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I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Technical Report (HRTR) has been prepared at the request of Dudek for the San Francisco State University’s (SF State) Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project at the former Parkmerced Blocks 1 and 6 in San Francisco, California. The HRTR will support the forthcoming Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

Parkmerced is a designed residential community located in the Lake Merced District of San Francisco, California. It is a rental housing complex consisting of two-story garden apartments and mid-rise apartment towers totaling 3,483 units. The complex was constructed between 1941 and 1951 as a response to the continued demand for housing in the United States during and after World War II. The full extent of the original Parkmerced development, now divided amongst several owners, was 192 acres.

The area of Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State includes building Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, 42, the former Parkmerced recreation area (now the site of SF State’s Mashouf Wellness Center), and the medians and traffic circles on a stretch of Font Boulevard between Lake Merced Boulevard and Serrano Drive. The original Parkmerced block numbers listed above are used to discuss the buildings in this report, as that is the identification used in previous historic documentation, and SF State also uses these terms. However, the Parkmerced block numbers correspond to the following Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) and other SF State names (see Figure 2 for locations):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parkmerced Block #</th>
<th>APN*</th>
<th>SF State Name</th>
<th>Other Names</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>7306-001</td>
<td>University Park South Building E</td>
<td>Tapia Triangle</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>7312-001</td>
<td>University Park South Building C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 5</td>
<td>7313-001</td>
<td>University Park South Building B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 6</td>
<td>7314-001</td>
<td>University Park South Building A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 41</td>
<td>7304-001^</td>
<td>University Park South Building F</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 42</td>
<td>7307-001</td>
<td>University Park South Building D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each block is also one large parcel.
^ This APN also includes the recreation area site, though the Parkmerced Block number only references the building.

This report includes architectural descriptions and summary historic context and significance statements derived from Page & Turnbull’s “Parkmerced Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment” (April 2009) and Page & Turnbull’s ‘HABS-HALS Written Report’ (January 2016). It also includes a Proposed Project Analysis, which analyzes the potential project and cumulative impacts of the new development at the subject blocks.

SUMMARY OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION

At the time that SF State undertook and completed its Campus Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in 2006/2007, Parkmerced had not previously been surveyed and evaluated for historic significance. The EIR assumed that the University Park South buildings and any other buildings that would turn 50 years old by 2020 could be a potential historic resource. In 2009, a Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment and EIR were produced for a
private developer for the entire Parkmerced development, including Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42 and the recreation area located on the SF State campus. The entire Parkmerced development was determined to be a National Register-eligible historic district, and therefore also eligible for listing in the California Register.

Much of the Parkmerced property owned by Parkmerced Investors LLC, located south of the SF State blocks, is entitled to be redeveloped over a 20- to 30-year period beginning in 2016 by demolishing the garden apartment blocks and building new multi-story residential buildings and other amenities on site. The nine towers, meadow, and Common will remain. If implemented, this project, which was approved by the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors in May 2011, has been shown to create a significant unavoidable impact on the eligible Parkmerced Historic District, wherein the historic district in its entirety will no longer be eligible for listing due to loss of integrity (see Current Historic Status section for more information).

Page & Turnbull has determined that, assuming Parkmerced Investors LLC demolishes the rest of the garden apartments in the upcoming years, the six blocks owned by SF State, plus the two nearest towers, would comprise a smaller but still representative eligible Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, and therefore would be considered historic resources for the purposes of review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (see Evaluation section for more information). The eligible historic district under consideration depends on the future demolition of most of Parkmerced, as entitled.

METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This report provides building descriptions, an abbreviated historic context statement, and an examination of the current historic status of the former Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State. The report includes a summary significance statement of the blocks’ eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. It includes CEQA assessments for project-specific and cumulative impacts, taking into consideration both existing conditions and the assumption that the entitled redevelopment at the Parkmerced Investors LLC site will be implemented. Lastly, the report recommends mitigation measures.

Page & Turnbull visited the site in May 2016. All site photographs in this report were taken by Page & Turnbull in May 2016, unless otherwise noted.

No primary historic research was conducted for this report, as the blocks have previously been researched and evaluated in Page & Turnbull’s “Parkmerced Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment” (2009) and “HABS-HALS Written Report” (2016). A records request was sent to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System in May 2016. The record search results are summarized in the Current Historic Status section along with information from other sources. There was no new information provided by the Northwest Information Center that had not been included in previous documentation about the site or the SF State campus.
Figure 1. SF State Campus map showing blocks from original Parkmerced development outlined in red at the south end of the campus.
Source: SF State, edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 2. Close view of SF State University Park South with original Parkmerced block numbers indicated in red. Note that the parking garage to the east (right) of Block 41 has been demolished, and the Mashouf Wellness Center is under construction at the recreation area site adjacent to Block 41.

Source: SF State, edited by Page & Turnbull.
II. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state and local historic ratings currently assigned to the former Parkmerced blocks at SF State’s University Park South and the previous historic evaluations that have been done for the property.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. National Register criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. There are four basic criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National Register. These criteria are:

Criterion A (Event): Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

Criterion B (Person): Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

Criterion C (Design/Construction): Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and

Criterion D (Information Potential): Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The University Park South blocks are not listed in the National Register of Historic Places, though the Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment (see following) determined the entire Parkmerced development to be a National Register-eligible historic district in 2009.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

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

The University Park South blocks are not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, though the Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment (see following) determined the entire Parkmerced development to be a California Register-eligible historic district in 2009.
CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE

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

None of the subject blocks (or the rest of Parkmerced) appear to have been formally submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation; they are not listed in the California Historical Resource Information System’s database (most updated version from 2012) with a CHRS Code.

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (2007)

The California State University Board of Trustees adopted the SF State Campus Master Plan (CMP) and certified the CMP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH#2006102050) in 2007. During the preparation of these documents in 2006/2007, the only building evaluated for historic significance was Mary Ward Hall (1960), which was found not to be an individually eligible historic resource. The EIR acknowledged that 22 buildings on the SF State campus would be 50 years or older by 2020, the planning horizon of the CMP, and could be considered historic resources as defined by CEQA. This included the University Park South buildings of the former Parkmerced, although these six blocks were listed as one building in the EIR and therefore counted as one in the above number. The Parkmerced development was not considered or specifically evaluated for the Campus Master Plan EIR, and the master plan pre-dated the Parkmerced Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment, described below.

The EIR provides a process for the review of historic resources as individual projects under the CMP are pursued, and provides mitigation measures in the case of their demolition.

PARKMERCED HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT (2009)

Page & Turnbull authored the Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment for Parkmerced in 2009. The findings in this document were concurred upon by the San Francisco Planning Department and were the basis of the Cultural Resource chapter of the Parkmerced EIR (see following). The report included an extensive historic context with historic photographs and drawings, architectural and landscape descriptions, and an evaluation of significance using cultural landscape methodology.

The entire Parkmerced development was found to be significant as a historic district for its association with community planning and for its mid-century design, with a period of significance from 1941 to 1951. The property was constructed by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife), and the majority of the features at Parkmerced retain integrity to MetLife’s period of ownership. Together the buildings, landscapes, and associated features of Parkmerced form a historic district and cultural landscape that reflects the original design and functionality of this planned residential community. This conclusion was reached through comprehensive research of the
property’s history, associated historic contexts, an existing conditions survey, and cultural landscape evaluation.

Parkmerced was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under the following criteria:

- Parkmerced is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a resource that is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of local history. Specifically, Parkmerced is significant for its association with MetLife’s nationwide housing effort during and after World War II, and for its association with development and growth of middle-income rental housing in San Francisco.

- Parkmerced is also significant under Criterion C (Design/Construction) as a resource that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type and period, and as a resource that represents the work of a master. Specifically, Parkmerced is significant as one of the last large-scale residential complexes completed by master architect Leonard Schultze and landscape architect Thomas Church. The property is also significant as a mid-century planned community in San Francisco.

If a property is determined eligible for listing in the National Register, it is automatically eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places.

PARKMERCED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (2010)

Much of Parkmerced will be redeveloped beginning in 2016 over a span of 20 or 30 years by demolishing the garden apartment blocks and building new multi-story residential buildings and other amenities on the site owned by Parkmerced Investors, LLC (Figure 3). The Parkmerced project, which was approved by the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors in May 2011, has been shown to create a significant and unavoidable impact on the eligibility of the historic district for the purposes of CEQA review due to loss of integrity. That project was also found to contribute to a cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Historic District because the owners of the other three properties in the original Parkmerced complex, including SF State, are planning for future redevelopment of their respective properties.


Of the alternatives, all caused impacts to historic resources except for “A. No Project Alternative” and “C. Retention of Historic District Central Core Alternative.” The latter retained 2,567 existing residential units in garden apartments located around the inner core of the site and the 11 tower buildings, while approximately 3,000 new units would be constructed around the western and southern portions of the site.

The alternative that most closely aligns with the anticipated future condition of Parkmerced that is studied in this report is “D. Partial Historic District Alternative,” which spared two garden apartment blocks (Blocks 43 and 44) in the northwest corner of the Parkmerced project site and six tower buildings that would remain unchanged while the rest of the site would be demolished and

2 A full description of the project is located on the San Francisco Planning Department’s website at this link: http://sf-planning.org/parkmerced-project
redeveloped. In addition to these blocks and towers, the garden apartments owned by SF State were factored into this alternative. With consideration of the full historic district, this alternative was found to cause a significant adverse impact.
III. CULTURAL LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTIONS

SITE

SF State’s University Park South blocks are located at the south border of the university campus at what was originally the northern border of Parkmerced (see Figures 1 and 3). Large university buildings, including the Humanities Building (1994), Creative Arts Building (1953), J. Paul Leonard Library (1953; renovation and addition 2012), and Administration Building (1989) are located immediately northeast of Block 1 and across Holloway Avenue from Blocks 2, 5, and 6. The former Parkmerced recreation area is located immediately north of Block 41, and is currently a construction zone where the Mashouf Wellness Center is under construction. The parking garage that was located east of Block 41 and was part of the original Parkmerced development was demolished in August 2015 and is now within the construction zone. Across Vidal Drive to the south of Block 41 and across Arballo Drive to the west of Block 42 are Parkmerced towers 39 and 40.

Natural landscape features include a relatively flat topography and vegetation. Designed landscape features include radial vehicular circulation with traffic circles and planting medians; street and carport parking; pedestrian pathway circulation; the public, semi-private, and private open spaces; views and vistas to the SF State buildings, Parkmerced garden apartments, and Parkmerced towers;
and small scale features, such as decorative and functional landscape walls, steps, privacy screens, railings, etc.

While the Parkmerced garden apartments owned by Parkmerced Investors, LLC will be demolished and new multi-story housing will be constructed with a new street pattern, the towers will remain within the viewshed of the SF State University Park South blocks.

![Figure 3. Block map of Parkmerced. The blocks outlined in red are SF State’s University Park South and the proposed project site. Source: Parkmerced Investors, LLC, edited by Page & Turnbull.]

**SUBJECT BLOCKS**

The following descriptions for SF State’s University Park South blocks are excerpted from Page & Turnbull’s HABS-HALS Written Report (January 2016) with updated information from a site visit in May 2016:

**Block #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings and Structures Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block Shape</strong></td>
<td>Triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Type(s)</strong></td>
<td>Scored concrete garden apartments; 27 units with laundry room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of construction</strong></td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Poured concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls</strong></td>
<td>Scored concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doors</strong></td>
<td>Flush wood paneled doors with either molded wood surrounds or flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised entablatures. Recessed wood paneled doors set within flush molded surrounds. On the courtyard side, each unit has rear full glass doors with flush wood frames that are centered in curved or hipped bay window projections leading to the terrace garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows</strong></td>
<td>International-style aluminum double-hung and sliding sash windows with no surrounds and concrete sills; horizontal ribbons of multi-lite steel casement windows on laundry room, some of which are operable sliding windows while others are fixed. On the courtyard side, each unit has a unique curved or hipped bay window projection covered with a copper roof that leads to each unit's individual terrace garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof, Chimneys</strong></td>
<td>Combination of flat &amp; gable-on-hip roof shapes with no overhangs’s; visible roofing materials include clay tiles and wood shingles; additional roof features include cupolas, metal chimneys, and vent pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads</strong></td>
<td>Full-height, full-façade, entry, and partial porches with combination of flat &amp; pyramidal roofs; classical 1-story, classical 2-story, modern 1-story, modern 2-story columns. Some entry portico column elements consist of repeating decorative pierced patterns in wood (1 and 2 story).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Concrete stairs are located at the corners of the buildings, access to courtyard and access to porches; decorative pierced wood balustrades; pipe railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Landscape Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Topography</strong></th>
<th>Relatively flat, slopes downward at northwest corner of block.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The perimeter of the block contains 4 ft. high shrubs along block faces with low beds with cedar chips and no additional plantings. Plantings include hydrangeas and other ornamentals. The courtyard contains specimen trees around the edges, planters, and mature shrubs. Open paving with picnic table, bench, and bike rack at center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Designed Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Circulation</strong></th>
<th>Aggregate concrete walks curve around central lawn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views and vistas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Views include surrounding campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small scale features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chain-link fence and gate at northwest corner of block; low concrete walls; square concrete planters; poured concrete divider walls. Wood slat fencing between some units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual terrace gardens are adjacent to each apartment unit. Terrace gardens are separated by one-story scored concrete walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Figure 4. Block 1, southwest façade at Font Blvd. and Tapia Dr., looking northeast.](image1.png)

![Figure 5. Block 1, interior courtyard, looking east.](image2.png)
### Block #2

#### Buildings and Structures Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Shape</th>
<th>Wedge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Type(s)</td>
<td>Wood-frame garden apartments with stucco siding; 66 units with laundry room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Smooth stucco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Doors  
Flush wood paneled doors with varied surrounds: wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by segmental broken pediments; wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by raised shaped pediments featuring a decorative keystone; wide flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised segmental pediments; simple molded wood surrounds; flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised entablatures; flanking full height wood shutters under flat semi-circular canopies with light fixtures; and simple molded surrounds under flat square canopies. Recessed wood paneled doors set within flush molded surrounds.

On the courtyard side, each unit contains a door on the right side of the glazing system. Some of the glazing systems have five lites and others full glass; all are recessed with wood frames and wood surrounds.

** Windows  
International-style aluminum double-hung, sliding sash and casement windows with wood surrounds and no sills; fixed porthole windows scattered throughout. The laundry room contains multi-lite steel hinged opening windows.
On the courtyard side, many of the units contain a glazing system consisting of two multi-lite (two over one) windows looking out to the terrace garden.

**Roof, Chimneys**
Combination of roof shapes include flat, side gable, front gable, and pyramidal with no overhangs; visible roofing materials include clay tiles and wood shingles; additional roof features include clay tiles and wood shingles; additional roof features include cupolas, metal chimneys, louvered vents, and vent pipes.

**Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads**
Full-façade, entry, and partial porches with combination of flat, gable, and pyramidal roofs; classical 1-story and classical 2-story columns.

**Garage, Carport**
Two masonry carports with entrances on Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard; attached masonry units with pyramidal roofs and cupolas.

**Other**
Concrete stairs at corners of buildings, access to courtyard, and access to porches; decorative pierced wood balustrades; pipe railings.

### Landscape Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Low slope throughout with a steeper sloping central lawn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The perimeter of the block contains specimen trees along the block faces intermixed with floral plantings in shrub beds with hedges. Species include eucalyptus, pine, and boxwood. The courtyard contains specimen trees and low beds with hedges and purple lilies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designed Features</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
<th>Aggregate concrete walks around the irregular-shaped lawn; parking spaces along the street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views and vistas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Views of towers 30 and 40 to west from within courtyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small scale features</strong></td>
<td>Lattice divider walls and four to five concrete stairs connecting interior courtyards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Individual terrace gardens are adjacent to some apartment units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Block 2, east façade at Serrano Dr. and Arellano Ave., looking west.

Figure 9. Block 2, interior courtyard west, looking northeast.

Figure 10. Block 2, interior courtyard east, looking northwest.

Figure 11. Block 2, southwest façade, looking northeast.

Block #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings and Structures Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block Shape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Type(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Technical Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Keystone; wide flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised segmental pediments; simple molded wood surrounds; flanking full height wood shutters under flat semi-circular canopies with light fixtures hanging underneath; and simple molded surrounds under flat square canopies. There are partial height flush, wood paneled doors with vents leading into mechanical or storage spaces on the ground level of some units. On the courtyard side, each unit contains a door on the right side of the glazing system. The doors feature either five lites or paneling and partial glazing; all are recessed with wood frames and wood surrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International –style aluminum double-hung and sliding sash windows with no surrounds or sills. On the courtyard side, many of the units contain a glazing system consisting of two multi-lite (two over one) windows looking out to the terrace garden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roof, Chimneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination of roof shapes include flat and side gable with simple trim; visible roofing materials include wood shingles; additional roof features include gutter downspouts, metal chimneys, louvered vents, and vent pipes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-height and partial porches with flat roofs; classical 2-story and modern 1-story columns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garage, Carport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One masonry carport with two entrances on Holloway Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stairs at corners of buildings, access to courtyard, and access to porches; pipe railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Topography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low slope throughout, with a slightly steeper slope in some courtyards, and lawns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The perimeter of the block includes foundation plantings and hedges along the façades of the buildings. Large heritage pine trees flank block 5 on Serrano Avenue. Lawns and curved beds with shrubs are located in the courtyard. Beds contain laurel, palm, hydrangea, maples, and cedars, as well as African lilies and roses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designed Features</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometric sidewalks, concrete and brick steps throughout the courtyards; each block face has entry off street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views and vistas | View to SF State buildings from within courtyards.
---|---
Small scale features | High concrete retaining walls and square brick planters are located within the courtyards; central courtyard contains a poured concrete slab; lattice divider walls and laundry racks between terraces. A couple benches and a picnic table are scattered in the central courtyard.
Other | Individual terrace gardens are adjacent to some apartment units.

Figure 12. Block 5, east façade at Cardenas Ave. and Serrano Dr., looking west.

Figure 13. Block 5, interior courtyard, looking east.

Figure 14. Block 5, interior courtyard, looking north.

Figure 15. Block 5, west façade on south side of block, inset from Serrano Dr., looking east.
## Block #6

### Buildings and Structures Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Shape</th>
<th>Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Type(s)</td>
<td>Wood-frame garden apartments with stucco siding; 27 units, one central courtyard, and 2 forecourts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Smooth stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Flush wood paneled doors with varied surrounds: wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by segmental broken pediments; wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by raised shaped pediments featuring a decorative keystone; wide flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised segmental pediments; simple molded wood surrounds; flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised entablatures; flanking full height wood shutters under flat semi-circular canopies with light fixtures mounted underneath; and simple molded surrounds under flat square canopies. Multi-lite full glass door and window systems leading to semi-private terraces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>International-style aluminum double-hung, sliding sash, and casement windows with no surrounds or sills; multi-lite, steel industrial windows on the corner of Holloway Avenue and Cardenas Avenue. On the courtyard side, many of the units contain a glazing system consisting of two multi-lite (two over one) windows looking out to the terrace garden. Each unit contains a unique curved or hipped bay window projection covered with a copper roof that leads to individual terrace gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof, Chimneys</td>
<td>Combination of roof shapes include flat and side gable with simple trim; visible roofing materials include wood shingles; additional roof features include gutter downspouts, metal chimneys, louvered vents, and vent pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads</td>
<td>Full-height and partial porches with combination of flat and pyramidal roofs; classical 1-story, classical 2-story, and modern 1-story columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage, Carport</td>
<td>One masonry carport with two entrances on Holloway Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Concrete stairs at corners of buildings, access to courtyard, and access to porches; decorative pierced wood balustrades; pipe railings; wooden railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Landscape Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly flat with a divided grade change in the courtyard.</td>
<td>The exterior of the block contains hedges and foundation beds along the facades of the buildings, with trees at the corners of the block. The courtyard contains sheared hedges and several trees at the lower level, some in low concrete planters. Species include boxwood and hydrangea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designed Features</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
<th>Views and vistas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate walks throughout street sides and courtyard.</td>
<td>One view into the courtyard through a breezeway from Serrano Drive. Northward view of SFSU buildings in the background.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small scale features</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square brick planters in the courtyard.</td>
<td>A bench located at side of courtyard. A half-flight of concrete steps leading between grade changes in courtyard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Figure 16. Block 6, context at Serrano Dr. and Crespi Dr., looking west.*  
*Figure 17. Block 6, south façade at Serrano Dr. and Cardenas Ave., looking north.*
Block #41

### Buildings and Structures Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Shape</th>
<th>Linear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Type(s)</strong></td>
<td>Scored concrete garden apartments, organized in a single linear grouping; 16 units with rear gardens, 1 forecourt, 1 concrete laundry room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of construction</strong></td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls</strong></td>
<td>Scored concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doors</strong></td>
<td>Flush paneled wood doors with flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by raised entablatures. Recessed wood paneled doors set within flush molded surrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows</strong></td>
<td>International-style aluminum double-hung, sliding sash, and casement windows with no surrounds and concrete sills. Each unit has a unique curved or hipped bay window projection covered with a copper roof that leads to each unit’s individual terrace garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof, Chimneys</strong></td>
<td>Combination of roof shapes include flat, front gable, and side gable with simple trim; visible roofing materials include clay tile and wood shingles; additional roof features include gutter downspouts, metal chimneys, louvered vents, and vent pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads</strong></td>
<td>Full-height, full-façade, entry, and partial porches with combination of flat and hipped roofs; classical 1-story and classical 2-story columns. Decorative pierced wood balustrades and pipe railings. Hanging iron lantern centered over main entries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 18. Block 6, west façade at Cardenas Ave., looking east.

Figure 19. Block 6, interior courtyard, looking west.
## Landscape Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Flat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Courtyards contain lawn courts with shaped lawns and walks, shrub beds in low concrete planters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed Features</td>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Aggregate walks, concrete steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views and vistas</td>
<td>Views into the rear courtyard through locked fence. Views out from the courtyard of adjacent towers to the south, and views of San Francisco State University recreation area (part of original Parkmerced site) to the north.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale features</td>
<td>Low concrete planters and pipe railings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Associated parking on the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 20. Block 41, south façade at Vidal Dr., looking north.

Figure 21. Block 41, south façade at Vidal Dr. and Arballo Dr., looking north.

Figure 22. Block 41, center of south façade at Vidal Dr., looking north.

Figure 23. Block 41, south façade at Vidal Dr., looking north.
### Block #42

#### Buildings and Structures Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Type</th>
<th>Wedge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Type(s)</strong></td>
<td>Wood-frame garden apartments with stucco siding, organized in three groupings; 66 units with rear gardens, 3 courtyards, 1 forecourt, 1 central service court, and 1 laundry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of construction</strong></td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls</strong></td>
<td>Stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doors</strong></td>
<td>Flush wood paneled doors with varied surrounds: wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by segmental broken pediments; wide flanking fluted pilasters, surmounted by raised shaped pediments featuring a decorative keystone; wide flanking fluted pilasters surmounted by raised segmental pediments; simple molded wood surrounds; flanking full height wood shutters under flat semi-circular canopies with light fixtures; and simple molded surrounds under flat square canopies. Recessed wood paneled doors set within flush molded surrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows</strong></td>
<td>International-style aluminum double-hung, sliding sash, and casement windows with no surrounds or sills; fixed porthole windows throughout; multi-lite steel casement windows on laundry room. Each unit has a unique curved or hipped bay window projection covered with a copper roof that leads to each unit’s individual terrace garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof, Chimneys</strong></td>
<td>Combination of roof shapes include flat, side gable, front gable, and pyramidal with simple trim and no overhangs; visible roofing materials include composite tiles and wood shingles; additional roof features include gutter downspouts, cupolas, metal chimneys, louvered vents, and vent pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads</strong></td>
<td>Full-height, entry, and partial porches with combination of flat and gable roofs; classical 1-story and classical 2-story columns. All entries have small lanterns mounted above or to the side of the doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garage, Carport</strong></td>
<td>Two masonry carports with entrances on Font Boulevard and Pinto Avenue; attached masonry units with pyramidal roofs and cupolas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Concrete stairs on the corners of buildings with access to porches and courtyards; decorative pierced wood balustrades; pipe, wood, and metal railings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Landscape Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Flat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Vegetation**   |            | **Low shrub beds, grass and specimen trees**  
|                  |            | **Along the exterior.**  
|                  |            | **Courtyards contain foundation plantings,**  
|                  |            | **hedges, amoeba shaped lawns,**  
|                  |            | **and large**  
|                  |            | **specimen trees,**  
|                  |            | **including hydrangea,**  
|                  |            | **California laurel,**  
|                  |            | **olive and**  
|                  |            | **jasmine.**  
| Designed Features| **Circulation** | Aggregate walks, brick steps and concrete sidewalks. |
| **Views and vistas** |            | **Views into the courtyards through breezeways.**  
|                  |            | **Views out of adjacent towers to the southwest.** |
| **Small scale features** |            | **Low concrete and brick planters,**  
|                  |            | **pipe railings,**  
|                  |            | **wood lattice dividing walls,**  
|                  |            | **wood slat dividing walls,**  
|                  |            | **and brick stairs.** |
| **Other**        |            | Paving with associated carports. |

---

**Figure 24.** Block 42, west façade at Arballo Dr. and Pinto Ave., looking east.  

**Figure 25.** Block 42, interior courtyard, looking northeast.
Figure 26. Block 42, south façade at Pinto Ave. and Tapia Dr., looking north.

Figure 27. Block 42, interior parking area, looking northwest.
IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

PARKMERCED HISTORIC CONTEXT

The following historic context is an abbreviated form of the context included in Page & Turnbull’s “HABS-HALS Written Report for Parkmerced,” which was derived from Page & Turnbull’s “Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment” for Parkmerced.

Please see the historic context sections of Page & Turnbull’s Historic Resource Evaluation or HABS-HALS Written Report for contextual history on the following topics: the Garden City Movement, Le Corbusier’s Ideal City, New Deal housing initiatives, and greenbelt towns; the Bay Area housing context, including public housing and low-income housing projects, defense housing projects, and private investment into middle-income housing projects; the broader history of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife); and the biographies of landscape Architect Thomas Church, architect Leonard Schultz & Associates, associate architect Frederick H. Meyer, and builder Starrett Brothers & Eken.³

Early Site History

The area around Lake Merced was originally inhabited by the Ramaytush Ohlone tribe of Native Americans, who used the area to fish, hunt, and gather other resources. During the early years of Spanish settlement in San Francisco, the shores of Lake Merced were used as common land for grazing cattle.⁴ It was not until 1835 that the land was privatized and granted to a rancher named Jose Antonio Galindo. The current site of Parkmerced formed part of the Rancho Laguna de la Merced.

The Spring Valley Water Company purchased Lake Merced and the surrounding land in 1868 as part of a move to establish a monopoly over San Francisco’s water supply. The company therefore began to sell off some of its land holdings by the 1890s. The future site of Parkmerced became the Ingleside Public Golf Course, one of the many golf courses built on the shores of Lake Merced around the turn-of-the-century.⁵

During the early decades of the twentieth century, the first signs of significant development began moving out across the dunes of the Sunset district and down into the Parkside district towards Lake Merced. As late as 1920, however, the Lake Merced District was still predominately rural.⁶ The 1930s brought significant change. The area around Lake Merced represented one of the largest tracts of undeveloped private land in San Francisco, which enticed the rapidly-expanding San Francisco State College (later renamed San Francisco State University) to purchase land for a new campus from the Spring Valley Water Company in 1937. However, construction for the new campus did not begin until after World War II, and the campus was not occupied until 1953—two years after the completion of Parkmerced.⁷

³ The Historic Resource Evaluation is publicly available from the San Francisco Planning Department, and the HABS-HALS report is available from the San Francisco Planning Department, the San Francisco History Center at the San Francisco Public Library, and the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University.


⁵ Sara Marcellino and Brandon Jebens, “The History of Human Use at Lake Merced” (San Francisco State University), Available Online at http://bss.sfsu.edu/holzman/lakemerced/landuse.htm (Accessed September 18, 2007).

⁶ Ibid.

Development of Parkmerced: Phase I (1941-1945)
The Parkmerced rental complex was constructed on 192 acres of land previously occupied by the Ingleside Golf Course between 1941 and 1951 as San Francisco’s first all-rental housing community. The community was planned as a self-contained development by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife) as part of a government-supported effort that encouraged direct investment in middle-income housing by insurance companies in the 1940s and 1950s. MetLife’s 1941 proposal was to build 2,500 apartments, which would house approximately 8,000-10,000 residents.

Parkmerced was designed by Leonard Schultze & Associates, who was also the architect of two related housing projects commissioned by MetLife during this period, Parkfairfax in Virginia (1941-1943) and Parklabrea in Los Angeles (1941-1950). Frederick H. Meyer, a prominent San Francisco architect, served as the local architect, while Thomas Church (and other landscape architects from his office) served as the landscape architect for the garden courtyards and public open spaces. Rental units were originally planned to be constructed of high quality, modern materials for the time period, such as reinforced concrete, but wartime shortages of materials dramatically limited the application of these materials. The original plans also included amenities such as modern appliances, parking, landscaped courtyards, playgrounds, and open spaces for recreation. The builders of the project were the New York City firm Starrett Brothers & Eken, who constructed the Empire State Building and several other MetLife housing projects, including Parkchester and Peter Cooper Village.

Site Planning
Schultze’s early plans for the buildings, layout, and grounds of the Parkmerced project showed a complex of two-story apartments and open spaces that were formal and axial. An early site plan and image of the original model for Parkmerced from 1944 showed the overall layout of the site and location of garden apartment blocks and open spaces. The difference between the original model and final site plan upon which construction was carried out was a more finished, urban western edge to the site plan and less open space towards Lake Merced. The early site plan appears to be loosely organized by Beaux Arts and Garden City principles. Evidence of these principles is seen in the overall form of the Parkmerced plan, with a series of landscaped streets radiating from a central common according to a hierarchical circulation system that divides the property into pie-shaped blocks. In addition to the garden apartment blocks, this early site plan included a small recreational area (tennis courts), a small commercial area with parking, and the Meadow.

Construction of the first phase of clustered garden apartments at Parkmerced began in 1941 and was completed in 1945. The initial phase of construction included all site planning by Schultze, including the layout of open spaces and the pie-shaped block grid, as well as the construction of six blocks (Blocks 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36) of unfinished concrete garden apartments, which were completed by 1944. Original plans called for the construction of all buildings with reinforced concrete, but wartime restrictions on building materials made reinforced concrete unavailable for private enterprise during this time. Although construction was allowed to continue through the war years, the original number of apartments was reduced from 2,500 to 1,700 to accommodate for materials shortages. The remaining garden apartments planned for the first phase of construction were completed in 1945.

---

8 Mark Daniels, “Parkmerced: San Francisco’s First All-Rental Community Housing Project” *Architect and Engineer* (September 1944), 15; Reproduced in Appendix I: Articles and Documents.
9 “A 12,500,000 Housing Project for San Francisco,” *Architect and Engineer* (January 1941), 51. Reproduced in Appendix I: Relevant Articles and Documents.
10 “Parkmerced Housing Project” *Architect and Engineer* (September 1943), 43.
11 Daniels, 16.
12 Ibid.
and constructed of wood frame and stucco (Blocks 2-13, 20-25, 29-31, 38, and 42-45). These include the subject blocks currently owned by SF State.

Landscaping of the Meadow, Common, and drives was completed by 1945, as well as the installation of playgrounds and an elementary school. At the conclusion of the initial construction phase in 1945, the site included 1,687 garden apartment units and associated landscaping within a contained area of low-rise blocks, bounded by Arballo Drive to the west, Holloway Avenue to the north, Cambon Drive to the east, and Brotherhood Way to the south. Two additional small blocks of housing extended beyond Arballo Drive on the west side of the development. The adjacent parcels at the edges of the property were left undeveloped, including the land east of Cambon Drive.

Critics applauded the unity of the whole, seamlessly combining infrastructure, housing, and recreation areas. Also of note were the pie-shaped blocks featuring convenient and designated laundry, play, and private garden space on the interior of each housing cluster.

During the development of the site plan, some of Church’s associates claim that he influenced the site design, while others claim that he was introduced later in the project after Schultze completed the overall site planning. However, these claims seem inaccurate in the face of the historical record, which shows Schultze’s designs and site plans for Parkmerced, which pre-date Church’s involvement.

While Thomas Church’s influence may not have been seen in the earliest site plan (pre-1941), he did design the landscaping of the garden apartment courtyards and open spaces, thus providing landscape interventions into the project site. As noted by author Marc Treib, Church’s role in the project was one of refinement, not creation, relative to the site plan and landscaping. Church utilized modern landscape design concepts to optimize the site conditions, including a focus on the combination of views and spaces instead of the relationship of the landscape to architectural facades. His influence was seen in the landscape elements found within the garden apartment courts, which relate to his other smaller-scale residential work.

Thomas Church utilized the assistance of landscape architects, contractors and designers associated with his firm throughout the duration of construction. These individuals included landscape contractors Floyd Gerow and Alec Cattini; landscape architects H. Leland Vaughn (associated with Church from 1931 to 1945); Robert Royston (associated with Church from c.1938 to 1942); June Meehan (associated with Church from 1940 to 1967); Douglas Baylis (associated with Church from 1941 to 1945); and Lawrence Halprin (associated with Church from c. 1944 to 1949).

Each block of attached garden apartments had a series of interior courtyards featuring private terraces, shared laundry areas, and parking. Within each courtyard Church used low walls and plantings to define private outdoor space associated with each living unit, leaving the central open spaces as a semi-private common for the residents of that building. A large section of open space west of the center of the property and bounded by Arballo Drive, Serrano Drive, and Gonzalez Drive, was called “The Meadow,” and was originally designed to feature a series of recreational nodes. A circular area of open space was set aside for a landscaped Common in the center of the site. Schultze’s site plan provided access to the property through four vehicle entrances, thereby limiting

13 Ibid., 22.
14 Parkmerced plans, University of California, Berkeley (UCB), Environmental Design Archives, Thomas Church Collection.
15 Reiss, 51.
through-traffic on the property with the intent of increasing pedestrian safety in the enclosed complex.\textsuperscript{17}

**Development of Parkmerced: Phase II (1948-1951)**

In the late-1940s, as a response to the continued demand for housing after World War II, MetLife developed the remaining parcels at Parkmerced to provide greater residential density and site amenities. This second phase of development at Parkmerced took place between 1948 and 1951, and included the addition of four blocks of garden apartments (Blocks 1, 19, 37, and 41), completed between 1948 and 1949, as well as the construction of the Cambon Drive shopping center (specified in the original site plan), an Administration Building (also specified in the original site plan), three underground garages, a Maintenance Building, and eleven mid-rise towers, which were all completed by 1951. All of the buildings constructed between 1948 and 1951 were made of poured-in-place molded concrete with horizontal scoring. The massing, height, and materials of these buildings serve as a clear visual marker of this last phase of construction.\textsuperscript{18}

Thomas Church joined Leonard Schultze again on the second phase of design. Church designed the landscaping around the eleven towers and re-designed the Meadow and associated green spaces to accommodate the larger-scale buildings on the project site.\textsuperscript{19} An additional 1,769 units were added to the Parkmerced complex upon the completion of the second phase of construction in 1951, thereby doubling the existing number of rentable units to a total of 3,456.

MetLife owned Parkmerced until 1970, when the property was sold to the Parkmerced Corporation.\textsuperscript{20} Property ownership changed again in 1995 and 1999. An 8.2-acre portion of the original Parkmerced property along Brotherhood Way was sold in 1999 and the Cambon Drive shopping center was sold in 2004. The SF State Foundation purchased Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6 between 2000 and 2005 and subsequently sold them to SF State/CSU. SF State purchased Blocks 41 and 42 directly. Parkmerced Investors LLC purchased the remainder of Parkmerced in 2005.

**SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY HISTORIC CONTEXT**

The following historic architectural context is excerpted from SF State's Campus Master Plan EIR:

**SFSU Campus**

San Francisco State Normal School, a two-year teacher-training college, was founded in 1899. It became a 4-year school in 1930, and received university status in 1972 through the California State University system. The original college was housed in a plain stone structure on Powell Street near Clay, which was destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. While the school reopened at another location on upper Market, it was not until 1939 that 54 acres of land was acquired at the existing campus location. This followed the introduction of the "M" streetcar line along 19\textsuperscript{th} Avenue and the construction of Lake Merced Boulevard. The campus's earliest temporary buildings and athletic fields replaced farmland. The campus remained largely in this form during the first decade.

\textsuperscript{17} Parkmerced plans, University of California Berkeley, Environmental Design Archives.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Assessor's Office information dates a transfer of the property from Met Life to Parkmerced Corp. on December 21, 1970. Whereas, City of San Francisco Building Inspection Commission meeting minutes quote a resident dating the Helmsley purchase to 1972.
It was not until 1949 when construction began on the first permanent structures, a stadium and a physical education building. Construction exploded on and around campus after that time. SFSU saw the construction of the campus core, while Villas Parkmerced and Stonestown were fully completed by the end of the 1950s (see further discussion below). New buildings continued to replace the older temporary structures on the campus, as the 1960s and 1970s saw the campus receive its first dormitories, a student center, two library expansions, and a pair of towering new science buildings. Even the valley, a remnant of the former stream canyon, had accumulated several structures. The last 15 years on campus have seen development across all building types, including an expansion in student housing, new academic and student support facilities, and an ongoing program of seismic upgrading of the University’s building stock. […]

Recent Acquisitions
The University Park North (UPN) was recently acquired by SFSU and was previously called the Stonestown apartments. The Western Neighborhoods Project provides a description of the history and architecture of Stonestown, which is summarized as follows (Western Neighborhoods Project, 2006). The Stonestown shopping center and the adjacent apartment towers and buildings were built in 1952. “Stonestown” as it was called, was the fourth largest apartment complex/shopping center in the United States at the time. By the early 1980s, the mall still retained a classic 1950s look, but a major renovation took place that added a story of stores, a glass ceiling, and marble floors, creating the “Stonestown Galleria.” The apartments and towers were purchased by SFSU in 2005 and remain much as they were in 1952.

The three blocks of University Park South (UPS) and the Tapia Triangle, owned by the San Francisco State University Foundation, are part of the larger Villas Parkmerced neighborhood that lies to the south of the campus. […]21

---

V. DISCUSSION OF ELIGIBILITY

As previously discussed, the entire Parkmerced development, containing the subject blocks, was found eligible for listing in the National Register (and therefore, the California Register) as a historic district (Figure 28). The demolition of the garden apartments at the site owned by Parkmerced Investors, LLC was found to cause a significant adverse impact since the historic district would be impaired.

Figure 28. Parkmerced Historic District (boundary in red), based upon the 2009 Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment.

For a property to be eligible for national, state or local designation under one of the significance criteria (see page 5), the essential physical features, known as character-defining features, that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. A property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The 2009 Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment provided a list of the Parkmerced Historic District’s character-defining features. In light of the approved project at the greater Parkmerced site that is anticipated to be implemented, the list of character-defining features is assessed below for whether they could still be represented by SF State’s Parkmerced Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42, along with the towers that will remain on Parkmerced Investors, LLC property to the south. Those character-defining features that would still be represented on SF State’s blocks and other areas to remain are noted in italicized font below.
Spatial Organization
- Overall site plan includes street grid, placement of buildings in blocks [at the Towers, Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42], the Meadow, and Parkmerced “Common.”
- Garden apartment blocks and courtyards (interior, entry, and laundry) [at Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42]
- Tower arrangement and courtyards

Cluster Arrangement
- Garden apartment blocks [at Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42]
- Tower clusters

Circulation
- Landscaped drives
  - Font Boulevard
  - Crespi Drive [circulation will remain though the landscaping will change]
  - Bucareli Drive [circulation will remain though the landscaping will change]
  - Grijalva Drive [circulation will remain though the landscaping will change]
- Juan Bautista Circle [circulation will remain though the landscaping will change]
- Traffic circles [At Font Boulevard]
- Aggregate and concrete paths (in courtyards and between buildings)

Topography
- Individual garden apartment courtyard grading

Buildings and Structures
- Garden apartments
- Towers
- Maintenance building
- Administration building
- Carports
- Laundry buildings
- Storage buildings

Vegetation
- Location and rhythm of street trees and plantings along drives and secondary streets, garden courtyard apartments, and towers
- Placement of specimen trees, lawns, and vegetation in courtyards of garden apartments and towers (actual species of vegetation has been altered in certain cases; this character-defining features should be evaluated on case-by-case basis)
- Parkmerced Common plantings
- Ornamental median plantings in traffic circles and along landscaped drives, where remaining.

Landscape Features
- Terrace divider walls in courtyards
- Planters (concrete, wood and brick)
- Low concrete and/or brick site walls
- Courtyard stairs (brick and concrete)

Views and Vistas
- Vistas down landscaped drives (see circulation above)
- Vistas to and from garden apartment courtyard breezeways
• Views to and from the Common
• Views from mid-rise towers to garden apartments and landscape

In addition to the character-defining features listed above located on Parkmerced Investors LLC site, which was the subject of the Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment done in 2009, the former Parkmerced recreation field (now the site of SF State’s Mashouf Wellness Center), and commercial complex under other ownership are also described in the HRE as being within the boundary of the original Parkmerced development, and thus are contributing features to the Parkmerced Historic District.

If the approved project at Parkmerced is implemented, most of the character-defining features could be represented through the remaining significant landscaped spaces, the towers, and SF State’s garden apartment blocks. Of the typologies of garden apartments that were constructed at Parkmerced, wood frame and stucco garden apartments and scored poured-in-place concrete garden apartments will be represented, but not smooth poured-in-place buildings.

The overall site plan would change because many streets in the existing grid will be removed, though primary radial streets from the Parkmerced Common will remain. The maintenance building, administration building, and other storage buildings would be demolished. Most vegetation and landscape features would continue to be represented by the SF State garden apartment blocks. While views and vistas would change due to the construction of new buildings on the Parkmerced site, the general concept of views down the streets framing the SF State garden apartments and from Towers 39 and 40 across the street from Blocks 41 and 42 would be retained.

Thus, while the garden apartments at the Parkmerced site would eventually be demolished, sufficient character-defining features exist in the six garden apartment blocks with laundry and carport facilities, the landscape features that remain at the SF State Parkmerced garden apartment blocks, and the adjacent Towers 39 and 40 to constitute a smaller, contiguous Parkmerced Remnant Historic District. Integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association would be maintained in this remnant district, though integrity of setting would be compromised to an extent due to new construction surrounding the remaining blocks. Overall, this remnant historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. The Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would represent two of three garden apartment construction typologies: scored concrete and wood-frame construction (poured concrete would no longer be represented). The blocks create a line along Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard west of 19th Avenue such that nearly the full width of the Parkmerced development would be represented.

With the implementation of the approved Parkmerced redevelopment project, the larger identified historic district was found in previous analyses to lose eligibility due to the anticipated change in integrity of the overall Parkmerced site. Intact examples of Metlife and other mid-century housing developments exist elsewhere in the country, including Stuyvesant Town in Manhattan, Parkfairfax in Alexandria, Virginia, and Parkchester in the Bronx. However, in California many of these types of mid-century middle-income developments have been altered or demolished, and a lower threshold of integrity may exist to represent the significant context. In sum, this report finds that Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42, along with towers 39 and 40 that will remain on the Parkmerced Investors, LLC property, constitute as a smaller Parkmerced Remnant Historic District eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources that is significant at the state and local levels (Figures 29). Even as a remnant landscape, the remaining components convey enough information about the to-be-demolished Parkmerced development to the south to be eligible on their own.
Figure 29. Eligible Parkmerced Remnant Historic District boundary comprised of SF State University Park South blocks and adjacent Parkmerced towers, shown with future build-out of Parkmerced redevelopment project. Source: SOM, October 2010; edited by author.

The SF State blocks are not individually significant, as their significance is rooted in the history and design of the larger development.
VI. EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

This section analyzes the project-specific and cumulative impacts on the environment for the SF State’s Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

The California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) is state legislation (PRC Section 21000 et seq.), that provides for the development and maintenance of a high quality environment for the present-day and future through the identification and consideration of significant environmental effects prior to considering projects for approval.\(^{22}\) CEQA applies to “projects” proposed to be undertaken or requiring approval from state or local government agencies. “Projects” are defined as “…activities which have the potential to have a physical impact on the environment and may include the enactment of zoning ordinances, the issuance of conditional use permits and the approval of tentative subdivision maps.”\(^{23}\) Historic and cultural resources are considered to be part of the environment. In general, the lead agency must complete the environmental review process as required by CEQA.

According to CEQA, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.”\(^{24}\) Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.”\(^{25}\) The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to local ordinance or resolution.\(^{26}\) In other words, a significant impact occurs when demolition or significant alteration renders a historical resource no longer eligible for listing in a historic register. A project may cause changes to a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less than significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

STATUS OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AS HISTORIC RESOURCES

A building or district may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). The four categories are:

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must

---


\(^{23}\) Ibid.

\(^{24}\) CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).

\(^{25}\) CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).

\(^{26}\) CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

- The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Pub. Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Pub. Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Pub. Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

In general, a resource that meets any of the four criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) is considered to be a historical resource unless “the preponderance of evidence demonstrates” that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.

Therefore, the smaller Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, which has been found in this report to be eligible for listing in the California Register, would be considered a qualified historic resource under CEQA under the third of the categories listed above.

PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following description of the proposed project is provided by SF State for the Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project.

SF State proposes to develop the Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project (Project) in the southern portion of the SF State campus (Figure 30). The Project includes the construction of the Creative Arts Replacement Building, an associated 800-seat concert hall, and a mixed-use development including student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services.

The approximately 3.6-acre Project site is located in the south campus, with one parcel (Block 6) on the south side of Holloway Avenue between Cardenas and Varela Avenues, and one parcel (Block 1), referred to as the Tapia Triangle, bounded by Tapia Drive, Holloway Avenue, and Font Boulevard. The Project site is part of University Park South, which was purchased by SF State between 2000 and 2005 and includes a portion of the original Parkmerced development, which extends beyond the central campus boundaries to the south. Most of the existing units are occupied by SF State students and affiliates.

The Campus Master Plan, adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees in 2007, addresses all aspects of future physical development and land use on the campus to accommodate the enrollment ceiling of 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students. The adopted Campus Master Plan accommodates a building program of 0.9 million gross square feet (GSF) of new and replacement non-residential building space and the development or conversion of about 1,198 additional units of housing for

27 Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.
faculty, staff, and students. The project is consistent with the Campus Master Plan building program; however, a master plan map revision is required to allow for the proposed uses on the identified sites.

The project would include demolition of existing housing and construction of new student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services on Block 6 on the south side of Holloway Avenue. The proposed residences would include apartment style student housing. Redevelopment of the block would allow for a more compact configuration to increase the supply of on-campus housing in conformance with the Campus Master Plan objectives. This development pattern is also in alignment with Parkmerced's redevelopment plans. The retail and support services space would include uses such as neighborhood-serving retail, student support services, bike storage, study rooms, copy center, and retail dining, and a modest amount of underground parking to replace parking being removed elsewhere on campus in the vicinity of the Project. The retail and student support services space would serve SF State affiliates, as well as neighbors in the immediate vicinity of the campus.

The project would also include demolition of existing housing and construction of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall on Block 1 on the north side of Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue. This development assumes a relocation of the existing Department of Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts (BECA) program from the existing Creative Arts building. An 800-seat concert hall would be located adjacent to the Creative Arts replacement building. The concert hall would have recording and broadcast capabilities that would provide hands-on learning for BECA students and would serve as a performance venue and state-of-the-art recording studio for chamber orchestras, choral/vocal music, instrumental ensembles, and music groups. It also could host and simulcast lecture series, film festivals, and debates. Events may be open to the campus community only or to the neighborhood and larger community, similar to the University's current program of performing arts and lectures housed in McKenna and Knuth Theaters.

Parking would be provided in the basement of the new residential building on Holloway to serve neighborhood retail, concert hall events, and visitors to campus. Student residential parking would be limited to accessible spaces. Consistent with the 2007 Campus Master Plan, parking on Holloway would relocate a portion of the campus parking supply to the perimeter of campus, removing existing parking along Tapia Drive, and would constitute no net increase in the overall campus parking supply. The table below provides a summary of the key elements of the Project.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Existing Site Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Site Conditions</th>
<th>Net Change with Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student housing (Block 6)</td>
<td>168 beds (Blocks 1 &amp; 6)</td>
<td>550 beds</td>
<td>360 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 units (Block 1)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood-serving retail/student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25,000 gross</td>
<td>25,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support services (Block 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>square feet (GSF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>53 auto spaces²</td>
<td>70 parking spaces</td>
<td>0 parking spaces³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 motorcycle spaces²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts replacement building</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert hall (Block 1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60,000 GSF</td>
<td>60,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800 seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data compiled by SF State in 2016.
The eight units are occupied by approximately 2.75 people per unit, which is equivalent to 22 beds.

Parking located on Tapia Drive.

Parking would be removed elsewhere on campus to provide for no net increase in parking with the Project.

The Project would also include the preparation and implementation of urban design and sustainability guidelines, and the target of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum and Net Zero Energy in support of the campus’ Climate Action Plan and core value of resiliency. Transportation improvements would include secured bicycle parking, loading and emergency access, streetscape improvements to benefit pedestrians, and vacating (removing) Tapia Drive to integrate Tapia Triangle into the campus academic core. The Project would connect to existing water and combined sewer services adjacent the site. Low impact landscaping and energy-efficient lighting improvements would also be installed with the Project.

Figure 30. SF State Campus map showing proposed new development at Block 1 and Block 6. Source: SF State, edited by Dudek.
PROPOSED PROJECT ANALYSIS

The proposed project includes the demolition of Parkmerced Blocks 1 and 6, which have been determined to be historic resources for the purposes of CEQA as they contribute to the previously identified Parkmerced Historic District, and are two of six garden apartment blocks and two towers that compose the identified smaller Parkmerced Remnant Historic District. The analysis takes into consideration both the existing condition, wherein all of the original Parkmerced development currently remains, and the future anticipated condition, whereby the approved project at the Parkmerced Investors LLC property is redeveloped.

Analysis of Project-Specific Impacts Under CEQA

Provided below is an analysis of the project’s potential impacts to historic architectural resources in terms of CEQA criteria.

Impact 1.0 – The Project would demolish Blocks 1 and 6, which are qualified historic resources as contributors to an identified Parkmerced Historic District. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 would erode the integrity of the historic district but would not materially impair its significance (Less than significant).

Demolition is often considered to be a significant adverse impact, since it could materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historic resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register or California Register. In this case, the Parkmerced Historic District includes all of the original Parkmerced development. The demolition of the garden apartment Blocks 1 and 6 in the larger Parkmerced Historic District, which is extant under current conditions, would erode the integrity of the historic district, but would not materially impair the district’s significance. The historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. The SF State blocks are not considered significant individually, and the majority of the site plan and blocks would remain. The remaining 28 garden apartment blocks, 11 towers, and landscape features on the Parkmerced Investors LLC site, as well as the other four SF State garden apartment blocks, would convey the character-defining features and all characteristic building typologies of the development. The larger Parkmerced Historic District would remain eligible under existing conditions with the implementation of the Project. Thus, the Project would create a less-than-significant project-specific impact on the larger historic district.

Impact 2.0 – The Project would demolish Blocks 1 and 6, which are qualified historic resources as contributors to an identified Parkmerced Remnant Historic District. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 would erode the integrity of the historic district but would not materially impair its significance (Less than significant).

In the event that the approved project at the Parkmerced Investors LLC site is fully implemented, the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District identified in this report—comprised of six garden apartment blocks with laundry and carport facilities, and two adjacent towers—is the historic resource under evaluation in this impact. The apartment blocks are not considered significant individually. The integrity of the historic district would erode with the demolition of Blocks 1 and 6, one-third of the represented garden apartments that line Holloway Avenue west of 19th Avenue. Block 1 is one of two scored concrete garden apartments with one of five total laundry units, and Block 6 is one of four wood frame and stucco garden apartments with one of four carport complexes. Although the number of these typologies would be reduced, all typologies of buildings represented in the identified district would remain, and the character-defining features that the six blocks feature would still be represented by four blocks. Furthermore, Blocks 1 and 6 are both on the...
edges of the line of former Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State: Block 1 is an outlier on the northeast side of Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard, and Block 6 is the furthest east in the row along Holloway. Removing these two blocks would not create a discontiguous condition amongst the remaining Parkmerced blocks.

The demolition of the garden apartment Blocks 1 and 6 in the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would erode the integrity of the remnant historic district, but it but would not materially impair the district’s significance. The historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. Therefore, the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would remain eligible with the implementation of the Project. The Project would create a less-than-significant project-specific impact on the remnant historic district.

Analysis of Cumulative Impacts Under CEQA

“Cumulative impacts” under CEQA refers to two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

This HRTR is being prepared to support the forthcoming Focused Tiered EIR for the project. CEQA also indicates that an EIR should not discuss cumulative impacts to which the project would not contribute. If the combined cumulative impact (impacts from other projects combined with the impact from the project) is not significant, then the EIR should briefly indicate why the impact is not significant, and no further evaluation is necessary. If the combined cumulative impact is significant, the EIR also must indicate whether the project’s contribution to that significant cumulative impact will be cumulatively considerable.

Reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects typically include approved but not yet constructed projects and projects for which there is a pending application or that are otherwise contemplated in adopted plans. Therefore, reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects addressed in the cumulative analysis include the following:

- The approved Parkmerced project, including demolition of all of the two-story garden apartment buildings and removal of all of the interior landscaping on the Parkmerced Investors LLC property.
- Future redevelopment of Parkmerced’s eastern 2.75-acre commercial shopping center owned by Yousef Realty.
- The current redevelopment project of the former Parkmerced recreation area to construct the Mashouf Wellness Center.
- The probable future build out of University Park South, as contemplated in the future vision included in the 2007 adopted Campus Master Plan, including demolition and redevelopment of all SF State garden apartment blocks in University Park South.

The cumulative impact analysis below considers the project’s contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to both the larger Parkmerced Historic District and the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District that would remain after the approved Parkmerced project is implemented.
Impact 3.0 – The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; however, the Project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable (Less-than-significant impact).

The EIR for the redevelopment project at the Parkmerced Investors LLC site already determined that the Parkmerced Historic District would not remain eligible for listing in any historic registers if that project proceeds as entitled and the project-level impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable for that project. Additionally, the cumulative study area for that project was the original Parkmerced complex, which included four other property owners of Parkmerced properties, SF State, Yousef Realty, and Olympic Realty. Redevelopment of these former Parkmerced properties is contemplated in some fashion by all of these owners, as described above. The EIR for the Parkmerced project determined that the impact associated with the Parkmerced project and the cumulative redevelopment projects would be significant and unavoidable, as anticipated redevelopment of all of the properties identified above would materially impair the significance of the historic district to the extent that it would no longer be eligible for listing. This impact was identified as being caused primarily by the Parkmerced Investors LLC redevelopment project. For example, out of 34 total garden apartment blocks, the Parkmerced Investors LLC project would demolish 28. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 for the Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed Use Project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact by eroding the Parkmerced Historic District’s integrity. However, when combined with known current, entitled, and future projects, including the large Parkmerced Investors LLC project, the Project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the cumulative impact of the Project on the Parkmerced Historic District would be less than significant.

Impact 4.0 – The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; the Project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable (Significant adverse impact).

Following the redevelopment of Blocks 1 and 6, the remaining blocks of Parkmerced garden apartments owned by SF State—blocks 2, 5, 41, and 42—are anticipated to be demolished eventually and redeveloped by SF State, and the landscape design of Font Boulevard is anticipated to be eventually altered. This would likely occur under the future vision included in the adopted 2007 CMP, which contemplated demolition and redevelopment of all SF State garden apartment blocks in University Park South beyond the 2020 horizon year for the CMP. While redevelopment of the entirety of University Park South is not yet approved or adopted, it is considered reasonably foreseeable and is therefore considered in this analysis.

The future redevelopment of Blocks 1 and 6 as part of the Project, as well as the rest of SF State’s Parkmerced blocks and street landscapes, would materially impair the significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District. The remnant historic district would no longer be able to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. This would constitute a significant cumulative impact, as the remnant district would no longer be eligible for listing. Because the remnant district only includes six garden apartment blocks and two towers, the Project would contribute one-third of the garden apartment demolitions. The Project therefore would create a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact when combined with the known and future redevelopment of all former Parkmerced blocks on the SF State campus, as contemplated
in the future vision for the campus in the 2007 CMP. Thus, the cumulative impact of the Project on the Remnant Parkmerced Historic District would be significant.

This significant cumulative impact can be reduced through the implementation of the applicable CMP EIR mitigation measures and through the implementation of the additional mitigation measures identified in the following section. However, the impact is significant and unavoidable as the implementation of feasible mitigation measures would not reduce the impact to less than significant.
VII. MITIGATION MEASURES

Historic resource mitigations are typically developed on a case-by-case basis, providing the opportunity to tailor them to the characteristics and the significance of the resource and the particular impacts to the resource. Common mitigation measures for demolition consist of documentation of the resource, typically to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), preparation of a salvage plan for significant architectural features and materials, or a commemorative plaque or interpretive display. While in some instances these mitigation measures are judged to reduce the level of adverse impacts to less than significant, they often do not alter the loss to community character and collective history. Section 15126.4(b)(2) of the Public Resources Code is clear in this regard: “In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by way of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur.”

Cultural resource mitigation measures have already been undertaken in response to the proposed demolition of buildings on the adjacent Parkmerced Investors LLC site. This includes HABS and HALS documentation in the form of measured drawings, digital photographs, and written report; as well as an interpretive program that includes two outdoor educational displays and a video on loop in the administration building.

The following mitigation measures are recommended in advance of the Project, and elaborate on the mitigation measure outlined in the Campus Master Plan EIR's Mitigation CULT-2C (ii):

If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.

DOCUMENTATION

SF State shall facilitate documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II per Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation CULT-2C, which includes:

1. **Drawings**: Select original Church and Schultze drawings of Blocks 1 and 6, if available from Parkmerced Investors LLC or the San Francisco Planning Department, should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar. Measured drawings are not required, as these were completed for each type of building.

---

28 Parkmerced Investors LLC transferred a set of historic Parkmerced drawings to the San Francisco Planning Department to be archived as part of the Parkmerced project's cultural resource mitigation measures.
as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced site (completed by Page & Turnbull in 2016).

2. **Photographs:** Archivally printed digital photographs of exterior and interior views of Blocks 1 and 6. These photographs must adequately document the character-defining features of the buildings and should be produced by a qualified professional who is familiar with the character-defining features of the buildings, as identified in the Historic Resource Evaluation completed by Page & Turnbull in 2009 and information provided in this report. Photographs should include general views that illustrate the setting; the exterior façades; the courtyard façades; details including front entrances and/or typical doorways; typical windows; exterior details indicative of the era of construction or of historic or architectural interest; and interior views to capture spatial relationships and any decorative elements. An example of printed digital photographs, site plans, and photo captions can be found in the Parkmerced HABS-HALS photographs produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site. These photograph sets are located at the San Francisco Public Library History Center and the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. The photograph set for Blocks 1 and 6 should correspond to the previously produced sets.

3. **Written data:** Not required, as these blocks are covered in the HABS-HALS written report produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. The HABS Level II documentation shall be completed by professionals who meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History.

Three copies of the drawings and photographs should be provided to the San Francisco Public Library History Center, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, and SF State University.

This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. Implementation of this mitigation measure will assist in reducing the project-specific impacts: however, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for significant impacts of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the impacts to less-than-significant.

**VIDEO RECORDATION**

The project sponsor will facilitate the creation of a walk-through video of Blocks 1 and 6 and their Parkmerced setting, including an exterior overview of adjacent streets (with medians and traffic circles), nearby tower apartments, and primary public spaces at Parkmerced such as the central Common and the Meadow. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, preferably one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified architectural historian. The documentation shall include as much information as possible—using visuals in combination with narration—about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use, and historic context of the historical resources. Copies of the video documentation shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library History Room, the Northwest Information Center, and SF State University. This mitigation measure will supplement the traditional HABS-HALS documentation.
VIII. CONCLUSION

The Parkmerced Historic District was identified in the Parkmerced Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment (2009) and is eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register under Criteria A/1 (Events) and C/3 (Architecture). In addition, assuming that the entitled project at the Parkmerced Investors LLC site is implemented, a Parkmerced Remnant Historic District has been identified at Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, 42 and towers 39 and 40 and determined significant under California Register Criteria 1 (Events) and 3 (Design). Therefore, both historic districts are considered historic resources for the purposes of CEQA analysis.

The proposed Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project requires the demolition of Blocks 1 and 6. Under current conditions, the project-specific impact of demolishing Blocks 1 and 6 on the Parkmerced Historic District would be less than significant, as the remaining blocks would continue to convey the historic district’s significance and its character-defining features and construction typologies. Likewise, assuming the entitled project is implemented, the project-specific impact of demolishing Blocks 1 and 6 on the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would be less than significant, as the remaining four blocks of the smaller district would continue to convey the historic district’s significance and its character-defining features and construction typologies.

The proposed Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project would contribute to a cumulative impact on the currently extant Parkmerced Historic District when considering all known current, entitled, and future projects, though the Project would not create a considerable contribution to that cumulative impact. The Project would also contribute to a cumulative impact on the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, and would create a considerable contribution to that cumulative impact. Mitigation measures are included in this report, which if implemented can reduce the impact of the proposed project but cannot eliminate the impact.
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