

DESIGNATING THE GOODMAN BUILDING AS A LANDMARK PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 10 OF THE CITY PLANNING CODE.

Be It Ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that The Goodman Building located at 1117 Geary Street, being Lot 11 in Assessor's Block 714, has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value, and that its designation as a Landmark will be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes of Article 10 of the City Planning Code and the standards set forth therein.

(a) Designation. Pursuant to Section 1004 of the City Planning Code, Chapter II, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the Goodman Building is hereby designated as a Landmark; this designation enacted after the Board of Supervisors, on appeal of organizations with a recognized interest in historical preservation, voted to overrule the recommendation for disapproval contained in Resolution No. 7209 of the City Planning Commission, which Resolution, along with Resolution No. 107 of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board initiating designation is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No. 90-74-8.1.

(b) Required Data.

1. The location and boundaries of the landmark site are as follows:

Beginning at a point on the southerly line of Geary Street, distant thereon 137.25 feet westerly from the westerly line of Van Ness Avenue, thence westerly along the southerly line of Geary Street for a distance of 97.5 feet, thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 120 feet to the northerly line of Myrtle Street, thence at a right angle easterly along the northerly line of Myrtle Street for a distance of 97.5 feet, thence at a right angle northerly for a distance of 120 feet to the point of beginning. Being Lot 11 in Assessor's Block 714.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2. This designation is applicable only to that structure on the aforementioned site known as the Goodman Building whose address is 1117 Geary Street. The characteristics of the Goodman Building which justify its designation, and the particular features that should be preserved are described and included in the said Resolution No. 107 of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board hereby incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

THOMAS M. O'NEILL
CITY ATTORNEY

By James J. Vink
Deputy City Attorney

Passed for Second Reading
Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

JAN 22 1975

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beringingen.

~~Noes: Supervisors~~

~~Absent: Supervisors~~

Read Second Time and Finally Passed
Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

JAN 27 1975

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beringingen.

~~Noes: Supervisors~~

~~Absent: Supervisors~~

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Betty Dean Clerk

90-74-8.1
File No.

JAN 29 1975

Approved

Peter Tamaras Mayor

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 7209

WHEREAS, A proposal to designate the Goodman Building at 1117 Geary Street as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code was initiated by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on May 15, 1974, and said Advisory Board, after due consideration, recommended approval of this proposal; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission, after due notice given, held a public hearing on July 11, 1974, to consider the proposed designation and the report of said Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, The Commission has determined that the Goodman Building has had substantial architectural alterations since its original construction, and is not sufficiently architecturally unique or meritorious; and

WHEREAS, It does not appear that this residential building played a unique role in the history of San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, Retention of the building would be inconsistent with the land use designation of the site in the Western Addition Area A-2 Redevelopment Plan;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission determines that the Goodman Building does not have sufficient merit or significance to conform with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the City Planning Code, and the Commission hereby DISAPPROVES the proposal to designate the Goodman Building at 1117 Geary Street as a Landmark.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the City Planning Commission at its Regular Meeting on July 11, 1974.

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Farrell, Fleishhacker, Porter, Rueda

NOES: Commissioner Newman

ABSENT: Commissioners Mellon, Ritchie

Passed: July 11, 1974

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD
Final Case Report - May 15, 1974

GOODMAN BUILDING

OWNER: San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

LOCATION: 1117 Geary Street, south line of Geary Street between Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street. The lot has a 97.5-foot frontage on Geary Street, a 97.5-foot frontage on Myrtle Street, and a 120-foot depth, being Lot 11 in Assessor's Block 714.

HISTORY: In 1869, Joseph Emeric returned to San Francisco and erected a residential structure on a portion of two fifty vara lots which he owned on the south side of Geary Street between Van Ness and Franklin Street.

Emeric, the son of a French naval officer, was born in Nouvelles, near Toulon, France, in the year 1815. At the age of thirteen, he left home for Marseilles where he soon became assistant bookkeeper for Renard & Company, an import firm. At the age of twenty, however, he engaged in a duel in which he wounded his adversary, a French naval officer, and was forced to leave Marseilles for Paris. In April 1836, he sailed for Boston, having been appointed consular agent as well as general agent in the United States for Renard and Company. In 1840, the company selected him to head its New York branch where he built up a large commission business in cotton. During this interval, he married Mary Mestoyer, the daughter of a French planter from Santo Domingo, and fathered two sons with only the younger, Henry, surviving.

In 1848, a commercial panic developed and Emeric was forced to dispose of all his assets. After attempting to recover his firm's losses, he left his family in New York and set sail for California, arriving in late February 1849, virtually penniless.

After engaging in unsuccessful business ventures in the mining regions, he returned to San Francisco early in 1850 and worked on the wharves. Within a year he was financially able to form a new partnership which engaged in cutting and selling wood and making charcoal. Two years later, he sold his interest and established a grain and commission house in Alameda under the name of Emeric, Tams and Company.

In 1854, as part of the dissolution of that partnership, Emeric acquired a portion of the San Pablo Rancho where, in 1855, he engaged in farming and where, in 1856, his family joined him. By 1861, Emeric had increased these holdings to 2,500 acres. During this same period he served on the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors.

HISTORY:
(Continued)

In 1869, the Emerics moved to San Francisco where Emeric and Victor Dumont formed a partnership specializing in French imports and wines from Mediterranean ports. In addition to his residence on Geary Street, other property holdings in the City included a building at Sansome and Jackson Streets (where he had his office), the California Hotel on Montgomery (Columbus) Avenue, a large parcel at Third and Folsom Streets and an interest in the Front Street Block.

Joseph Emeric died in 1889 leaving the bulk of his estate to his son, Henry, who survived his father by ten years. Although the younger Emeric is listed in the San Francisco City Directories as having local residency during that interval, he represented Contra Costa County in the 30th session of the State Assembly from 1893 to 1895. He was State Fish Commissioner from 1895 to 1897.

Some three years after Henry Emeric's death on August 15, 1889, his daughter Elizabeth Emeric Moitoza, sold the residence on Geary Street to Abraham and Sarah Goodman who had arrived in the City from New York in 1896. Mr. Goodman was engaged in the ladies tailoring business and for some years after their purchase of the building in December 1900, it served as both business and residential address for the family.

The records of the Spring Valley Water Company reveal that water service for 1117 Geary Street was requested in May 1869 by a party who signed the application only with the surname Emeric. For the next twenty-eight years, either Joseph or Henry Emeric, and sometimes both, are listed in the City Directory at this address.

The building survived the earthquake and fire of 1906 and in all probability because of this disaster soon underwent major remodeling to accommodate the immediate needs of the City.

On June 6, 1906, Abraham Goodman filed Building Permit Application No. 476 for 1117 Geary Street in which it was stated that the proposed work was to:

Raise a two-story frame building, 97½ X 65 feet, 12 feet, and erect five store rooms as per plans.

HISTORY:
(Continued)

Indicated on the accompanying plans was that the five store rooms were actually five stores for commercial use. Also shown was that the upper two floors were to be converted to hotel rooms and offices. In connection therewith, windows were to be installed in the wall between the offices and adjoining hallway.

The plans, drawn by Rousseau and Son, Architects, Pine and Webster Streets, are on file in the Central Permit Bureau and while not extensively detailed, help, along with older photographs showing portions of the building, establish a very general character of the building before the remodeling. (They also indicate that the plans were not entirely carried out as drawn.) Regarding the building's original character, it appears to have been a single building instead of four buildings, as reported, in which four two-story-over-basement residences of equal size were separated by party walls. Each residence was the reverse plan of the one(s) adjoining. This judgment is based on the Rousseau's 1906 plans which indicate walls and stairs for removal and also show the existence of bay windows which were to, and did for a time, remain on the second story of the facade. The Rousseau plans indicate bay windows on the third floor; however, a 1903 photograph taken four years before these plans were drawn in 1907 clearly shows the westerly half of the then second floor (now third floor) of the Goodman Building and no bay windows. The photograph, when compared with the building today, indicates that there has been no change in the appearance of the facade at that level, save for the removal of a parapet at the time the mansard roof was added. Following the raising of the structure, the second story bay windows were to have projected beyond the facade of the stores below. However, a 1907 photograph showing the stores constructed also shows a portion of the upper facade with the second floor bays set back behind the plane in which the street level facade occurs. Today the bays no longer exist and the front of the building at second and third floor levels is essentially a flat plane in line with the stores below -- indicative of a second major remodeling to the structure, sometime after the 1907 photograph, in which the facade was moved forward and the second floor bays removed.

HISTORY:
(Continued)

Although there are no permits on file for major changes to the building after the 1906 application, Mervyn Goodman, Abraham's son, recalls that Architect Conrad W. Meussdorffer, who also designed a number of multi-story Neo-classic structures in San Francisco, completely remodeled the facade, a fact verified by the architect's son.

Thus, based on the 1903 photograph, it is established that the third floor facade remains intact today and from all evidence remains unchanged from 1869, of which it is typical. While the second floor facade has been altered by the removal of bay windows, some of the extant detailing apparently came from the original facade. In particular such details include the arched window heads which contain the letter "E" (presumably for Emeric) incorporated into the ornamental carved leaves and scrollwork -- all representative of the early Italianate style of the late 1860's and early 1870's. Elements which undoubtedly post-date 1906 are the ground floor, large rectangular windows across the second floor level and the present mansard roof.

ARCHITECTURE: This frame structure is four stories in height. The ground floor is occupied by five stores of nearly equal width and also by the entryway leading to the upper floors, which is placed slightly to the right of the center of the building.

The facade of the second and third floors is surfaced with rustic, or siding, with symmetrically arranged irregularly spaced windows.

Those at second floor level are comprised of two sizes and shapes. Single windows near each end and a set of paired windows in the center have rounded tops with horizontal divisions at the spring lines. Between each of these groupings are two large rectangular windows with a horizontal division at the same level as those arched. All are capped with a straight cornice underscored by dentils between supporting brackets at either end. All windows at this level are slightly brought forward from the facade and these projections are encased by quoin-like detailing.

The third floor windows all have semi-circular arched tops. They are of two widths, both narrower than their arched counterparts below. Single windows of intermediate width appear centered above the second-story windows and narrower paired windows above the rectangular ones. At third-story level, the windows are topped by a sloping horizontal cornice

ARCHITECTURE: with brackets and dentils matching those below. At each, a decorative infill appears between the arched top and the cornice. A colonete separates the paired windows and the raised effect, found on all second story windows, here is revealed only where the window below it is arched.
(Continued)

This raised effect or forward extension is carried into the cornice topping the third floor. The cornice is supported by brackets which are deeper and of a different design than those previously referred to. Dentils and other decorative infill are placed between the brackets. Single brackets are located above the extremities of the third floor paired windows; all other brackets are paired.

A mansard-type roof encloses the fourth floor. It is surfaced in metal and capped by a simple cornice. This roof is interrupted near the easterly end by a skylight deeply set into the mansard and also by irregularly spaced rectangular windows, also inset. The windows are topped by a simple cornice and supported by brackets. A doorway at the westerly end of the mansard opens onto a fire escape. Other fire escapes are found at the extremities of the second and third floors.

ZONING AND
SURROUNDING
LAND USE:

Zoning for the Geary-Van Ness area is C2 and is mixed commercial. This lot is included in Redevelopment Area A2.