FILE NO. 071376 RESOLUTION NO. 581-07

[Resolution to Initiate the Designation of 690 Market, the Chronicle Building, as a Landmark]

Resolution initiating the designation of 690 Market, the Chronicle Building, Lot 6 in Assessor's Block 311, as a landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code and urging expedited consideration of the building's landmark status and a Mills Act contract associated with the building's rehabilitation and restoration.

WHEREAS, 690 Market, also known as the Chronicle Building, is located immediately north of Market and Geary Street; and

WHEREAS, the building has stood at this intersection since 1890; and,

WHEREAS, the building has survived both the 1906 and 1989 earthquakes; and

WHEREAS, the building was entirely completed and repaired in 1908 after significant damage from the 1906 earthquake.

WHEREAS, the building was remodeled in 1962-1963 to install corporate-modern steel and a glass curtain wall; and,

WHEREAS, the building's original sandstone base exterior remained intact underneath the glass curtain wall

WHEREAS, the building is a cultural and architectural anchor for the Financial District; and,

WHEREAS, the building is associated with the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906, and with the San Francisco labor movement (National Register criterion A); and,

WHEREAS, the building is closely associated with *San Francisco Chronicle* publisher and San Francisco civil leader and downtown landowner Michael H. de Young (National Register criterion B); and,

WHEREAS, the building is San Francisco's first steel-frame skyscraper, features pioneering seismic systems and is a work of masters Daniel H. Burnham, John Wellborn Root and Willis Polk (National Register criterion C); and,

WHEREAS, the building's corporate-modern steel and a glass curtain wall has now been removed and building's exterior has been rehabilitated to restore its historic character; and,

WHEREAS, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board approved the building as a "conditional landmark" by Resolution No. 570, and the Planning Commission approved the building as a "conditional landmark" by Resolution No. 16751; and,

WHEREAS, the building appears to have been restored and rehabilitated in accordance with the terms contemplated by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and the Planning Commission when they approved the building's "conditional landmark" designation; now, therefore, be it,

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors does hereby initiate the designation of 690 Market, the Chronicle Building, Lot 6 in Assessor's Block 311, as a landmark, and so directs the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board to place the property in consideration as a landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code and other appropriate provisions of law; and be it,

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors does hereby urge the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, the Planning Department and the Planning Commission to give expedited consideration to both the designation of the property as a landmark and the approval of a Mills Act contract in association with the historic restoration and rehabilitation of the property.

City and County of San Francisco

Tails

Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 071376 **Date Passed:**

Resolution initiating the designation of 690 Market, the Chronicle Building, Lot 6 in Assessor's Block 311, as a landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code and urging expedited consideration of the building's landmark status and a Mills Act contract associated with the building's rehabilitation and restoration.

October 23, 2007 Board of Supervisors — ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Alioto-Pier, Ammiano, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Chu, Maxwell, Mirkarimi, Peskin, Sandoval
Excused: 1 - McGoldrick

File No. 071376

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 23, 2007 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

10/29/2007
Date Approved

Mayor Gavin Newsom

ATTACHMENT 4

Case No. 2003.0584L
690 MARKET STREET
The Old Chronicle Building
Assessor's Block 311, Lot 6

SAN FRANCISCO

PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 16751

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO LANDMARK INITIATION AND APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF 690 MARKET STREET, THE OLD CHRONICLE BUILDING, ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 311, LOT 06, AS LANDMARK NO. 243.

WHEREAS, on August 18, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., authorized agent for the owners of 690 Market Street, 690A HCT LLC and 690B HCT LLC, submitted a verified application to initiate the designation of 690 Market Street as a San Francisco Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code; and

1. On July 1, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., submitted a Potential San Francisco Landmark Questionnaire for the Old Chronicle Building, for the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) to review regarding the potential landmark designation of the subject property; and
2. The Potential San Francisco Landmark Questionnaire for the Old Chronicle Building was reviewed by the Landmarks Board at its meeting of July 16, 2003; and
3. On July 18, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., submitted a draft Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report, for the Landmarks Board to consider recommendation of the landmark designation of the property; and
4. A draft Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report was reviewed by the Landmarks Board at a duly noticed public hearing on February 4, 2004; and
5. At the same February 4, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board required revisions to statements contained in the draft Landmarks Designation Report (Report) for 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, and also required the addition of a section to the Report addressing labor history associated with the subject building, and voted to continue the hearing to February 18, 2004;
6. At the Landmarks Board February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board reviewed the required revisions made to the draft Report and determined the revisions to be satisfactory, with the exception that the required additional section on labor history was not included, and it was also determined that the historic elevator mechanical penthouse above the roof level of the 16th story should also be described in the Report. The Landmarks Board voted to add as conditions of approval to its Resolution No. 570, attached as Exhibit A of said Resolution, that the Project Sponsor would complete the section on labor history and add a description the elevator penthouse in the Report and return to the Landmarks Board for approval of the final Report including these two items, and that these revisions would need to be completed to the Landmarks Board's

satisfaction before the issuance of a site permit by the Planning Department; and

7. At the same February 18, 2004, the Landmarks Board adopted the Report as so conditioned as a Final Landmark Designation Report; and

8. In adopting the draft Landmark Designation Report for 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building as a Final Landmark Designation Report, the Landmarks Board found that if the Old Chronicle Building's physical integrity is reclaimed through the proposed restoration project, the Old Chronicle Building would be eligible for *National Register* listing based on the following three Criteria: Criterion A (buildings that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history); Criterion B (buildings that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past); and Criterion C (buildings that embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction). Specifically, the building's significance is based on its association with the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906, and with the San Francisco labor movement (Criterion A); association with *San Francisco Chronicle* publisher and San Francisco civic leader and downtown landowner Michael H. de Young (Criterion B); and its important role as San Francisco's first steel-frame skyscraper, its pioneering seismic systems, and as a work of a master: Daniel H. Burnham, John Wellborn Root and Willis Polk (Criterion C); and

9. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board determined that the proposed restoration portion of the proposed project would comply with a reasonable interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Restoration (Standards), including compliance with the proposed Rehabilitation Program as revised by the Landmarks Board, as follows:

    Restoration Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.

    Discussion: The building's use will be changed from commercial to residential. As a result, the Standards for Rehabilitation will be used to guide this work. Please see Rehabilitation Standard 1 below under the Vertical Addition section of this report for discussion.

    Restoration Standard 2: Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.

    Discussion: The exterior of the Old Chronicle Building will be restored to its 1909 appearance. Exterior materials (sandstone base, red pressed brick shaft, terra cotta detailing, etc.) dating from this period will not be removed or altered. Instead, these materials will be retained and repaired.

    Exterior materials that will be treated according to the Standards for Rehabilitation

include the storefronts at the building's base and the walls and windows of the light court, which will be filled in to accommodate the new structural system.

Restoration Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Discussion: Work completed to stabilize, conserve, consolidate and repair historic materials and features will be properly documented and distinguishable from the old upon close inspection. Any changes to the exterior of the building that have achieved significance in their own right and that date from the period of significance will be retained.

Restoration Standard 4: Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

Discussion: Finishes and cladding that were applied to the building in 1962-63 will be removed from the building so the underlying historic fabric can be restored. The existing non-historic cladding has been documented through original construction drawings. Because of this, no new drawings of this cladding system will be created, although photographs will be taken to document its removal.

***Restoration Standard 5**: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.*

Discussion: The Old Chronicle Building contains distinctive masonry materials and features under its non-historic cladding. These existing masonry materials and features will be revealed, retained and restored.

Restoration Standard 6: Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

Discussion: Deteriorated features and materials will undergo a program of repair rather than replacement. In cases where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the replacement feature will match the original in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

Restoration Standard 7: Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other

properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

Discussion: No conjectural features will be added to the building and no false sense of history will be created. Where a distinctive feature has been removed, such as the bay window facing Market Street, and when sufficient historical evidence remains about the feature's design, composition and materials, the feature will be rebuilt to match the original in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

Restoration Standard 8: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Discussion: If chemical or physical treatments are necessary, they will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Restoration Standard 9: Archaeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Discussion: Foundations will be strengthened as part of the project and additional excavation may occur. If any archaeological material should be encountered, construction will be halted and proper mitigation undertaken pursuant to mitigation measures set forth in the proposed project's preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Restoration Standard 10: Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

Discussion: The Kearny and Market Street façades will be restored and will include features and materials that were found on the building during its period of significance. This restoration work will be guided by and will comply with the Standards for Restoration. The storefronts at the building's base cannot be restored, due to a lack of adequate historical evidence and there will be no attempt at historic conjecture in the design of new storefronts in this area. Both the design of the storefronts and the vertical addition on the building's roof will be guided by the Standards.

Based on the above analysis of the Standards for Restoration, it was concluded by the Landmarks Board that the proposed façade restoration portion of the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties; and

10. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmark Board reviewed and endorsed the description, location and boundary of the Old Chronicle Building Landmark site as 690 Market Street, encompassing all of and limited to Lot 06 in Assessor's Block 311; and

11. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board acknowledged that the Old Chronicle Building's status as the city's first steel-frame skyscraper, in addition to the National Register Criteria previously mentioned, justify its designation as a local landmark; and

12. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board also imposed a third condition of approval to its Resolution No. 570, (Exhibit A to said Resolution), requesting the Zoning Administrator to confer with Department staff and the Landmarks Board before making a final determination that the restoration work described in this Resolution is in compliance with the approved Rehabilitation Program (Exhibit B to said Resolution); and

13. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board reviewed and endorsed the following particular features of the proposed Landmark that should be preserved, once uncovered and restored by the proposed project:

    a. The sandstone base, pressed brick shaft, terra cotta banding, terra cotta windowsills and jamb moldings per the Rehabilitation Program developed for the proposed Mills Act Contract to be attached to Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570 (as well as to the Landmarks Board Mills Act Resolution, No. 572) as Exhibit B;

    b. Missing features such as the painted wood double-hung windows, metal cornice, central projecting bay, the frieze course and the entrance arch, which have been documented in historic photographs and drawings, and are proposed to be reconstructed to restore the building to its 1909 appearance per the Rehabilitation Program developed for the proposed Mills Act Contract to be attached to Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570 (as well as to the Landmarks Board Mills Act Resolution, No. 572) as Exhibit B;

    c. All features as described in the Maintenance Program to be attached to Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570 (as well as to the Landmarks Board Mills Act Resolution, No. 572) as Exhibit C;

    d. Any significant historic exterior physical features that were associated with newspaper production labor functions and loading that might be discovered upon removal of the non-historic metal, glass and marble exterior cladding installed in 1962; and

14. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board reviewed documents, correspondence and oral testimony on matters relevant to the proposed landmark designation, at the aforementioned duly noticed public hearings held on February 4 and 18, 2004; and

15. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board hereby recommended by Resolution No. 570 that the Planning Commission approve a ***conditional landmark designation*** of 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, Assessor's Block 311, Lot 06 as Landmark No. 243, pursuant to Article 10 of the

Planning Code, contingent on the complete removal of the non-historic curtain wall and storefront identified in this Resolution and the Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report, and the rehabilitation and restoration of the subject property in conformance with the standards set forth in the Rehabilitation Program developed for the proposed Mills Act Contract to be attached to Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570 (as well as to the Landmarks Board Mills Act Resolution, No. 572) as Exhibit B; and

16. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board directed its Recording Secretary to transmit its Resolution No. 570, The Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report and other pertinent materials in the case file 2003.0584L to the Planning Commission; and

17. That the Planning Commission reviewed the case file (No. 2003.0584L) and considered the findings and recommendation of the Landmarks Board set forth in the Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570, and held a duly noticed public hearing on the matter on March 18, 2004.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission does hereby concur with the findings and recommendation of the Landmarks Board and **APPROVES** the ***conditional landmark designation*** of the property at 690 Market Street, known as the Old Chronicle Building, in Assessor's Block 311, Lot 6, as Landmark No. 243 with Conditions attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the landmark is set forth in the adopted Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report, Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570 and other materials on file in the Planning Department Docket No. 2003.0584L, which is incorporated herein and made a part of thereof as though fully set forth; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the adopted Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report and other pertinent materials in the Case File No. 2003.0584L, and a copy of this Resolution of Approval to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was Adopted by the Planning Commission on March 18, 2004.

Linda D. Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Antonini, Bradford-Bell, Feldstein, Hughes, S. Lee, W. Lee

NOES: None

ABSENT: Boyd

ADOPTED: March 18, 2004

G:\Documents\Landmarks\Landmark Designations\The Chronicle Building\2003.0584L, 690 Market Street, The Old Chronicle Building, CPC Landmark Designation Resolution.DOC

EXHIBIT A

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Landmark Designation of 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building

Case No. 2003.0584L

1. Prior to the Planning Department's approval of a site permit for the proposed Project, the Project Sponsor shall return to the Landmarks Board with a revised Landmark Designation Report (Report) containing an additional section describing labor history related to 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, and such revised report shall be satisfactory to the Landmarks Board.

2. Prior to the Planning Department's approval of a site permit for the proposed Project, the Project Sponsor shall also include a description of the historic elevator mechanical penthouse above the 16th story roof level in the Report to the satisfaction of the Landmarks Board.

3. The Planning Director will confer with Department staff and the Landmarks Board before making a final written determination that the rehabilitation and restoration work described in this Resolution is in compliance with the approved Rehabilitation Program (Exhibit B of Landmarks Board Resolution No. 570). Once this written determination has been issued by the Planning Director, the Landmark designation will be final and the property will be a qualified historic property under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 71.2(b).

4. Prior to the issuance of any new or amended building or site permit for the construction of the Project, the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, which notice shall state that construction of the Project is subject to the conditions of this Motion.

ATTACHMENT 5

Case No. 2003.0584L
690 MARKET STREET
The Old Chronicle Building
Assessor's Block 311, Lot 6

SAN FRANCISCO

PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 16751a

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO AN APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL DESIGNATION OF 690 MARKET STREET, THE OLD CHRONICLE BUILDING, ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 311, LOT 06, AS LANDMARK NO. 243, WITH SPECIFIC FINDINGS REGARDING THE CONSISTENCY OF A VERTICAL ADDITION (RANGING FROM EIGHT-TO-THIRTEEN-STORIES ABOVE THE EXISTING ROOF LEVELS) WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES.

WHEREAS, on August 18, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., authorized agent for the owners of 690 Market Street, 690A HCT LLC and 690B HCT LLC, submitted a verified application to initiate the designation of 690 Market Street as a San Francisco Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code; and

1. On July 1, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., submitted a Potential San Francisco Landmark Questionnaire for the Old Chronicle Building, for the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) to review regarding the potential landmark designation of the subject property; and
2. The Potential San Francisco Landmark Questionnaire for the Old Chronicle Building was reviewed by the Landmarks Board at its meeting of July 16, 2003; and
3. At the same July 16, 2003 meeting, the Landmarks Board provided comments and in regard to the design of a proposed façade restoration and new vertical addition (ranging from eight to thirteen stories above the existing roof levels) to the Old Chronicle Building to ensure that such a project would enhance the potential landmark status of the Old Chronicle Building; and
4. On July 18, 2003, Mary G. Murphy, Esq., submitted a draft Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report, for the Landmarks Board to consider recommendation of the landmark designation of the property; and
5. A draft Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report was reviewed by the Landmarks Board at a duly noticed public hearing on February 4, 2004; and
6. At the same February 4, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board required revisions to statements contained in the draft Landmarks Designation Report (Report) for 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, and also required the addition of a section to the Report addressing labor history associated with the subject building, and voted to continue the hearing to February 18, 2004;
7. At the Landmarks Board February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board reviewed the

required revisions made to the draft Report and determined the revisions to be satisfactory, with the exception that the required additional section on labor history was not included, and it was also determined that the historic elevator mechanical penthouse above the roof level of the 16th story should also be described in the Report. The Landmarks Board voted to add as conditions of approval to its Resolution No. 570, attached as Exhibit A of said Resolution, that the Project Sponsor would complete the section on labor history and add a description the elevator penthouse in the Report and return to the Landmarks Board for approval of the final Report including these two items, and that these revisions would need to be completed to the Landmarks Board's satisfaction before the issuance of a site permit by the Planning Department; and

8. At the same February 18, 2004, the Landmarks Board adopted the Report as so conditioned as a Final Landmark Designation Report; and

9. In adopting the draft Landmark Designation Report for 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building as a Final Landmark Designation Report, the Landmarks Board found that if the Old Chronicle Building's physical integrity is reclaimed through the proposed restoration project, the Old Chronicle Building would be eligible for *National Register* listing based on the following three Criteria: Criterion A (buildings that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history); Criterion B (buildings that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past); and Criterion C (buildings that embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction). Specifically, the building's significance is based on its association with the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906, and with the San Francisco labor movement (Criterion A); association with *San Francisco Chronicle* publisher and San Francisco civic leader and downtown landowner Michael H. de Young (Criterion B); and its important role as San Francisco's first steel-frame skyscraper, its pioneering seismic systems, and as a work of a master: Daniel H. Burnham, John Wellborn Root and Willis Polk (Criterion C); and

10. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board determined that, while a more conservative, conventional reading of the Secretary of the Interior Standards could conclude otherwise, the proposed rehabilitation project including a proposed eight-story vertical addition would create a net preservation benefit for the subject property, and comply with a reasonable interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the "Secretary's Standards") as follows:

Rehabilitation Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

Discussion: The original use of the building, as combined offices and production center for the Chronicle newspaper, has not been present since 1924. The building continued in use as offices between 1924 and the present. While introduction of residential use is yet another

change, the change of use itself does not cause substantial change to the building's distinctive materials, features, spaces or spatial relationships. The new vertical addition, however, constitutes a substantial change and is accordingly discussed in Standard 2 below.

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

Discussion: The important features that are significantly altered by this project are the building's height and the interior light well. Assuming that seismic and life-safety needs supercede retention of the light well, the central issue is height. The proposed project continues an architectural progression that began in 1889-1890, when Michael H. de Young sought the tallest building he could get and Burnham & Root designed it. Willis Polk's 16-story addition of 1905 was at least partly in response to the arrival of the Call Building on the opposite side of Market Street, in 1898. Willis Polk's proposed addition of 1915—another 37 stories on top of the existing 16 stories for a grand total of 53 stories—responded to the Hearst Building of 1909, as well as to the boosterism of the time. The present addition allows the building to take its place among a grouping of much taller contemporary neighbors and continues the tradition, on this site, of adding height. In general, substantial vertical additions are discouraged by the Guidelines, which state, "The construction of an exterior addition on a historic building may seem to be essential for the new use, but it is emphasized in the Rehabilitation guidelines that such new additions should be avoided, if possible, and considered only after it is determined that those needs cannot be met by altering secondary, i.e., non character-defining interior spaces." The project sponsor claims that the proposed addition is necessary to render the rehabilitation and restoration economically feasible. In addition, the verticality of the proposed addition complements the original spirit of de Young's building and the modern skyscraper in general, and furthermore, is designed in a contemporary architectural style so as not to create a false sense of historical development. Finally, the addition is substantially set back at various heights to clearly delineate and subordinate the addition from historic building form.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Discussion: No such creation of false history or adding conjectural features will be undertaken, as the proposed vertical addition and new storefronts are designed in a contemporary style so as to be easily distinguishable from the historical portions of the building. No conjectural features will be added to the historic façade. The new cornice proposed for the 16th floor will be clearly distinguishable from the historic portions of the building while also unifying the new and old.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance

in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Discussion: The 1905-06 additions and 1907-09 reconstruction have clearly acquired historic significance and will be retained and preserved where feasible.

It could be argued that the changes to the building exterior in 1962-1963 are typical of their time and are legitimate alterations to the historic resource. Were these alterations already 50 years old, such an argument might have more force. But at this time there seems to be wide agreement that the 1960s alterations were misguided (viz: Splendid Survivors), and that returning to the building's historic 1909 appearance is desirable.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Discussion: See discussion under Standard 2 for proposed alterations to basic floor plan, light-well and building height.

Rehabilitation Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Discussion: These methods will be followed.

Rehabilitation Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Discussion: If chemical or physical treatments are necessary, they will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Rehabilitation Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Discussion: Foundations will be strengthened as part of the Project and additional excavation may occur. If any archeological material should be encountered, construction will be halted and proper mitigation undertaken.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of

the property and its environment.

Discussion: The proposed new addition will be of its own time and be differentiated from the old and a careful effort made in design to produce compatible forms and use compatible materials. The new vertical addition will be set back about 15 feet from the Geary and Market Street façades successively at the 12th, 21st and 22nd floors, respectively. It would be further set back about 5 feet from Geary and Market Streets and about 10 feet from the Geary/Kearny Streets corner at the 24th level to clearly delineate and subordinate the vertical addition from the historic building. (See discussion under Standard 2 concerning basic floor plan, light well, and building height).

Rehabilitation Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Discussion: In California, the introduction of seismic retrofit is a permanent alteration to a historic building, but one that is generally found to comply with the Standards because of the benefits involved. While removal of the proposed vertical addition is improbable, it could be done without altering the form and integrity of the 1890, 1905, and 1909 portions of the existing building.

Based on the above analysis of the *Standards for Rehabilitation*, it is concluded that the proposed façade restoration portion of the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*; and

11. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board reviewed documents, correspondence and oral testimony on matters relevant to the proposed landmark designation, at the aforementioned duly noticed public hearing held on February 4 and 18, 2004; and

12. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board recommended that the Planning Commission find that the proposed eight-to-thirteen story vertical addition to the existing roof levels for the conditional landmark at 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, Assessor's Block 311, Lot 06, meets a broad interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation; and

13. At the same February 18, 2004 hearing, the Landmarks Board directed its Recording Secretary to transmit Resolution No. 571, The Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report and other pertinent materials in the case file 2003.0584L to the Planning Commission; and

14. The Planning Commission reviewed the case file (No. 2003.0584L) and considered the findings and recommendation of the Landmarks Board set forth in the Landmarks Board Resolution No. 571, and held a duly noticed public hearing on the matter regarding the proposed consistency of the aforementioned vertical addition to 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of

Historic Structures, on March 18, 2004.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission does hereby concur with the findings and recommendation of the Landmarks Board and **FINDS** that the proposed eight-to-thirteen story vertical addition to the existing roof levels for the conditional landmark at 690 Market Street, the Old Chronicle Building, Assessor's Block 311, Lot 06, meets a broad interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the adopted Old Chronicle Building Landmark Designation Report and other pertinent materials in the Case File No. 2003.0584L, and a copy of this Resolution of Approval to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was Adopted by the Planning Commission on March 18, 2004.

Linda D. Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Antonini, Bradford-Bell, Feldstein, Hughes, S. Lee, W. Lee

NOES: None

ABSENT: Boyd

ADOPTED: March 18, 2004

G:\Documents\Landmarks\Landmark Designations\The Chronicle Building\~$2003.0584L, 690 Market Street, The Old Chronicle Building, CPC Landmark Designation in-lieu C of A Resolution.DOC

LANDMARK / HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION REPORT

Attachment A

HISTORIC NAME	The Chronicle Building
POPULAR NAME	The Chronicle Building
ADDRESS	690 Market Street
BLOCK & LOT OWNER	Assessor's Block 311, Lot 6
ORIGINAL USE	Headquarters of the San Francisco Chronicle
CURRENT USE	Office and commercial use
ZONING	Commercial District: C-3-0 Height and Bulk District: 250-S[1] Not located in a Special Use District[2] Not located in a Preservation District

NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA

(A) _x_ Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
(B) _x_ Association with the lives of persons significant in our past.
(C) _x_ Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinctions.
(D) ___ Has yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

Period of Significance

1890 - 1924

Integrity

The Chronicle Building underwent several major alterations during its period of significance, in addition to alterations in 1962-63 that cloaked the historic Romanesque Revival office building in a modern veneer. However, underneath this veneer the building is thought to retain much of its original exterior fabric and detailing.

[1] The Owner/Applicant has requested that the Height and Bulk District for the building site be reclassified from 250-S to 285-S concurrently with any future Landmark designation. Supervisor Peskin plans to introduce an ordinance to permit such reclassification.
[2] The Owner/Applicant has requested that a temporary "Downtown Housing Demonstration Special Use District" be created concurrently with any future Landmark designation. Supervisor Peskin plans to introduce an ordinance to create this new Special Use District.

The first major alteration occurred in 1905, when *San Francisco Chronicle* publisher Michael H. de Young commissioned Daniel H. Burnham & Co. to add two stories to the original building and to design a new sixteen-story tower for the adjoining parcel to the north. As work commenced in 1905 the timber-frame and bronze-clad clock tower was destroyed by fire ignited by bottle rockets set off by a demonstration in front of the building. The reconstruction was not yet complete when the 1906 Earthquake and Fire again ravaged the building, gutting its interior completely and destroying the brownstone cladding at the ground and mezzanine floor levels. During the reconstruction, which lasted from 1907 to 1909, the 1905 Annex was repaired and reopened and the original 1890 section reconstructed. The two bays facing Geary Street had to be demolished and completely rebuilt. In addition, the clock tower was not rebuilt. Aside from these changes, the building was largely reconstructed along the lines of Burnham's 1905 plans.

Between 1909 and 1924 the Chronicle Building continued to serve as the headquarters of the *San Francisco Chronicle.* In 1924 the *Chronicle* moved to a new combined printing plant and office building constructed for the newspaper at 901 Mission Street. The old headquarters at the corner of Third and Market Street continued to be known as the Chronicle Building or the de Young Building and appears to have undergone few significant changes.

Between 1962 and 1963 the Home Mutual Savings and Loan Association undertook a $1.6 million dollar renovation and "modernization" of the building. During this remodeling campaign the original storefronts were removed as well as some of the projecting masonry detailing in order to cloak the facades behind an "up-to-date" aluminum, glass and fiberglass exterior skin. According to the former owners, this remodeling was intended to make their "new" headquarters resemble the corporate modern skyscrapers being erected along Market Street.

In order to restore the building's integrity, the current owner intends to remove the aluminum, glass and fiberglass skin to re-expose and rehabilitate the building's historic exterior masonry shell. The proposed restoration includes the conversion of existing office uses to residential, a full seismic retrofit and the addition of up to eight new floors of housing.

The owner understands that final landmark designation will be contingent upon the successful removal of the 1960's cladding and restoration of the historic exterior fabric. Although the extent of the original fabric surviving beneath the skin is not fully known, historic photographs taken by the former owner during the course of the 1963 alterations, exploratory removal of the cladding in various locations on the facade and detailed plans provided by the architectural firm involved in the 1962-63 remodel indicate that the majority of the building's façade survives intact. For these reasons, and to increase the efficiency and certainty of the entitlement process, the owner desires to proceed with the landmark designation process concurrently with obtaining planning entitlements for the proposed rehabilitation project and in advance of the ultimate removal of exterior cladding. This process will create, in effect, a landmark designation that is conditioned and effective upon the removal of the 1960's cladding and restoration of the historic exterior.

ARTICLE 10 REQUIREMENTS—SECTION 1004 (b)

Boundaries of the Landmark Site

The Chronicle Building sits on Lot 6 of Assessor's Block 311 in the City and County of San Francisco. The block is bounded by Geary and Market Streets to the south, Montgomery

Street to the east, Post Street to the north and Kearny Street to the west. Due to its location at the confluence of Market, Geary and Kearny Streets, the Chronicle Building sits on an irregularly shaped corner lot, giving the plan its unique polygonal shape.

Characteristics of the landmark that justify its designation

The Chronicle Building's status as the city's first steel-frame skyscraper justifies its designation as a local landmark.

Description of the particular features that should be preserved

The building's brownstone base, pressed brick shaft, terra cotta banding, terra cotta window sills and jamb moldings will be made visible. It is likely that these materials will require repair and conservation work. Missing features such as the cornice, the frieze course and the entrance arch, which have been documented in historic photographs and drawings, may be reconstructed to restore the building to its 1924 appearance. All of these features are currently obscured by the modernist veneer that was installed on the building in 1962-63. The removal of the modernist veneer should be a condition precedent to the designation of this landmark.

DESCRIPTION

SETTING

The Chronicle Building occupies part of a prominent intersection historically known as "Newspaper Angle," or "The Times Square of the West." Beginning with the original Chronicle Building of 1879 (demolished in 1889) the intersection of Geary, Market, Kearny and Third Streets evolved into the center of San Francisco's newspaper publishing industry, much as Park Row in New York had evolved into "Newspaper Row" during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Beginning with the *San Francisco Chronicle*, three of San Francisco's major newspapers eventually built prominent office towers on the corner of Third and Market. Three of these towers continue to anchor three corners of this busy intersection: The Chronicle Building at 690 Market (1889, 1905 and 1908), Central Tower (originally the Call Building) at 703 Market Street (1898 and 1938), and the Hearst Building at 691-99 Market Street (1909).

With the exception of several other early steel-frame skyscrapers and the small enclave of Jackson Square, Downtown San Francisco was completely destroyed during the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. Although several survivors were reconstructed immediately after the catastrophe, the majority of the area was built anew between 1907 and 1912, with some buildings being completed as late as the 1920s. As a result, the architectural character of much of downtown San Francisco remained quite cohesive until the construction of Corporate Modernist office towers from the 1960s onward. The buildings sharing Block 311 with the Chronicle Building reflect the architectural diversity of the area. The next property to the east is 660 Market Street, a five-story commercial structure designed by Lewis Hobart and constructed in 1924. Abutting the Chronicle Building's northern property line is a six-story historic office building and north of this building is the twenty-one story Cal-Fed Tower at 88 Kearny which was built in the 1980s.

EXTERIOR

The Chronicle Building is composed of two sections: a nine-story plus mezzanine office tower originally designed by Burnham & Root and constructed in 1889-90, enlarged in 1905 by D. H. Burnham & Co. into an eleven-story tower and reconstructed in 1907-09 by Willis Polk; and an adjoining sixteen-story tower designed and constructed in 1905 by D. H. Burnham &

Co. and reconstructed in 1908 by Willis Polk. The Chronicle Building has two elevations facing public streets—the west elevation facing Kearny Street and the south elevation facing both Geary and Market Streets. In addition, parts of the north, south and east walls are visible from Market Street and adjoining buildings. Currently the entire exterior of the Chronicle Building is concealed beneath a veneer of marble, aluminum and structural glass installed in 1963 as part of a misguided attempt at "modernization." This exterior skin gives the exterior an antiseptic expression that conflicts with the rich Romanesque Revival facades hidden beneath. If not removed, this skin would continue to significantly impair the integrity of the property. Although the extent of the original fabric surviving beneath the skin is not fully known, historic photographs taken by the building owner during the course of the 1963 alterations and plans provided by the architectural firm involved in the 1962-63 remodel indicate that the majority of the building's façade survives intact. A major component of the proposed rehabilitation of the Chronicle Building will entail the removal of the veneer. Accordingly, the historic facades underneath the non-contributing veneer are described below.

Façade

The combined Geary and Market Street façade of the Chronicle Building is seven bays in width and faces south. Due to its location on an irregularly shaped parcel, the building features an asymmetrically composed façade consisting of a projecting entry pavilion which is flanked to the west by a wing two bays in width and to the east by a wing that is four bays in width. The east wing is set at an angle to the west wing as the former conforms to the Market Street right-of-way. The entry pavilion projects about eighteen inches beyond the rest of the façade, indicating the former position of the oriel window in the Burnham & Root composition. Above street level the wings are articulated by vertical bands of aluminum double-hung and canopy sash windows. Aluminum panels separate the window bands from each other and structural glass demarcates the floor levels. As the focal point of the façade, the entry pavilion is given slightly more treatment than the façade bays, with a solid vertical band of windows divided by aluminum mullions.

A five-story-high section of the south wall of the 1905 Annex projects above the roofline of the 1889-90 section of the Chronicle Building. Visible from Market Street and the west side of Kearny Street, this section of wall is similar to the rest of the façade and clad in aluminum and structural glass paneling. It is one-and-a-half bays wide, with two vertical bands of aluminum windows occupying the left bay and a steel and aluminum fire escape comprising the half-bay on the right. Located immediately east of this section is the windowless elevator tower.

Kearny Street Elevation

The west elevation of the Chronicle Building faces Kearny Street. The Kearny Street elevation is asymmetrical, with the northern half steeping up dramatically from ten to sixteen stories. This staggered appearance reflects the fact that the Chronicle Building is actually composed of two buildings. The northern part of the Kearny Street elevation, which corresponds with the 1905 Annex, is three bays wide. Each bay is comprised of three vertical bands of windows divided by aluminum mullions. Floor levels are demarcated by structural glass panels similar to those found on the entry pavilion on the facade. The southern part of the Kearny Street elevation, which corresponds with the original 1889-90 tower, is composed of a large central bay three windows wide, which is flanked on either side by a single vertical band of windows.

North and East Elevations

Parts of the north and east walls are visible from public ways and adjacent buildings. These elevations are very simple in terms of materials and detailing and retain significant amounts of historic fabric. Both walls are faced in brick and painted white to match the 1962-63 veneer. Both elevations are fenestrated by various combinations of wood double-hung windows with terra cotta sills and headers. Decorative metal mullions divide the windows from each other.

Storefronts

The storefronts of the Chronicle Building date from the 1962-63 remodel. They feature white marble cladding with large plate glass shop windows and black Brazilian granite accents. The Market Street entry is surrounded in black granite and features the building's street number overhead in large numbers reading "690."

HISTORIC APPEARANCE OF THE CHRONICLE BUILDING

This section will describe the historic facades that survive beneath the building's 1962-63 veneer. When it was initially completed in 1889, the Chronicle Building was a nine-story (ten stories if the mezzanine was counted), steel-frame skyscraper clad in brownstone at street level and pressed brick and terra cotta above. Although technologically advanced, the exterior of the Chronicle Building was designed in a very conservative mode with ornamental brickwork and massing derived from the already outdated Richardsonian Romanesque style. Originally the Chronicle Building had an asymmetrical roughly U-shaped plan with a light court at the northeastern corner. In addition to the construction of the sixteen-story tower in 1905, the original nine-story building was given two additional floors and the interior lightwell was partially infilled. Prior to the beginning of construction, the clock tower was destroyed by a fire. Heavily damaged in the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, the Chronicle Building was reconstructed 1907-09 in accordance with D. H. Burnham & Co.'s 1905 plans. After its completion in 1909, the Chronicle Building underwent few substantial exterior changes until 1962-63 when the existing veneer was installed.

Façade

Beneath the modern veneer, the exterior of the Chronicle Building follows the familiar tripartite organization favored for tall office buildings during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Originally the building had a rusticated brownstone base corresponding with the first floor and mezzanine offices; a smooth shaft clad in face brick corresponding to the speculative office zone; and a prominent cornice and tower crowning the ensemble like a classical capital. Dominating the first floor of the façade was a large rusticated "Syrian" entry arch, which provided access to the first floor and mezzanine offices. Historic photographs reveal that this stone cladding was destroyed by fire in 1906, replaced between 1907-09 and then removed during the 1962-63 remodel. Above the entry was a three-sided, chamfered oriel. This originally ran from a corbelled base to the cornice. It was removed in 1962 to accommodate the modern veneer.

A terra cotta belt course divides the first floor and the shaft. The second floor level is embellished with polychromatic terra cotta banding which differentiates this floor from the smooth, monochromatic pressed brick cladding of the rest of the shaft. A belt course separates the second floor from the third and fourth floors. The third and forth floor levels are very simply detailed, with smooth, pressed brick surfaces and recessed windows with sloped terra cotta sills. Another belt course demarcates the fourth and fifth floors. The fifth through the eighth stories are grouped together in vertical bays capped by round arched windows at

the eighth floor level. The recessed window bays are embellished by terra cotta jamb shafts. The capitals of these serve as the spring course for the semi-circular arches that span each bay. A narrow belt course demarcates the seventh and eighth floors. The bays of the ninth floor are composed of pairs of recessed square windows with projecting terra cotta sills. The tenth and eleventh stories were added in 1905. Each bay consists of a row of three window openings. The architraves and sills appear to have been removed in 1962 in order to make way for the modern veneer. The façade of the Chronicle Building originally terminated in a corbelled frieze and a cornice (now removed). The tower that originally capped the building was destroyed by fire in 1905 and it was not replaced during the post-quake reconstruction.

Kearny Street Elevation

Prior to the 1962-63 alterations, the Kearny Street elevation strongly resembled the façade in terms of its materials and detailing, especially the southernmost three bays, which correspond to the original 1889-90 building. Unlike the façade, this section of the Kearny Street elevation is symmetrical, with a central bay, three windows wide, which is flanked on either side by a single band of windows. The oriel that originally existed above the Kearny Street entry was not replaced after the 1906 earthquake—in fact the entire western third of the original building was demolished and reconstructed.

Beneath the modern cladding of the Kearny Street elevation, the façade of the 1905 Annex is quite different from the southernmost three bays of the original 1889-90 building. First, the Annex is sixteen stories in height, five stories taller than the rest of the building. The Kearny Street elevation of the Annex is three bays wide, with each bay comprised of three deeply recessed window openings. The historic materials of the first floor and mezzanine levels were all removed in the 1962-63 remodeling. In addition, four brick and terra cotta belt courses (at the first, second, twelfth and fifteenth floor levels), pilaster capitals and cornice were all removed in order to install the aluminum and glass veneer. The rest of the façade appears to be intact, including terra cotta window sills and jamb moldings as well as the pressed brick cladding.

Interior

The plan of the Chronicle Building is largely the result of the 1907-09 reconstruction designed by Willis Polk in association with D. H. Burnham & Co. The mezzanine and the next nine floors of the original 1890 section of the building possess an irregularly shaped plan consisting of a double-loaded corridor with offices on either side. In contrast, the exposed finishes within the interior of the building seem to date largely from the 1962-63 remodel. The ground floor is currently occupied by two commercial tenants as well as the entry vestibule, elevator lobby, elevator shafts and non-public utility rooms. The retail spaces are finished similarly with white marble flooring, gypsum board walls and suspended T-bar ceilings and fluorescent lighting fixtures. The vestibule and elevator lobby are finished similarly, with nothing on the surface surviving from the 1906-09 reconstruction. Historic fabric survives in greater quantities within the upper floors of the office towers. A great deal of historic fabric is exposed along the walls that face the interior light well, including brick walls, wood window moldings and base moldings. Additional historic fabric is exposed in the stair wells and the attic. The stairs are cast iron with decorative iron balusters and oak railings. Within the attic one finds historic cast iron spiral staircases and ink tanks surviving from the building's days as the printing plant and headquarters of the *San Francisco Chronicle*.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

If its physical integrity can be reclaimed, the Chronicle Building appears to be eligible for *National Register* listing based on the following three Criteria: Criterion A - associations with events; Criterion B - associations with persons; and Criterion C - construction or design value. Specifically, the building's significance is based on its association with the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906 (Criterion A); association with *San Francisco Chronicle* publisher and San Francisco civic leader Michael H. de Young (Criterion B); as well as its significance as a building that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type of construction: an early steel-frame skyscraper with pioneering seismic strengthening, and finally a work that represents the work of a master, in this case: Daniel H. Burnham, John Wellborn Root and Willis Polk (Criterion C).

CRITERION A

The Chronicle Building appears to be eligible for individual listing under *National Register* Criterion A as one of only a handful of nineteenth century office buildings in downtown San Francisco to survive the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. Historic photographs taken of downtown San Francisco immediately after the catastrophe reveal that few buildings escaped complete destruction. Although the interior was heavily damaged, the steel frame and significant portions of the exterior of the building survived. Within two years of the disaster the Chronicle Building was rehabilitated and back in service. In addition to the Chronicle Building about twenty-five buildings survived in some manner. Some of the most important in addition to the Chronicle Building include: the Mutual Savings Bank Building at 704 Market Street (1902), the Call Building at 703 Market Street (1898), the Flood Building at 870-90 Market Street (1904), the Shreve Building at 201 Grant Avenue (1905), the Merchant's Exchange at 465 California Street (1903), the Mills Building at 220 Montgomery Street (1891) and the Kohl Building at 400 Montgomery Street (1901). Of this group, the Chronicle Building is the oldest, making it the oldest office building in downtown San Francisco.

CRITERION B

The Chronicle Building is significant for its association with San Francisco newspaper publishing baron, Michael H. de Young and his hugely influential newspaper, *The San Francisco Chronicle*. M. H. de Young (1849-1925) was an often controversial and extremely powerful leader in San Francisco following the Civil War. Along with his brother Charles, the de Youngs founded San Francisco's influential newspapers as well as a powerful family dynasty. Throughout his lifetime Michael de Young acted as one of San Francisco's most avid civic boosters, seeking at every opportunity to lure Eastern capital and immigrants to what was still a sparsely populated frontier region. The most concrete manifestation of this activity was de Young's instrumental role in bringing the Midwinter Exposition to Golden Gate Park in 1894. Like many of his contemporaries in Gilded Age San Francisco, de Young was acutely aware of the crude civic amenities of his adopted city. Seeking both to improve the prestige of his name and his city, M. H. de Young founded the M. H. de Young Museum after the Fair in one of the former exhibition halls. De Young was also a controversial figure and he attracted much criticism for his newspaper's sensationalist tone. Much of the criticism was personally directed against de Young's own humble origins. His decision to construct the Chronicle Building in 1887 was substantially motivated by his desire for prestige as well as to demonstrate the power and influence of his mouthpiece, the *San Francisco Chronicle*.

Journalism in San Francisco

Even before the Gold Rush, several newspapers and journals grew up to serve the population of San Francisco, which was on average more literate than other American cities. Many of these journals were short-lived and served small segments of the population. Others had wider circulation and evolved into some of the dominant significant social, political and

economic forces on the West Coast. Some of San Francisco's earliest notable periodicals include the *Daily Alta California,* which ran from 1849 until 1891 and the *San Francisco Daily Evening News & Picayune,* which ran from 1850 until 1856. The 1850s and 1860s witnessed an explosion in periodicals. Some of the most important included the *Daily Evening Bulletin* (renamed *The Bulletin* in 1895), which ran from 1855 until 1929 when it merged with the *San Francisco Call;* the *Morning Call* (renamed the *San Francisco Call* in 1895), which was published from 1856 until 1929, when it merged with *The Bulletin;* the *Evening Post,* which ran from 1871 until 1913; the *San Francisco Examiner* which ran from 1865 until the present and finally the *San Francisco Chronicle,* which ran from 1868 until the present.[3]

Michael H. de Young and the San Francisco Chronicle

Launched in January 1865 by the brothers, Charles and Michael H. de Young as *The Daily Dramatic Chronicle,* a "daily record of affairs—local, critical and theatrical," the paper was distributed gratis in restaurants, saloons, hotels, stores and playhouses. Initially one of dozens of small newspapers in circulation in San Francisco, the *Daily Dramatic Chronicle* was launched into the limelight after Michael de Young scooped the story of Abraham Lincoln's assassination in April 1865 and became the first to publish the story in San Francisco. Following its first major reporting success, the one-time show business gossip sheet found itself under increasing pressure to publish more news and less entertainment. By the end of April 1865 circulation had risen to over 5,000. Three years later it was 8,000. Gradually the newspaper began to grow in scope and content and on September 1, 1868 the *Daily Dramatic Chronicle* was replaced by the *Morning Chronicle.*[4] By 1873 Charles de Young claimed that the *San Francisco Chronicle* was the most widely read journal in the West. The growing prestige of the de Young's newspaper was reflected by the decision to move the Chronicle offices and printing facilities to a four-story commercial block at the corner of Third and Market Streets in 1879. This intersection, the location of the existing Chronicle Building, was the most prominent intersection in downtown San Francisco—Third Street was the main route into the City from San Mateo County and Market Street was the main commercial and retail street of San Francisco.

Throughout the last third of the nineteenth century the *San Francisco Chronicle* continued to gain readership in San Francisco and throughout the West. Agents aggressively traveled through the hinterlands of the West, offering free trial subscriptions to whomever would take them and offering as an extra incentive to publish the names of new subscribers. The Chronicle kept loyal readers subscribing by offering their readers sensationalistic accounts of disaster, murder, mayhem and corrupt politics. The competition was often cutthroat, with three other major newspapers: the *San Francisco Examiner, The San Francisco Call* and the *San Francisco Bulletin,* vying for the loyalty of San Franciscans. Running a brash daily newspaper in a frontier city such as San Francisco was a dangerous activity, especially for the scrappy de Youngs. In April 1880, Isaac Kalloch, the son of the successful Workingman's Party gubernatorial candidate, walked into the *Chronicle* office and shot Charles de Young to death in retaliation for de Young's own attempted murder of Kalloch's father earlier that year.[5] Four years later, Michael de Young narrowly survived an attempted assassination by Adolph Spreckels, the son of sugar magnate, Claus Spreckels. Many San Franciscans regretted Spreckels failure to kill de Young, whose reputation for libel and blackmail won him many

[3] Marianne Leach, *Newspapers of the California State Library,* (Sacramento: California State Library Foundation, 1986).
[4] Carl Nolte, "134 Years of the Chronicle," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 16, 1999), p. 2.
[5] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

enemies, including renowned gadfly Ambrose Bierce who wrote: "Hatred of de Young is the first and best test of a gentleman."[6]

De Young Commissions the Chronicle Building

Following his older brother's death, Michael de Young took over the helm of the *Chronicle.* During the 1880s he turned his attention toward marketing the state of California to investors and immigrants from the East. As the publisher of the largest daily newspaper west of the Rocky Mountains, de Young envisioned the *Chronicle* as the voice of the West.[7] De Young was also one of the largest landowners in the State and his fortunes would surely increase along with an expanding population. In accordance with his growing ambition and prestige, in 1887 de Young commissioned the Chicago firm of Burnham & Root to replace the old Chronicle Building on the intersection of Geary, Market, Third and Kearny Streets, with a new steel-frame skyscraper, the first of its kind in the West. The new Chronicle Building would serve not only as a speculative office building, but also as an instantly recognizable corporate icon for the de Young family and the *San Francisco Chronicle.* De Young's pride in the new Chronicle Building is indicated by a carved and gilded sign placed over the main Market Street entrance to the building which read simply: "Erected by M. H. de Young."

When it was completed in June 1890, the Chronicle Building was San Francisco's first bona fide skyscraper. De Young published a multi-page article on the *Chronicle's* new headquarters in the June 22, 1890 edition to commemorate its completion. The article does not defer to modesty, trumpeting the building's significance as "the only modern building in San Francisco" as well as being "the strongest, the safest, and for its size, the most expensive office building in the world."[8] This was not entirely hyperbole. Historic photographs show the newly completed Chronicle Building dwarfing its neighboring two-or-three-story Victorian commercial blocks. Michael H. de Young's new headquarters dominated the skyline as his journal was coming to dominate the local media. De Young's intention to use his new headquarters as a corporate icon, much as the later Chrysler Building or the Transamerica Pyramid did for their respective companies, became evident when the building's silhouette was placed on the company letterhead in the 1890s.

Almost until his death in 1925, Michael de Young presided over California from his suite in the Chronicle Building, initially on the top floor beneath the tower, and later removed to the third floor during the reconstruction of the building after 1906. During the rest of his life Michael H. de Young continued to serve as a tireless booster of California, "the Cornucopia of the World." Some of his more notable achievements include bringing part of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition to San Francisco in 1894. Commonly known as the San Francisco Midwinter Fair, this extravagant festival held in a complex of temporary pavilions and halls in Golden Gate Park and known as "the Sunset City," showcased California's benign climate, economic stability and industrial and agricultural products. After the Fair, de Young commandeered one of the pavilions, the Fine and Decorative Arts Building, and installed parts of his growing art collection therein. Initially called the Midwinter Memorial Museum, this predecessor to the M. H. de Young Museum opened to the public on March 21, 1895. Stocked with an initial bequest of 6,000 items donated by de Young, San Francisco's first major public art museum was supported by de Young for the rest of his life.[9]

---

[6] Gray Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), p. 174.
[7] Ibid.
[8] "The Chronicle's New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 22, 1890), p. 1.
[9] Chris Pollock, *San Francisco's Golden Gate Park: A Thousand and Seventeen Acres of Stories,* (Portland, Oregon: Westwinds Press, 2001), p. 72.

Chronicle Building Damaged by Fire

In 1901 Michael de Young's *San Francisco Chronicle* became embroiled in a prolonged fight with the infamous political machine run by "Boss" Abe Ruef and his band of stooges, led by personable band leader Eugene Schmidt. De Young battled against the machine in the pages of the *Chronicle* for several years but to no avail. After Schmidt was re-elected in 1905, Boss Ruef's followers organized a victory parade. The parade came to a stop in front of the Chronicle Building so that Ruef's supporters could jeer de Young. Somebody set off skyrockets and within minutes the bronze and wood clock tower on top of the building had caught fire.[10] The destruction of the tower and de Young's suite on the top floor inspired de Young to begin work on a long-awaited expansion of the Chronicle Building. De Young hired D. H. Burnham & Co., the successor firm to Burnham & Root, to begin work designing a two story vertical addition for the original building as well as a sixteen-story Annex for the parcel to the north. The Romanesque tower was not to be rebuilt, giving the roofline of the building a more up-to-date appearance.

1906 Earthquake and Fire

Work was largely completed on the Chronicle Building expansion when San Francisco was hit by a massive earthquake on April 18, 1906. Although damaged, the Chronicle Building was usable and efforts were underway to get an extra addition out when massive firestorms began roaring through downtown San Francisco, destroying the entire interior of the Chronicle Building. Although designed to be "fireproof," fire got into the building through openings caused by the ongoing construction and ignited the top floor. Weakened by the heat, the top floor apparently gave way, taking the heavy type-setting equipment with them. The weight of the cascading equipment took out every floor within the building, coming to a rest in the basement. After the disaster, de Young initially sought to minimize the impact of the catastrophe, boasting that the Chronicle Building would be the first building rebuilt. Within ninety days, de Young had rebuilt temporary offices in the ruins of the old Chronicle Building. Although this was more of a public relations stunt (the other three major papers had temporarily relocated to Oakland), de Young pressed ahead with the reconstruction of his prized office building. By the spring of 1907, the Annex was complete and over the next three years the old Chronicle Building was partially demolished (the west wing) and reconstructed. The interior was also reconfigured, with most of the Chronicle's operations consolidated on the lower floors.[11]

CRITERION C

The Chronicle Building appears to be eligible for *National Register* listing under Criterion C as a building that "embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period and method of construction...and as "the work of a master." The primary significance of the Chronicle Building is derived from its significance as representative of a "type" and a "period" as San Francisco's first major steel-frame skyscraper, as well as being the work of one of America's most important architecture firms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Burnham & Root and its successor firm, D. H. Burnham & Company. The building is also closely associated with one of the most important architects to work in San Francisco during the same period, Willis Jefferson Polk. Polk ran the West Coast office of D. H. Burnham & Co. after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire and in this position he oversaw the reconstruction of the heavily damaged Chronicle Building.

---

[10] Carl Nolte, "134 Years of the Chronicle," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 16, 1999), p. 5.

[11] "Pride of Creator in Great Structure he had Built Up Would not Bow to Calamity," *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 16, 1925).

Example of a Type, Period and Method of Construction

The Chronicle Building is an extremely significant building in the architectural history of San Francisco. Designed in 1887 by the Chicago firm of Burnham & Root and built between 1889-90, the orginal nine-story (fourteen, counting the mezzanine and tower) was San Francisco's first steel-frame skyscraper and the tallest building in San Francisco for almost a decade until the Reid Brothers-designed Spreckels Building was built diagonally across Market Street in 1898. As discussed above, when Michael H. de Young decided to replace the existing four-story Chronicle Building, he was looking not only to build an appropriate headquarters for his fast-growing newspaper; he was seeking to make a statement about the power and prestige of his family and their increasingly influential newspaper. De Young used architecture to assert his growing power on the skyline of San Francisco. De Young was probably familiar with the use of tall buildings as corporate headquarters by Eastern newspapers, in particular the towers of New York's "Newspaper Row," and his decision to build the first skyscraper in the West was probably motivated by this precedent.

History of the Skyscraper

It is a truism that the skyscraper is the most important American contribution to architecture. To be sure, the tremendous growth of the American economy during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which grew hand-in-hand with increasingly sophisticated technologies, provided the proper conditions for the birth of this building type in America. Chicago in the late 1880s was the crucible of American industrial and economic might during the last two decades of the nineteenth century and it was in "the most American of American cities" that this building type saw its genesis. With a geographically constricted downtown circumscribed by the Chicago River and an expanding elevated railway system, land prices in downtown Chicago (later nicknamed the Loop) had grown astronomically after the Great Fire of 1871. The Fire drew hundreds of experienced architects and engineers to the City, much as the 1906 Earthquake and Fire would do in San Francisco. The combination of high land costs, a surplus of talented engineers and a culture of innovation and concern with the "bottom line" facilitated the development of the modern skyscraper in Chicago. Although drawing upon technologies developed elsewhere (the first pantent on the steel frame was actually taken out by an architect in Minneapolis in 1884), the combination of factors that led to the development of the skyscraper initially converged in Chicago in 1885 with the erection of the ten-story Home Insurance Company Building.

Designed by Chicago engineer William Le Baron Jenney and constructed on the corner of La Salle and Adams Streets in downtown Chicago, the Home Insurance Company Building was the first steel-frame skyscraper ever built. Unlike New York's Tribune Building, the Home Insurance Company Building dispensed with load-bearing masonry construction techniques and overtly historicist ornament. The benefits of this new construction technology were immediately apparent. The steel frame/curtain wall configuration reduced the width of perimeter walls and opened up interior floorplates, dramatically increasing the amount of leasable space. The concurrent improvements in elevator technology also contributed to making the construction of much taller buildings feasible.

Although skyscrapers were being built in New York and Boston as well, tall buildings in Eastern cities tended to employ overtly historicist massing and ornamentation. Lower Manhattan's Newspaper Row, comprised of Richard Morris Hunt's Tribune Building (1873-75), George B. Post's New York World Building (1890) and R. H. Robertson's Park Row Building (1899), were all historical confections incorporating Renaissance domes, Gothic spires and Mediaeval cupolas. Contrasting with this were Chicago's technologically and aeasthetically advanced skyscrapers of the same period, including Burnham & Root's stripped-down

Monadnock Building (1889) or their highly innovative Reliance Building (1894), with its steel-frame, terra cotta curtain-wall construction and large areas of glazing.

The Skyscraper in San Francisco

As one of America's fastest-growing cities during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, San Francisco would not remain untouched by the skyscraper boom of the 1880s for very long. Like Chicago, San Francisco had grown from a humble village of less than a thousand into a major metropolis in a single generation. From the Gold Rush until the early 1920s, San Francisco remained the largest and most important city west of Chicago. After the Gold Rush had ended in 1852 the population had grown from a little over a thousand to almost 35,000 people. In the decades that followed, San Francisco's population continued to mushroom thanks to its position as the financial, industrial and shipping center of the West. By 1870,the population had reached 150,000 and by 1890, the year that the Chronicle Building was completed, it had doubled to almost 300,000. Much of the population growth occurred as a result of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad in 1869, which brought waves of immigrants from eastern states, Ireland, Germany, Italy and elsewhere to the cosmopolitan outpost on the West Coast.

The economic conditions suitable for skyscraper development were present in San Francisco. From its earliest days, land suitable for commercial development in downtown San Francisco has been in short supply. Topographical factors loomed large--with the steep flanks of Nob and Russian Hills located immediately to the west, Telegraph Hill to the north and vast sand dunes to the south, commercial development in downtown San Francisco was restricted to a narrow band of mud flats clinging to the edge of Yerba Buena Cove. Although cable cars eventually solved the problem of ascending the hills and armies of laborers gradually hauled away the sand dunes, the amount of easily developable land remained scarce and as a result, very expensive. However, despite these conditions, most of the Victorian commercial development in downtown San Francisco consisted of small brick buildings, between two and five stories in height. Environmental factors such as the prevalence of earthquakes and lack of adequate building materials, combined with a shortage of experienced architects contributed to this situation.

Prior to the construction of the Chronicle Building, the largest commercial building in San Francisco was the seven-story Palace Hotel. Completed in 1875, this large brick building was designed by New York architect John P. Gaynor. Aside from the Palace Hotel and several other substantial and significant buildings, downtown San Francisco was characterized by contemporaries as a chaotic assemblage of small brick buildings with ornate cast iron facades jumbled together on narrow, congested streets. By the late 1880s, many of San Francisco's business leaders were grumbling about the provincial atmosphere of downtown San Francisco. San Francisco's civic and business leaders were spurred on by the criticism of visiting Easterners. By the 1890s San Francisco was the tenth largest city in the United States and the second largest port after New York. Many of San Francisco's leaders felt that a city of San Francisco's stature needed to shed its ragtag pioneer past and built suitable parks, monuments, civic buildings and infrastructure that would reflect its status as the de facto capital of a growing Western and Pacific Rim empire.

Michael H. de Young, one of San Francisco's most prominent business leaders and the publisher of the *San Francisco Chronicle,* was one of these boosters. Not taking Los Angeles into account, de Young believed that San Francisco would have a population of two million by 1920 and remain the economic and cultural capital of the West. As the publisher of the *San Francisco Chronicle,* the self-appointed mouthpiece of the West, de Young believed that he needed to replace his outdated Victorian office block with a more appropriate symbol. After

learning of their pioneering skyscraper designs in Chicago, de Young retained the firm of Burnham & Root to construct the first building of this type in San Francisco. In 1887, only two years after the Home Insurance Company was completed in Chicago, Burnham & Root came up with a design that was based closely on their recent Rookery Building in Chicago. Rendered in a restrained version of the Romanesque Revival style, the Chronicle Building was radically different from anything else yet constructed in San Francisco. As it was being erected on the site of the old Chronicle Building on Market Street, the skeletal steel frame of the Chronicle Building became an object of wonder for San Franciscans who had not seen anything like it before. When completed, the fourteen story building (including the bronze clock tower) rose to 208' above the pavement, 88' higher than the Palace Hotel, heretofore San Francisco's tallest building.[12]

Even before it was completed, more skyscrapers were on the drawing boards for downtown San Francisco. The next one to be built was Burnham & Root's Mills Building, which is located on the northeastern corner of Bush and Montgomery Streets. It was completed in 1891 for Darius Ogden Mills, the founder of the Bank of California. Not to be outdone by de Young, other newspaper publishers including Claus Spreckels and William Randolph Hearst built the Call Building (1898) and the Examiner Building (1904) respectively on the intersection known locally as "Newspaper Angle." By 1900 residents of the outer residential neighborhoods in San Francisco as well as San Mateo, Alameda Counties could see the clusters of skyscrapers sprouting up in downtown San Francisco. Photographs taken immediately prior to the 1906 Earthquake indicate that downtown San Francisco had at least a dozen buildings ten stories or taller, mostly concentrated around the intersections of Market and Third and Montgomery and California Streets,with other clusters beginning to develop along Mission Street and elsewhere within the Financial District.

On April 18, 1906, San Francisco was hit by an extremely powerful earthaquke which heavily damaged the City. Within hours a series of fires sparked by broken gas mains began to sweep through the downtown core, destroying almost everything that the temblor had spared. After the catastrophe, most of downtown San Francisco lay in ruins. Aside from the United States Mint, the only buildings to survive to some degree were either steel-frame or reinforced concrete office buildings. Although the interiors of most of these buildings were ravaged by fire, in many cases the exterior walls survived, including the sixteen-story Annex to the Chronicle Building designed by D. H. Burnham & Co. in 1905. With the majority of Victorian San Francisco's Financial District removed in one fell swoop, the predominance of the modern skyscraper was assured in the period of reconstruction that extended from 1906 to roughly 1925. During this two decade-long period, downtown San Francisco arose from the ashes in a very cohesive manner similar to Chicago after the Great Fire of 1871. Most of the buildings constructed were steel-frame or reinforced concrete office and commercial buildings with minimal Renaissance/Baroque ornamentation. Rebuilt along with the new skyscrapers, the venerable Chronicle Building retained its primary positions of importance as San Francisco's first skyscraper.

Period: Romanesque Revival

The Chronicle Building is designed in a restrained version of the Romanesque Revival style, popularized by Boston architect Henry Hobson Richardson in the 1870s and disseminated throughout the United States throughout the ensuing decades. With its massive rusticated first floor and mezzanine, heavy Syrian arch entry, arched bays and gigantic clock tower with corner turrets, the Chronicle Building closely resembled the Rookery Building being completed in Chicago by Burnham & Root that same year. Designed at the same time as H.

[12] "The Chronicle's New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 22, 1890), p. 1.

H. Richardson's Marshall Field Warehouse (completed in 1887), Chicago's Rookery Building (named after its predecessor Chicago's pigeon-infested temporary City Hall) shared much in common with Richardson's masterpiece, including the rusticated base, bold corner piers, arched bays and the grid-like organization of the façade. The American source of the Romanesque Revival style was derived from Richardson's Trinity Church in Boston (1872), whose architectural vocabulary was in turn based on early medieaval French and Spanish ecclesiastical and monastic architecture.

While the architectural vocabulary of the Chronicle Building is based on the Rookery, its irregular corner gore lot resulted in some departures from its source. In order to conform to the assymetrical triangular lot formed by Kearny, Geary and Market Streets, the façade of the Chronicle Building was built with two structural bays to the west and four bays to the east of the tower. In order to accommodate the transition between Geary Street (which runs roughly east-west) and Market Street (which runs southwest-northeast), the eastern four bays facing Market Street were set at an angle to the rest of the facade. In order to resolve this asymmetrical condition, Burnham & Root created a strong entrance bay capped by a four-story tower between the two wings. The Chronicle Building's design definitely elicited criticism from some members of San Francisco's design community. Many believed that the building's composition was terribly awkward and still others felt that the choice of the Romanesque Revival style was a little old-fashioned for a progressive city like San Francisco.

Method of Construction

The Chronicle Building is not only significant as the first steel-frame skyscraper in San Francisco; it is also significant on the national level as the first documented example of a skyscraper built with fire and earthquake resistant technologies. The Chronicle Building's survival of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire resulted from Burnham & Root's utilization of innovative fire-resistant construction techniques and seismic reinforcement. Unique for their time, the new Chronicle Building was to usher in a new era in San Francisco, in which modern steel-frame and fire-resistant skyscrapers would displace the dangerously unstable and fire-prone Victorian commercial structures of the past.

Prior to the Chronicle Building, seismic concerns had never been a factor in the early years of skyscraper design. Most of the early skyscraper pioneers worked in Chicago, a city known for fires and the occasional flood but never the terrifying uncertainty of seismic activity. In their first San Francisco commission, Burnham & Root had to take seismic issues into account for the first time. The irregular, misshapen lot upon which the Chronicle Building would rise resulted in a very strange building footprint with multiple re-entrant angles, never effective in resisting the racking caused by a major temblor. To compensate for this inherent deficiency, engineer John Wellborn Root developed a mixed structural system consisting of self-supporting masonry outer walls combined with a framing system of cast iron columns and steel girders and beams. The framing was then braced to the masonry walls for mutual support. Root also devised a network of horizontal steel straps running diagonally between the columns, linking them with the beams at each crossing. These were introduced in order "to prevent the lateral racking and dislocation which an earthquake of great force might bring about."[13] Judging by the fact that the Chronicle Building was not destroyed by the 1906 earthquake, the system devised by Root seems to have been effective.

The Chronicle Building was also designed with innovative fire-resistant technologies. According to Michael H. de Young, the Chronicle Building was actually fireproof, and not merely fire-resistant. Although this claim did not turn out to be true in 1906, the scale of the

[13] Donald Hoffman, *The Architecture of John Wellborn Root,* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1973), p. 128.

conflagration could probably not have been imagined in 1890. In its design, John Wellborn Root incorporated technologies used in skyscraper construction in Chicago. In addition to minimizing the usage of wood in floors, walls and ceilings, the iron and steel frame was concealed within fire-resistant materials such as hollow clay tile units. Floors and partition walls were also made of hollow clay tile, unlike most contemporary buildings which still mostly utilized flooring materials of heavy timber beams and wood decking. Within the interior of the Chronicle Building, wood was only introduced for finish flooring, door and window surrounds and doors and sash.[14]

Work of a Master: Burnham & Root

When Michael H. de Young was searching for an architectural firm to design the new *Chronicle* headquarters he quickly discovered that there were no architects in San Francisco competent to design a structure as complex as a steel-frame skyscraper. As a building type in its infancy, there were only a few firms in the entire United States, mostly in New York and Chicago, who had the necessary qualifications to undertake such a project. The choice of Chicago's Burnham & Root was wise. Along with fellow Chicago-based firms, William LeBaron Jenney and Holabird & Roche, Burnham & Root had been instrumental in the invention of this new building type. It appears that the choice of a Chicago-based firm angered local firms and de Young felt the need to justify his selection. In an article that appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle* following the opening of the Chronicle Building the author wrote:

> The Chronicle Building was designed entirely by Messrs. Burnham & Root, the widely known and famous Chicago firm of architects....Messrs. Burnham & Root had constructed twenty-eight buildings on the same principles as this one before the first line was drawn for it. The experience thus gained has been brought to bear upon the now completed structure, and it stands to-day in its many innovations an open challenge to the criticism of all architects and builders.[15]

The partnership of Daniel Hudson Burnham (1846-1912) and John Wellborn Root (1850-1891) was one of the most important architecture firms to ever put pen to vellum in the United States. Daniel Burnham was born in Henderson, New York in 1846. In 1854 he moved to Chicago with his family. As a child he studied at Snow's Swedenborgian Academy and subsequently at Chicago Public Schools. In 1867 he went to work as a draftsman at a mercantile house. For a brief time he also worked in the offices of the pioneer skyscraper designer, William Le Baron Jenney. After working unsuccessfully at several various other occupations, including running for a Senate seat in Nevada, Daniel Burnham returned to Chicago in 1870 and went to work for an architecture firm named Carter, Drake & Wright. It was there that he met the talented draftsman and civil engineer John Wellborn Root in 1872.[16]

John Wellborn Root was born in Lumpkin, Georgia in 1850 and raised in Atlanta. When Union troops occupied Atlanta, Root went to Liverpool, England to study at the Clare Mount School. In 1866 he returned to the United States and in 1869 he graduated from New York University with a degree in civil engineering. For the next several years he worked in New York, moving to Chicago to take advantage of the avalanche of work following the Chicago Fire.[17]

The Great Chicago Fire of 1871 destroyed over one-third of the city, including the entire downtown. With plans for reconstruction beginning while the ashes were still cooling,

[14] "The Chronicle's New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 22, 1890), p. 1.
[15] Ibid., p. 1.
[16] Adolph K. Placzek, *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects. Vol. 1.* (London: The Free Press, 1982).
[17] Ibid.

architects from all over the country were making their way to Chicago to take advantage of the anticipated flood of building projects. Recognizing their fortunate position, in 1873 Daniel Burnham and John Wellborn Root decided to break from Carter, Drake & Write and start their own firm. Throughout their eighteen-year partnership, the two partners operated the firm in the classical partnership method, with Burnham handling business development and Root overseeing the design department. The firm's early work consisted primarily of small houses and barns. Their first break occurred in 1874 when John B. Sherman, known locally as "The Father of the Stockyards," retained Burnham & Root to design a large three-and-a-half-story mansion on Prairie Avenue, one of the most desirable residential areas on the South Side of Chicago. While working on the house for Sherman, Sherman's daughter Margaret fell in love with Daniel. Apparently the attraction was mutual for Daniel and Margaret were married on January 20, 1876.[18]

Thanks in part to Sherman's social connections, commissions from Chicago's elite soon began flowing into the offices of Burnham & Root. After a decade of designing fairly traditional commercial buildings, churches and residences, Burnham & Root, along with Holabird & Roche and William LeBaron Jenney, became increasingly involved in groundbreaking skyscraper designs, or as they called them, "big buildings for big business."[19] Some of their most famous early skyscrapers include the Montauk Building (1882), the Rookery (1885-88), the Monadnock Building (1891) and the twenty-two story Masonic Temple (1890-92), the tallest building in the world at that time. The Montauk Building, which was designed for the cost-driven Boston brothers, Peter and Shepherd Brooks, was the firm's first major commercial building designed by the firm in their trademark stripped-down, structurally expressive mode, later called the "Chicago School" by twentieth century architectural historians.

Following Root's death in 1891 from pneumonia the firm was renamed D. H. Burnham & Company. Root's death was a severe blow for the firm. His sharp mind and engineering skills were able to find solutions to the most difficult structural and aesthetic problems. Never the consummate designer, Burnham turned his attention toward developing a very successful career in city and area planning, developing plans for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. After developing the plan for the Fair, Burnham went on to design Beaux Art-influenced plans for Washington, D.C. (1901), San Francisco (1905-06), Chicago (1909), Cleveland, Manila, Baltimore and Duluth. Burnham's work was a centerpiece of what is called the "City Beautiful Movement."

At the time of his death in Heidelberg, Germany in 1912, Daniel Burnham's D. H. Burnham & Co. was the world's largest architecture firm. Its almost factory-like organizational system has been a model for large architectural firms up to the present day. It replaced the almost feudal apprenticeship system that had existed previously with a highly centralized and specialized system in which each employee had a distinct function, not unlike the assembly-line techniques of modern American industrial production. When Burnham died he was the head of the American Institute of Architects and had been named by President Taft as the Chairman of the Committee on Fine Arts. His sons, Hubert and Daniel Jr., succeeded their father, renaming the firm Burnham Brothers.

---

[18] David Jameson, "Daniel Hudson Burnham," *Artists Represented Website:* http://www.architechgallery.com/arch_info/artists_pages/burnham_bio.html

[19] Adolph K. Placzek, *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects, Vol. 1.* (London: The Free Press, 1982).

Willis Polk

From 1906 until 1910, during the reconstruction of the Chronicle Building, Willis Jefferson Polk (1867-1924) was the San Francisco representative of D. H. Burnham & Co. Both before and after his association with Burnham, Polk produced work that is among some of the best ever produced in San Francisco. The son of a carpenter, Willis Polk was born in Jacksonville, Illinois on October 17, 1867. Willis and his brother Daniel had their first jobs at the age of eight, serving as "spikers" for their father, a master builder. At the age of thirteen, Polk was apprenticed to an architect and two years later he submitted his first design in an architectural competition, winning the opportunity to design a schoolhouse in Hope, Arkansas. His design was praised by regional newspapers who called Willis a "boy genius." As a result of this success, Willis Sr. decided to start his own architecture and contracting firm in Kansas City, Missouri. Comprised of Willis Sr. and his two sons Daniel and Willis, Jr., the firm was known as W. W. Polk & Sons. Soon after, Willis Sr. decided that the best way for all of his talented children, including his sisters Daisy, a virtuoso violinist, and Endemial, an opera star, was to move the family to Italy. Much to Willis Sr.'s dismay, young Willis decided to remain in Kansas City, where at the age of twenty he went to work for the prominent firm of Van Brunt & Howe.[20]

Willis Jr. worked at several architectural firms throughout the United States before moving to San Francisco in 1889 to partner with Fritz Maurice Gamble in the firm of Polk & Gamble. Following the premature death of his daughter Endemial right before her debut at the Paris Opera, the grief-stricken Willis Polk, Sr. brought his family back to the United States. Soon the Polk clan relocated to San Francisco to join Willis Jr. Eventually the family partnership of Polk & Polk Architects was reconstituted, with Daniel serving as the chief draftsman, Willis Jr. as the designer and salesman and Willis Sr. as the chief financial officer and general contractor. Several Polk cousins migrated west to work as carpenters in the firm. They built a house in which to live and work at 1013 Vallejo Street, one of the earliest Arts and Crafts landmarks in California. Although the family business thrived for three years, Daniel decided to move to New York to perform as a banjo player in Vaudeville. Shortly thereafter, Willis Sr. retired and the company ran out of money, closing in bankruptcy in 1897.[21]

Willis Polk Jr. was still rebounding from bankruptcy when a chance came to allow him to rebuild his career. In December 1899 he replaced F. F. Hamilton as design partner in the venerable San Francisco firm of Percy & Hamilton. Working closely with surviving principal George Washington Percy, Polk began overseeing all design work. The firm's most important work was the Kohl Building at the corner of California and Montgomery Streets (1901). Polk gradually became increasingly frustrated with Percy's refusal to make Polk a full partner. Nevertheless, Polk enjoyed financial security for the first time in years and he continued working with Percy until the latter architect's death in 1900. Finding himself alone again, Polk engineered an introduction to Daniel Burnham. In a letter to Burnham, Polk suggested that the two men start a partnership. Although flattered, Burnham turned Polk's offer down. When this scheme failed Willis Polk traveled to Chicago to inquire whether he could work for Burnham in Chicago. Burnham agreed and in September 1901 Polk and his young wife Christina Barreda Moore moved to Chicago, remaining there for almost two years.[22]

In Burnham's office, Willis Polk found a mentor and good friend. Until this time Polk's work had been extremely individual in nature, most of it in a highly personal Arts and Crafts-

[20] John T. Hunter, "Willis Jefferson Polk," Website: http://www.willispolk.com
[21] Ibid.
[22] Richard Longstreth, *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, p. 299.

influenced idiom sharing much in common with the work of his Bay Area contemporaries, Ernest Coxhead, A. C. Schweinfurth and Bernard Maybeck. In Burnham's office Polk learned to appreciate Burnham's suave and urbane formulas for city planning and major commercial buildings. In 1903, Polk returned to San Francisco and formed a short-lived partnership with George Alexander Wright. His friendship with Burnham did not wither; in fact Polk was influential in obtaining support for Burnham's proposed Plan for San Francisco, which was being readied for publishing when San Francisco was suddenly destroyed by earthquake and fire on April 18, 1906.

With downtown San Francisco lying in ruins, Polk seized the opportunity to take part in the reconstruction by reviving his plans to open a branch office of D. H. Burnham & Co. in San Francisco. As a veteran of Chicago's Great Fire, Burnham realized the potential for scores of lucrative commissions and enthusiastically embraced Polk's plan. Although the Burnham Plan for San Francisco was largely scrapped in the haste to rebuild, Polk was quite successful in bringing in other work. Between 1906 and 1910, Willis Polk secured contracts for several significant buildings, including the Pacific Union Club, the Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Mary's Hospital, First National Bank Building (now Crocker Building), as well as the reconstruction of the Chronicle Building.[23] Polk was largely responsible for overseeing all of the design work in the San Francisco office, as evidenced by the fact that the buildings formerly attributed to D. H. Burnham & Co. were reattributed to Polk after the breakup of the partnership.

Despite the initial level of success, Polk's position began to erode—always a firebrand he managed to alienate many potential clients through his irascibility and flamboyant lifestyle. In addition, Polk lacked proper business acumen and the San Francisco office of D. H. Burnham began to suffer from cost overruns and mismanagement. In 1910 Burnham severed the relationship with Polk. The two men remained friends and officially Burnham maintained that Polk had earned the right to continue on his own but the decision to end the partnership was unquestionably a blow to Polk's pride. Adding insult to injury, Polk was dismissed as the Supervising Architect for the proposed Panama Pacific International Exposition, which was to open in 1915.[24]

Following the dissolution of Burnham's relationship with Polk, the latter formed his own practice, called Willis Polk & Co. Along with several of his contemporaries, including Ernest Coxhead, A. C. Schweinfurth, John Galen Howard, Arthur Brown, Jr. and Bernard Maybeck, Willis Polk contributed immeasurably to the increasingly professional nature of architecture in San Francisco. Polk's abilities were widely recognized and despite his difficult temperament, he continued to find work. Unfortunately, he did not bring in as many commissions for large downtown office buildings as he had with Burnham. Two significant exceptions include the Hallidie Building on Post Street (1912), the first glass curtain walled structure in the United States, and the Hobart Building at Market and Second Streets (1914).

With much of Downtown San Francisco already rebuilt, he turned his attention toward large suburban and rural villas and designs for public utility agencies such as the Spring Valley Water Company and Pacific Gas & Electric. One of Polk's most famous post-Burnham commissions was for the Sunol Water Temple, a commemorative structure based on the Hellenic Monument to Lysicrates in Athens (335 B.C.). Located in the small East Bay village of Sunol, the structure designed for the Spring Valley Water Company was completed in 1911. Although not nearly as well known, Willis Polk's series of substations for Pacific Gas & Electric and pumping stations for Spring Valley Water Company are very interesting and

[23] Ibid., p. 300.
[24] Ibid., p. 301.

successful attempts to provide architectural interest to utilitarian boxes that by virtue of their function had to be located in the middle of residential and commercial neighborhoods.

By the time of his death in 1924 Willis Polk's practice had declined significantly. His public behavior, which was exacerbated by chronic drinking, coupled with his irreverent stance toward his contemporaries brought Polk increasing criticism and increasing ostracization. Nevertheless, Polk's design abilities had not yet deserted him. Some of his last projects include the Duncan McDuffie Residence in Claremont, the J. B. Metcalf Residence in Piedmont, the L. J. Hopkins Residence in St. Francis Wood (San Francisco), the B. W. Ford Residence in Hillsborough, the California Golf Club in San Mateo and even a gas station in San Francisco.

CROSS STREET REFERENCE MAP

See copy of the property map and adjacent streets provided in the DPR 523B form.

REFERENCES

Charles Hall Page & Associates, *Splendid Survivors: San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage,* (San Francisco: California Living Books, 1979).

Marianne Leach, *Newspapers of the California State Library,* (Sacramento: California State Library Foundation, 1986).

Carl Nolte, "134 Years of the Chronicle," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 16, 1999).

Gray Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

"The Chronicle's New Home," *San Francisco Chronicle* (June 22, 1890).

Chris Pollock, *San Francisco's Golden Gate Park: A Thousand and Seventeen Acres of Stories,* (Portland, Oregon: Westwinds Press, 2001).

"Pride of Creator in Great Structure he had Built Up Would not Bow to Calamity," *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 16, 1925).

Donald Hoffman, *The Architecture of John Wellborn Root,* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1973).

Adolph K. Placzek, *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects. Vol. 1.* (London: The Free Press, 1982).

David Jameson, "Daniel Hudson Burnham," *Artists Represented Website:* http://www.architechgallery.com/arch_info/artists_pages/burnham_bio.html

John T. Hunter, "Willis Jefferson Polk," Website: http://www.willispolk.com

Richard Longstreth, On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

RATINGS

The Chronicle Building does not have a formal architectural quality rating. Several major architectural surveys have taken place since it was remodeled in 1963, including the Junior League's survey of architecture in the Bay Area (published in book form as *Here Today* in 1968) and the San Francisco Planning Department's 1976 *Architectural Quality Survey.* Despite its status as San Francisco's first skyscraper, the building was ignored in both surveys. Nevertheless, the *Chronicle Building* was included in Charles Hall Page & Associates' *Downtown Survey* which was subsequently published in 1978 as *Splendid*

Survivors. Due to the fact that the facades are concealed behind the modern veneer the Chronicle Building was not given a rating. Nonetheless, the surveyors provided an important caveat regarding the building's potential significance if the skin was to be removed in the future, stating: "The present outer skin of the building appears to be a thin veneer of enameled metal porcelain panels that has left the original facades intact and could be easily removed. The restoration of this building, one of the most important buildings in the city, would be a great civic gesture, comparable in its own way to its original construction which was intended and accepted as an object of beauty and a source of pride. Restored to its original appearance, this would be a strong "A" group building."[25] This commentary and caveat is consistent with this application's recognition that a landmark status could only attach to this building upon the removal of the aluminum cladding. According to the methodology used by Charles Hall Page & Associates in the *Downtown Survey*, buildings with "A" rating are individually eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places.*

PREPARED BY

Research and text by Christopher VerPlanck; formatting by Carolyn Kiernat

ADDRESS

Page & Turnbull, Inc.
724 Pine Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
415-362-5154

ATTACHMENTS

Check all that apply.
523A _x_, 523B _x_, 523L (continuation sheets) ___,
Context Statement ___, Other _____

[25] Charles Hall Page & Associates, *Splendid Survivors: San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage,* (San Francisco: California Living Books, 1979), p. 85.



Image 2: Chronicle Building 1904.