Jones." *San Francisco Call*. September 2, 1899.

roastery at 447 Battery Street called Thierbach & Co. Though M.P. Jones had died in 1899, records indicate that Thierbach's new company and the Jones-Paddock Co. merged by 1912, changing the name of Thierbach's company to the Jones-Thierbach Co.⁵⁴ No further information about the merger was found, such as whether one of Jones's sons, Webster or Milton, may have also been involved in the company at that time.

While it appears that the Jones-Thierbach Co. was not known to pioneer new techniques or products in the early years of the industry, the company maintained a profitable mid-size roastery and manufacturing facility out of which they produced several popular wholesale brands of canned coffee. Records indicate only a few companies were industry competitors in the immediate post-fire years, including the Ceylon Tea Company (1909 Mission Street), Columbia Coffee and Spice Company (423 Jackson Street), and Eagle Coffee and Spice Mills (520 Washington Street). Other larger companies, such as Folger's (520 Washington Street) and Hill's Brothers Coffee also continued to operate in downtown San Francisco in their multi-story manufacturing and roasting facilities.⁵⁵ In 1915, the year of the Panama Pacific Exposition, city directories identify Charles Thierbach as the Vice President of the Jones-Thierbach Co.

Several articles from the 1910s advertise the Jones-Thierbach Co. for their high-quality coffees and teas. However, one article from 1912 (the year of the company merger) describes a legal case in which the Jones-Thierbach Co. was reported by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture for misbranding a shipment of coffee beans. According to the case summary, a quantity of bags was inaccurately labeled "Arab Coffee with Chicory" (including a picture of an Arab man at center) with a description of the contents containing ground coffee and chicory. In reality, the coffee was found to contain 90 percent South American coffee, about 10 percent chicory, and none of the higher quality Arabic coffee. Thierbach pleaded guilty and the company was fined \$25 for deceiving the purchaser.⁵⁶

Despite this negative press, the Jones-Thierbach Co. was selected a few years later to exhibit in the Food Products Building at the 1915 PPIE, in addition to other well-known consumer brands, including Folgers, Ghirardelli (chocolate), McCormick (spices), Heinz (ketchup), and Morton's (salt).⁵⁷ Though Jones-Thierbach was known principally for its 'Alta' brand of coffee by this time, the company had branched out its product base to include spices, extracts, tea, and baking powder. The photos below of the PPIE portray the interior with the typical coffee bean grinding equipment used at that time. They also marketed the brand by giving out free samples of the Alta coffee with its 'Gold Medal' award. A trade journal in 1915 remarked that the company had received the award at the PPIE for their entire Alta line, "a line of exceptional merit as far as quality is concerned" **(Figures 39 to 41)**.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ "Two Large Firms Consolidate." *California Grocers Advocate*, Volume 17, Issues 1-26. 1912.

⁵⁵ San Francisco city directories, 1905 – 1908.

⁵⁶ U.S. National Library of Medicine. Case Number #4815 "Misbranding of coffee. U.S. v. The Jones-Thierbach Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Date issued, September 18, 1917. <https://ceb.nlm.nih.gov/fdanj/handle/123456789/39796> Accessed July 17, 2017.

⁵⁷ Moore, Charles C. Official Catalogue of Exhibitors, Panama-Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco, California, 1915.

⁵⁸ Phyfe, James, Simmon's Spice Mill, Devoted to the Interests of the Coffee, Tea, and Spice Trades, Vol. 38, January 1915.



Figures 39-41. Jones-Thierbach Showroom Interior and Advertising Letterhead (1917). Typical vacuum-packed Alta coffee grounds jar (1920). Source: UC Davis, Special Collections (photographs), Ebay (letterhead and jar).

Census records list Thierbach as a San Francisco “merchant” and “importer of wholesale coffee,” and later of tea and spices (likely expanded product base following the merger though no exact record was found), for every decade from 1907 through 1930. Little additional information was found about Charles or the company after the 1930s. Thierbach continued working until the age of 83, soon before he died in 1931, at the age of 84. One of Thierbach’s sons, George, assumed ownership of the company following his father’s death, where he had begun working as superintendent, according to city directories, since the 1920s. George Thierbach was also the head of the National Coffee Association for several years, particularly during the 1930s through mid-1940s.⁵⁹ George traveled often to promote the brand, featured below in an image with Joe DiMaggio, performing a “cupping” flavor test (Figure 42).

⁵⁹ “Coffee Unit Reelects.” *The Salt Lake Tribune*. October 17, 1943. Pg. 13.
October 6, 2017



Figures 42. New York Yankee, Joe DiMaggio, and friend George Thierbach (right), tasting coffee in Indiana (1940) Source: The Edinburg Daily Courier, Indiana. February 29, 1940. Pg. 4.

George Thierbach died in 1952, after which time it is not clear who assumed ownership of the company, though it remained listed in city directories as the Jones-Thierbach Co. until 1967. At this time, the subject building was sold and the company ceased to exist. No other employees were discovered in public records or articles to have made particular contributions to the company over its nearly 60-year tenancy at 447 Battery Street.

VI. EVALUATION

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation's most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. Typically, resources over fifty years of age are eligible for listing in the National Register if they meet any one of the four criteria of significance and if they sufficiently retain historic integrity. However, resources under fifty years of age can be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of "exceptional importance," or if they are contributors to a potential historic district. National Register criteria are defined in depth in *National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*.

The California Register follows nearly identical guidelines to those used by the National Register, but identifies the Criteria for Evaluation numerically. The four basis criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National or California registers are:

- *Criterion A/1 (Event)*: Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- *Criterion B/2 (Person)*: Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- *Criterion C/3 (Design/Construction)*: Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and
- *Criterion D/4 (Information Potential)*: Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource can be considered significant on a national, state, or local level to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The following section examines the eligibility of 447 Battery Street for listing in the National and California Registers.

Criterion A/1 (Event)

The building at 447 Battery Street is associated with the period of post-earthquake redevelopment in the city and specifically, with that of the produce market district and redevelopment of the wholesale coffee and roasting industries in San Francisco. The district was an epicenter of mercantile activity with constant deliveries and transactions of foodstuffs to markets and warehouses that supplied the city. Industrial/commercial buildings in the district typically had wide, publicly accessible merchant stalls, shop windows, or loading areas on the street level. Although 447 Battery Street was located just within the western boundary of the district, it does not appear to be a particularly representative example of a typical commercial/industrial building that characterized the produce market district with open merchant stalls or loading areas on the street level. Sanborn maps and early photographs indicate that 447 Battery Street featured one storefront with an awning, but otherwise did not feature open stalls, and contained a single private office space. Two other storefronts are recorded on the map, though only one is shown in the photograph to be publicly accessible. Thus, 447 Battery Street is not individually significant in association with the post-earthquake redevelopment period or the produce market.

The subject building also housed the coffee roastery, storage warehouse, offices, packaging, and manufacturing facility of the Jones-Thierbach Co., and was therefore historically associated with the post-earthquake redevelopment of the coffee industry in San Francisco. In the nineteenth century, the majority of coffee roasters were located along California Street in the Financial District. While the Folgers multi-story brick masonry building survived the fires, most of the city's other coffee roasteries and manufacturing facilities were forced to relocate and rebuild, including Jones-Thierbach's parent company, the Jones-Paddock Co., Hills Brothers, MJB, and many other smaller operations. During reconstruction, most of these businesses relocated to commercial warehouse buildings going up rapidly in the South of Market District, while others, including the Jones-Thierbach Co. at the subject property, relocated to buildings in the expanding produce market district and Financial District.

There is record of Jones-Thierbach Co.'s early successes in the industry during the decade following reconstruction and the merger with the well-established Jones-Paddock Co. in 1912, including the release of their "Alta" coffee brand and the pavilion at the 1915 Exposition. The Alta ground coffee was jarred and later canned using the Hills' Bros. new vacuum-packing technique, which improved the coffee's shelf-life and flavor, contributing to its quick popularity. Shortly after the merger in 1912, Thierbach was accused of mislabeling South American coffee to sell it for more as Arabian coffee, and he pleaded guilty to the charge later that year. Little additional information was found about the company or its products after the 1920s, except for a listing in 1932 in the National Coffee Roasters Association, which at that point included twenty-five other competing large and mid-size roasteries of similar or greater repute. Charles's son, George, assumed leadership of the company in the early 1930s, and though he was active in the National Coffee Association, there was no information found regarding the company's contributions to any notable product or industry policy innovations. Despite Jones-Thierbach's early growth, which appears partially due to the successes of the more established Jones-Paddock Co., no later records indicate that the company was known to be particularly unique or innovative in the coffee and tea roasting and wholesale supply industries.

Overall, 447 Battery Street is not particularly representative of the redevelopment period and appears to lack significance in association with San Francisco's coffee roasting and tea wholesale industries. Thus, the building does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)

The building at 447 Battery Street does not appear to have been associated with persons important to the produce market district or greater history of San Francisco to the extent that the building would be considered individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2. Charles Thierbach's first involvement in the coffee industry began in 1881 at the Jones-Paddock Company. The company survived the 1906 disaster; however, Thierbach left to start his own roastery and wholesale operation in 1907 at 447 Battery Street called Thierbach & Co. The Jones-Paddock Company merged with Thierbach's roastery and wholesale business in 1912, changing the name at that time to the Jones-Thierbach Co. This merger was the beginning of the mid-size local coffee roastery and wholesale supplier that would occupy the building for nearly 60 years. Although M.P. Jones is regarded as a respected, early pioneer merchant of San Francisco and the partial namesake of the Jones-Thierbach Co., he died in 1899, eight years before Thierbach started his company at 447 Battery Street, and thus is not directly associated with the subject property. No further information was found about Charles Thierbach or his employees at the Jones-Thierbach Company.

Charles Thierbach's son, George, assumed ownership of the brand in the early 1930s and was active throughout his career in local and national coffee organizations, but as mentioned, neither father nor son was found to be associated with any major innovations in the coffee roasting or coffee and tea wholesale supply industries. After the Jones-Thierbach Co.'s tenancy at 447 Battery Street ended in

1966, the building housed several different businesses, including two computer consultancies known as the Recording and Statistical Co. and the Burroughs Corporation. Research did not reveal further information about these companies or their owners to evaluate whether any employees would be considered historically influential in association with the building. Thus, 447 Battery Street does not appear to rise to a level of significance such that the building would be eligible for listing under Criterion B/2 (Persons).

Criterion C/3 (Architecture/Design)

The building at 447 Battery Street does not appear to be individually significant under Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design). Though it is an example of a multi-story, brick masonry-constructed industrial/commercial building typical in San Francisco during the post-earthquake period of reconstruction, 447 Battery Street is not a particularly rare example of this typology. Nearby properties were surveyed for this report (see IV. Historic Context) and appear to be better representatives of the typology. All of these buildings were built during the period of the subject property's construction or shortly after (1906-1911), and are located within two-and-a-half blocks of 447 Battery Street in the northeast, northwest, and southwest directions. Based on the character-defining features of the typology, those buildings with a similarly restrained, yet higher level of architectural merit include: 405 Sansome Street, 407 Sansome Street, 568 Sacramento Street, 843-851 Montgomery Street, 298 Pacific Avenue, and 705 Sansome Street. These buildings feature more refined ornamental Neoclassical-style brickwork, arched openings, highly decorative cornices, beltlines, dentils, and pilasters at the primary and secondary façades. The identified buildings at 200 Jackson Street, 601-615 Front Street, and 705 Sansome Street, appear to feature original windows and/or doors, intact brickwork and other architectural detailing, and less compromised surrounding environments. In general, all of these properties were found to feature an overall higher level of architectural merit and/or to exhibit more character-defining features of the industrial/commercial building typology. Therefore, 447 Battery Street does not appear individually significant in association with the brick building typology from the post-earthquake period.

447 Battery Street is also not a noteworthy example of its building typology, largely due to alterations that have occurred over time. Aside from 447 Battery Street's original three-story and two-part vertical massing, brick and timber construction, arched openings, and three-course brick belt line, the building contains no original features or characteristics that would make it architecturally significant as an example of an industrial/commercial style building of the early-twentieth century, nor as an example of any observable architectural style. Overall, the building does not appear to be a representative example of the type, period, or method of construction, nor does it feature high artistic merit. Therefore, the building does not appear to be individually significant under this criterion.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential)

"Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history" or the "potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of California" relates to archeological resources, rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the building is the principal source of important construction-related information. Based on research, Criterion D/4 is not applicable to 447 Battery Street.

INTEGRITY

In order to qualify for listing in the National Register of the California Register, a property must possess significance under one of the aforementioned criteria and have historic integrity. The process of determining integrity is similar for both the California Register and the National Register. The same seven variables or aspects that define integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association—are used to evaluate a resource's eligibility for listing in the

California Register and the National Register. According to the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, these seven characteristics are defined as follows:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.

Setting addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s).

Materials refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.

Feeling is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Although the subject property was found to possess no individual significance under any of the Criteria for listing, the following provides a brief discussion of the building's integrity:

The building at 447 Battery Street retains its integrity of location, having never been moved from its original location on Battery and Merchant streets. However, 447 Battery Street does not retain overall integrity of setting, given that the surrounding neighborhood is no longer characterized by one- to three story industrial/commercial buildings. Beginning as early as the mid-1960s, the expansion of the Financial District led to the construction of several high-rise modern office buildings directly adjacent to the subject property on the north, west and south sides, as well as the Golden Gate Redevelopment project across the street. 447 Battery Street also has compromised integrity of design, workmanship, and materials given that it has undergone significant alterations to the building interior and exterior façades, including the removal of the original stucco cladding, repeated sandblasting of the brick, as well as several modifications to the Battery Street storefronts, door openings on the Merchant Street façade, and replacement of the original wood frame windows. Closer examination of the exterior brick also demonstrates the extent to which original masonry elements had been damaged or removed and haphazardly patched with varying types of brick, pieces of wood, concrete, and grout, impacting further the integrity of materials and workmanship.

Although the primary Battery Street storefront and window openings have not been altered and the overall building massing maintained, the original design intent of 447 Battery Street was significantly compromised by the aforementioned alterations, including the removal of the stucco cladding and cornice damage on the visible façades of the building. It is important to note that it was not perceived as a brick masonry building during its existence as the Jones-Thierbach Co. building, but instead as a stucco-clad building with painted signage through the mid-1960s. Given these exterior alterations and interior remodel in 1967 to convert the original use of the building, the building has significantly compromised integrity of feeling and association as it no longer conveys its original commercial and warehouse uses significant to the produce market district or any visible remnants of the Jones-Thierbach Co.

HISTORIC DISTRICT ANALYSIS

Existing Potential Historic Districts

This section evaluates 447 Battery Street as a potential contributor to both the neighboring Front-California Downtown Conservation District, a few blocks to the southeast and the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, one block to the southwest (**Figure 43**).

The Front-California Downtown Conservation District consists of one- to eleven-story commercial office buildings, many of which date from the post-earthquake period of reconstruction (completed by the 1930s) and were built to serve the produce market district with offices and retail on the street level and storage on the upper stories. The following text is included in Appendix H to *Article 11, Front-California Conservation District*, and sets forth the following justification for the Conservation District:

Located to the east of the financial district on filled land, this District was outside of the major downtown growth corridors in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The location of the Federal Reserve Bank on Battery Street and the construction of several office buildings (Southern Pacific, Matson) in the 1920s, linked the financial district with port-oriented buildings on lower California and Market Streets. While office uses have been located on California Street since 1906, the area east of Battery Street was not fully integrated into the financial district until 1920, when the street assumed its present character. The development of Front Street proceeded at a slower pace and was not complete until the 1930s. Front Street was redeveloped after the fire, with warehouses and industrial buildings serving the produce district to the north and office support services serving the office core to the west and on California Street. Buildings on Front Street commonly contained stores and offices at the ground level while upper stories were used for stock purposes and general storage. Several offices and printers were also located on the street.

Character-defining features of the Front-California Conservation District include:


- Varied street wall height, from one to 11 stories
- Façade materials include exposed brick, stucco, metal and terra cotta panels
- Façade details include glazed brickwork, arches, decorated spandrels, projecting cornices and belt courses, pilasters, and rustication
- Building styles vary from utilitarian brick industrial with decorative brickwork to ornate Renaissance Revival
- Ornament is generally derived from Renaissance sources
- Buildings employ similar scale, height, fenestration, texture, and materials
- The District forms a coherent entity. Outside the boundary, the older buildings become larger and are interspersed with more modern structures. The similar character and scale of the buildings unify the District.

The Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District to the north of the subject property consists of narrow parcels and small-scale, two- to six-story buildings (excluding one high-rise), largely reconstructed in the post-earthquake years and completed in the early 1920s. It also traditionally contained a wide variety of businesses, which enjoyed the convenience of proximity to the Financial District. The following text is included in Appendix H to *Article 11, Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District*, and sets forth the following justification for the Conservation District:

While Montgomery Street has historically been the preferred address for major banks and offices, Commercial and Leidesdorff Streets contained a wide variety of uses which found it convenient to be located near the office district. In the 19th century, Leidesdorff Street connected the A. Paladini Fish Market on Clay Street with the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce on Pine. In the 1920s, these streets boasted several printers and binderies, a cigar factory (554 Commercial), photoengravers, a chemical storage warehouse as well as a paints, oils and varnish business. The special character of this block is created by the intersection of Commercial and Leidesdorff Streets, dividing the block into quadrants. The northeast quadrant of the block has been developed by a highrise of insensitive scale and design and was therefore excluded from this District. The remaining three quadrants of the Conservation District remain intact. The small size of the parcels determines narrow width of the buildings. Focusing on the intersection of the two alleys, the District is a quiet area contrasting with the intensity of the Financial District.

Character-defining features of the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District include:

- Small-scale (two to four story) masonry buildings on narrow parcels
- District focused around the intersection of Commercial and Leidesdorff streets creating a concentration of rich visual interest and a dense pedestrian environment
- Variety of architectural styles but overall, the buildings display outstanding merit and a relatively high quality of Classically derived detailing and historic character



Figures 43. Relationship of the subject property (shaded red) to the Front-California Conservation District (shaded yellow) and the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District (shaded orange).
Source: SF Planning Department, Downtown Area Plan. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Survey Area

At the request of the San Francisco Planning Department, Page & Turnbull has conducted a windshield survey of 16 total buildings in the vicinity of the subject building (**Figure 44**). Surveyed parcels include the surrounding buildings of the 400 block of Battery Street and the buildings on the

east and west faces of Battery Street between California Street (south) and Washington Street (north) in order to determine if a potential extension of the Front-California Conservation District should include the subject property. In addition to the district survey, several comparative examples of other buildings in the neighborhood are noted, which are representative examples of multi-story, brick masonry-constructed industrial/commercial buildings built during the post-fire period. These properties are shown in a map, table, and discussed in greater detail at the end of this section.




Figure 44: Surveyed buildings in vicinity of 447 Battery Street (shaded blue) are outlined in orange.
Source: San Francisco Planning Department, Property Information Map.
Edited by Page & Turnbull.


Inventory

The following inventory for the survey area, organized by side of the block face, includes relevant information from the online San Francisco Property Information Map; Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps; and photographs taken by Page & Turnbull in July 2017.

400 Block of Battery Street

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>1 447 Battery Street (subject property)</p>		<p>APN: 0206/002 Year Built: 1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: A-Historic Resource Present (SF Planning) “1” rating – Rated 0-5 with 1 as lowest architectural rating (Department of City Planning, 1976)</p>
<p>2 423 Washington Street</p>		<p>APN: 0206/019 Year Built: 1983 Style: Postmodern Historic Status: C-No Historic Resource Present / Not Age Eligible</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>3 425 Washington Street and 424 Merchant Street</p>		<p>APN: 0206/014 Year Built: 1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Neoclassical features Historic Status: B – Unknown / Age Eligible</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>4 339-445 Washington Street and 440 Merchant Street</p>		<p>APN: 0206/013 Year Built: 1907 Style: Commercial/Industrial with Italian Renaissance Revival features Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age- Eligible</p>
<p>5 530 Sansome Street</p>		<p>APN: 0206/017 Year Built: 1975 Style: Brutalist Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age- Eligible</p>

Battery Street – Between Washington Street and California Street

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p style="text-align: center;">6 444 Battery Street (Parking garage of One Maritime Plaza)</p>		<p>APN: 0204/019 Year Built: 1967 Style: International Style Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">7 425 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0206/025 Year Built: 2000* Style: Vernacular with Edwardian façade features Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible (requires updating on PIM)</p> <p>* Date of construction not listed in Property Information Map; date taken from building permits for demolition and new construction</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
8 365 Battery Street	 The photograph section contains three images of a tall, modern building. The top image shows a street-level view of the building's base, featuring a dark, possibly glass-enclosed ground floor and a white car parked on the street. The middle image is a low-angle shot looking up at the building's facade, which has a repeating pattern of balconies and windows. The bottom image is another low-angle shot, showing the building's verticality against a clear blue sky.	APN: 0229/020 Year Built: 1989 Style: Neofuturist Historic Status: C – No Historic Resources Present / Not Age Eligible

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p style="text-align: center;">9 361 Battery Street (Embarcadero Center 1 Podium)</p>		<p>APN: 0230/028 Year Built: 1970 Style: Late Modern Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">10 334 Battery Street (Embarcadero Center 1 Tower and Garage)</p>		<p>APN: 0230/028 Year Built: 1970 Style: Late Modern Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>11 322 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0229/003 Year Built: 1919; 1989 Style: Greek Revival Historic Status: A – Historic Resource Present</p> <p>Planning App. No: 2004.0943E Date: 7/1/2016 Decision: A – Historic Resources Present</p>
<p>12 292 Battery Street and 353 Sacramento Street (tower portion connected at interior to 292 Battery Street)</p>		<p>APN: 0237/015 Year Built: 1922 and 1982 (tower) Style: Classical Revival and Postmodern, respectively Historic Status: B-Unknown/Age-Eligible and C- Not Age Eligible, respectively</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>13 275 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0238/001 Year Built: 1988* Style: Late Modern Historic Status: Listing for this parcel in the Property Information Map is for 241 Battery Street (the Eastman Kodak building)</p> <p>* Date of construction not listed in Property Information Map; date taken from building permits for new construction</p>
<p>14 220 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0237/013 Year Built: 1913 Style: Vernacular with commercial/industrial features Historic Status: A – Historic Resources Present*</p> <p>*A contributor to the Front-California Conservation District</p>

Address	Photograph	Property Information
<p>15 215 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0237/011 Year Built: 1910 Style: Neoclassical Historic Status: A – Historic Resources Present*</p> <p>*A contributor to the Front-California Conservation District</p>
<p>16 211 Battery Street</p>		<p>APN: 0238/002 Year Built: 1946 Style: Modern Historic Status: C – No Historic Resources Present / Not Age Eligible</p>

Conservation District Discussion

Construction Dates & Alterations

The buildings in the survey area were built during a wide range of construction periods, between 1907 and early 2000s. Based on information available in San Francisco’s Property Information database, including available permits, seven buildings were constructed within the early twentieth century (1907-1922) or (41%), five buildings during the mid-twentieth century (1946-1970) or (29%), and four buildings during the late twentieth century (1983-c.2000) or (24%). Though about half of the properties were constructed during the period of reconstruction following the earthquake, several appear to have been significantly altered, including 220 and 292 Battery streets, while the other half dates from a wide range of periods in the second half of the twentieth century, resulting in the neighborhood’s lack of architectural cohesion and compromised integrity of setting.

Building Types & Massing

Buildings within the survey area are mostly commercial office buildings exhibiting a range of heights, styles, and massing. The earliest buildings within the surveyed area are smaller scale with rectilinear footprints, and feature stores or restaurants at the street level with office space on the upper stories. Mid- and late-twentieth century buildings are mostly high-rise and modern office towers with lobbies, restaurants, or retail at the street level. Massing styles vary, though most are rectilinear on large half or full block parcels.

Architectural Styles

As mentioned, approximately half of the buildings within the survey area were originally constructed between 1907 and 1922, which spans the period of reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake and fires. These buildings are typically constructed of brick masonry and exhibit a variety of Classical Revival styles that were prominent between the 1880s and 1930. The mid-century buildings, including 211 Battery, 334-444 Battery, 530 Sansome, and 361 Battery streets, feature several common architectural styles of the time, including International Style, Modern, Brutalist, and Late Modern, respectively. The later buildings, including 275 Battery, 292 Battery, and 365 Battery, largely feature a variety of popular design styles of those decades, including Late Modern, Postmodern, and Neofuturist, respectively. This results in a relatively heterogeneous stylistic inventory of buildings in the survey area, which spans ten decades of development (1907- 2000). Despite small clusters of similar age/style buildings, such as that of the subject block, there are not enough of the same type or style to exhibit an overall sense of architectural cohesion in terms of shared chronology and character-defining features.

Conservation District Analysis

Potential Contributors to the Front-California Conservation District

Based on this windshield survey of the east and west faces of Battery Street between California and Washington streets, there appear to be a cluster of similar masonry-constructed, post-fire reconstruction era buildings (1907-1913) that are not already contributors to the Front-California Conservation District: two buildings west-adjacent of the subject property (425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street) and one building on the south-adjacent block (432 Clay Street). Despite the similar construction era, scale, and Category 'B' (age-eligible) rating, these buildings neither appear sufficiently visually cohesive with the nearby district or with each other, nor representative of the building typology and era of construction to warrant an expansion of the existing Conservation District, or eligibility to form their own historic district inclusive of the subject property. While 292 Battery Street's corner Neoclassical-style portion fits within the period of construction of the Conservation District and is located on the north-adjacent block, the intervening modern tower has significantly compromised the integrity of design and setting of this building such that it also does not appear visually connected with the nearby district. Similarly, the late redevelopment-era building at 322 Battery Street (1919) is visually disconnected from the Conservation District and thus does not appear to be eligible as a contributor to this coherent entity. Moreover, its Greek Revival design and stone cladding does not align with the character-defining features of the Front-California Conservation District.

Similarly, while the subject property's historic use and massing fit the criteria of the Front-California Conservation District, the contributing buildings of the district were generally larger in scale and many were constructed more slowly, not reaching completion until the 1930s. Unlike the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, this district spans a couple blocks along Front Street; however, one of the character-defining features of the district is maintaining the "coherent entity of the district". As a result, 447 Battery Street does not appear to be an eligible contributor to the district due to several blocks of intervening modern redevelopment, such that the physical connection with the Conservation District no longer exists and therefore, the property is not directly associated with the coherent entity of the Front-California Conservation District.

447 Battery Street as a Contributor to the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District

447 Battery Street lies just outside the eastern boundary of the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District. Although the subject building's date, scale, and historic use as a coffee roastery and wholesale supplier align with the building type and variety of commercial uses of the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District's contributors, the primary features of this district are its

orientation around one street intersection and a relatively high level of architectural merit exhibited by the buildings. Therefore, the subject property would not be considered an eligible contributor to this district given its two-and-one-half block distance from the intersection and pedestrian alleyway, as well as its compromised integrity of design and setting, and relatively lower level of architectural merit.

Therefore, although 447 Battery Street still retains its original scale, massing, structure, and fenestration pattern, and was likewise constructed in the post-earthquake period, the building is surrounded by substantial intervening modern development and is not close enough to either of the nearby Conservation Districts to warrant its inclusion in either district.

VII. CONCLUSION

Constructed in 1907, 447 Battery Street was built on the site of former commercial and warehouse properties following the 1906 earthquake and fires in San Francisco on the western edge of the city's produce market district. The first tenant of the building was a small coffee roastery and coffee, tea, and spice wholesale company, called the Jones-Thierbach Co. by 1912. The company operated at this property for nearly sixty years, vacating the property in 1966. Though the building does maintain some associations with the post-fire period of reconstruction, the produce market district, and the redevelopment of the city's coffee wholesale industry, 447 Battery Street does not appear to be particularly representative of these periods, events, or design typology to the extent that it should be found to be individually significant under Criteria 1 or 3. Furthermore, while the company's namesakes, M.P. Jones, Charles Thierbach and his son, George, were fairly well-known and active in the city's coffee industry, they do not appear to have been responsible for particular innovations or advancements in the field, especially in association with the subject property. Thus, 447 Battery Street does not appear to be significant under Criteria 2 and not applicable to D/4.

Though the building was determined in some past surveys to be a known historic resource, new evidence discovered for the purpose of this report has led to a reconsideration of its status as a resource. It has been confirmed that several of the building's original features were removed or replaced without documentation, including the stucco façades and the original wood frame windows of the primary, and most likely, south façades. As a result, 447 Battery Street has significantly compromised integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, and setting due to the removal and haphazard repairs of these original exterior design elements, the complete remodeling of the building interior and conversion of its use from commercial/industrial to office, and the surrounding development of the Financial District. Based on these findings of significance and integrity, 447 Battery Street was found not to be eligible for listing in the California Register. Due to its relatively low level of architectural merit and compromised integrity of design and setting, the building was also not found to be an eligible contributor to a potentially expanded Front-California Conservation District. According to CEQA guidelines, 447 Battery Street should not be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

VIII. REFERENCES CITED

PUBLISHED WORKS

- Brandi, Richard. *A Reevaluation of Urban Renewal in San Francisco* (MA thesis, Goucher College, 2008).
- Corbett, Michael R. and Page, Charles Hall. *Splendid Survivors, San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage* (Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, 1979).
- Corbett, Michael R. *Port City: The History and Transformation of the Port of San Francisco, 1848-2010* (San Francisco: San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 2011).
- Fogelson, Robert M. *Downtown: Its Rise and Fall, 1880-1950*. 3rd Edition. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).
- Hays, Allen R. *The Federal Government & Urban Housing* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012).
- Ken Lastufka, *Redevelopment of Sacramento's West End, 1950-1970: A Historical Overview with an Analysis of the Impact of Relocation* (MA thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1985).
- Page & Turnbull, *Historic Context Statement, South of Market Area*, Prepared for the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, June 2009.
- Page & Turnbull, *Historic Context Statement, Jackson Square*, Internal database, last revised 2016.
- Rand Richards, *Historic San Francisco. A Concise History and Guide* (San Francisco: Heritage House Publishers, 2001).

PUBLIC RECORDS

- Department of City Planning (DCP), San Francisco Architectural Quality Survey, *447 Battery Street, 400-410 Merchant Street* (Block 206/Lot 2), 1976.
- Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, *San Francisco in the 1930s: The WPA Guide to the City by the Bay* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).
- Junior League of San Francisco, *Here Today, San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*, Recorded by Mary Franck in March, 1968. San Francisco Public Library History Room, accessed April 2016.
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for San Francisco County, *447 Battery Street*, 2012.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, San Francisco, California: 1887, 1905, 1913, 1950.
- San Francisco Assessor's Negatives Collection. Battery Street and Jones-Thierbach Co. July 1957. San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.
- San Francisco Department of Public Works Historic Photograph Collection. 447 Battery Street. February 1917 & September 1918. San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.

San Francisco Planning Department, Historic Preservation Commission, *San Francisco Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey and Historic Context*, 1990.

San Francisco Police Records Historic Photograph Archive. Battery Street. March 1956. San Francisco Public Library History Room, Photo Desk.

San Francisco Property Information Map (PIM), *Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co., 431-447 Battery Street*, Assessor's Block 206/Lot 2, Accessed online at <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/> July, 2016.

San Francisco City Directories, California Marriage Index 1960-1985, 1944 California Voters Registration, 1910-1940 U.S. Census, Stanford Yearbook.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

"Christopher Announces His Program," *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 2, 1951.

"Coffee Unit Reelects." *The Salt Lake Tribune*. October 17, 1943.

"Death of M.P. Jones." *San Francisco Call*. September 2, 1899.

Gary Kamiya, "Odd Arch is Last Remnant of Bustling Produce Market Built in 1874," *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 27, 2015.

Lenihan, V.M. "San Francisco Fills Nation's Coffee Cup." *Sausalito News*, Number 12, March 22, 1951.

Moore, Charles C. *Official Catalogue of Exhibitors, Panama-Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco, California*, 1915.

Phyfe, James, *Simmon's Spice Mill, Devoted to the Interests of the Coffee, Tea, and Spice Trades*, Vol. 38, January, 1915.

"Relocation of S.F. Produce Market is Recommended," *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 9, 1953.

The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company. *All About Tea*, William H. Ukers, Editor, Vol. II, 1935.

"Two Large Firms Consolidate." *California Grocers Advocate*, Volume 17, Issues 1-26. 1912.

INTERNET SOURCES

"A Bay Area Coffee History." Shanna Farrell. *Edible East Bay*. February 12, 2016. Available <http://edibleeastbay.com/online-magazine/spring-2016/the-right-blend/> Accessed July 17, 2017.

Ancestry.com, *Charles Frederick Thierbach, 1847 – 1931*. Referencing US Census records and San Francisco city directories. Accessed by ESA on May 24, 2016.

"Coffee" a history of San Francisco coffee from the podcast, Containers. Available <https://medium.com/containers/episode-4-coffee-78ac6571caea> Accessed July 17, 2017.
Also sourced from a book by William H. Ukers, *All About Coffee* published in 1920. New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1922.

“PPIE: The City That Knows How.” Available at <https://sfpl.org/?pg=2000141201>
Accessed July 12, 2017.

“Produce Market.” Available [http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Produce Market](http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Produce_Market)
Accessed July 12, 2017.

“San Francisco’s Coffee History,” *Timeline News in Context*. Available <https://m-staging.timeline.com/stories/san-francisco-coffee> November 2015. Accessed July 17, 2017.

“Thieves’ Highway – Produce Market.” Available at citysleuth@reelsf.com December 3, 2010,
Accessed July 12, 2017.

UC Davis, Special Collections, <http://oac.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/c8d21zvj/?brand=oac4> Accessed
by ESA May, 2016, and www.ebay.com , accessed by ESA May, 2016).

U.S. National Library of Medicine. Case Number #4815 “Misbranding of coffee. U.S. v. The Jones-Thierbach Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Date issued, September 18, 1917. Available at <https://ceb.nlm.nih.gov/fdanj/handle/123456789/39796> Accessed July 17, 2017.

IX. APPENDIX

Appendix
The Ross Kaufman Companies
529 Commercial
Waterfront-Telegraph Hill

HISTORIC-BUILDING DATA SHEET
Junior League of San Francisco, Inc. AREA #3
Section

1. Street and Number *431-447* Block *206* Lot *2* Zoning *C-3* Year Built *1907*

2. Present Owner and/or Occupant *Ostrous Kahn & Kaufman* Present Use _____

3. Interim Owner (s) _____ Interim Use (s) _____

4. Original Owner _____ Original Use _____

5. Architect _____ Builder _____

6. Architecture:
A. Construction Material _____
B. Number Stories *3*
C. Style of Architecture _____
D. Physical Condition
Excellent Fair _____
Good _____ Poor _____
E. Exterior Desecration of Original Design
None or Little _____
Moderate Amount
Considerable _____

F. Notable Features (Continue, Second Sheet)
G. Architectural Significance
as example of its style
Exceptional _____ Fair _____
Excellent _____ Poor _____
Good _____
H. Future
Secure _____ Desperate _____
Holding _____ Unknown _____
Threatened _____

7. Neighborhood Information:
A. Compatibility With Neighborhood
Structure Yes _____ No _____
Use Yes _____ No _____
B. Importance to Neighborhood
Great _____
Moderate _____
Minor _____

C. Architecturally Strong Neighborhood
Entire Block _____
Both Sides of Street _____
Row of Houses _____
Number in Row _____
Comments: _____

8. Historical Information:
A. Significance
National or State _____ Community _____

B. Facts (Continue, Attach Second Sheet)
*reconstruction modernized, keeping only
style - put plate glass windows
on front*

9. Open to Public/Hours _____

10. Special Research Sources
Name/Item _____
Where _____

11. Screening (Date)
Community Consultants: Accept _____
Reject _____
Comments _____

12. Cross Street Reference

13. Number of Photos Attached *1*

14. Surveyor Signature _____

Revised 2/25/64
10/20/64 - 8th Printing



Junior League Property Survey Form for 431-447 Battery Street. Recorded by Mary Franck. 1968.
Page 2. San Francisco Public Library History Room Archives.

street address 447 Battery 400-410 MERCHANT block number 206 lot number 2 summary 1

building type/use/number of floors C-3 landmark number

RELATIONSHIP WITH SURROUNDING BUILDINGS

Relationship of setting to building -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Importance as contribution to a cluster/streetscape -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN VALUATION

Facade proportions -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Richness/Excellence of detailing/decoration -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Unique visual feature of interest 0 1 2 3 4 5

Example of a rare or unusual style or design 0 1 2 3 4 5

Overall architectural quality -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

PROPOSED FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

CORNICE, PARAPET, APPENDAGE

Importance of cornice to building design -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Cornice contribution to streetscape -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

FACADE CONDITION

Physical condition -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Paint/Material color -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

REMODELING

Appropriateness of improvements -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Enger 11-30-76 date

Field Notes

Review Notes

Junior League Listing
 text index file
 Northern California Guide
 Other Listing _____

photo 279-8

F1



Department of City Planning (DCP), San Francisco Architectural Quality Survey, 447 Battery Street, 400-410 Merchant Street (Block 206/Lot 2), 1976.

ARCHITECTURE
PLANNING & RESEARCH
MATERIALS CONSERVATION

www.page-turnbull.com

417 Montgomery Street, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104
415.362.5154 / 415.362.5560 fax

2401 C Street, Suite B
Sacramento, California 95816
916.930.9903 / 916.930.9904 fax

417 S. Hill Street, Suite 211
Los Angeles, California 90013
213.221.1200 / 213.221.1209 fax

Exhibit D



Architectural
Resources Group

Architecture
Planning
Conservation



447 Battery Street Historic Resource Evaluation Peer Review

Prepared for

447 Partners LLC

Prepared by

Architectural Resources Group, Inc.
San Francisco, California

FINAL

June 2017

SAN FRANCISCO

Pier 9, The Embarcadero, Suite 107
San Francisco, California 94111

T: 415.421.1680

F: 415.421.0127

argsf.com

PASADENA

8 Mills Place, 3rd Floor, Suite 300
Pasadena, CA 91105

T: 626.583.1401

F: 626.583.1414

arg-la.com

PORTLAND

111 SW Fifth Avenue, 24th Floor
Portland, OR 97204

T: 971.256.5324

arg-pnw.com



Architectural
Resources Group

447 Battery Street
Historic Resource Evaluation Peer Review
San Francisco, CA

Final – June 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Summary of Findings	1
3. Summary of Historic Resource Evaluation	1
4. Peer Review Findings	3
<i>California Register Evaluation</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>5</i>
5. Conclusion	7

Appendix

Appendix A: Existing Conditions Photographs



1. INTRODUCTION

447 Partners, LLC retained Architectural Resources Group (ARG) to complete a peer review of the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report for the commercial building at 447 Battery Street in San Francisco, California, that was completed by Page & Turnbull on August 19, 2016.¹ The building was designed by an unknown architect, and completed in 1907 at the northwest corner of Battery and Merchant streets (Block 206, Lot 002) in the Financial District. Specifically, ARG reviewed the report's conclusion that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) as an individual resource and as a contributor to a potential historic district or Conservation District designated under Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code.

To complete this peer review, ARG reviewed the HRE report and conducted a site visit of the subject property on May 8, 2017. During the site visit, ARG photographed the building and noted that the condition had not changed since it was recorded by Page & Turnbull in July 2016. Existing conditions photographs of the building are presented in Appendix A. This peer review provides a summary of the California Register evaluation, followed by a discussion of ARG's findings and recommendations for expanding and clarifying the HRE report.

2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on a review of the HRE report completed by Page & Turnbull, ARG concurs that the commercial building at 447 Battery Street is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register due to a lack of integrity. We recommend, however, that the evaluation under Criterion 1 (association with significant events) be expanded to address the building's role in the reconstruction of city following the 1906 earthquake and fires. Even if the revised evaluation concludes that the building is eligible for the California Register for possessing significance under Criterion 1, ARG concurs that the building would not be eligible due to a lack of integrity. Based on a preliminary review of adjacent buildings, we also concur with Page & Turnbull's finding that the building is not eligible as a contributor to a nearby Conservation District or potential historic district. While the Page & Turnbull report is largely thorough and complete, ARG recommends that the document be revised to provide additional context and to clarify select information to support the findings.

3. SUMMARY OF HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

In the August 2016 HRE of the commercial building at 447 Battery Street, Page & Turnbull concluded that the property is not eligible for listing in the California Register due to a lack of significance under the criteria and a lack of integrity. In summary, the building lacked significance under the four California Register criteria as follows:²

- Criterion 1 (Event): While the building was located at the outer edge of San Francisco's produce market district, it lacked multiple public entrances or merchant stalls and an accessible loading dock. This indicates it had a "more insular use, primarily storage or manufacturing, as compared

¹ Page & Turnbull, *447 Battery Street, San Francisco Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), Part 1 [16074], Final*, Prepared for 447 Partners LLC, August 19, 2016.

² *Ibid.*, 25-26.

with other market district buildings.” Therefore, the building does not have a strong association with the produce market district that was rebuilt after the 1906 earthquake and fires.

- Criterion 2 (persons): The building is not associated with persons significant to San Francisco’s market produce district or its citywide history. Its longtime owner from 1907 to 1931, Charles Thierbach of the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Co., was not “known to be particularly original or innovative in the coffee, tea, or spice industries.” Archival research did not reveal information regarding subsequent owners and occupants that indicates they played a significant role in local, state, or national history.
- Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design): The building is not a significant example of a “multi-story, brick masonry-constructed industrial/commercial loft building typical in San Francisco during the post-fire period of redevelopment.” Additionally, its original design has been substantially altered and damaged during repointing and cleaning of the exposed masonry brick. The report concludes that the building “does not appear to be a representative example of a type, period, or method of construction, nor does it feature high artistic merit.”
- Criterion 4 (Information Potential): This criterion is typically applied to archaeological resources and therefore, is not applicable to the subject property.

Additionally, Page & Turnbull concluded that the building lacks integrity due to several modifications, including:

- the removal of the original exterior stucco cladding and cornice on the east and south façades;
- the modification of storefronts on the east façade facing Battery Street and door openings on the south façade facing Merchant Street;
- the replacement of the original wood-sash windows;
- the damage of original masonry material due to sandblasting; and
- the replacement of portions of the original masonry material with new brick, pieces of wood, concrete, and grout.

For these reasons, the building lacks integrity of design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. While the building retains integrity of location as it has not been moved from its original location, its setting has been significantly impacted by the mid-1960s expansion of the Financial District that resulted in adjacent high-rise modern office buildings and the Golden Gateway redevelopment project to immediately to the east.³

Page & Turnbull also completed a cursory examination of the Front-California Downtown Conservation District designated under Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code and a cluster of “similar style buildings further north on Battery between Jackson and Broadway streets” and concluded that the subject property would not be eligible as a contributor to either grouping of buildings. The subject property is a “single building interspersed among several larger buildings on the directly adjacent blocks,

³ Page & Turnbull, *447 Battery Street HRE*, 26-27.

its existence and character are not directly associated with the coherent entity of the [Front-California Downtown Conservation] District.”⁴

4. PEER REVIEW FINDINGS

California Register Evaluation

The following section provides a peer view of Page & Turnbull’s evaluation of the subject property for listing in the California Register as an individual building and as a contributor to a potential historic district.

California Register Criterion 1 [Association with Significant Events]

To be considered eligible for listing under Criterion 1, a property must be associated with one or more events important in a defined historic context. This criterion recognizes properties associated with single events, a pattern of events, repeated activities, or historic trends. The event or trends, however, must clearly be important within the associated context. Further, mere association of the property with historic events or trends is not enough, in and of itself, to qualify under this criterion: the specific association must be considered important as well.⁵

ARG concurs that 447 Battery Street does not possess significance under California Register Criterion 1 due to an association with San Francisco’s produce market district. However, the evaluation under this criterion should be expanded to address the building’s role in reconstructing the city following the 1906 earthquake and fires. In particular, it was built in 1907 during the rapid recovery period that occurred in just a few years after the disastrous event. The post-1906 reconstruction significantly affected in economic and physical development of San Francisco.

California Register Criterion 2 [Association with Significant Persons]

This criterion “applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented.” It identifies properties associated with individuals “whose activities are demonstrably important within a local, State, or national historic context,” and is typically limited to those properties that have the ability to illustrate a person's important achievements.⁶

ARG concurs that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2 for its association with Charles Thierbach. Other than operating a successful business at this location, Charles Thierbach is not known to have played a significant role in the commercial development of San Francisco. As such, the building does not meet the threshold for significance under this criterion.

ARG recommends that the report identify subsequent owners of the coffee company following Thierbach’s death in 1931. ARG assumes that they are likewise not eligible for the California Register under Criterion 2 as they took over the company from the founder and did not substantially expand the business.

⁴ Page & Turnbull, *447 Battery Street HRE*, 28.

⁵ National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, accessed June 16, 2107, http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_6.htm.

⁶ Ibid.

California Register Criterion 3 [Architectural Significance]

This criterion applies to properties that “embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.”⁷ “Distinctive characteristics” are the physical and design features that commonly recur in individual types, periods, or methods of construction. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics to be considered a true representative of a particular style.⁸ A master “is a figure of generally recognized greatness in a field, a known craftsman of consummate skill, or an anonymous craftsman whose work is distinguishable from others by its characteristic style and quality.”⁹

ARG concurs that the subject property is ineligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 primarily as the building’s original features, including its original stucco cladding, entrances, and windows have been removed or replaced. The corbelled cornice has also been significantly damaged through the removal of the stucco. The building is not known to have been designed by a prominent architect and its original design was quite modest with exterior detailing largely limited to a simple corbelled cornice and painted signage. With the removal or damage of the majority of its character-defining features, the building is not significant as a vernacular, early twentieth century commercial building in San Francisco.

ARG recommends expanding the evaluation section under Criterion 3 to state that the building is not known to be associated with a significant architect or builder.

California Register Criterion 4 [Potential to Yield Information]

Criterion 4 is generally applied to archaeological resources, and ARG concurs that it not applicable for this HRE report.

Integrity

ARG concurs that the building lacks integrity for listing in the California Register. As stated above, the building has lost its original cladding, windows, and doors, and its brick construction was not meant to be exposed. As such, the building lacks integrity of design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. ARG also concurs that the building lacks integrity of setting due to the redevelopment of the block to the east as part of the Golden Gateway redevelopment project and continual redevelopment of adjacent parcels over the past several decades.

Potential Historic District

Based on a preliminary review of the subject property’s setting during the site visit and the information presented in the Page & Turnbull HRE report, ARG concurs that it is likely that the building at 447 Battery Street is not a contributor to a nearby Conservation District or potential historic district. This is largely due to the significant redevelopment that has occurred in the surrounding blocks. The subject property and the two adjacent buildings at 425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street (Block 0206, Lot 014) and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street (Block 0206, 013) comprise a small, isolated grouping of post-earthquake and fire reconstruction buildings that do not have a strong physical or visual link with other buildings sharing a similar development context.

⁷ National Park Service, National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, 3, June 16, 2107, <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>.

⁸ National Park Service, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.

⁹ Ibid.

However, we recommend that the discussion of its eligibility as a district contributor be revised as follows:

- The map showing the subject property’s location to nearby conservation districts (Figure 35) is incorrect.¹⁰ The subject property should be located four blocks to the north of its current location in the map and therefore, it is situated almost equidistant from the Front-California and Commercial-Leidesdroff conservation districts. ARG recommends that the report be expanded to address both conservation districts and provide a brief summary of their construction dates and architectural styles to provide more context. It would help underscore the fact that while the buildings were constructed around the same time (ca. 1906-1909), the buildings located within the conservation districts are more ornate and had different functions. Additionally, the subject property does not have a strong physical connection with the conservation districts due to several blocks of intervening redevelopment.
- This section provides the first mention of “similar style buildings further to the north on Battery Street between Jackson and Broadway streets,” yet it does not provide details regarding construction dates, building materials, architectural styles, integrity, and survey ratings. Given that the buildings are also vernacular, brick commercial buildings also constructed ca. 1906-1907, it would make more sense to evaluate their relationship to the subject property.
- ARG also recommends expanding this section to address the two adjacent buildings at 425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street. They are both vernacular brick commercial buildings constructed in 1907 and are Category B buildings with no previous survey ratings. ARG finds that this cluster of three buildings does not form a potential historic district.

Recommendations

In addition to the recommendations to expand the evaluation under the California Register criteria above, ARG has the following suggestions for revising and clarifying other sections of the HRE report:

General Comments

- Enlarge the photographs so that it is easier to compare the building’s original design and current condition. These could be placed in an appendix.
- Provide photographs of adjacent block faces to convey the significant redevelopment that has occurred since the mid-twentieth century.

I. Introduction

- Clarify that a coffee/tea company was located at the property from 1907 to 1966, with the company changing its name in 1911 and continuing to operate until 1966 (p. 1).
- Revise the last sentence to state that the report findings have led to “a different conclusion regarding the significance under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria” (p. 1).

¹⁰ Page & Turnbull, *447 Battery Street HRE*, 28.

II. Current Historic Status

- Clarify when and why the building was recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register (p. 2). Confirm with Planning Department staff that the building's National Register eligibility is correct.
- While the building is not currently listed in the California Register, also state that the building has not been previously evaluated for this register (p. 2).
- Clarify that California Historical Resources Status Code "3S" indicates the building appears to be eligible for the National Register as an individual property through a survey evaluation (p. 2). Category 3 buildings do not require additional research or evaluation. Also, update the description of the seven categories accordingly.
- Add a citation for the Unreinforced Masonry Building (UMB) survey (p. 4).
- Confirm the rationale behind the Category A resource designation rather than conjecturing; San Francisco Planning staff can confirm the accuracy of its categorization (p. 4).

III. Architectural Description

- Under "Downtown San Francisco," provide a summary of construction dates of adjacent buildings and note the two adjacent post-reconstruction buildings at 425 Washington Street/424 Merchant Street and 339-445 Washington Street/440 Merchant Street (p. 5). Also mention the proximity to other post-reconstruction commercial buildings to the north on Battery Street between Jackson and Broadway streets.
- Under "Exterior of 447 Battery Street," clarify that the "stepped, triple-course of brick" is a remnant of the original cornice (p. 6). It appears that it was not entirely removed but heavily damaged when the stucco was removed. Clarify this throughout the report.
- Under "Interior of 447 Battery Street," add relevant interior photographs and update the figure number (p. 9).

IV. Historic Context

- For the historic context presented on pages 10-14, add references to the subject property to indicate how it relates to the various contexts. ARG recommends significantly expanding the context on the post-1906 reconstruction in San Francisco and adding a section on the history of the coffee company and a biography on Thierbach. The postwar urban renewal section could also be condensed as this primarily impacts the building's setting. Lastly, ARG recommends adding a short section on the continual redevelopment over the past several decades as has directly affected the subject property's block, creating an isolated cluster of post-earthquake reconstruction buildings. These revisions will help tie together the historic context (pages 10-14), "Project Site History" summary (pages 15-18), and "Owners and Occupants" summary (pages 22-24), which are currently disjointed. ARG recommends providing the bulk of the information on the building and its owners and occupants in the historic context and summarizing relevant information in subsequent sections.
- Under "Growth of Downtown San Francisco," expand the architectural history of the post-earthquake reconstruction of San Francisco (p. 11). Mention the proximity of other reconstruction buildings, including the two adjacent buildings already mentioned and the

commercial building to the south at 432 Clay Street (Block 0206, Lot 006), which was built in 1912. Also, discuss the commercial brick buildings on Battery Street to the north.

- Under “Project Site History,” mention the two adjacent 1907 buildings in the paragraph on page 16.
- Under “Project Site History,” clarify that the coffee company’s tenancy begins in 1907 and clarify this throughout the report (see page 22). Thierbach operated a coffee/tea import business as early as 1907 but that the company changed names when he took on a partner in 1911.
- Under “Owners and Occupants,” expand the statement that “coffee manufacturing was one of San Francisco’s earliest and most profitable industries” (p. 23). Add this information to the historic context and cite the source for this statement.
- Provide more information on Randal & Jones in the historic context, since this is the first time mentioning the firm (p. 23).
- Identify other people who may have been involved in the company, such as who took over the company when Thierbach died in 1931 (p. 24).
- Identify people associated with the Recording and Statistical Co. as its association with the subject property is over 45 years old (p. 23-24).

5. CONCLUSION

ARG concurs with the findings in the Page & Turnbull HRE report that the commercial building at 447 Battery Street is not eligible for listing in the California Register due to a lack of integrity. The subject property also does not appear to be eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district or nearby Conservation District due to intervening redevelopment that has left 447 Battery Street and the two adjacent 1907 buildings as an isolated cluster with no physical or visual connection to buildings sharing a similar development context. As delineated in Section 4, ARG recommends expanding and clarifying the California Register evaluation and other sections in the HRE in order to substantiate the findings.

Appendix A: Existing Conditions Photographs





East and south façades, view northwest (ARG, May 2017)



East façade, view west (ARG, May 2017)




Detail of the first story on the east façade, view south (ARG, May 2017)



Detail of the windows on the second and third stories on the east façade (ARG, May 2017)



South façade, view northwest (ARG, May 2017)



Detail of the entrances on the south façade, view north
(ARG, May 2017)



Detail of the third story on the south façade (ARG, May 2017)

Exhibit E



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

Date July 31, 2020
Case No.: 2014-1036ENV
Project Address: 447 Battery Street
Zoning: C-3-O (Downtown Office)
 200-S Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0206/002
Date of Review: December 18, 2017 (Part 1)
 July 31, 2020 (Part 2)
Staff Contact: Rachel Schuett (Environmental Planner)
 (415) 575-9030
rachel.schuett@sfgov.org
 Jørgen G. Cleemann (Preservation Planner)
 (415) 575-8763
jorgen.cleemann@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
 Suite 400
 San Francisco,
 CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
 Information:
415.558.6377

PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

Proposed Project Demolition Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: _____ 7/1/2020 _____

Part 1 Summary

In the Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 1 (dated December 18, 2017), Planning staff determined that the existing three-story, brick-clad building at 447 Battery Street is eligible for individual listing in California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1, for its associations with post-1906 reconstruction and the historically significant San Francisco coffee industry, and under Criterion 3, as a notable example of the early 20th century store-and-warehouse building type. The period of significance is 1907-1967.

Part 2 Revision

The current document is a revision of an earlier Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 2 (dated September 20, 2019) that was prepared by Planning staff. The HRER Part 2 has been revised to reflect the current project design and to incorporate an expanded analysis under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The determination from the original HRER Part 2—that the project will result in an impact to the individually eligible historic resource at 447 Battery—has not changed.

Project Description

The project proposes to demolish the existing building and construct a new 18-story hotel building. The new building will be clad in stone, glass, and metal and will rise out of the retained street facades of the existing building.

Project Evaluation

If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.

Subject Property/Historic Resource:

- The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
- The project will cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:

- The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.
- The project will cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

Under CEQA, a project that conforms to all of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) benefits from the presumption that it will not result in an impact to historic architectural resources (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(3)). If a project fails to meet the Standards, then it must be analyzed further to determine if the project will "materially impair" the significance of a historic resource. Material impairment occurs when a project "[d]emolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources" (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(2)(B)).

Staff finds that the proposed project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and would result in a significant adverse impact to historic resources.

The project does not meet the following Standards:

Standard 1. *A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*

The project proposes to construct a new hotel building on the project site. In order to do so, the north and west exterior walls will be removed, openings will be created in the partially retained street facades, and a large new building will be constructed on the site. Although the proposed project will retain some character-defining features, the conversion to hotel use will result in the removal of most of the building's exterior walls and entire roof and internal structure, effectively negating its status as a building. Furthermore, the size, scale, and architectural character of the new construction will fundamentally alter the physical appearance of the historic resource's site and environment. Therefore, the proposed project does not meet Standard 1.

Standard 2. *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

The project proposes to remove large sections of the facade at the ground story of the south facade in order to allow for the installation of two storefronts, an exit door, and a loading bay. On the ground story of the east facade, the sill would be removed from the central display window. The building's roof and entire internal structure—including all walls, vertical supports, and floor plates—would be removed in order to allow for excavation and new construction. Although the interior does not contribute to the building's historic significance, the complete removal of the interior, along with the roof, effectively negates the property's status as a building, which is integral to its historic significance. Because the proposed project would remove 100 percent of the internal structure and floor plates, Preservation staff has determined that the amount of removal of interior elements is sufficiently large to meet a standard definition of demolition. Finally, because the existing building's 3-story height has been identified as a character-defining feature, the proposal to construct a new 18-story building will damage the historic character that is tied to the building's existing massing and scale. In sum, the proposal to undertake substantial facade removal, demolition, and a drastic change in massing and scale does not meet Standard 2.

Standard 5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*

As noted, the proposed project will effectively demolish the subject building by removing most of its exterior walls, roof, and entire internal structure. Although some character-defining features on the street facades would be retained, they would no longer be able to convey their full historic significance due to the loss of the building itself. Furthermore, by constructing a large new building within the footprint of the historic building, the proposed project would fail to preserve the subject building's character-defining three-story height. Therefore, the proposed project does not meet Standard 5.

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

The project proposes to construct an 18-story tower that will rise out of the existing building's retained facades. This construction necessitates the demolition of the subject building's entire internal structure (see Standard 2 above). When completed, the new construction will read as a 15-story addition to an existing building. Although the new construction will be differentiated from the old through the use of modern cladding materials, window configurations, and a two-story setback "hyphen" over the existing building; and although the new construction will gesture toward the historic building through the use of masonry materials and a design that abstractly references brick construction; overall, the size, scale and proportion, and massing of the new construction is too large to be considered compatible under Standard 9. According to the *Preservation Brief 14*, a publication of the National Park Service that provides guidance on designing compatible and appropriate exterior additions to historic buildings, a "new addition

should be smaller than the historic building—it should be subordinate in both size and design to the historic building.”¹ Referring specifically to rooftop additions, *Preservation Brief 14* states, “Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height.”² Because it is not subordinate in size to the historic building, and because it far exceeds the one-story standard for rooftop additions, the new construction proposed in this project does not meet Standard 9.

Standard 10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

If the new construction were removed in the future, the only remnants of the historic building would be the retained facades. Because no interior elements would remain and sections of the south façade would have been removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would be impaired.

In sum, the proposed project would not meet Standards 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10. Additionally, it is staff’s determination that the project would result in a material impairment to the historic resource. Because the project would essentially negate the property’s status as a building through the demolition of sections of the façade, the entire roof, and internal structure, and because the new construction would be incompatible in size and scale and would overwhelm the remnants of the historic building, Preservation staff has determined that the proposed project would result in a material impairment to the individually-eligible historic resource at 447 Battery Street.

Impacts to Offsite Historic Resources

The subject property’s setting is characterized by a diversity of building types and styles constructed at various points throughout the twentieth century. Due to the highly compromised integrity of the subject property’s historic setting, the project is not expected to have an impact on offsite historic resources.

EIR and Mitigation Measures

Because the project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historic resource, CEQA requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in order to disclose impacts, evaluate alternatives, and describe required mitigation measures. Mitigation measures related to impacts to historic architectural resources for this project will likely include the following:

- Documentation: Documentation typically includes Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level architectural photography, measured drawings, and a historical narrative, as well as video recordation and the preparation of a print-on-demand softcover booklet containing the relevant historical documentation in an easily accessible format.
- Interpretation: The sponsor will be required to develop an interpretive program for the purpose of communicating the subject building’s historic significance to the general public. Examples of

¹ Anne E. Grimmer and Kay D. Weeks, *Preservation Brief 14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns*, National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, <https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/14-exterior-additions.htm>, accessed 21 August 2019.

² Ibid.

interpretive materials include publicly accessible building signage, multimedia displays, walking tour itineraries, and interactive websites.

The final mitigation measures will be included in the Environmental Impact Report. Planning staff notes that while these and other mitigation measures may reduce the impact of the proposed project, they will not reduce it to a less than significant level. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

PART II: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: Allison Vanderslice
Allison Vanderslice, *Principal Preservation Planner*

Date: 8/13/2020

cc: Rachel Schuett, Environmental Planner
Christy Alexander, Project Planner



Figure 1. 447 Battery Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Street View.

Exhibit F



November 6, 2020

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: **447 Battery Street Draft EIR**
Planning Department File No. 2014.1036ENV

Dear Ms. Gibson,

On November 4, 2020, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held a public hearing and took public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed 447 Battery Street project (2014.1036ENV). After discussion, the HPC arrived at the following comments regarding the DEIR:

- The HPC found the DEIR to be adequate and accurate, and concurred with the analysis presented in the DEIR concerning historic resources.
- The HPC expressed various viewpoints regarding the preservation alternatives. The HPC acknowledged the challenge of developing a viable partial preservation alternative for “retained elements” project like this one, in which the project itself resembles what might be presented as a partial preservation alternative for a project that does not retain historical elements. In this case, the HPC noted that the partial preservation alternative successfully incorporates the HPC’s previous comments. Ultimately, the HPC agreed that the DEIR analyzed an appropriate range of preservation alternatives to address historic resource impacts, and thus satisfied the expectations outlined in HPC Resolution No. 0746 and CEQA requirements.
- Although it may not affect the content of this particular document, the HPC requested that the EIR preparation process be studied and revised as necessary in order to address, incorporate, and promote racial and social equity.

Regarding the proposed project, the HPC provided the following comments:

- The HPC was generally supportive of the proposed project and satisfied with the design of the new

building.

- Commissioner Hyland recommended that the new windows that are to be installed in the existing window openings of the retained facades be historically appropriate and modeled after the windows that were originally installed.
- Commissioner Hyland praised the design of the recessed vertical hyphen stories, noting that this feature allows for a successful transition between the retained historic facades and the contemporary design of the upper stories.
- Commissioner So was concerned that the stepped-back upper stories above the cornice element of the proposed project do not relate successfully to the lower stories and recommended that the sponsor explore design revisions that better integrated these upper stories into the larger design.

The HPC appreciates the opportunity to participate in review of this environmental document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Hyland', written over a circular stamp or seal.

Aaron Hyland, President
Historic Preservation Commission

Exhibit G

1 [Initiating Landmark Designation - Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building - 447 Battery
2 Street]

3 **Resolution initiating landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code for**
4 **the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building at 447 Battery Street.**

5

6 WHEREAS, Under Planning Code, Section 1004.1, the Board of Supervisors (Board)
7 may by Resolution initiate landmark designation; and

8 WHEREAS, The existing building at 447 Battery Street was constructed in 1907 at its
9 current location in the present-day Financial District, an area of San Francisco that was
10 largely industrial and commercial in character around the turn of the twentieth century and
11 effectively leveled by the earthquake and fires that devastated much of San Francisco in
12 1906; and

13 WHEREAS, Following the 1906 earthquake disaster, members of San Francisco's
14 political and business spheres raced to rebuild areas within and adjacent to downtown San
15 Francisco, including the existing building at 447 Battery Street; and

16 WHEREAS, Upon its construction, the existing building at 447 Battery Street expressed
17 the relatively straightforward design of an industrial warehouse, with a minimal level of
18 external architectural ornamentation, which was limited to the evenly spaced bands of
19 segmental arched windows at the Battery Street and Merchant Street facades as well as the
20 simple belt courses that spanned these same facades between the third story and the
21 roofline; and

22 WHEREAS, The firm that initially occupied the subject building upon its construction in
23 1907 was Thierbach and Company, a medium-sized, San Francisco-based coffee roasting
24 and wholesaling company led by Charles Frederick Thierbach, which changed its name to the
25 Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company when Michael P. Jones joined the firm in 1912; and

1 WHEREAS, The Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company contributed to the active local
2 coffee industry in San Francisco, which represented a significant commercial sector in San
3 Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the
4 twentieth century; and

5 WHEREAS, The design of the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company is attributed to Frank
6 S. Van Trees, a classically trained Bay Area architect who was responsible for works
7 elsewhere in San Francisco, whose simplified architectural scheme at 447 Battery Street
8 aligned with the building’s utilitarian warehouse function; and

9 WHEREAS, The setting of the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building experienced
10 a substantial shift in character during the post-World War II period, when the San Francisco
11 Redevelopment Agency pushed forward plans to demolish a large portion of the city’s
12 produce market district – located near the waterfront immediately east of the subject building
13 – and construct the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project; and

14 WHEREAS, The trend toward urban development in support of commercial and
15 financial firms displaced a number of the remaining industrial and warehousing businesses
16 near the waterfront north of Market Street; and

17 WHEREAS, The building at 447 Battery Street is a relic of the industrial and mercantile
18 history of San Francisco and illustrative of the massive efforts to reconstruct downtown San
19 Francisco following the widespread destruction caused by the 1906 earthquake and fires; and

20 WHEREAS, The building at 447 Battery Street survived Redevelopment and was later
21 surveyed and listed in the 1968 book *Here Today: San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage*,
22 which was subsequently adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors through
23 Resolution No. 268-70, and therefore qualifies as an official local historical register under
24 CEQA; and

25

1 WHEREAS, The building at 447 Battery Street has historical significance to San
2 Francisco's coffee industry and is the only building known to remain in the industry's hub north
3 of Market Street that was used for coffee roasting and warehousing, and stands as a
4 significant built-environment remnant that signifies San Francisco's economy and urban form
5 during the first half of the twentieth century; and

6 WHEREAS, The building at 447 Battery Street is architecturally significant because of
7 its status as a rare remaining example of a brick commercial building and warehouse in the
8 present-day Financial District and shares a historic context and many architectural
9 characteristics with contributors to surrounding historic districts including the Jackson Square
10 Landmark District, the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, and the Front-California
11 Conservation District, each of which represents an intact collection of post-1906 commercial
12 buildings that remain embedded within a more recent urban fabric; now, therefore, be it

13 RESOLVED, That the Board hereby initiates landmark designation of the intact Jones-
14 Thierbach Coffee Company located at 447 Battery Street; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board requests that the Planning Department
16 prepare a Landmark Designation Report to submit to the Historic Preservation Commission
17 for its consideration of the special historical, architectural, and aesthetic interest and value of
18 the existing building at 447 Battery Street; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board requests that the Historic Preservation
20 Commission consider whether the existing building at 447 Battery Street warrants landmark
21 designation, and submit its recommendation to the Board according to Article 10 of the
22 Planning Code.



City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Resolution

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

File Number: 201298

Date Passed: January 12, 2021

Resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code for the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building at 447 Battery Street.

January 04, 2021 Land Use and Transportation Committee - RECOMMENDED

January 12, 2021 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani and Walton

File No. 201298




I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 1/12/2021 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

London N. Breed
Mayor

Date Approved

Exhibit H







LANDMARK RESOLUTION RECOMMENDATION RESOLUTION NO. 1196

HEARING DATE: AUGUST 4, 2021

Record No.: 2021-002874DES
Project Address: 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building)
Zoning: C-3-O (Downtown-Office)
200-S Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0206/002
Project Sponsor: Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Property Owner: Montgomery Realty Group, Inc.
447 Battery Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Staff Contact: Pilar LaValley 628-652-7372
pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org

RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF 447 BATTERY STREET (AKA JONES-THIERBACH COFFEE COMPANY BUILDING), ASSESSOR'S PARCEL BLOCK NO. 0206, LOT NO. 002, AS LANDMARK NO. XXX CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES AND STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 10.

1. WHEREAS, on November 10, 2020, Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Resolution under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File No. 201298 to initiate the Landmark designation process for 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002; and
2. WHEREAS, on January 4, 2021, the Board of Supervisors at its Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting recommended unanimously to recommend to the full Board approval of the Resolution to initiate Landmark Designation (Board File No. 201298); and
3. WHEREAS, on January 12, 2021, the Board voted unanimously to adopt the Resolution to initiate Landmark Designation, and on January 22, 2021 with the Mayor's signature, Resolution No. 009-21 became effective (Board File No. 201298); and
4. WHEREAS, Department Staff, who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards,

prepared the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet for 447 Battery Street, which was reviewed for accuracy and conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10; and

5. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of August 4, 2021, reviewed Department staff's analysis of 447 Battery Street's historical significance pursuant to Article 10 as part of the Landmark Designation Executive Summary dated July 28, 2021, and recommended Landmark designation with modifications through this Resolution; and
6. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that the nomination of 447 Battery Street as a Landmark is in the form prescribed by the Historic Preservation Commission and contains supporting historic, architectural, and/or cultural documentation; and
7. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that 447 Battery Street is eligible for local designation for its association with the San Francisco coffee industry, an important commercial sector in San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century, and with reconstruction of downtown San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake and fires; and
8. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that designation of 447 Battery Street for its architectural significance as a surviving example of the brick store-and-warehouse type is not appropriate as it does not appear to be a particularly representative or historically significant example of this building type nor does it appear to retain sufficient physical integrity to convey this significance; and
9. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that 447 Battery Street meets the eligibility requirements of Section 1004 of the Planning Code and warrants consideration for Article 10 landmark designation; and
10. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that the boundaries and the list of character-defining features considered for preservation under the proposed landmark designation as they relate to 447 Battery Street's historical significance, as identified in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet and draft Ordinance, should be amended to remove the building's three-story height and rectangular footprint as a character-defining feature; and
11. WHEREAS, the proposed designation is consistent with the General Plan priority policies pursuant to Planning Code, Section 101.1 and furthers Priority Policy No. 7, which states that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved, and will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302; and
12. WHEREAS, the Department has determined that landmark designation is exempt from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15308 (Class Eight - Categorical); and,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Historic Preservation Commission hereby recommends to the Board of Supervisors approval of landmark designation of 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, consistent with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on August 4, 2021.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Black, Foley, Johns, So, Matsuda

NOES: Nageswaran

RECUSED: Wright

ADOPTED: August 4, 2021



447 BATTERY STREET (JONES-THIERBACH COFFEE CO.) LANDMARK DESIGNATION (BOS FILE NO. 211021)

NOVEMBER 15, 2021
BOS – LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Source: Google Streetview

M. Pilar LaValley, LEED AP
Senior Preservation Planner
pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org



San Francisco
Planning




Above: Detail of upper story windows at Battery Street, 2017

Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc.

Right: Battery Street elevation, 2017

Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc.





Above: Detail of windows and damaged brick corbelling at Merchant Street elevation, 2017
Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc.

Left: Merchant Street elevation, 2017
Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc.



THANK YOU



M. Pilar LaValley, LEED AP
Senior Preservation Planner
pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org

**San Francisco
Planning**

www.sfplanning.org

Battery Street elevation, 1957

Source: San Francisco Office of Assessor, Record Photographs, San Francisco Public Library

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

601 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone (415) 956-8100
Facsimile (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

November 12, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

Re: 447 Battery Street Landmark Designation (Case No. 2021-002874DES)

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Melgar, and Preston:

Our office represents 447 Partners, LLC, owner of the property located at 447 Battery Street that is the subject of the proposed landmark designation. The property owners do not agree that the property constitutes a landmark. Multiple historic preservationists have determined that past development at the site has significantly altered the original architectural features and the building no longer retains its historic integrity, findings that were confirmed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) in its review of the proposed landmark designation. Moreover, a landmark designation is unnecessary because over the last seven years the owners have undergone extensive environmental review to develop a hotel at the site and all potential impacts to historic resources were thoroughly evaluated during that process. The owners have created a thoughtfully designed project that preserves any of the marginal architectural features that remain intact, such as the brick façade, and HPC determined that the design successfully preserves any remaining historic features. Finally, if the Committee does determine that the property should be landmarked, the owners request that the Committee adopt the designation as recommended by HPC without the addition of any character-defining features because the designation as originally proposed would prevent any economic use of the building.

1. The Property does not Constitute a Landmark

Article 10 of the Planning Code contains general, vague language about the protection of significant historical sites, but does not actually contain any specific criteria for identifying or evaluating historic resources. As a result of the lack of any criteria in Article 10, the City has largely utilized the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and

Historic Preservation” and the California Register of Historical Resources criteria as guidance when evaluating potential landmarks.

The owners of 447 Battery first proposed a hotel project at the site in 2014 and that project has undergone seven years of extensive review. A Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) was completed by preservation architects Page & Turnbull, and that HRE was peer reviewed by preservation architects Architectural Resources Group. Both the HRE and peer review concluded that the Property should *not be considered a historic resource at all*. The Planning Department disagreed and concluded that the property was a minor historic resource for purposes of CEQA, but at no point over the last seven years did the Planning Department identify the property as a landmark. The Project was reviewed twice by HPC, once to develop potential project alternatives and once to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and at no point did HPC identify the Property as a potential landmark.

Even though two independent consultants, the Planning Department, and HPC studied the property extensively and did not identify it as a potential landmark, landmark legislation was introduced in November 2020. Due to the long historic resource review process that had already been completed, the property owners have difficulty understanding the justification for the introduction of a landmark designation, particularly because Article 10 does not provide any standards for the introduction of a landmark designation. HPC Commissioners were equally confused during their review of the landmark designation, with Commissioner So stating she had “questions why we are here” and that a landmark designation seemed “excessive.” Commissioner Johns similarly expressed hesitation because the question of historic preservation “has already been decided.”

Considering the criteria in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the California Register of Historical Resources that the City typically uses as guidance when evaluating potential landmarks, 447 Battery does not meet the criteria to be designated a landmark. The four criteria typically considered by the City are Criterion 1 (event); Criterion 2 (persons); Criterion 3 (architecture/design); and Criterion 4 (information potential, typically archeological resources). The landmark legislation as originally introduced identified Criterion 1 (event) and Criterion 3 (architecture/design) as potential reasons to designate 447 Battery as a landmark.

Criterion 1 examines whether a property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The HRE and peer review found that the building at 447 Battery Street is associated with the produce market district but lacks any of the characteristics typically associated with the district, such as open merchant stalls or street level loading areas. The building housed the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company and is associated with the San Francisco coffee industry, but most coffee roasters were located along California Street in the Financial District. There are no records to indicate that the company was known to be particularly unique or innovative in the coffee industry, with almost no record of the company at all past the 1920s. Both the HRE and peer review found that the building was not particularly representative of the coffee industry and lacks significance in association with the industry.

Criterion 3 examines whether a property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, and/or represents the work of a master. The HRE and peer review found that while 447 Battery is an example of a brick masonry industrial building, the building lacks any distinctive characteristics such as refined brickwork, arched openings, highly decorative cornices, beltlines, dentils, and pilasters on the façades. Moreover, the property is not a noteworthy example of its building typology due to the extensive past alterations that occurred, such as the removal of the original stucco and paint, damage to the cornice, sandblasting and replacement of some of the original brickwork, doorway alterations on the Merchant Street façade, and removal of original wood frame windows.

HPC focused in particular on the extensive alterations that have occurred at the building as a reason not to landmark the building. Commissioner Nageswaren commented on her experience with that damage this cause to historic buildings that have been sandblasted, explaining that she “hesitates to landmark a building” that has been so extensively sandblasted. In discussing the architectural features of 447 Battery, Commissioner Johns noted that “as a physical thing, its been completely stripped.” As a result, HPC did not support criterion 3 as a reason to landmark the Property.

This situation is similar to the analysis of the properties right next door to 447 Battery, 425 Washington and 439-445 Washington, which the City just approved for complete demolition. Those buildings were also originally built in 1906; also retain some original façade and brickwork on Merchant Street; also exemplify the simple industrial design of the post-1906

earthquake reconstruction era; and, unlike 447 Battery, are associated with the wholesale produce industry that was a significant and important part of the financial district's history. However, due to past alterations and a lack of lasting contributions to the industry, the City approved the complete demolition of these properties. (See William Kostura, *HRE of 425 and 439-445 Washington Street*, May 2017; San Francisco Planning Department, *HRE Response for 425 and 439-445 Washington Street*, February 11, 2018.) Given the lack of concern with the loss of two similarly situated buildings right next door to 447 Battery, there does not appear to be consistently applied criterion for when the City determines whether a building constitutes a landmark.

In sum, the Property has been fully evaluated by every department with expertise in historic preservation and at no time has the property been identified as a potential landmark. The building is not particularly representative and lacks significance in association with the coffee industry and is not an architecturally unique building that has undergone significant alterations since originally constructed. The building does not meet the criteria for landmark designation.

2. A Landmark Designation of the Property is Unnecessary

The core purpose of Article 10 landmark designation is to ensure the “protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of structures” and prevent their unnecessary destruction. As explained above, the owners have embarked on a seven-year process to redevelop the site as a hotel. The project proposes to retain the existing public facing façades on Battery and Merchant Streets, and transition to a modern hotel building with significant step backs that separate the addition from the original façade below. In addition to the hotel itself, the project proposes a voluntary revitalization of the full block of Merchant Street between Battery Street and Sansome Street into a pedestrian-friendly, landscaped, shared street.

A Draft EIR for the project has been published and the project was reviewed twice by HPC, once to develop potential project alternatives and once to review the Draft EIR. HPC was supportive of the project and determined that the design successfully preserves the main remaining historic features, namely the remaining brick façade and cornice. During review of the landmark designation, HPC extensively discussed their past support of the project and questioned the necessity of a landmark designation for a building that has already been extensively reviewed.

The owners similarly question the necessity of the landmark designation as they have already provided multiple historic evaluations of the building and explored several different preservation alternatives. Any marginal architectural features that remain will be preserved as part of the proposed project. In fact, the proposed project will ensure that the existing façade is maintained over time and preserve whatever architectural features are left. Without the proposed project, the existing building will likely fall into disrepair. Approving the project as proposed is the best way to preserve the remaining features.

The purpose of Article 10 is to prevent the unnecessary destruction of historic structures and ensure their preservation. It is clear through the extensive review of the proposed project that this purpose has already been fulfilled by existing City procedures. Thus, the landmark designation is simply unnecessary.

3. At Minimum, the Landmark Designation Should be Implement as Recommended by HPC

As explained above, the building does not meet the criteria for a landmark designation and should not be landmarked at all. HPC specifically did not support criterion 3 as a reason to landmark the property and removed the three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint as a character-defining feature. If this Committee does decide to landmark the property, the owners request that the designation be adopted pursuant to HPC's recommendation.

HPC extensively discussed the interrelation of the landmark designation and the proposed project. The Commissioners hesitated to landmark the building at all, including because HPC had already expressed their support for the project and expressed concern that the proposed landmark designation would interfere with the preferred preservation alternative. To get enough Commissioners to recommend approval of the landmark at all, the Commissioners amended the designation to remove criterion 3 and remove the three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint as a character-defining feature.

The owners are similarly concerned that the landmark designation will interfere with the proposed project and would deprive the owners of all economically viable use of the property. In particular, the character-defining features as originally proposed would appear to prohibit any future additions or alterations to any portion of the existing building, limiting any future owner from making any use of the structure beyond costly historic restoration work. Particularly

considering that the remaining marginal features of the building have already been preserved through the existing City procedures, there is no reasonably necessary public purpose to impose additional landmark protections unless such protections were intended specifically prevent any future economical use of the building. The owners therefore respectfully request that if the landmark designation move forward at all, the designation be adopted pursuant to HPC's recommendation as this recommendation would potentially allow for an economically viable use of the property.

CONCLUSION

The property has already been fully evaluated by the City and determined not to be potential landmark. The proposed project at the site preserves any marginal remaining architectural features, making the designation simply unnecessary. We therefore respectfully request that the Committee not move forward with the landmark legislation.

Very truly yours,

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC



Brian O'Neill

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a remote public hearing to consider the following hearing matter and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: November 15, 2021

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: REMOTE MEETING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org

Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen.

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Subject: **File No. 211021.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, as a Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN

WATCH: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99, (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, and the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen; or

VISIT: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Please visit the Board's website (<https://sfbos.org/city-board-response-covid-19>) regularly to be updated on the City's response to COVID-19 and how the legislative process may be impacted.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, November 12, 2021.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-4441)

Please Note: *The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

em:vy:ams

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a remote public hearing to consider the following hearing matter and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: February 28, 2022

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: REMOTE MEETING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org

Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen.

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Subject: **File No. 211021.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 447 Battery Street (aka Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building), Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot No. 002, as a Landmark consistent with the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN

WATCH: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99, (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, and the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen; or


VISIT: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, February 25, 2022.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-4441)

Please Note: *The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

em:jec:ams