

FORM A

NEPA SECTION 106 RESEARCH FORM

Mayor's Offices of Housing and Community Development

Reviewed per 2006 Programmatic Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Office.

(To be completed by MOHCD representative)

Date: **10/17/2023**

PROJECT INFORMATION **1044 Howard Street (United Playaz**

Building Rehab)

Address: **1044 Howard St, San Francisco, CA 94103**

Assessor's Block: **3726/019**

Zoning: **MUG – Mixed-Use-General**

Year of Initial Construction: **1964**

Type of Ownership: ☐ Unknown ☐ Federal ☐ State ☒ Private ☐ CCSF ☐ Special District

☒ Existing Use: **Industrial – Wholesale Storage**

Proposed Use: **Community**

Facility

*Interior Work: Yes ☒ No ☐

*Exterior Work: Yes ☒ No ☐

Proposed Building Expansion: Yes ☒ No ☐

Area of Potential Effects: **Refer to attached APE**

Map: Please attach a map if the area of potential effect is larger than the footprint of the subject building

*PLANS AND CLEAR PHOTOGRAPHS ARE ALWAYS REQUIRED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED EXTERIOR WORK. PLANS AND PHOTOGRAPHS ARE REQUESTED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED ALTERATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERIORS.

Project Contact: **Lorena Guadiana**
Email: **Lorena.Guadiana@sfgov.org**

Phone: **628-652-5965**

Lead Federal Agency: **HUD**

Local Agency: **SF MOHCD**

Architect: **Architectonica**

Architect

Phone:

«Architect_Phone»

Architect Email:

Architect Complete Address:

Environmental Consultant:

Environmental Science Associates

Contact: **Susan Yogi, Senior Managing Associate**

Environmental Consultant Phone: **415-962-8447**

Environmental Consultant Email: SYogi@esassoc.com

Environmental Consultant Address: **575 Market Street, Suite 3700, San Francisco, CA 94105**

Applicable HUD Program: Check all that apply.

☐ CDBG ☐ Home ☐ HOPWA ☐ HOPE VI

☐ Public Housing Modernization ☐ Section 8

☐ McKinney Programs (Identify the specific program)

☐ VASH

☒ Other (Please specify – i.e., Special Purpose): **HUD Economic Development Initiative – Community Project Funding (EDI/CPF)**

RESOURCE INFORMATION

*Please attach supporting documents (maps, survey data, designation reports, etc) as applicable.

1. Resource (the subject being evaluated is a):

☐ District ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object

2. Designations/Survey Information

Listing	Ratings	Landmark No. or Local District /National Register Information	Information Attached? (Yes or No)
SF Planning Historic Resource Status Code	C- No Historic Resource Present		Refer to SF PIM document attached
National Register	Not listed		No
California Register of Historic Places	Not listed		No
City Landmark or Historic District Article 10	Not listed		No
Conservation Buildings or District Article 11	Not listed		No
General Area Plan	Not listed		No
Here Today Survey	Not listed		No
1976 Architectural Survey	Not listed		No
Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey	Not listed		No
San Francisco Heritage Survey	Not listed		No
Other Surveys (Please List)	South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey	6Z	Refer to SF PIM document attached

Maps (Please check if consulted)

Type	Consulted – yes or no	Attached – attach if consulted
Sanborne	No	
Metroscan	No	
Coastal Survey	No	

4. Photographs (List historic photographic sources)

Type	Attached – yes or no	Source
Current	Yes	Site visit; refer to memo.
Historic	Yes	Refer to photos in memo & DPR 523 forms from the San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library, and Library of Congress Geography and Map Division

FORM B

NEPA SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco

Reviewed per 2007 Programmatic Agreement among the City and County of San Francisco, the ACHP and the SHPO.

Subject Address: **1044 Howard Street, San Francisco CA 94103**

Assessor's Block: 3726 Lot: 19

Case Number _2023-005532FED

Date Review Completed _11/1/2023

- ☐ District
☐ Site
☒ Building
☐ Structure
☐ Object

1. National Register Status

Note on Source of Determination: If the State Office of Historic Preservation has made no previous determination of eligibility for the resource, the Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility for the purposes of this Section 106 review. In this case, the planner should put his or her initials under source for the status code chosen. If there is a determination made by the State Office Historic Preservation Office (OHP), please put OHP under source for the status code. Use item 3 on page 2 of this review form to show the Planning Department's application of the National Register Criteria for eligibility.

a.	<u>Source</u>	<u>Determination (indicates the status generally):</u>
	_____	1 Listed in the National Register
	_____	2 Determined eligible for the Register in a formal process involving federal agencies
	_____	3 Appears eligible for listing in the National Register in the judgment of the person(s) completing or reviewing the form. (In this case the form is either an attached survey or nomination form, not the Section 106 review form.)
	_____	4 Might become eligible for listing
	_____	5 Ineligible for the Register but still of local interest
	JAG	_X_ 6 Determined ineligible for National Register listing
	_____	7 Not evaluated

b. The subject status (indicates why the registration status was given to the property):

- _____ D Part of District
_____ I Individual Property
_____ B Both of the above

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 2

2. Record of Planning Department's Application of National Register Criteria for Eligibility
**The Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility only when no other determination of eligibility has been made.*

The subject resource being evaluated is a:

- ☐ district
☐ site
☒ building
☐ structure
☐ object

The subject resource possesses integrity of: N/A

- ☐ location
☐ design
☐ setting
☐ materials
☐ workmanship
☐ feeling and association

OR

- ☐ does not possess integrity of any of the above

The subject resource has significance by virtue of its being:

- ☐ A associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
☐ B associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
☐ C embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction which:
☐ represents the work of a master
☐ possesses high artistic values
☐ represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
☐ D has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

OR

- ☒ does not have significance for any reason above

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 3

3. Record of Proposed Projects and Required Approvals (check and complete items that apply):

☒ The proposed project is shown in plans labeled: United Playaz Project plans prepared by Arquitectonica, dated 8/22/2023 that are included in the project file (in the 2023-005532PRJ file).

☐ There is no active Building Permit Application (BPA) at the time of Section 106 review.

☒ Associated active BPA's at time of Section 106 review include:
BPA no.: 202305047097 (2023-005532PRJ) Assigned planner: Elizabeth Mau

☐ A notation was placed in Parcel Tracking to notify planners of the need to review future BPAs with the associated section 106 review. This is required if a project was reviewed and approved under Section 106 but had no active BPA.

☐ A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the proposal. Case No. and Date reviewed
by Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board:

4. Findings

Finding of no adverse effect

☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments: The planning department has determined the building at 1044 is not eligible for listing in the National Register (see attached DPR form for 1044 Howard Street) therefore the project would cause no adverse effect to historic resources.

Finding of no adverse effect with mitigations

☐ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments:

Proposed activity causes an adverse effect:

☐ yes ☐ no

Comments:

Justin Greving
Senior Preservation Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

11/1/2023
Date

State of California ♦ The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Primary #

HRI #

Trinomial

NRHP Status Code

Other

Review Code

Reviewer

Date

Listings

Page 1 of 4 *Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) 1044 Howard Street

P1. Other Identifier: N/A

*P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted

*a. County San Francisco and (P2c, P2e, and P2b or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad San Francisco North Date 2021 T 2S; R 5W; 1/4 of 1/4 of Sec ; B.M.

c. Address 1044 Howard Street City San Francisco Zip 94103

d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone , mE/ mN

e. Other Locational Data: APN 3726/019


*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements.)

1044 Howard Street is a mostly one-story industrial building with a rear second story pop up. The building was constructed in 1964. The rectangular building is built to the lot lines and constructed of painted CMU block and flat black membrane roof. The primary façade faces southeast onto Howard Street and has an offset recessed single door entrance with a metal gate set flush with the façade and a small angled awning. Two floor to ceiling vertical rectangular metal windows and grills are located on opposing corners of the façade. The only other visible elevation faces southwest along Russ Street and contains 3 horizontal rectangular metal frame 3 over 2 divided lite windows to the right of a slightly recessed double door. Towards the rear of the building the second story pop-up is visible and is clad in fiberglass shingles. The second story has small rectangular windows of unknown material that are mostly covered in plywood or screens. A single door opens to the roof on the elevation that faces Howard Street. A metal fire escape extends from the roof over the sidewalk near the double door. Most recently the Howard Street elevation has been painted white and the Russ Street elevation was painted with a mural in 2022.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: HP8. Industrial building

*P4. Resources Present: ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)



P5b. Description of Photo: View of primary (southeast) façade on Howard Street and secondary (southwest) elevation on Russ Street, facing northwest. Photo from Google Street View, September 2022.

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:

☒ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

1984. San Francisco Department of Building Inspection

*P7. Owner and Address:

United Playaz Inc.
1038 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)

Justin Greving, San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

*P9. Date Recorded: October 27, 2023

*P10. Survey Type: Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: None

*Attachments: ☐ NONE ☐ Location Map ☒ Continuation Sheet ☒ Building, Structure, and Object Record
☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record
☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (List):

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

*Resource Name or # 1044 Howard Street

*NRHP Status Code 6Z

Page 2 of 4

B1. Historic Name: N/A

B2. Common Name: 1044 Howard Street

B3. Original Use: Photo engraving studio

B4. Present Use: vacant

*B5. Architectural Style: industrial vernacular

*B6. Construction History: Based on the building permit record the building was originally constructed between 1964-1965 as a photo engraving plant for Gustav Horn. The architect was Glenn Peterson. The partial second story was added in 1966 for use as storage. The building did see some minor interior alterations in 1991 along with installation of a new awning in 1992.

*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: N/A

Original Location: N/A

*B8. Related Features: none

B9a. Architect: Glenn Peterson

b. Builder: unknown

*B10. Significance: Theme N/A Area N/A

Period of Significance N/A

Property Type N/A

Applicable Criteria N/A

The subject property is located in the South of Market neighborhood just two blocks south of Market Street between 6th and 7th streets. The subject property has been previously surveyed as it is located within the South of Market Area Historic Resources Survey. At the time of the survey the subject property was given a status code of 6Z because it wasn't yet age eligible at the time of the survey.

The building is across the street from the northeastern boundary of the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District (West SOMA historic district). The West SOMA historic district was determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 and 3 as both a diverse neighborhood almost entirely destroyed and rebuilt after the 1906 Earthquake, and as an intact collection of a range of different building types dating almost entirely from the period of 1906-1913 and later from 1918 to the early 1920s. The period of significance for the historic district is from 1906 to ca. 1936.

This historic district contains a range of different resource types including low to mid-rise industrial and warehouse buildings, commercial buildings, and a number of apartment buildings and residences. The findings of the South of Market Area Historic Resources Survey were adopted by the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission on February 16, 2011. (cont'd on p. 3)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: None

*B12. References: see p. 3

B13. Remarks: None

*B14. Evaluator: Justin Greving, SF Planning Department

*Date of Evaluation: October 31, 2023

(This space reserved for official comments.)



Source: San Francisco Planning Department
Planning Information Map

CONTINUATION SHEET

Page 3 of 4

*Resource Name or # 1044 Howard Street

*Recorded by: Justin Greving, SF Planning Department

*Date: 10/31/2023

☒ Continuation ☐ Update

B10. Significance:

The subject property is just outside of the boundary of this eligible historic district.

Ownership and occupancy history

Based on original building permits and plans, and city directories, the building was originally operated by Gustav Horn as West Coast Engraving Co. but through the 1970s and 1980s had a variety of tenants mostly related to the printing and engraving business. West Coast Engraving shows up in city directories as late as 1970 but by 1972 Sonic Microfilm Co. operated out of 1044 Howard. In 1979 Carl's Litho Plate service and Rampton Associates and Advertising occupied the building but by 1982 three different companies were in the space: Forman-Leibrock litho printing, Hearly David (a graphic designer), and Elan Graphic Resources (graphics designers).

Evaluation for National Register Eligibility

The south of Market Area Historic Context Statement provides an evaluative framework for industrial buildings:

Industrial buildings in the South of Market Area can be determined eligible under National Register Criteria A and C and California Register 1 and 3. The primary significance of the South of Market Area is its post-1906 history as a predominantly light industrial district of small factories, shops, warehouses, and infrastructure serving these uses. West of 5th Street, much of the physical legacy of this historic context remains intact. Properties eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 (Event) will have a close association with either an important industry or be associated with an important historical event such as the post-1906 reconstruction era, the 1934 Waterfront Strike, or the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

One of the most common significant individual resource types in the South of Market Area are properties that appear eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C or in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). The dominant building type in much of the neighborhood are one-to-six story concrete or brick industrial buildings constructed between 1906 and 1914 and during the 1920s, with a handful of outliers constructed during the 1930s. Entire block-faces, such as 9th Street between Mission and Townsend or Howard Street between 5th and 12th streets are lined with such buildings. Page & Turnbull has identified several historic districts comprising industrial buildings of this era but there are several dozen that are especially distinguished due to their individual use and/or design.

The subject property was constructed in 1964 and therefore has no direct relationship with the post-1906 reconstruction of the area. Additionally, there is no evidence to demonstrate that any of the identified companies associated with 1044 Howard Street have association with National, State, or Local history such that it would elevate the building to be individually eligible under Criterion A for its association with these businesses.

There are no persons or individuals that appear to have a significant national, state, or local significance, Therefore the property is not eligible for listing under Criterion B.

As a minimally detailed CMU building constructed in 1964, the subject property does not demonstrate any architectural merit that would make it eligible under Criterion C. There is no information in the record to demonstrate that Glen Peterson is an architect of merit.

CONTINUATION SHEET

*Page 4 of 4

*Resource Name or # 1044 Howard Street

*Recorded by: Justin Greving, SF Planning Department *Date: 10/31/2023 ☒ Continuation ☐ Update

Additionally, the subject property does not appear to contribute to any previously identified historic districts. This block of Howard between 6th and 7th streets was excluded from the adjacent SOMA Historic District to the west and the 6th Street Lodging House Historic District to the east due to the relative low integrity of some buildings and later construction dates of others along the block. As such, this block of Howard Street does not resemble the importance of post-1906 Earthquake reconstruction for which the SOMA Historic district is significant, nor does it contain a large concentration of low to medium scale residential buildings for which the 6th Street Lodginghouse Historic District is significant.

Integrity

In addition to being eligible for listing in the National Register under one of the 4 National Register criteria, a property must also demonstrate sufficient integrity to convey this significance. Because 1044 Howard was determined to be ineligible for listing in the National Register a discussion of integrity is not required.

Summary

In conclusion 1044 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register nor does it contribute to any identified or potential historic districts. Therefore, it does not qualify as a property under the National Historic Preservation Act.

*B12. References: (continued from page 2)

Bloomfield, Anne. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 D Form for the Sixth Street Lodginghouse Historic District. San Francisco, August 1, 1997.

City and County of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Building Permits and Plans.

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

California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SOMA Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009.

Polk's San Francisco City Directory. R.L. Polk & Co. Publishers. Los Angeles, CA. Various dates. Accessed October 28, 2023, <https://sfpl.org/locations/main-library/magazines-newspapers-center/bay-area-city-directories-and-phone-books/san-0>

FORM A

NEPA SECTION 106 RESEARCH FORM

Mayor's Offices of Housing and Community Development

Reviewed per 2006 Programmatic Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Office.

(To be completed by MOHCD representative)

Date: **10/17/2023**

PROJECT INFORMATION **1044 Howard Street (United Playaz**

Building Rehab)

Address: **543-545 Natoma St, San Francisco, CA 94103**

Assessor's Block: **3726/046**

Zoning: **MUG – Mixed-Use-General**

Year of Initial Construction: **1964**

Type of Ownership: ☐ Unknown ☐ Federal ☐ State ☒ Private ☐ CCSF ☐ Special District

☒ Existing Use: **residential**

Proposed Use: **N/A**

*Interior Work: Yes ☐ No ☒

*Exterior Work: Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed Building Expansion: Yes ☐ No ☒

Area of Potential Effects: **Property is within the APE of 1044 Howard Street (United Playaz Building Rehab) project Refer to attached APE**

Map: Please attach a map if the area of potential effect is larger than the footprint of the subject building

*PLANS AND CLEAR PHOTOGRAPHS ARE ALWAYS REQUIRED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED EXTERIOR WORK. PLANS AND PHOTOGRAPHS ARE REQUESTED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED ALTERATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERIORS.

Project Contact: **Lorena Guadiana**
Email: **Lorena.Guadiana@sfgov.org**

Phone: **628-652-5965**

Lead Federal Agency: **HUD**

Local Agency: **SF MOHCD**

Architect: **Architectonica**

Architect

Phone:

«Architect_Phone»

Architect Email:

Architect Complete Address:

Environmental Consultant:

Environmental Science Associates

Contact: **Susan Yogi, Senior Managing Associate**

Environmental Consultant Phone: **415-962-8447**

Environmental Consultant Email: SYogi@esassoc.com

Environmental Consultant Address: **575 Market Street, Suite 3700, San Francisco, CA 94105**

Applicable HUD Program: Check all that apply.

☐ CDBG ☐ Home ☐ HOPWA ☐ HOPE VI

☐ Public Housing Modernization ☐ Section 8

☐ McKinney Programs (Identify the specific program)

☐ VASH

☒ Other (Please specify – i.e., Special Purpose): **HUD Economic Development Initiative – Community Project Funding (EDI/CPF)**

RESOURCE INFORMATION

*Please attach supporting documents (maps, survey data, designation reports, etc) as applicable.

1. Resource (the subject being evaluated is a):

☐ District ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object

2. Designations/Survey Information

Listing	Ratings	Landmark No. or Local District /National Register Information	Information Attached? (Yes or No)
SF Planning Historic Resource Status Code	C- No Historic Resource Present		Refer to SF PIM document attached
National Register	Not listed		No
California Register of Historic Places	Not listed		No
City Landmark or Historic District Article 10	Not listed		No
Conservation Buildings or District Article 11	Not listed		No
General Area Plan	Not listed		No
Here Today Survey	Not listed		No
1976 Architectural Survey	Not listed		No
Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey	Not listed		No
San Francisco Heritage Survey	Not listed		No
Other Surveys (Please List)	South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey	7R	Refer to SF PIM document attached

Maps (Please check if consulted)

Type	Consulted – yes or no	Attached – attach if consulted
Sanborne	No	
Metroscan	No	
Coastal Survey	No	

4. Photographs (List historic photographic sources)

Type	Attached – yes or no	Source
Current	Yes	Site visit; refer to memo.
Historic	Yes	Refer to photos in memo & DPR 523 forms from the San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library, and Library of Congress Geography and Map Division

FORM B

NEPA SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco

Reviewed per 2007 Programmatic Agreement among the City and County of San Francisco, the ACHP and the SHPO.

Subject Address: **543-545 Natoma Street, San Francisco CA 94103**

Assessor's Block: 3726 Lot: 46

Case Number _2023-005532FED

Date Review Completed _11/1/2023

☐ District

☐ Site

☒ Building

☐ Structure

☐ Object

1. National Register Status

Note on Source of Determination: If the State Office of Historic Preservation has made no previous determination of eligibility for the resource, the Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility for the purposes of this Section 106 review. In this case, the planner should put his or her initials under source for the status code chosen. If there is a determination made by the State Office Historic Preservation Office (OHP), please put OHP under source for the status code. Use item 3 on page 2 of this review form to show the Planning Department's application of the National Register Criteria for eligibility.

a. Source Determination (indicates the status generally):

- | | | | |
|-------|-------|---|--|
| _____ | _____ | 1 | Listed in the National Register |
| _____ | _____ | 2 | Determined eligible for the Register in a formal process involving federal agencies |
| _____ | _____ | 3 | Appears eligible for listing in the National Register in the judgment of the person(s) completing or reviewing the form. (In this case the form is either an attached survey or nomination form, not the Section 106 review form.) |
| _____ | _____ | 4 | Might become eligible for listing |
| _____ | _____ | 5 | Ineligible for the Register but still of local interest |
| _JAG_ | _X_ | 6 | Determined ineligible for National Register listing |
| _____ | _____ | 7 | Not evaluated |

b. The subject status (indicates why the registration status was given to the property):

- | | | |
|-------|---|---------------------|
| _____ | D | Part of District |
| _____ | I | Individual Property |
| _____ | B | Both of the above |

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 2

2. Record of Planning Department's Application of National Register Criteria for Eligibility
**The Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility only when no other determination of eligibility has been made.*

The subject resource being evaluated is a:

- ☐ district
☐ site
☒ building
☐ structure
☐ object

The subject resource possesses integrity of: N/A

- ☐ location
☐ design
☐ setting
☐ materials
☐ workmanship
☐ feeling and association

OR

- ☐ does not possess integrity of any of the above

The subject resource has significance by virtue of its being:

- ☐ A associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
☐ B associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
☐ C embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction which:
☐ represents the work of a master
☐ possesses high artistic values
☐ represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
☐ D has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

OR

- ☒ does not have significance for any reason above

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 3

3. Record of Proposed Projects and Required Approvals (check and complete items that apply):

☒ The proposed project is shown in plans labeled: United Playaz Project plans prepared by Arquitectonica, dated 8/22/2023 that are included in the project file (in the 2023-005532PRJ file).

☐ There is no active Building Permit Application (BPA) at the time of Section 106 review.

☒ Associated active BPA's at time of Section 106 review include:
BPA no.: 202305047097 (2023-005532PRJ) Assigned planner: Elizabeth Mau

☐ A notation was placed in Parcel Tracking to notify planners of the need to review future BPAs with the associated section 106 review. This is required if a project was reviewed and approved under Section 106 but had no active BPA.

☐ A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the proposal. Case No. and Date reviewed
by Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board:

4. Findings

Finding of no adverse effect

☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments: The planning department has confirmed the building at 543-545 Natoma Street is not eligible for listing in the National Register (see attached report and DPR form for 543-545 Natoma Street prepared by LSA dated October 13, 2023) therefore the adjacent project would cause no adverse effect to historic resources.

Finding of no adverse effect with mitigations

☐ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments:

Proposed activity causes an adverse effect:

☐ yes ☐ no

Comments:

____Justin Greving____
Senior Preservation Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

____11/1/2023____
Date

FORM A

NEPA SECTION 106 RESEARCH FORM

Mayor's Offices of Housing and Community Development

Reviewed per 2006 Programmatic Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Office.

(To be completed by MOHCD representative)

Date: **10/17/2023**

PROJECT INFORMATION **1044 Howard Street (United Playaz**

Building Rehab)

Address: **1040-1042 Howard St, San Francisco, CA 94103**

Assessor's Block: **3726/018**

Zoning: **MUG – Mixed-Use-General**

Year of Initial Construction: **1964**

Type of Ownership: ☐ Unknown ☐ Federal ☐ State ☒ Private ☐ CCSF ☐ Special District

☒ Existing Use: **residential**

Proposed Use: **N/A**

*Interior Work: Yes ☐ No ☒

*Exterior Work: Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed Building Expansion: Yes ☐ No ☒

Area of Potential Effects: **Property is within the APE of 1044 Howard Street (United Playaz Building Rehab) project. Refer to attached APE**

Map: Please attach a map if the area of potential effect is larger than the footprint of the subject building

*PLANS AND CLEAR PHOTOGRAPHS ARE ALWAYS REQUIRED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED EXTERIOR WORK. PLANS AND PHOTOGRAPHS ARE REQUESTED FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED ALTERATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERIORS.

Project Contact: **Lorena Guadiana**
Email: **Lorena.Guadiana@sfgov.org**

Phone: **628-652-5965**

Lead Federal Agency: **HUD**

Local Agency: **SF MOHCD**

Architect: **Architectonica**

Architect

Phone:

«Architect_Phone»

Architect Email:

Architect Complete Address:

Environmental Consultant:

Environmental Science Associates

Contact: **Susan Yogi, Senior Managing Associate**

Environmental Consultant Phone: **415-962-8447**

Environmental Consultant Email: SYogi@esassoc.com

Environmental Consultant Address: **575 Market Street, Suite 3700, San Francisco, CA 94105**

Applicable HUD Program: Check all that apply.

☐ CDBG ☐ Home ☐ HOPWA ☐ HOPE VI

☐ Public Housing Modernization ☐ Section 8

☐ McKinney Programs (Identify the specific program)

☐ VASH

☒ Other (Please specify – i.e., Special Purpose): **HUD Economic Development Initiative – Community Project Funding (EDI/CPF)**

RESOURCE INFORMATION

*Please attach supporting documents (maps, survey data, designation reports, etc) as applicable.

1. Resource (the subject being evaluated is a):

☐ District ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object

2. Designations/Survey Information

Listing	Ratings	Landmark No. or Local District /National Register Information	Information Attached? (Yes or No)
SF Planning Historic Resource Status Code	C- No Historic Resource Present		Refer to SF PIM document attached
National Register	Not listed		No
California Register of Historic Places	Not listed		No
City Landmark or Historic District Article 10	Not listed		No
Conservation Buildings or District Article 11	Not listed		No
General Area Plan	Not listed		No
Here Today Survey	Not listed		No
1976 Architectural Survey	Not listed		No
Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey	Not listed		No
San Francisco Heritage Survey	Not listed		No
Other Surveys (Please List)	South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey	7R	Refer to SF PIM document attached

Maps (Please check if consulted)

Type	Consulted – yes or no	Attached – attach if consulted
Sanborne	No	
Metroscan	No	
Coastal Survey	No	

4. Photographs (List historic photographic sources)

Type	Attached – yes or no	Source
Current	Yes	Site visit; refer to memo.
Historic	Yes	Refer to photos in memo & DPR 523 forms from the San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library, and Library of Congress Geography and Map Division

FORM B

NEPA SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco

Reviewed per 2007 Programmatic Agreement among the City and County of San Francisco, the ACHP and the SHPO.

Subject Address: 1040-1042 Howard Street, San Francisco CA 94103	☐	District
Assessor's Block: 3726 Lot: 18	☐	Site
Case Number _2023-005532FED	☒	Building
Date Review Completed _11/1/2023	☐	Structure
	☐	Object

1. National Register Status

Note on Source of Determination: If the State Office of Historic Preservation has made no previous determination of eligibility for the resource, the Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility for the purposes of this Section 106 review. In this case, the planner should put his or her initials under source for the status code chosen. If there is a determination made by the State Office Historic Preservation Office (OHP), please put OHP under source for the status code. Use item 3 on page 2 of this review form to show the Planning Department's application of the National Register Criteria for eligibility.

a.	<u>Source</u>	<u>Determination (indicates the status generally):</u>
	_____	1 Listed in the National Register
	_____	2 Determined eligible for the Register in a formal process involving federal agencies
	_____	3 Appears eligible for listing in the National Register in the judgment of the person(s) completing or reviewing the form. (In this case the form is either an attached survey or nomination form, not the Section 106 review form.)
	_____	4 Might become eligible for listing
	_____	5 Ineligible for the Register but still of local interest
	JAG	_X_ 6 Determined ineligible for National Register listing
	_____	7 Not evaluated

b. The subject status (indicates why the registration status was given to the property):

_____	D	Part of District
_____	I	Individual Property
_____	B	Both of the above

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 2

2. Record of Planning Department's Application of National Register Criteria for Eligibility
**The Planning Department should make a determination of eligibility only when no other determination of eligibility has been made.*

The subject resource being evaluated is a:

- ☐ district
☐ site
☒ building
☐ structure
☐ object

The subject resource possesses integrity of:

- ☐ location
☐ design
☐ setting
☐ materials
☐ workmanship
☐ feeling and association

OR

- ☐ does not possess integrity of any of the above

The subject resource has significance by virtue of its being:

- ☐ A associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
☐ B associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
☐ C embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction which:
☐ represents the work of a master
☐ possesses high artistic values
☐ represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
☐ D has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

OR

- ☒ does not have significance for any reason above

FORM B
SECTION 106 REVIEW FORM
Page 3

3. Record of Proposed Projects and Required Approvals (check and complete items that apply):

☒ The proposed project is shown in plans labeled: United Playaz Project plans prepared by Arquitectonica, dated 8/22/2023 that are included in the project file (in the 2023-005532PRJ file).

☐ There is no active Building Permit Application (BPA) at the time of Section 106 review.

☒ Associated active BPA's at time of Section 106 review include:
BPA no.: 202305047097 (2023-005532PRJ) Assigned planner: Elizabeth Mau

☐ A notation was placed in Parcel Tracking to notify planners of the need to review future BPAs with the associated section 106 review. This is required if a project was reviewed and approved under Section 106 but had no active BPA.

☐ A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the proposal. Case No. and Date reviewed
by Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board:

4. Findings

Finding of no adverse effect

☒ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments: The planning department has confirmed the building at 1040-1042 Howard Street is not eligible for listing in the National Register (see attached report and DPR form for 1040-1042 Howard Street prepared by LSA dated October 13, 2023) therefore the adjacent project would cause no adverse effect to historic resources.

Finding of no adverse effect with mitigations

☐ yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐ not applicable

Comments:

Proposed activity causes an adverse effect:

☐ yes ☐ no

Comments:

____Justin Greving____
Senior Preservation Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

____11/1/2023____
Date



575 Market Street
Suite 3700
San Francisco, CA 94105
415.896.5900 [phone](#)
415.896.0332 [fax](#)

esassoc.com

memorandum

date October 13, 2023

to Lorena Guadiana, Environmental Compliance Coordinator, MOHCD

cc

from Johanna Kahn, Senior Architectural Historian, ESA

subject 1044 Howard Street Project – Section 106 Cultural Resources Survey Report (Final)

Introduction

United Playaz, a San Francisco-based violence prevention and youth development organization, has outgrown its current youth center at 1038 Howard Street (Assessor Parcel Number [APN] 3726/017) in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood of San Francisco, which was constructed in 1947, and is proposing to renovate, seismically rehabilitate, expand, and change the use of an existing building at 1044 Howard Street to develop a community hall to accommodate its need for additional program space. For this purpose, United Playaz proposes a substantial rehabilitation of an existing one-story building located at 1044 Howard Street (APN 3726/019) in San Francisco, which was constructed in 1964, and building a new two-story, 6,000-square-foot community center. The project would retain most of the existing Howard Street concrete masonry unit (CMU; often referred to as “concrete block”) wall while demolishing the existing west, north, and east CMU walls and replacing them with new, reinforced CMU walls that would be constructed around a newly building steel structural frame. Portions of the existing foundation and the slab-on-grade would be retained. The existing floors and roof would be replaced with a concrete-over-metal deck system. The project would upgrade and strengthen the existing concrete perimeter foundations, which would be tied to the new steel structural system. All building mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) systems would also be replaced.

The proposed project is adjacent to two potential historic properties located at 1040–1042 Howard Street (APN 3726/018) and 543–545 Natoma Street (APN 3726/046) and the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. The San Francisco Planning Department previously determined that both buildings are ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (National Register), and there are no historic properties within the project site.

United Playaz is being awarded federal funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As a federal undertaking (a new or continuing project receiving federal financial assistance in whole or in part or issued a federal permit), the project is subject to 24 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 58 and federal environmental laws and authorities, including the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended (54 United States Code [U.S.C.] 306108). The HUD is the lead federal agency for NHPA purposes, and the San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is the responsible entity (RE) for environmental review in charge of compliance with HUD guidance.

This environmental review document records the existing conditions of the proposed 1044 Howard Street project site regarding cultural resources, specifically historic architectural resources. The work performed consists of background and archival research as well as documentation and evaluation of potential historic properties in the Area of Potential Effects (APE).

In accordance with NHPA Section 106, a cultural resources study was conducted to:

- Delineate an APE and identify cultural resources, specifically historic architectural resources, within its boundaries;
- Evaluate the significance of identified cultural resources according to the criteria set forth by the National Register and make recommendations as to whether they qualify as historic properties under Section 106;
- Determine whether the project would cause an adverse effect to a historic property under Section 106; and
- If applicable, recommend procedures for avoidance or mitigation of adverse effects to a historic property under Section 106.

California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 form sets for the two potential historic properties located at 1040–1042 Howard Street and 543–545 Natoma Street are included in **Appendix A**.

Federal Regulatory Framework

As a federal undertaking subject to HUD approval, the project is subject to federal environmental laws and authorities, including the NHPA. The HUD is the lead federal agency for NHPA purposes, and the MOHCD will serve as the RE for environmental review responsible for compliance with HUD guidance.

Effects of federal undertakings on both historic architectural and archaeological resources are considered through the NHPA, and its implementing regulations. Before a federal undertaking (i.e., project receiving federal financial assistance or issuance of a federal permit) is implemented, NHPA Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of the undertaking on historic properties (i.e., properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register) and to afford the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and/or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect historic properties. Under the NHPA, a property is considered significant if it meets one of the National Register listing Criteria A through D, in 36 CFR 60.4, as follows:

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, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and that:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. 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; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

For a property to be eligible for listing in the National Register, it must also retain the integrity to be recognizable as a historic property and to convey its significance. Properties that are less than 50 years old are generally not considered eligible for the National Register and do not require review by the SHPO and ACHP. Per guidance

from the SHPO, a buffer of five years has been added to the age-eligibility threshold (i.e., 45 years or older) to allow time for project construction.¹

Area of Potential Effects

According to the implementing regulations of NHPA Section 106, as amended, the APE is defined as “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking” (36 CFR § 800.16[d]).

For the purposes of this undertaking, the architectural APE includes the two parcels that comprise the project site (1038 and 1044 Howard Street) and the two adjacent parcels (1040–1042 Howard Street and 543–545 Natoma Street) and is defined as the property boundary for each parcel (i.e., APNs 3726/017, 3726/018, 3726/019, and 3726/046) (**Figure 1**).



The APE is outlined in red. The project site is shaded blue. A portion of the adjacent National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District is shaded yellow.

SOURCE: Google Maps, 2023; edited by ESA, 2023

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 1
Area of Potential Effects (red outline)

¹ California State Office of Historic Preservation, “Instructions for Recording Historical Resources,” March 1995, 2, <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/manual95.pdf>.

Current Historic Status of Buildings Within the APE

In 2000, the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (precursor to the Historic Preservation Commission) adopted the National Register and California Register criteria of evaluation for use in all historic resource surveys in San Francisco.² None of the four buildings located within the APE—1038 Howard, 1040–1042 Howard, 1044 Howard, and 543–545 Natoma streets—are listed in the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD) for San Francisco County, and this indicates either that they have not been previously evaluated or that previous evaluations were not submitted to the OHP for inclusion in the BERD.

The four properties within the APE were surveyed in 2008 as part of the *SoMa Area Plan Historic Resource Survey*. Both 1038 and 1044 Howard Street were assigned the California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC) “6Z,” signifying that they were found ineligible for listing on the National Register or California Register or as San Francisco landmarks through survey evaluation. According to the San Francisco Planning Department’s Property Information Map (PIM),³ both properties are currently identified as “Category C” properties, meaning that they have been determined not to be historic properties for the purposes of NHPA Section 106 or historical resources for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Both 1040–1042 Howard Street and 543–545 Natoma Street were assigned CHRSC “7R,” signifying that they were identified in a reconnaissance-level survey and not evaluated. The PIM identifies both as “Category B” properties,⁴ meaning that further consultation and review is required for evaluating whether they are eligible as historic properties or historical resources.

None of the buildings within the APE are located within any listed or eligible historic districts, including historic districts designated under Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. None were identified in the 1968 Junior League of San Francisco Architectural Survey, *Here Today*; 1976 San Francisco Department of City Planning (DCP) Architectural Survey; or 1977–1978 San Francisco Architectural Heritage Surveys, *Splendid Survivors* and *Splendid Extended*.

Property Descriptions

An ESA architectural historian performed a pedestrian survey of the APE on August 31, 2023. The following architectural descriptions of potential historic properties are based on observations made in the field.

1040–1042 Howard Street

The building located at 1040–1042 Howard Street is a three-story, mixed-use building that was constructed in 1914. It features an I-shaped footprint (formed by two lightwells on the side walls), is of wood-frame construction, is clad in stucco, and is capped by a flat roof. According to the 1990s Sanborn map, the first floor contains one commercial space, and a total of five apartments are contained within the second and third floors.⁵

The primary (southeast) façade faces Howard Street (**Figure 2**). At the first floor, an aluminum-frame storefront assembly is located behind a metal security grille. The storefront is flanked by two recessed entrances to the

² In 2003, the California Office of Historic Preservation released new California Historical Resource Status Codes (formerly known as the National Register Status Codes) to be assigned to evaluated historic resources during local surveys. The status codes were updated again in 2020.

³ San Francisco Property Information Map, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/?search=3731094>.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Records at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection indicate that the 1914 building plans for 1040–1042 Howard Street included eight total residential units—four efficiencies and four one-bedroom apartments. Although not noted in subsequent permit records, several original residential units were likely consolidated to create the five units indicated in the 1990s Sanborn map.

residential units above. The recessed entrances are fitted with metal security grilles and contain concrete steps, and the steps to the east entrance are covered with mosaic tiles. Stacked, angled bay windows on the second and third floors feature one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows; some of the original windows have been replaced with single-hung, vinyl-sash windows. The façade terminates in a simple cornice with egg-and-dart molding that disguises a stepped parapet behind.

The side (northeast and southwest) façades are clad in channel-drop wood siding, and fixed, sliding, and single-hung, aluminum-sash windows are located within the light wells. The rear (northwest) façade features stacked, angled bay windows and a metal fire escape.

Construction Chronology

The construction chronology of 1040–1042 Howard Street based on building permit records and field observations is summarized in **Table 1** below.



SOURCE: ESA, 2021

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 2
1040–1042 Howard Street (left), view facing northwest

TABLE 1
1040–1042 HOWARD STREET CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY

Year	Owner (if listed)	Note
1914	--	Assessor records indicate that the building was constructed in 1914.
1915	--	Known as the "La Rose Apartments"
1966	Anchor Realty Co.	Building permit to install new fire escape ladders.
Post-1974	--	Field observation: original windows on second and third floors removed; original decorative medallion between bays removed; original panel cornice likely stripped. (Figure 3)
1978	Transamerican Title Insurance	Building permit to complete various repairs including new sprinklers, plaster work, and repairing stairs.
1985–91	--	Building permit for structural work including foundation and first-floor framing, bathrooms, and kitchens. The rehabilitation architect was Marie-Louise Laleyan.
1986	--	Building permit for foundation work
1987	--	Building permit for unspecified structural work
1988–91	--	Building permit to repair fire damage to the third floor
2016	--	Building permit to replace egress doors and repair damaged drywall, one window, and one step in egress stairway

SOURCES: San Francisco Department of Building Inspection; San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map; San Francisco City Directories



SOURCE: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Office of Assessor-Recorder Photograph Collection

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 3
1044 Howard Street, 1974

543–545 Natoma Street

The building located at 543–545 Natoma Street (also addressed as 51–55 Russ Street) was constructed in 1909 and contains residential flats. It features a roughly rectangular footprint, is of wood-frame construction, and is capped by a flat roof. Typical windows are one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows except where replacement windows are described below. The northeast portion of the building (addressed 543–545 Natoma Street) contains three flats and is three stories over a basement, and the southeast portion of the building (addressed 51–55 Russ Street) contains three flats and is three stories in height.

The primary (northwest) façade faces Natoma Street, is clad in stucco, and is composed of three structural bays (**Figure 4**). At the first floor, the east bay features an arched opening fitted with a metal security grille that contains a recessed entry. The center and west bays each contain a pair of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows behind metal security grilles. Angled bay windows on the second and third floors as well as the horizontal space between the bays feature one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows. The façade terminates in a cornice with egg-and-dart molding, dentil molding, and carved brackets.

The secondary (southwest) façade faces Russ Street and is clad in stucco (Figure 4). The first floor features four pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window; a gated doorway; and an arched opening with concrete steps and a metal security grille. The second floor features four pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window as well as one pair of sliding, vinyl-sash replacement windows. The third floor features five pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window. The façade terminates in a cornice with egg-and-dart molding, dentil molding, and carved brackets.

The rear façade faces southeast and is clad in channel-drop wood siding. Only the third story is visible above the adjacent building at 1044 Howard Street, and it features a pair of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows.



SOURCE: ESA, 2023

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 4
543–545 Natoma Street, View Facing East

Construction Chronology

The construction chronology of 543–545 Natoma Street based on building permit records and field observations is summarized in **Table 2** below.

TABLE 2
543–545 NATOMA STREET CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY

Year	Owner (if listed)	Note
1909	Louis Haas	Building permit to construct a three-story, wood-frame building with six residential flats (two flats per floor). It was originally clad in channel-drop wood siding on all façades. The architect was Charles O. Clausen, and the builder was Ratto and Giannini.
1931	Louis Haas	Building permit to re-clad the building's primary and secondary façades in cement (i.e., stucco).
1939	Mrs. Stadlberger	Building permit to complete minor structural work and repairs to stairs and basement.
1940	Teresa Stadlberger	Building permit to cement the basement.
Ca. 1940–2007		Field observation: original exposed concrete basement was clad in stucco; pair of original windows replaced with vinyl-sash sliders; original bay window trim removed; original decorative medallion above Russ Street entrance removed (Figure 5).
2012	Manuel and Marilyn Devera	Building permit to repair siding, rear stairs, and guardrail.
2013	--	Building permit to reroof the building
2017–19	Marilyn Devera	Building permit to seismically retrofit the building
2018–19	--	Building permit to install 13 metal window grilles at first floor

SOURCES: San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map, Google Street View



SOURCE: San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Office of Assessor-Recorder Photograph Collection

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 5
543–545 Natoma Street, 1946

Surrounding Area

The four buildings within the APE are situated two blocks south of Market Street, one of San Francisco's major thoroughfares. The surrounding area is urban in character and consists of a combination of residential, commercial, light industrial, and government buildings. The APE is located in the SoMa neighborhood. It is also situated outside of and adjacent to the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, which encompasses the area roughly bounded by Mission Street to the north, 5th Street to the east, Harrison and Bryant streets to the south, and 13th Street to the west and contains 336 contributing buildings that date to the period 1906–36.⁶ These include residential and mixed-use residential-over-commercial buildings that feature angled bay windows, flat roofs, and decorative cornices. Residential buildings were designed in popular early-20th-century styles, such as Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Mediterranean Revival styles. The historic district also includes a variety of commercial and industrial buildings. For instance, across Howard Street to the east is the Eng-Skell Building at 1035 Howard Street, a three-story Art Deco-style industrial building constructed in 1930. To the southeast of the APE is a two-story industrial building constructed in 1923 and designed by architect James H. Hjul in a Baroque-inspired style.^{7,8}

Historic Context

Previous Surveys and Context Statements

The subject property is geographically and/or thematically associated with several adopted cultural resources surveys and historic context statements in San Francisco. The following documents were consulted for relevant contextual information:

- *South of Market Area Plan Historic Resource Survey* (Page & Turnbull, 2007). The four subject properties are located within the survey area.
- *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement* (Page & Turnbull, 2009). The four subject properties are located within the study area.
- *San Francisco Neighborhood Commercial Buildings 1865–1965 Historic Context Statement* (San Francisco Planning Department, 2022).
- *Flats and Small Apartment Buildings 1915–1978 Historic Context Statement* (ICF, 2023).
- *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935–1970 Historic Context Statement* (Mary Brown for the San Francisco City and County Planning Department, 2010).

South of Market Neighborhood

The following brief history of the SoMa neighborhood is summarized from the 2009 *SoMa Historic Context Statement*. Because the area suffered extensive destruction from the 1906 earthquake and fire and was subsequently reconstructed, this summary focuses on the early 20th-century Reconstruction Period (1906–13). It is during this period that the two subject buildings were constructed. For information about prehistoric, Spanish, Mexican, and early American periods, see pages 13–30 of the historic context statement.

⁶ Page & Turnbull, Inc., California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523D form for Western SoMa Light Industrial & Residential Historic District, 2009, on file at the San Francisco Planning Department.

⁷ Page & Turnbull, Inc., California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 form set for 1035 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA, 2009, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://sfplanninggis.org/docs/DPRForms/3731094.pdf>.

⁸ San Francisco Property Information Map.

By the early 20th century, SoMa had become one of San Francisco's most ethnically diverse and densely populated neighborhoods. SoMa boasted a large Irish population and was also the home of African American, Greek, Chinese, Japanese, and other European-born residents. As foreign-born immigrants settled in the neighborhood in increasing numbers, many native-born and upwardly mobile San Franciscans relocated from SoMa to the Mission District and other outlying sections of the city.⁹

The neighborhood's demographic trends influenced its built environment. The majority of SoMa's residential workforce was manual workers, and the rest were seasonally or intermittently employed.¹⁰ Consequently, the neighborhood was uncommonly transient and attracted residents less likely to own property and more likely to reside at one address for long periods of time. In contrast to the large-scale, masonry commercial buildings that dominated Market Street, SoMa's industrial buildings and warehouses were interspersed among a growing number of wood-frame tenements, residential hotels, and apartments that accommodated the primarily single, male, and working-class population.¹¹

SoMa was decimated by the earthquake that hit San Francisco on April 18, 1906. Numerous fires ravaged the area's aging, wood-frame building stock and destroyed the neighborhood within six hours. With several notable exceptions, such as the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Post Office and Court of Appeals buildings, nearly every building and structure in SoMa was consumed.¹²

The first years of the post-earthquake reconstruction period (1906–13) in SoMa were largely devoted to clearing debris and salvaging any stable and intact buildings and structures. While waiting for the disbursement of insurance claims, some enterprising business owners erected temporary buildings that could be dismantled and moved with relative ease.¹³ Once active reconstruction commenced, most of investors' attention and capital was directed towards rebuilding the district's infrastructure as well as its industrial and commercial core. Largely through the lobbying efforts of the SoMa Improvement Association, efforts to repave streets, re-establish transit lines, and restore gas, water, and electricity were underway by 1909 (**Figure 6**).¹⁴ Throughout the late 1910s and 1920s, concentrated areas of reinforced concrete or steel-frame and brick buildings dominated the district south of Howard Street.¹⁵ Light industrial and commercial buildings populated major roads, such as the 6th Street commercial corridor, and operated as retail or office spaces, restaurants, and service shops. Most were constructed during a second building boom during the 1920s and were typically made of concrete and had multi-lite windows in the upper stories to provide natural light. Less austere than the warehouses and industrial buildings in the district, these new commercial buildings often incorporated ornamentation derived from Art Deco, Spanish Colonial Revival, or Classical Revival architectural styles.¹⁶

The district also underwent a demographic shift during the reconstruction period. While commercial and industrial areas grew relatively quickly, residential reconstruction was limited and sporadically funded. As a result, the district's residential population shrank dramatically. Between 1900 and 1910, SoMa's residential population dropped from 62,000 to 24,000.¹⁷ The neighborhood's working-class inhabitants, who lacked the financial reserves to remain in the recovering district, largely relocated to the working-class Potrero and Mission districts or eventually secured single-family dwellings along the outskirts of the city. Small yet vibrant Greek, Japanese, and Filipino enclaves developed along Folsom Street and in the vicinity of South Park, and many

⁹ *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*, 45.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 46.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² See Gladys Hansen, *Denial of Disaster* (San Francisco: Cameron & Company, 1989). Cited in *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*, 46.

¹³ *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*, 51.


¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 58.

single, white, American-born males also settled in SoMa. Subsequent restrictive immigration laws exacerbated this trend and ensured that SoMa's residential population remained predominantly white and American-born until World War II.¹⁸



North is right. Market Street is the major diagonal thoroughfare visible at the center, and SoMa is shown to the left (south) of Market Street.

SOURCE: Library of Congress Geography and Map Division

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 6

Map showing reconstruction within San Francisco's burned areas, 1908

Edwardian-Era Multi-Family Residential Architecture

During the early 20th century, the dueling demands for commercial development and new homes for people displaced by the 1906 Earthquake transformed the overall character, density, and appearance of SoMa.¹⁹ Nineteenth-century real estate developers had previously responded to San Francisco's growing housing demands by creating new subdivisions with narrow lots (ranging from 20 to 30 feet wide), thereby enabling landowners to maximize the potential income from an individual parcel. Many of these lots, originally intended for single-

¹⁸ Ibid., 59-60.

¹⁹ City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Neighborhood Commercial Buildings Historic Context Statement, 1865-1965*, 2022, 72.

family dwellings, were densely redeveloped with multi-family residential buildings after 1906 and fundamentally reshaped the form of residential neighborhood throughout San Francisco for much of the 20th century.²⁰

During the reconstruction period, former residential neighborhoods in SoMa were largely replaced by new industrial and commercial buildings. Nevertheless, residential enclaves survived the disaster, and the pressing demands for housing resulted in the construction of numerous flats, residential hotels, boarding houses, cottage courts, and the occasional single-family residence. Between 1906 and 1913, residential reconstruction produced buildings from three major categories: wood-frame or masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings ranging from three to six stories tall; wood-frame, single-family dwellings and cottages; and wood-frame multi-family flats. While hotels and apartment houses were typically designed in Colonial Revival or Classical Revival styles, cottages and flats were often designed in Craftsman and Mission Revival styles.²¹

Edwardian-era multi-family residential buildings dating from the post-1906 reconstruction period—including the two subject buildings at 1040–42 Howard Street and 543–545 Natoma Street—share several notable defining characteristics. The San Francisco Planning Department defines the term “Edwardian” to encompass popular architectural styles in Great Britain and its territories during the reign of King Edward VII (1901–10). Edwardian architecture is comprised primarily of five contemporaneous styles: Beaux-Arts, Arts and Crafts, Gothic Revival, Baroque Revival, and Neo-Georgian.²² Much like other early 20th-century American variants, Edwardian residential buildings in SoMa are typically wood-frame apartment buildings or multi-unit flats that are clad in stucco or wood siding and feature flat roofs, decorative cornices, and angled bay windows. Apartments from this period typically featured restrained ornamentation such as simple wood door and window moldings, modillion or box cornices, and raised or recessed spandrels and are predominantly situated along 10th, Folsom, and Howard streets.²³⁻²⁴

Multi-family residential flats are also common in the area. The British term “flat” is generally characterized as buildings with floor-through dwelling units with independent, often recessed or covered, entrances for each unit. Edwardian-era flats often shared the restrained ornamental features found on contemporary apartment buildings, such as simple wood window and door moldings, modillion or box cornices, and raised or recessed spandrel panels.²⁵ Common in San Francisco’s older residential neighborhoods, flats in SoMa were typically constructed within a decade following the 1906 Earthquake and are usually located along alleys and side streets.²⁶ Some multi-family residences were mixed-use buildings with street-level spaces devoted to commercial or light industrial uses. Such buildings often feature commercial storefronts with recessed entry vestibules, storefront transoms, plate glass display windows, and fabric awnings.²⁷

APE Development History

Before the 1906 Earthquake and subsequent fires caused widespread destruction in San Francisco’s downtown and SoMa neighborhoods, the APE was occupied by at least seven distinct buildings. They contained a variety of uses including a saloon, a wood and coal distributor, three multi-family residential buildings, and several mixed-

²⁰ ICF, *Flats and Small Apartment Buildings (1915-1978)*, prepared for San Francisco Planning Department, 2023, E-1.

²¹ Page & Turnbull, *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*, Prepared for City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco, CA, 2009, 55.

²² City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 18: Residential and Commercial Architectural Periods and Styles in San Francisco*, accessed September 13, 2023, <https://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/5099-PresBulletin18ARCHSTYLES.pdf>.

²³ *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*, 85.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 56.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 86.

²⁶ Page & Turnbull, California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009, 4, on file at the San Francisco Planning Department, <https://tinyurl.com/5e9r6may>.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

use commercial and residential buildings.²⁸ The buildings located within and surrounding the APE were completely destroyed by the 1906 Earthquake and subsequent fires.

By 1913, all four parcels within the APE had been redeveloped. There was a tin shop at the present-day location of 1038 Howard Street, three commercial shops at 1040–1042 Howard Street, the synagogue of Congregation Chevra Thilim at 1044 Howard Street (**Figure 7**) with a three-unit residential flats building behind it on Russ Street, and the extant six-unit residential flats building at 543–545 Natoma Street (constructed in 1909).^{29,30} Of these reconstruction-era buildings, only the building with frontage on Natoma Street remains.

By 1949, the extant buildings at 1038 and 1040–1042 Howard Street had been constructed (in 1947 and 1914, respectively), and the synagogue had been replaced by a wood-frame used furniture store-turned-mattress factory owned by Martin Stanovich. The extant building at 1044 Howard Street was constructed in 1964 as the Coast Engraving Co. (photography engraving) owned by Gustave Horn.³¹



SOURCE: San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco
Historical Photograph Collection, AAB-3999

1044 Howard Street Project Cultural Resources Survey Report

Figure 7
Congregation Chevra Thilim (at right, formerly at 1044 Howard Street), 1927

Ownership and Occupancy History

1040–1042 Howard Street

The ownership history of 1040–1042 Howard Street is summarized in **Table 3** below. A preliminary review of San Francisco city directories and U.S. Federal Census records did not identify any long-term (i.e., 10 years or more) tenants or commercial occupants of 1040–1042 Howard Street.

²⁸ 1899 Sanborn map of San Francisco, Vol. 2, 139.

²⁹ 1913 Sanborn map of San Francisco, Vol. 2, 170.

³⁰ Polk City Directories.

³¹ Ibid.

TABLE 3
1040–1042 HOWARD STREET OWNERSHIP HISTORY

Year(s)	Name(s)	Note
1935	Oliver Goldblatt	
1946	Erich R. and Christel Klawonn	
1966	Anchor Realty Co.	Anchor Realty Co. (est. 1945) is a San Francisco-based brokerage and property management firm.
1976	Transamerican Title Insurance	
1985	Frances Clewans	Frances Clewans was a local property owner. A 1954 <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> article names her as the owner of a nearby apartment building at 159–165 Russ Street.
Unknown – 1998	Prana Associates Fifteen LP	
1998–2002	Declan Ryan	
2001–02	Gregory Moore	
2002 – Unknown	Susan Choy and Michael Kwong	
2023	Michael Kwong	

SOURCES: San Francisco Assessor-Recorder Public Index Search; San Francisco City Directories; building permits on file at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection; San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map; San Francisco Block Books for 1935 and 1946; *San Francisco Examiner* articles.

543–545 Natoma Street

The ownership history of 543–545 Natoma Street is summarized in **Table 4** below. A preliminary review of San Francisco city directories and U.S. Federal Census records did not identify any long-term (i.e., 10 years or more) tenants of 543–545 Natoma Street.

TABLE 4
543–545 NATOMA STREET OWNERSHIP HISTORY

Year(s)	Name(s)	Note
1909-1931	Louis Haas	Louis Haas was a local property owner. A 1913 <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> article lists Haas as the owner of the properties at 1666–1668 Howard Street and 1524–1526 Golden Gate Avenue.
1935	Louis and Carrie Haas	SF Block Book records for 1935 also list Haas as the owner for the nearby property at 551 Natoma Street.
1939–40	Teresa Stadlberger	Teresa Stadlberger was a local property owner. The 1935 Block Book lists her as the owner of the properties at 516, 519, 556, 558, and 560 Natoma Street. The 1946 Block Book lists her as the owner of the properties at 543–545, 552, 554, 556, 558, and 560 Natoma Street.
1946	Teresa Stadlberger and Arthur Liebschutz	Arthur Liebschutz was a local property owner. The 1946 Block Book lists him as the owner of the properties at 519 and 529 Natoma Street.
1963	Teresa Doely and Arthur Liebschutz	
1975–91	Francis W.K. Hom and Sui Ying Hom Estate of Francis W.K. Home and Daniel W. Hom	

1991–92	Prana Associates Fourteen	
1992	Shari Vlahos and James Vlahos	
1992–2016	Manuel L. Devera and Marilyn J. Devera	
2016 – present	Marilyn J. Devera, Marilyn J. De Vera Living Trust	

SOURCES: San Francisco Assessor-Recorder Public Index Search; San Francisco City Directories; building permits on file at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection; San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map; San Francisco Block Books for 1935 and 1946; *San Francisco Examiner* articles.

Design Professionals

Charles O. Clausen, Architect of 543–545 Natoma Street

Charles O. Clausen (1886–1973) was a local architect who designed a variety of commercial buildings, theaters, apartments, and single-family residences throughout San Francisco. Clausen was born in Napa and raised in San Francisco’s Inner Sunset and Richmond District neighborhoods. He apprenticed with the architecture firm Meyer and O’Brien and earned his architect’s certificate by the age of 23; at age 24, Clausen opened his own office in San Francisco.^{32,33} The 1909 construction date of the residential flats building at 543–545 Natoma Street within the APE establishes it as one of Clausen’s earliest designs as a licensed architect.

Some early examples of Clausen’s work include a 1911 Tudor Revival-style residence at 2844 Woolsey Street in Berkeley (extant)³⁴ and the 1913 Mission Revival-style Larkspur City Hall (extant). During this period and into the early 1940s, Clausen designed many Beaux Arts-inspired apartment buildings and single-family residences in San Francisco’s Pacific Heights (1910, 1923), Potrero Hill (1912), the Tenderloin (1914), the Mission District (1914, 1916), Presidio Heights (1918), Russian Hill (1923, 1926), St. Francis Wood (1935), and Sea Cliff (1940) neighborhoods. In 1927, Clausen embarked on a four-year partnership with architect F. Frederick Amandes and designed numerous apartment buildings, residences, and theaters including the 1928 Parkside Theater in the Sunset District (no longer extant).³⁵

Like many creative professionals during the Great Depression, Clausen underwent a career shift during the early 1930s. After ending his partnership with Amandes in 1931, Clausen was hired by small-scale developers to design modest, single-family homes. Working out of his home office in the Richmond District, Clausen designed small tracts and individual homes largely inspired by the Mediterranean Revival style. Clausen was also one of a select group of architects commissioned to build single-family residences in San Francisco’s Sunset District. His best-known work in San Francisco, and one of the few buildings he designed in a Modern style, is the Art Deco-style Doelger Building constructed in 1932 at 320 Judah Street (extant; San Francisco Landmark No. 265).³⁶

The San Francisco Planning Department considers Clausen an architect of merit.³⁷

³² *Landmark Designation Report: Doelger Building, 320-326 Judah Street, Landmark No. 265*, prepared for the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, 2012, 2-3, accessed September 6, 2023, https://default.sfplanning.org/Preservation/landmarks_designation/Approved_Doelger_Final_LM_Report.pdf.

³³ City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, *Sunset District Residential builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context Statement*, 2013, 70, accessed September 6, 2023, https://www.kevinandjonathan.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Adopted_SunsetHCS.pdf.

³⁴ “BAHA Preservation Awards 2012 Part Two,” *Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association*, accessed September 6, 2023, <http://berkeleyheritage.com/awards/awards2012.2.html>.

³⁵ *Sunset District Residential builders*, 70.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *Architecture, Planning, and Preservation Professionals: A Collection of Biographies* (draft), n.d., n.p., accessed September 7, 2023, <https://sfplanning.org/project/architecture-planning-and-preservation-professionals-collection-biographies>.

Marie-Louise Laleyan, Rehabilitation Architect of 1040–1042 Howard Street

Surviving buildings records on file at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection do not identify the original architect for the building at 1040–1042 Howard Street. Architectural plans for the 1985–86 rehabilitation of the building were designed by Bulgarian-born architect Marie-Louise Laleyan (1935–2014). She immigrated to the United States in 1964 and worked briefly as an architectural designer for Hart & Turner Architects in Sacramento, California. During the mid-1960s, Laleyan worked in the Los Angeles office of Richard Neutra where she developed an expertise in color and detailing.³⁸ In 1969, she relocated to San Francisco and worked for various local architecture firms before receiving her architect’s license in 1972. That same year, Laleyan became an American citizen and co-founded the Organization of Women Architects, a Bay Area non-profit organization that aimed to provide professional support for women working in the male-dominated architecture and design-related fields.³⁹ During the 1970s, Laleyan was a vocal advocate for women’s issues within the American Institute of Architects (AIA), serving as the co-author of the 1975 AIA Affirmative Action Plan and co-chair of the AIA Task Force on Women in Architecture.⁴⁰⁻⁴¹ In 1977, Laleyan established her own architecture firm, Laleyan Associates, which accepted commissions for commercial, institutional, medical, public, and residential buildings. Laleyan Associates particularly specialized in remodeling and alteration designs and oversaw the rehabilitation of several San Francisco apartment buildings and residence hotels.⁴² During the 1980s, one of the firm’s clients was the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, a non-profit organization that provided low-income housing.⁴³

Evaluation for National Register Eligibility

Significance Evaluation

The following section provides the evaluation of individual historic significance for two buildings located within the APE that have not been previously evaluated (i.e., 1040–1042 Howard Street and 543–545 Natoma Street). The evaluation is based on the pedestrian survey and research presented above, following National Register Criteria A through D. The San Francisco Planning Department previously determined that the buildings located at 1038 and 1044 Howard Street do not qualify as historic properties; therefore, they are not evaluated below.

SoMa Historic Context Statement Significance Requirements

The following significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood were established in the 2009 historic context statement:

Residential Buildings

Residential buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...]. Given the generally rapid rate of residential reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake, residential buildings eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A [...] (Event) should have been built between 1906 and 1936, with potentially the most

³⁸ Marie Laleyan, “Architect With a Social Conscience,” *Daily Pacific Builder*, October 31, 1986, *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8748>.

³⁹ “Our History,” Organization of Women Architects and Design Professionals, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://owa-usa.org/history.php>.

⁴⁰ “Executives In the News,” San Francisco, California, ca. 1977. *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8747>.

⁴¹ Gabrielle Esperdy, “The Incredible True Adventures of the Architectress in America,” *Places Journal*, September 2012, accessed September 6, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.22269/120910>.

⁴² “Executives In the News;” “Architect With a Social Conscience.”

⁴³ “Architect With a Social Conscience.”

significant examples constructed between 1906 and 1914, the earliest episode of post-quake reconstruction.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), residential properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Because the South of Market Area has traditionally been a working-class neighborhood, it is likely that residential properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] will be associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions.

Most dwellings in the South of Market Area are vernacular in origin, having been built by private individuals and contractors without the assistance of a trained architect. Some buildings, in particular larger apartment buildings and residential hotels, do have a conventional architectural pedigree as defined as having been architect-designed and/or manifesting "high artistic values." Therefore, in order for residential buildings to be determined eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction) they should ideally have been constructed between 1906 and 1914 and demonstrate distinctive characteristics of a "type, period, region, or period of construction." Most of the residential building types are examples of fairly common types citywide, so in order to be individually eligible, the property should either represent an unusual or distinctive property type, such as an intact bungalow court, or possess "high artistic values" or "represent the work of a master" architect, builder, or designer.⁴⁴

Commercial Buildings

Commercial buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...] Currently undesignated properties can be determined eligible for listing under National Register Criterion A [...] (Event) if they represent an important context, such as survivors of the 1906 Earthquake or as buildings constructed during the immediate post-quake reconstruction era. They can also represent other important events localized to the individual building.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), commercial properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Commercial properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] should be associated with important industrialists or businesspersons who may have built and/or occupied a building in the area for the most important part of their career. Comparatively few buildings will qualify under this Criterion.

After industrial buildings, the most common significant individual resource type in the South of Market Area are commercial properties that appear eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction). This is the dominant building type within the area bounded by Market, 1st, Howard, and 3rd streets with isolated examples outside this area. [...]M]any of the most individually significant commercial properties are already individually designated or determined eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, locally designated City Landmarks, or contributors to historic districts and conservation districts. Of undesignated commercial buildings, those that are eligible are those constructed between 1906 and 1914 and during the 1920s, and a handful of later examples constructed during the 1930s. Entire block-faces, such as New Montgomery Street, the south side of Market Street between 1st and 9th streets, and much of Mission Street between 1st and 3rd streets are still lined with such buildings.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Page & Turnbull. *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*. June 2009, 102.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 102–103.

Criterion A (Event)

1040–1042 Howard Street

1040–1042 Howard Street is associated with the pattern of events that occurred immediately following the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era in San Francisco that ended in 1913. The SoMa neighborhood was decimated, and this particular mixed-use (commercial and residential) building was constructed in 1914, one year after the initial wave of reconstruction activities ended and America had entered a recession that lasted the duration of World War I.⁴⁶ 1040–1042 Howard Street is the only extant building on the subject block constructed during wartime; the next oldest surviving building was constructed in 1926 (1014 Howard Street). Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, archival research does not indicate that the building's association with reconstruction activities is a significant one or that it is significantly associated with any known events localized to the building itself. Rather, it appears to have been typical and unremarkable among contemporary residential and commercial buildings.

The adjacent National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District “is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a representation of a noteworthy trend in development patterns and the establishment of various ethnic groups in San Francisco, most notably the Greek community. [... SoMa] was the only fully-developed and populated mixed-use area in the City that was completely destroyed and then completely redeveloped with a new light industrial emphasis. This emphasis encouraged the habitation of particular working class ethnic groups who had not previously resided in the neighborhood.”⁴⁷ According to the 1915 San Francisco city directory, some of the earliest tenants of 1040–1042 Howard Street were named Davis, Goldblatt, Gribble, Griffin, Lundgren, Quickmire, Stafford, Stiller, Vacillio, and Webb.⁴⁸ Based on these surnames and information gathered from the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder and Department of Building Inspection, archival research does not suggest that 1040–1042 Howard Street was associated with any particular ethnic group for which the adjacent historic district possesses significance.

For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion A.

543–545 Natoma Street

543–545 Natoma Street is associated with the pattern of events that occurred during the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era in San Francisco. The SoMa neighborhood was decimated, and this particular residential flats building was one of many others constructed in the years immediately following the disaster. Built in 1909 according to building permit records, it was predated by at least four extant buildings on the same block. Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential buildings presented above, archival research does not indicate that the building's association with reconstruction activities is a significant one; rather, it appears to have been typical and unremarkable.

The adjacent National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District “is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a representation of a noteworthy trend in development patterns and the establishment of various ethnic groups in San Francisco, most notably the Greek community. [... SoMa] was the only fully-developed and populated mixed-use area in the City that was completely destroyed and then completely redeveloped with a new light industrial emphasis. This emphasis encouraged the habitation of

⁴⁶ Ibid., 51.

⁴⁷ Page & Turnbull, California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009, 73, on file at the San Francisco Planning Department, <https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/external/link.ashx?Action=Download&ObjectVersion=-1&vault={A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0}&objectGUID={D315FBBE-2F5B-49BB-BCDD-0B129C89DF02}&fileGUID={76612D40-7CC6-450E-8202-ED93D660AB5B}>.

⁴⁸ 1915 Crocker-Langley San Francisco city directory.

particular working class ethnic groups who had not previously resided in the neighborhood.”⁴⁹ According to the 1910 San Francisco city directory, some of the earliest tenants of 543–545 Natoma Street were named Lacombe, Malone, Permanter, Rarrea, Watson, and Yeager.⁵⁰ Based on these surnames and information gathered from the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder and Department of Building Inspection, archival research does not suggest that 543–545 Natoma Street was associated with any particular ethnic group for which the adjacent historic district possesses significance.

For these reasons, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion A.

Criterion B (Person)

1040–1042 Howard Street

Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, preliminary archival research does not indicate that 1040–1042 Howard Street is associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions. Historically, the building was part of the multi-property real estate portfolio of a few different local property owners, and none of the building’s residents appeared to have remained there for longer than a few years. Additionally, the ground-floor commercial space does not appear to be associated with important industrialists or businesspersons. For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion B.

543–545 Natoma Street

Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential buildings presented above, preliminary archival research does not indicate that 543–545 Natoma Street is associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions. Historically, the building was part of the real estate portfolio of a few different local property owners, and none of the building’s residents appeared to have remained there for longer than a few years. For these reasons, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion B.

Criterion C (Design/Construction)

1040–1042 Howard Street

1040–1042 Howard Street is an altered example of a typical mixed-use building constructed in 1914 after the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era. It does not represent an unusual or distinctive property type, possess high artistic values, or represent the work of a prominent designer (the original architect is unknown). The contributions by Marie-Louise Laleyan, the architect of the building’s 1980s rehabilitation, appear to be minimal and completed too recently for consideration as a potentially significant alteration. When compared to other individually eligible, listed, or landmarked mixed-use buildings in SoMa and evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, 1040–1042 Howard Street exhibits little architectural interest or distinction. For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion C.

⁴⁹ Page & Turnbull, California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009, 73, on file at the San Francisco Planning Department, <https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/external/link.ashx?Action=Download&ObjectVersion=-1&vault={A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0}&objectGUID={D315FBBE-2F5B-49BB-BCDD-0B129C89DF02}&fileGUID={76612D40-7CC6-450E-8202-ED93D660AB5B}>.

⁵⁰ 1910 Crocker-Langley San Francisco city directory.

543–545 Natoma Street

543–545 Natoma Street is an altered example of a typical residential flats building constructed during San Francisco’s post-earthquake reconstruction era. Somewhat atypical is the fact that it was one of few such buildings in SoMa designed by a recognized architect of merit, Charles O. Clausen. Archival research suggests that 543–545 Natoma Street was one of Clausen’s first commissions in San Francisco as a licensed architect, and he rose to prominence as one of the architects responsible for designing many single-family residences in the Sunset District during the 1930s. It was during that period that Clausen designed his best-known buildings, including the Doelger Building at 320 Judah Street (extant; San Francisco Landmark No. 265). As an early and altered example of Clausen’s work, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be an important or representative example of his architectural legacy. Therefore, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion C.

Criterion D (Information Potential)

According to guidance in the *SoMa Historic Context Statement*, residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood are not eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion D (information potential).⁵¹ Therefore, an evaluation of properties in the APE under Criterion D is not presented.

Historic District Considerations

Based on the architectural descriptions provided above and documentation of the physical development of the project area, the four buildings located within the APE—1038 Howard, 1040–1042 Howard, 1044 Howard, and 543–545 Natoma streets—do not together form a historic district. They were constructed independently of one another over the course of nearly 55 years by different property owners. No cohesive design or use unites the grouping of buildings. None of the buildings appear to be related in terms of architectural design, function, or historical development. As such, none of the subject buildings contribute to a potential historic district.

The APE is located across Howard and Russ streets from the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. The historic district represents a concentration of light industrial, residential, and commercial properties constructed primarily between 1906 and ca. 1936 that are cohesive in scale, building typology, materials, architectural style, and relationship to the street.⁵² As originally documented in 2009, the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District included a total of 1,053 properties and encompassed the previously documented National Register-eligible Sixth Street Lodginghouse Historic District as well as the four buildings in the APE.⁵³ Upon review, Planning Department preservation staff recommended that the two historic districts should be geographically separate and proposed redrawn boundaries of the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District to exclude the Sixth Street Lodginghouse Historic District as well as the four buildings in the APE and other nearby buildings located between the historic districts.⁵⁴ A motion to adopt the *SoMa Historic Resources Survey* as amended was put before the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, and it was officially adopted on February 16, 2011.⁵⁵

⁵¹ The *SoMa Historic Context Statement* allows that public assembly/institutional buildings may possess significance under Criterion D, but no other building types (i.e., residential, commercial, and industrial) may be eligible for information potential. Page & Turnbull, *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*. June 2009, 102–104.

⁵² Page & Turnbull, California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009, 1, on file at the San Francisco Planning Department, <https://citypln-m-extn1.sfgov.org/external/link.ashx?Action=Download&ObjectVersion=-1&vault={A4A7DACD-B0DC-4322-BD29-F6F07103C6E0}&objectGUID={D315FBBE-2F5B-49BB-BCDD-0B129C89DF02}&fileGUID={76612D40-7CC6-450E-8202-ED93D660AB5B}>.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, “Executive Summary of SoMa Historic Resource Survey Findings (Case no. 2010.0486U),” prepared for the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, December 1, 2010.

⁵⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, “Historic Preservation Commission Motion 0103 to Adopt the SoMa Historic Resources Survey (Case no. 2010.0486U),” prepared for the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, adopted February 16, 2011.

Because the officially adopted boundaries of the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District exclude the four buildings in the APE, no further analysis of considerations relative to the historic district is presented.

Integrity Analysis

In addition to being eligible for listing under at least one of the four National Register criteria, a property must also retain integrity, i.e., the ability of a property to convey its significance through the retention of essential physical features that express its historic identity. As neither 1040–1042 Howard Street nor 543–545 Natoma Street appear to be individually significant under any National Register criteria, a discussion of integrity is not applicable.

Conclusion

Based on a site survey, archival research, and the analysis presented in this memo, ESA recommends the buildings at 1040–1042 Howard Street nor 543–545 Natoma Street as ineligible for individual listing in the National Register under any criteria. As such, neither 1040–1042 Howard Street nor 543–545 Natoma Street would be considered historic properties for the purposes of NHPA Section 106. Because no historic properties are located within the APE, ESA recommends the project would result in a finding of **No Historic Properties Affected**.

Sources

Anchor Realty. “Our Story.” Accessed September 14, 2023. <https://anchorealtyinc.com/about-us-3/>.

Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association. “BAHA Preservation Awards 2012 Part Two.” Accessed September 6, 2023. <http://berkeleyheritage.com/awards/awards2012.2.html>.

Brown, Mary. *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for the San Francisco City and County Planning Department, 2010.

California State Office of Historic Preservation. “Instructions for Recording Historical Resources.” March 1995. <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/manual95.pdf>.

City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. *San Francisco Neighborhood Commercial Buildings Historic Context Statement, 1865-1965*. San Francisco, CA. 2022. On file at the San Francisco Planning Department.

-----, *San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 18: Residential and Commercial Architectural Periods and Styles in San Francisco*. Accessed September 13, 2023. <https://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/5099-PresBulletin18ARCHSTYLES.pdf>.

-----, *Sunset District Residential builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context Statement*. San Francisco, CA. 2013. Accessed September 6, 2023. https://www.kevinandjonathan.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Adopted_SunsetHCS.pdf.

-----, Block Book 3627-2746 (vol. 25). 1935; 1946.

“Decreed Nuisance.” *San Francisco Examiner*. November 24, 1954.

Esperdy, Gabrielle. “The Incredible True Adventures of the Architectress in America.” *Places Journal*. September 2012. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.22269/120910>.

- “Executives In the News.” Untitled news clipping, San Francisco, California, ca. 1977. *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8747>.
- ICF. *Flats and Small Apartment Buildings 1915–1978 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco, CA. 2023.
- Laleyan, Marie. “Architect With a Social Conscience.” *Daily Pacific Builder*. October 31, 1986. *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8748>.
- Organization of Women Architects and Design Professionals. “Our History.” Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://owa-usa.org/history.php>.
- “Outlying Sections of the City Gain Activity in Realty Trading.” *San Francisco Examiner*. August 31, 1913.
- Page & Turnbull, Inc. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 form set for *Western SoMa Light Industrial & Residential Historic District*. 2009. On file at the San Francisco Planning Department.
- . California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 form set for 1035 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA. 2009. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://sfplanninggis.org/docs/DPRForms/3731094.pdf>.
- . *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco, CA. 2009.
- . *South of Market Area Plan Historic Resource Survey*. Prepared for City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco, CA. 2009.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps.
- San Francisco Relief and Red Cross Funds Corporation. Department Report of the San Francisco Relief and Red Cross Funds Corporation. San Francisco, CA. 1907.
- San Francisco Property Information Map. “Report: 3731094.” Accessed September 6, 2023, <https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/?search=3731094>.
- San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission. *Landmark Designation Report: Doelger Building, 320-326 Judah Street, Landmark No. 265*, 2012. Accessed September 6, 2023. https://default.sfplanning.org/Preservation/landmarks_designation/Approved_Doelger_Final_LM_Report.pdf.
- Tobriner, Stephen. *Bracing for Disaster: Earthquake-Resistant Architecture and Engineering in San Francisco, 1838-1933*. Berkeley, CA: Bancroft Library and Heyday Books, 2006.

Appendix A

DPR Series 523 Form-sets for
1040–1042 Howard Street and
543–545 Natoma Street

State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Primary
HRI #
Trinomial
NRHP Status Code

Other Listings
Review Code

Reviewer

Date

Page 1 of 6

***Resource Name or #:** 1040–1042 Howard Street

P1. Other Identifier: N/A

***P2. Location:** ☐ Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted

***a. County** San Francisco

***b. USGS 7.5' Quad** San Francisco North

Date 2021

T 2S; R 5W; ¼ of ¼ of Sec ; B.M.

c. Address 1040–1042 Howard Street

City San Francisco

Zip 94103

d. UTM: Zone , mE/ mN

e. Other Locational Data: APN 3726-018

***P3a. Description:**

The building located at 1040–1042 Howard Street is a three-story, mixed-use building that was constructed in 1914. It features an I-shaped footprint (formed by two lightwells on the side walls), is of wood-frame construction, is clad in stucco, and is capped by a flat roof. According to the 1990s Sanborn map, the first floor contains one commercial space, and a total of five apartments are contained within the second and third floors.

The primary (southeast) façade faces Howard Street. At the first floor, an aluminum-frame storefront assembly is located behind a metal security grille. The storefront is flanked by two recessed entrances to the residential units above. The recessed entrances are fitted with metal security grilles and contain concrete steps, and the steps to the east entrance are covered with mosaic tiles. Stacked, angled bay windows on the second and third floors feature one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows; some of the original windows have been replaced with single-hung, vinyl-sash windows. The façade terminates in a simple cornice with egg-and-dart molding that disguises a stepped parapet behind.

The side (northeast and southwest) facades are clad in channel-drop wood siding, and fixed, sliding, and single-hung, aluminum-sash windows are located within the light wells. The rear (northwest) façade features stacked, angled bay windows and a metal fire escape.

***P3b. Resource Attributes:** HP3. Multiple Family Property, HP6. 1-3 Story Commercial Building

***P4. Resources Present:** ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects).



P5b. Description of Photo:

View of primary (southeast) façade on Howard Street, facing northwest. Photo by ESA, August 31, 2023.

***P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:**

☒ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

1914. Source: San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.

***P7. Owner and Address:**

Michael Kwong
120 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

P8. Recorded by:

Amy Langford / ESA
180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1050
Oakland, CA 94612

***P9. Date Recorded:** August 31, 2023

***P10. Survey Type:** Intensive

***P11. Report Citation:** ESA. *1044 Howard Street Project—Section 106 Cultural Resources Survey Report*. Prepared for the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. October 2023.

***Attachments:** ☐ NONE ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☒ Continuation Sheet ☒ Building, Structure, and Object Record
☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record
☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (List):

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

*Resource Name or # 1040–1042 Howard Street *NRHP Status Code 6Z

Page 2 of 6

- B1. Historic Name: N/A
B2. Common Name: 1040–1042 Howard Street
B3. Original Use: Mixed Use B4. Present Use: Mixed Use

*B5. Architectural Style: Edwardian

*B6. Construction History:

Constructed in 1914. A review of building permit records indicate that the building remained largely unchanged until the installation of new fire escape ladders in 1966. Between 1966 and 1978, the building underwent various repairs, including new sprinklers, plaster work, and stair repairs. Between 1985 and 1991, the building underwent substantive rehabilitation repairs, including structural work, foundation repair, and repairs related to a 1987 fire. In 2016, repairs were made to damaged drywall, one window, and replace egress doors. ESA staff observed that original windows on the second and third floor, original decorative medallions, and original panel cornice were removed from the exterior sometime after 1974.

*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: N/A

Original Location: N/A

*B8. Related Features: None

B9a. Architect: Original architect is unknown; ca. 1980s rehabilitation architect is Marie-Louise Laleyan b. Builder: Unknown

*B10. Significance: Theme N/A

Area N/A

Period of Significance N/A

Property Type N/A

Applicable Criteria N/A

South of Market Neighborhood

1040–1042 Howard Street is located two blocks south of Market Street in the heart of San Francisco's South of Market neighborhood (SoMa). The following brief history of SoMa is summarized from the 2009 *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement* (Page & Turnbull, 2009) and focuses on the early 20th-century Reconstruction Period (1906–13).

By the early 20th century, SoMa had become one of San Francisco's most ethnically diverse and densely populated neighborhoods. The majority of SoMa's residential workforce was manual workers, and the rest were seasonally or intermittently employed. Consequently, the neighborhood was uncommonly transient and attracted residents less likely to own property and more likely to reside at one address for long periods of time. In contrast to the large-scale, masonry commercial buildings that dominated Market Street, SoMa's industrial buildings and warehouses were interspersed among a growing number of wood-frame tenements, residential hotels, and apartments that accommodated the primarily single, male, and working-class population.

SoMa was decimated by the earthquake that hit San Francisco on April 18, 1906. Numerous fires ravaged the area's aging wood-frame building stock and destroyed the neighborhood within six hours. With several notable exceptions (e.g., the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Post Office and Court of Appeals buildings), nearly every building and structure in SoMa was consumed.

The first years of the post-earthquake reconstruction period (1906–13) in SoMa were largely devoted to clearing debris and salvaging any stable and intact buildings and structures. Once active reconstruction commenced, most of investors' attention and capital was directed towards rebuilding the district's infrastructure as well as its industrial and commercial core. Throughout the late 1910s and 1920s, concentrated areas of reinforced concrete or steel-frame and brick buildings dominated the district south of Howard Street. Light industrial and commercial buildings populated major roads, such as the 6th Street commercial corridor, and operated as retail or office spaces, restaurants, and service shops. (Continued on page 3)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: None


*B12. References: See page 6

B13. Remarks: None

*B14. Evaluator: Johanna Kahn / ESA

*Date of Evaluation: September 2023

(This space reserved for official comments.)



Source: San Francisco Planning Department's Property Information Map

***B10. Significance:** (Continued from page 2)

Most were constructed during a second building boom during the 1920s and were typically made of concrete and had multi-lite windows in the upper stories to provide natural light. Less austere than the warehouses and industrial buildings in the district, these new commercial buildings often incorporated ornamentation derived from Art Deco, Spanish Colonial Revival, or Classical Revival architectural styles.

The district also underwent a demographic shift during the reconstruction period. While commercial and industrial areas grew relatively quickly, residential reconstruction was limited and sporadically funded. As a result, the district's residential population shrank dramatically. Between 1900 and 1910, SoMa's residential population dropped from 62,000 to 24,000. The neighborhood's working-class inhabitants, who lacked the financial reserves to remain in the recovering district, largely relocated to the working-class Potrero and Mission districts or eventually secured single-family dwellings along the outskirts of the city. Small yet vibrant Greek, Japanese, and Filipino enclaves developed along Folsom Street and in the vicinity of South Park, and many single, white, American-born males also settled in SoMa. Subsequent restrictive immigration laws exacerbated this trend and ensured that SoMa's residential population remained predominantly white and American-born until World War II.

Edwardian-Era Multi-Family Residential Architecture

After the 1906 Earthquake, the pressing demands for housing resulted in the construction of numerous flats, residential hotels, boarding houses, cottage courts, and the occasional single-family residence. Between 1906 and 1913, residential reconstruction produced buildings from three major categories: wood-frame or masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings ranging from three to six stories tall; wood-frame, single-family dwellings and cottages; and wood-frame multi-family flats. While hotels and apartment houses were typically designed in Colonial Revival or Classical Revival styles, cottages and flats were often designed in Craftsman and Mission Revival styles.

Edwardian-era multi-family residential buildings dating from the post-1906 reconstruction period—including 1040–42 Howard Street—share several notable defining characteristics. The San Francisco Planning Department defines the term “Edwardian” to encompass popular architectural styles in Great Britain and its territories during the reign of King Edward VII (1901–10). Edwardian-era architecture is comprised primarily of five contemporaneous styles: Beaux-Arts, Arts and Crafts, Gothic Revival, Baroque Revival, and Neo-Georgian. Much like other early 20th-century American variants, Edwardian-era residential buildings in SoMa are typically wood-frame apartment buildings or multi-unit flats that are clad in stucco or wood siding and feature flat roofs, decorative cornices, and angled bay windows. Apartments and residential flats from this period typically featured restrained ornamentation such as simple wood door and window moldings, modillion or box cornices, and raised or recessed spandrels and are predominantly situated along 10th, Folsom, and Howard streets. Some multi-family residences were mixed-use buildings with street-level spaces devoted to commercial or light industrial uses. Such buildings often feature commercial storefronts with recessed entry vestibules, storefront transoms, plate glass display windows, and fabric awnings.

Ownership and Occupancy History

The ownership history of 1040–1042 Howard Street is summarized in the table below. A preliminary review of San Francisco city directories and U.S. Federal Census records did not identify any long-term (i.e., 10 years or more) tenants or commercial occupants of 1040–1042 Howard Street.

Year(s)	Name(s)	Note
1935	Oliver Goldblatt	
1946	Erich R. & Christel Klawonn	
1966	Anchor Realty Co.	Anchor Realty Co. (est. 1945) is a San Francisco-based brokerage and property management firm.
1976	Transamerican Title Insurance	
1985	Frances Clewans	Frances Clewans was a local property owner. A 1954 <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> article names her as the owner of a nearby apartment building at 159–165 Russ Street.
Unknown – 1998	Prana Associates Fifteen LP	
1998–2002	Declan Ryan	
2001–02	Gregory Moore	
2002 – Unknown	Susan Choy & Michael Kwong	
2023	Michael Kwong	

Marie-Louise Laleyan, Rehabilitation Architect of 1040–1042 Howard Street

Surviving buildings records on file at the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection do not identify the original architect for the building at 1040–1042 Howard Street. Architectural plans for the 1985–86 rehabilitation of the building were designed by Bulgarian-born architect Marie-Louise Laleyan (1935–2014). She immigrated to the United States in 1964 and worked briefly as an architectural designer for Hart & Turner Architects in Sacramento, California. During the mid-1960s, Laleyan worked in the Los Angeles office of Richard Neutra where she developed an expertise in color and detailing. In 1969, she relocated to San Francisco and worked for various local architecture firms before receiving her architect's license in 1972. That same year, Laleyan became an American citizen and co-founded the Organization of Women Architects, a Bay Area non-profit organization that aimed to provide professional support for women working in the male-dominated architecture and design-related fields. During the 1970s, Laleyan was a vocal advocate for women's issues within the American Institute of Architects (AIA), serving as the co-author of the 1975 AIA Affirmative Action Plan and co-chair of the AIA Task Force on Women in Architecture. In 1977, Laleyan established her own architecture firm, Laleyan Associates, which accepted commissions for commercial, institutional, medical, public, and residential buildings. Laleyan Associates particularly specialized in remodeling and alteration designs and oversaw the rehabilitation of several San Francisco apartment buildings and residence hotels. During the 1980s, one of the firm's clients was the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, a non-profit organization that provided low-income housing.

Evaluation for National Register Eligibility

Significance Evaluation

SoMa Historic Context Statement Significance Requirements

The following significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) were established in the 2009 historic context statement:

Residential Buildings

Residential buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...]. Given the generally rapid rate of residential reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake, residential buildings eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A [...] (Event) should have been built between 1906 and 1936, with potentially the most significant examples constructed between 1906 and 1914, the earliest episode of post-quake reconstruction.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), residential properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Because the South of Market Area has traditionally been a working-class neighborhood, it is likely that residential properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] will be associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions.

Most dwellings in the South of Market Area are vernacular in origin, having been built by private individuals and contractors without the assistance of a trained architect. Some buildings, in particular larger apartment buildings and residential hotels, do have a conventional architectural pedigree as defined as having been architect-designed and/or manifesting "high artistic values." Therefore, in order for residential buildings to be determined eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction) they should ideally have been constructed between 1906 and 1914 and demonstrate distinctive characteristics of a "type, period, region, or period of construction." Most of the residential building types are examples of fairly common types citywide, so in order to be individually eligible, the property should either represent an unusual or distinctive property type, such as an intact bungalow court, or possess "high artistic values" or "represent the work of a master" architect, builder, or designer.

Commercial Buildings

Commercial buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...]. Currently undesignated properties can be determined eligible for listing under National Register Criterion A [...] (Event) if they represent an important context, such as survivors of the 1906 Earthquake or as buildings constructed during the immediate post-quake reconstruction era. They can also represent other important events localized to the individual building.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), commercial properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Commercial properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] should be associated with important industrialists or businesspersons who may have built and/or occupied a

building in the area for the most important part of their career. Comparatively few buildings will qualify under this Criterion.

After industrial buildings, the most common significant individual resource type in the South of Market Area are commercial properties that appear eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction). This is the dominant building type within the area bounded by Market, 1st, Howard, and 3rd streets with isolated examples outside this area. [...] Many of the most individually significant commercial properties are already individually designated or determined eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, locally designated City Landmarks, or contributors to historic districts and conservation districts. Of undesignated commercial buildings, those that are eligible are those constructed between 1906 and 1914 and during the 1920s, and a handful of later examples constructed during the 1930s. Entire block-faces, such as New Montgomery Street, the south side of Market Street between 1st and 9th streets, and much of Mission Street between 1st and 3rd streets are still lined with such buildings.

Criterion A—Event

1040–1042 Howard Street is associated with the pattern of events that occurred immediately following the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era in San Francisco that ended in 1913. The SoMa neighborhood was decimated, and this particular mixed-use (commercial and residential) building was constructed in 1914, one year after the initial wave of reconstruction activities ended and America had entered a recession that lasted the duration of World War I. 1040–1042 Howard Street is the only extant building on the subject block constructed during wartime; the next oldest surviving building was constructed in 1926 (1014 Howard Street). Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, archival research does not indicate that the building's association with reconstruction activities is a significant one or that it is significantly associated with any known events localized to the building itself. Rather, it appears to have been typical and unremarkable among contemporary residential and commercial buildings.

The adjacent National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District “is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a representation of a noteworthy trend in development patterns and the establishment of various ethnic groups in San Francisco, most notably the Greek community. [...] SoMa] was the only fully-developed and populated mixed-use area in the City that was completely destroyed and then completely redeveloped with a new light industrial emphasis. This emphasis encouraged the habitation of particular working class ethnic groups who had not previously resided in the neighborhood.” According to the 1915 San Francisco city directory, some of the earliest tenants of 1040–1042 Howard Street were named Davis, Goldblatt, Gribble, Griffin, Lundgren, Quickmire, Stafford, Stiller, Vacillio, and Webb. Based on these surnames and information gathered from the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder and Department of Building Inspection, archival research does not suggest that 1040–1042 Howard Street was associated with any particular ethnic group for which the adjacent historic district possesses significance.

For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion A.

Criterion B—Person

Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, preliminary archival research does not indicate that 1040–1042 Howard Street is associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions. Historically, the building was part of the multi-property real estate portfolio of a few different local property owners, and none of the building's residents appeared to have remained there for longer than a few years. Additionally, the ground-floor commercial space does not appear to be associated with important industrialists or businesspersons. For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion B.

Criterion C—Design/Construction

1040–1042 Howard Street is an altered example of a typical mixed-use building constructed in 1914 after the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era. It does not represent an unusual or distinctive property type, possess high artistic values, or represent the work of a prominent designer (the original architect is unknown). The contributions by Marie-Louise Laleyan, the architect of the building's 1980s rehabilitation, appear to be minimal and completed too recently for consideration as a potentially significant alteration. When compared to other individually eligible, listed, or landmarked mixed-use buildings in SoMa and evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings presented above, 1040–1042 Howard Street exhibits little architectural interest or distinction. For these reasons, 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion C.

Criterion D—Potential to Yield Information. According to guidance in the *SoMa Historic Context Statement*, residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood are not eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion D (information potential). Therefore, an evaluation of properties in the APE under Criterion D is not presented.

Page 6 of 6

*Resource Name or # 1041–1042 Howard Street

*Recorded by: Johanna Kahn / ESA

*Date: September 2023

☒ Continuation

☐ Update

Integrity

In addition to being eligible for listing under at least one of the four National Register criteria, a property must also retain integrity, i.e., the ability of a property to convey its significance through the retention of essential physical features that express its historic identity. As 1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually significant under any National Register criteria, a discussion of integrity is not applicable.

Summary

1040–1042 Howard Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register, and an assessment of integrity is not applicable. Therefore, it does not qualify as a historic property under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

***B12. References:** (Continued from page 2)

City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. *San Francisco Neighborhood Commercial Buildings Historic Context Statement, 1865-1965*. 2022.

City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. "San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 18: Residential and Commercial Architectural Periods and Styles in San Francisco." Accessed September 13, 2023. <https://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/5099-PresBulletin18ARCHSTYLES.pdf>.

Esperdy, Gabrielle. "The Incredible True Adventures of the Architectress in America." *Places Journal*. September 2012. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.22269/120910>.

"Executives In the News." San Francisco, California, ca. 1977. *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*, /accessed September 6, 2023. <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8747>.

ICF. *Flats and Small Apartment Buildings 1915-1978 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco, CA. 2023.

Laleyan, Marie. "Architect With a Social Conscience." *Daily Pacific Builder*. October 31, 1986. *VT Special Collections and University Archives Online*. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://digitalsc.lib.vt.edu/items/show/8748>.

"Our History." Organization of Women Architects and Design Professionals. Accessed September 6, 2023. <https://owa-usa.org/history.php>.

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

----- California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009. On file at the San Francisco Planning Department.

State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Primary
HRI #
Trinomial
NRHP Status Code

Other Listings
Review Code

Reviewer

Date

Page 1 of 7

***Resource Name or #:** 543–545 Natoma Street

P1. Other Identifier: N/A

***P2. Location:** ☐ Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted

***a. County** San Francisco

***b. USGS 7.5' Quad** San Francisco North **Date** 2021

T 2S; **R** 5W; $\frac{1}{4}$ of $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec ; **B.M.**

c. Address: 543–545 Natoma Street, 51–55 Russ Street

City: San Francisco

Zip: 94103

d. UTM: Zone , mE/ mN

e. Other Locational Data: APN 3726-046

***P3a. Description:**

The building located at 543–545 Natoma Street (also addressed as 51–55 Russ Street) was constructed in 1909 and contains residential flats. It features a roughly rectangular footprint, is of wood-frame construction, and is capped by a flat roof. Typical windows are one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows except where replacement windows are described below. The northeast portion of the building (addressed 543–545 Natoma Street) contains three flats and is three stories over a basement, and the southeast portion of the building (addressed 51–55 Russ Street) contains three flats and is three stories in height.

The primary (northwest) façade faces Natoma Street, is clad in stucco, and is composed of three structural bays. At the first floor, the east bay features an arched opening fitted with a metal security grille that contains a recessed entry. The center and west bays each contain a pair of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows behind metal security grilles. Angled bay windows on the second and third floors as well as the horizontal space between the bays feature one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows. The façade terminates in a cornice with egg-and-dart molding, dentil molding, and carved brackets. (Continued on page 3)

***P3b. Resource Attributes:** HP3. Multiple Family Property

***P4. Resources Present:** ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)



P5b. Description of Photo:

View of primary (northwest) and secondary (southwest) façades, view facing southeast. Photo by ESA, August 31, 2023.

***P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:**

☒ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

1909. Source: San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.

***P7. Owner and Address:**

Marilyn J. Devera, Marilyn J. Devera Living Trust
22 Clear View Drive
Daly City, CA 94015

P8. Recorded by:

Amy Langford / ESA
180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1050
Oakland, CA 94612

***P9. Date Recorded:** August 31, 2023

***P10. Survey Type:** Intensive

***P11. Report Citation:** ESA. *1044 Howard Street Project—Section 106 Cultural Resources Survey Report*. Prepared for the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. October 2023.

***Attachments:** ☐ NONE ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☒ Continuation Sheet ☒ Building, Structure, and Object Record
☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record
☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (List):

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

*Resource Name or # 543–545 Natoma Street *NRHP Status Code 6Z

Page 2 of 7

- B1. Historic Name: N/A
B2. Common Name: 543–545 Natoma Street, 51–55 Russ Street
B3. Original Use: Multiple-Family Residence B4. Present Use: Multiple-Family Residence

*B5. Architectural Style: Edwardian

*B6. Construction History:

The building was constructed in 1909. A review of building permit records indicates that the wood-frame building was originally clad in channel-drop wood siding on all facades. The building's primary and secondary facades were re-clad in cement (i.e., stucco) in 1931. Between 1939 and 1940, the building underwent minor structural work, repairs were made to stairs, and the basement was repaired and cemented. ESA staff observed that the original exposed concrete basement was clad in stucco, two original windows were replaced, original bay window trim was removed, and an original decorative medallion above the Russ Street entrance was removed at some point between 1940 and 2007. Between 2012 and 2019, the building underwent various repairs, including repairs to siding, rear stairs, and guardrails, the installation of metal window grilles at the first floor. During this time, the building was also reroofed and underwent seismic retrofitting.

*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: N/A

Original Location: N/A

*B8. Related Features: None

B9a. Architect: Charles O. Clausen

b. Builder: Ratto and Giannini

*B10. Significance: Theme N/A

Area N/A

Period of Significance N/A

Property Type N/A

Applicable Criteria N/A

South of Market Neighborhood

543–545 Natoma Street is located two blocks south of Market Street in the heart of San Francisco's South of Market neighborhood (SoMa). The following brief history of SoMa is summarized from the 2009 *South of Market Area Historic Context Statement* (Page & Turnbull, 2009) and focuses on the early 20th-century Reconstruction Period (1906–13).

By the early 20th century, SoMa had become one of San Francisco's most ethnically diverse and densely populated neighborhoods. The majority of SoMa's residential workforce was manual workers, and the rest were seasonally or intermittently employed. Consequently, the neighborhood was uncommonly transient and attracted residents less likely to own property and more likely to reside at one address for long periods of time. In contrast to the large-scale, masonry commercial buildings that dominated Market Street, SoMa's industrial buildings and warehouses were interspersed among a growing number of wood-frame tenements, residential hotels, and apartments that accommodated the primarily single, male, and working-class population.

SoMa was decimated by the earthquake that hit San Francisco on April 18, 1906. Numerous fires ravaged the area's aging wood-frame building stock and destroyed the neighborhood within six hours. With several notable exceptions (e.g., the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Post Office and Court of Appeals buildings), nearly every building and structure in SoMa was consumed.

The first years of the post-earthquake reconstruction period (1906–13) in SoMa were largely devoted to clearing debris and salvaging any stable and intact buildings and structures. Once active reconstruction commenced, most of investors' attention and capital was directed towards rebuilding the district's infrastructure as well as its industrial and commercial core. Throughout the late 1910s and 1920s, concentrated areas of reinforced concrete or steel-frame and brick buildings dominated the district south of Howard Street. Light industrial and commercial buildings populated major roads, such as the 6th Street commercial corridor, and operated as retail or office spaces, restaurants, and service shops. (Continued on page 3)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: None


*B12. References: See page 6

B13. Remarks: None

*B14. Evaluator: Johanna Kahn / ESA

*Date of Evaluation: September 2023

(This space reserved for official comments.)



Source: San Francisco Planning Department's Property Information Map

***P3a. Description:** (Continued from page 1)

The secondary (southwest) façade faces Russ Street and is clad in stucco. The first floor features four pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window; a gated doorway; and an arched opening with concrete steps and a metal security grille. The second floor features four pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window as well as one pair of sliding, vinyl-sash replacement windows. The third floor features five pairs of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows and one individual one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash window. The façade terminates in a cornice with egg-and-dart molding, dentil molding, and carved brackets. The rear façade faces southeast and is clad in channel-drop wood siding. Only the third story is visible above the adjacent building at 1044 Howard Street, and it features a pair of one-over-one, single-hung, wood-sash windows.

***B10. Significance:** (Continued from page 2)

Most were constructed during a second building boom during the 1920s and were typically made of concrete and had multi-lite windows in the upper stories to provide natural light. Less austere than the warehouses and industrial buildings in the district, these new commercial buildings often incorporated ornamentation derived from Art Deco, Spanish Colonial Revival, or Classical Revival architectural styles.

The district also underwent a demographic shift during the reconstruction period. While commercial and industrial areas grew relatively quickly, residential reconstruction was limited and sporadically funded. As a result, the district's residential population shrank dramatically. Between 1900 and 1910, SoMa's residential population dropped from 62,000 to 24,000. The neighborhood's working-class inhabitants, who lacked the financial reserves to remain in the recovering district, largely relocated to the working-class Potrero and Mission districts or eventually secured single-family dwellings along the outskirts of the city. Small yet vibrant Greek, Japanese, and Filipino enclaves developed along Folsom Street and in the vicinity of South Park, and many single, white, American-born males also settled in SoMa. Subsequent restrictive immigration laws exacerbated this trend and ensured that SoMa's residential population remained predominantly white and American-born until World War II.

Edwardian-Era Multi-Family Residential Architecture

After the 1906 Earthquake, the pressing demands for housing resulted in the construction of numerous flats, residential hotels, boarding houses, cottage courts, and the occasional single-family residence. Between 1906 and 1913, residential reconstruction produced buildings from three major categories: wood-frame or masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings ranging from three to six stories tall; wood-frame, single-family dwellings and cottages; and wood-frame multi-family flats. While hotels and apartment houses were typically designed in Colonial Revival or Classical Revival styles, cottages and flats were often designed in Craftsman and Mission Revival styles.

Edwardian-era multi-family residential buildings dating from the post-1906 reconstruction period—including 543–545 Natoma Street—share several notable defining characteristics. The San Francisco Planning Department defines the term "Edwardian" to encompass popular architectural styles in Great Britain and its territories during the reign of King Edward VII (1901–10). Edwardian-era architecture is comprised primarily of five contemporaneous styles: Beaux-Arts, Arts and Crafts, Gothic Revival, Baroque Revival, and Neo-Georgian. Much like other early 20th-century American variants, Edwardian-era residential buildings in SoMa are typically wood-frame apartment buildings or multi-unit flats that are clad in stucco or wood siding and feature flat roofs, decorative cornices, and angled bay windows. Apartments and residential flats from this period typically featured restrained ornamentation such as simple wood door and window moldings, modillion or box cornices, and raised or recessed spandrels and are predominantly situated along 10th, Folsom, and Howard streets.

Ownership and Occupancy History

The ownership history of 543–545 Natoma Street is summarized in the table below. A preliminary review of San Francisco city directories and U.S. Federal Census records did not identify any long-term (i.e., 10 years or more) tenants of 543–545 Natoma Street.

Year(s)	Name(s)	Note
1909–1931	Louis Haas	Louis Haas was a local property owner. A 1913 <i>San Francisco Examiner</i> article lists Haas as the owner of the properties at 1666–1668 Howard Street and 1524–1526 Golden Gate Avenue.
1935	Louis and Carrie Haas	SF Block Book records for 1935 also list Haas as the owner for the nearby property at 551 Natoma Street.
1939–40	Teresa Stadlberger	Teresa Stadlberger was a local property owner. The 1935 Block Book lists her as the owner of the properties at 516, 519, 556, 558, and 560 Natoma Street. The 1946 Block Book lists her as the owner of the properties at 543–545, 552, 554, 556, 558, and 560 Natoma Street.
1946	Teresa Stadlberger and Arthur Liebschutz	Arthur Liebschutz was a local property owner. The 1946 Block Book lists him as the owner of the properties at 519 and 529 Natoma Street.
1963	Teresa Doely and Arthur Liebschutz	
1975–91	Francis W.K. Hom and Sui Ying Hom Estate of Francis W.K. Home and Daniel W. Hom	
1991–92	Prana Associates Fourteen	
1992	Shari Vlahos and James Vlahos	
1992–2016	Manuel L. Devera and Marilyn J. Devera	
2016 – present	Marilyn J. Devera, Marilyn J. De Vera Living Trust	

Charles O. Clausen, Architect of 543–545 Natoma Street

Charles O. Clausen (1886–1973) was a local architect who designed a variety of commercial buildings, theaters, apartments, and single-family residences throughout San Francisco. Clausen was born in Napa and raised in San Francisco's Inner Sunset and Richmond District neighborhoods. He apprenticed with the architecture firm Meyer and O'Brien and earned his architect's certificate by the age of 23; at age 24, Clausen opened his own office in San Francisco. The 1909 construction date of the residential flats building at 543–545 Natoma Street within the APE establishes it as one of Clausen's earliest designs as a licensed architect.

Some early examples of Clausen's work include a 1911 Tudor Revival-style residence at 2844 Woolsey Street in Berkeley (extant) and the 1913 Mission Revival-style Larkspur City Hall (extant). During this period and into the early 1940s, Clausen designed many Beaux Arts-inspired apartment buildings and single-family residences in San Francisco's Pacific Heights (1910, 1923), Potrero Hill (1912), the Tenderloin (1914), the Mission District (1914, 1916), Presidio Heights (1918), Russian Hill (1923, 1926), St. Francis Wood (1935), and Sea Cliff (1940) neighborhoods. In 1927, Clausen embarked on a four-year partnership with architect F. Frederick Amandes and designed numerous apartment buildings, residences, and theaters including the 1928 Parkside Theater in the Sunset District (no longer extant).

Like many creative professionals during the Great Depression, Clausen underwent a career shift during the early 1930s. After ending his partnership with Amandes in 1931, Clausen was hired by small-scale developers to design modest, single-family homes. Working out of his home office in the Richmond District, Clausen designed small tracts and individual homes largely inspired by the Mediterranean Revival style. Clausen was also one of a select group of architects commissioned to build single-family residences in San Francisco's Sunset District. His best-known work in San Francisco, and one of the few buildings he designed in a Modern style, is the Art Deco-style Doelger Building constructed in 1932 at 320 Judah Street (extant; San Francisco Landmark No. 265).

The San Francisco Planning Department considers Clausen an architect of merit.

Evaluation for National Register Eligibility

Significance Evaluation

SoMa Historic Context Statement Significance Requirements

The following significance requirements for residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) were established in the 2009 historic context statement:

Residential Buildings

Residential buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...]. Given the generally rapid rate of residential reconstruction after the 1906 Earthquake, residential buildings eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A [...] (Event) should have been built between 1906 and 1936, with potentially the most significant examples constructed between 1906 and 1914, the earliest episode of post-quake reconstruction.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), residential properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Because the South of Market Area has traditionally been a working-class neighborhood, it is likely that residential properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] will be associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions.

Most dwellings in the South of Market Area are vernacular in origin, having been built by private individuals and contractors without the assistance of a trained architect. Some buildings, in particular larger apartment buildings and residential hotels, do have a conventional architectural pedigree as defined as having been architect-designed and/or manifesting "high artistic values." Therefore, in order for residential buildings to be determined eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction) they should ideally have been constructed between 1906 and 1914 and demonstrate distinctive characteristics of a "type, period, region, or period of construction." Most of the residential building types are examples of fairly common types citywide, so in order to be individually eligible, the property should either represent an unusual or distinctive property type, such as an intact bungalow court, or possess "high artistic values" or "represent the work of a master" architect, builder, or designer.

Commercial Buildings

Commercial buildings in the South of Market Area can be evaluated under National Register Criteria A, B, and C [...]. Currently undesignated properties can be determined eligible for listing under National Register Criterion A [...] (Event) if they represent an important context, such as survivors of the 1906 Earthquake or as buildings constructed during the immediate post-quake reconstruction era. They can also represent other important events localized to the individual building.

For properties to be listed under National Register Criterion B [...] (Person), commercial properties should be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. This association should be demonstrable and be related to the person's productive life. Commercial properties eligible for listing under [Criterion] B [...] should be associated with important industrialists or businesspersons who may have built and/or occupied a building in the area for the most important part of their career. Comparatively few buildings will qualify under this Criterion.

After industrial buildings, the most common significant individual resource type in the South of Market Area are commercial properties that appear eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C [...] (Design/Construction). This is the dominant building type within the area bounded by Market, 1st, Howard, and 3rd streets with isolated examples outside this area. [...] Many of the most individually significant commercial properties are already individually designated or determined eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, locally designated City Landmarks, or contributors to historic districts and conservation districts. Of undesignated commercial buildings, those that are eligible are those constructed between 1906 and 1914 and during the 1920s, and a handful of later examples constructed during the 1930s. Entire block-faces, such as New Montgomery Street, the south side of Market Street between 1st and 9th streets, and much of Mission Street between 1st and 3rd streets are still lined with such buildings.

Criterion A—Event

543–545 Natoma Street is associated with the pattern of events that occurred during the initial post-earthquake reconstruction era in San Francisco. The SoMa neighborhood was decimated, and this particular residential flats building was one of many others constructed in the years immediately following the disaster. Built in 1909 according to building permit records, it was predated by at least four extant buildings on the same block. Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential buildings presented above, archival research does not indicate that the building's association with reconstruction activities is a significant one; rather, it appears to have been typical and unremarkable.

The adjacent National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District "is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a representation of a noteworthy trend in development patterns and the establishment of various ethnic groups in San Francisco, most notably the Greek community. [...] SoMa] was the only fully-developed and populated mixed-use area in the City that was completely destroyed and then completely redeveloped with a new light industrial emphasis. This

emphasis encouraged the habitation of particular working class ethnic groups who had not previously resided in the neighborhood." According to the 1910 San Francisco city directory, some of the earliest tenants of 543–545 Natoma Street were named Lacombe, Malone, Permanter, Rarrea, Watson, and Yeager. Based on these surnames and information gathered from the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder and Department of Building Inspection, archival research does not suggest that 543–545 Natoma Street was associated with any particular ethnic group for which the adjacent historic district possesses significance.

For these reasons, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion A.

Criterion B—Person

Evaluated against the *SoMa Historic Context Statement* significance requirements for residential buildings presented above, preliminary archival research does not indicate that 543–545 Natoma Street is associated with prominent labor leaders, community activists, religious leaders, or others advocating for the betterment of neighborhood conditions. Historically, the building was part of the real estate portfolio of a few different local property owners, and none of the building's residents appeared to have remained there for longer than a few years. For these reasons, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion B.

Criterion C—Design/Construction

543–545 Natoma Street is an altered example of a typical residential flats building constructed during San Francisco's post-earthquake reconstruction era. Somewhat atypical is the fact that it was one of few such buildings in SoMa designed by a recognized architect of merit, Charles O. Clausen. Archival research suggests that 543–545 Natoma Street was one of Clausen's first commissions in San Francisco as a licensed architect, and he rose to prominence as one of the architects responsible for designing many single-family residences in the Sunset District during the 1930s. It was during that period that Clausen designed his best-known buildings, including the Doelger Building at 320 Judah Street (extant; San Francisco Landmark No. 265). As an early and altered example of Clausen's work, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be an important or representative example of his architectural legacy. Therefore, 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion C.

Criterion D—Potential to Yield Information

According to guidance in the *SoMa Historic Context Statement*, residential and commercial buildings in the SoMa neighborhood are not eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion D (information potential). Therefore, an evaluation of properties in the APE under Criterion D is not presented.

Integrity

In addition to being eligible for listing under at least one of the four National Register criteria, a property must also retain integrity, i.e., the ability of a property to convey its significance through the retention of essential physical features that express its historic identity. As 543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually significant under any National Register criteria, a discussion of integrity is not applicable.

Summary

543–545 Natoma Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register, and an assessment of integrity is not applicable. Therefore, it does not qualify as a historic property under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

***B12. References:** (Continued from page 2)

"BAHA Preservation Awards 2012 Part Two." *Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association*. Accessed September 6, 2023. <http://berkeleyheritage.com/awards/awards2012.2.html>.

----- *San Francisco Neighborhood Commercial Buildings Historic Context Statement, 1865–1965*. 2022.

----- "San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 18: Residential and Commercial Architectural Periods and Styles in San Francisco." Accessed September 13, 2023. <https://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/5099-PresBulletin18ARCHSTYLES.pdf>.

----- *Sunset District Residential builders, 1925–1950, Historic Context Statement*. 2013. Accessed September 6, 2023. https://www.kevinandjonathan.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Adopted_SunsetHCS.pdf.

----- *Architecture, Planning, and Preservation Professionals: A Collection of Biographies* (draft). n.d.. Accessed September 7, 2023. <https://sfplanning.org/project/architecture-planning-and-preservation-professionals-collection-biographies>.

CONTINUATION SHEET

Trinomial

Page 7 of 7

*Resource Name or # 543-545 Natoma Street

*Recorded by: Johanna Kahn / ESA

*Date: September 2023

☒ Continuation

☐ Update

ICF. *Flats and Small Apartment Buildings 1915-1978 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco, CA. 2023.

Landmark Designation Report: *Doelger Building, 320-326 Judah Street, Landmark No. 265*. Prepared for the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission. 2012. Accessed September 6, 2023.
https://default.sfplanning.org/Preservation/landmarks_designation/Approved_Doelger_Final_LM_Report.pdf.

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

-----, California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record (DPR 523D) for the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, 2009. On file at the San Francisco Planning Department.