

## AWARD USE

(Please separate this page from the rest of the application and submit in an unsealed envelope attached to the front of your submission.)

If this project were selected for the award, describe how the recipients would use the award money. Propose a rough budget and describe how this will further your goals. Include in your description, if you wish, how the presentation of the award will be incorporated into the event or project that you propose. While this information will not be a criterion in the selection process and will not be shared with the Selection Committee, it will help inform the Foundation about the continuing interest of the project team in promoting urban excellence.

Marquis Associates would use the award money to pay for architectural and landscape studies to help improve the project. For example, investigate what would be the best use for the "no man's land" between project two blocks near YMCA, study the possibility of a building management office on site thus restoring one apartment to residential use and determine how to revitalize laundry areas. If we were awarded this grant, we would work with management and residents to ascertain what design problems they would like to see addressed.

Project Name St. Francis Square Cooperative Apartments

Location San Francisco, California

Applicant Name Robert B. Marquis Marquis Associates



**PROJECT PROFILE**

(Please limit answers to the space available on these pages)

Project Name ST. FRANCIS SQUARE CO-OPERATIVE APARTMENTS  
 Location 10 BERTIE MINOR LANE SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA  
 Owner ST. FRANCIS SQUARE INC. (co-operative)  
 Project Use(s) RESIDENTIAL  
 Project Size 299 UNITS Total Development Cost 3,497,000 (construction cost

Application submitted by: 1963) 5,360,000 mortgage

Name Robert B. Marquis, FAIA  
 Title President

Organization Marquis Associates Architects

Address 243 VALLEJO STREET SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA 94111

Telephone ( 415 ) 788-2644

Signature Robert B Marquis

Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Key person\* \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

■ Public agencies San Francisco Wilbur Hamilton 771-8800  
Redevelopment Agency

■ Developer \_\_\_\_\_

■ Professional consultants

Architect MARQUIS & STOLLER Robert Marquis 788-2644

Landscape architect LAWRENCE HALPRIN Lawrence Halprin 546-1952

Urban designer \_\_\_\_\_

Planner \_\_\_\_\_

Lawyer \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

■ Community group(s) \_\_\_\_\_

■ Sponsor ILWU-PMA Pension Fund N/A N/A

\*Please attach an additional sheet, if necessary, to identify others who should be credited as having been instrumental in the development of this project.

1. Describe the characteristics of this project: the important aspects of the project's design, development, and public approval process. Indicate why these are exemplary.

- o The project was a three block (8.2 acre) site in the heart of San Francisco's Western Addition redevelopment area.
- o A competition was held to provide moderate income housing to stem the exodus of families from the city to the suburbs.
- o The International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, together with the Pacific Maritime Association (workers and employers), retained the architectural firm of Marquis and Stoller, who produced the winning design.
- o An important aspect in the project design was obtaining approval to close the streets so that the three blocks would provide one contiguous community with generous open space. Six units were organized around one central stair (two to a floor). Each unit has a balcony or private courtyard facing onto the generous central open space, thus providing a sense of territory for each block.

2. What were the significant dates of the project's development and when was it completed?

- o Designer-Developer competition won in 1961
- o Construction started July 1962
- o Sales started March 1963
- o Sold out September 1963
- o Completion (owner occupied) February 1964

3. What urban issues did this project address? Were there important associated issues that this project did not address?

St. Francis Square demonstrated that low-rise family housing, with generous, safe open space could be designed to work with and fit into the fabric of the inner city. Entrances to units face out to street or public spaces so the apartments have a row house appearance,. Rows of apartments surround the interior open space, resulting in a secure urban environment. The integration of the existing YMCA building and the adjacent school was not as successful politically as the designers had hoped.

4. Describe the financing for the project. Was there something particularly unique or innovative about it?

- o Financing: F.H.A. Section 221d-3 of the National Housing Act
- o Mortgage: \$5,360,000, 3-1/8 percent, 40 years.
- o Restricted to families of two or more, meeting F.H.A. limitations of annual income per household (which at time of occupancy was approximately \$7,000 to \$9,900 depending on size of family).
- o Innovative at that time (not previously provided under this program) was the fact that owners could hold an equity position in project and if family income rose above the maximum income limitation they were permitted to remain in their unit but had to pay an increase in monthly charges.

5. What were the goals of this project? How well were they met?

- o To provide stable family housing in the city: Turnover is minimal. There has been a waiting list since completion.
- o To provide racially integrated housing: Original composition was 50% Caucasian, 27% Black, 21% Oriental, 2% Other.
- o To provide affordable housing: At time of completion a typical three bedroom unit cost \$18,500 with a \$550 down payment and monthly charges of \$131.50.
- o To provide safe housing, suitable for families with small children: This goal has been successfully met.

6. Why does this project merit The Rudy Bruner Award for Excellence in the Urban Environment?

St. Francis Square Apartments was one of the first inner city high-density, low-rise housing developments for moderate income families. It has become a model for subsequent low income housing in San Francisco and throughout the country. The strategies of design and management have proven to work since St. Francis Square is now 24 years old and looks, and works, better than when it was originally built.

---

**PROFESSIONAL  
CONSULTANT  
PERSPECTIVE**

## PERSPECTIVE/Professional Consultant

This sheet is to be filled out by those professionals who worked as consultants on the project, providing design, planning, legal, or other professional services.

If possible, answers to all questions should be typed directly on this form or a photocopy. If the form is not used and answers are typed on a separate page, each answer must be preceded by the question to which it responds. The length of answers should be limited to the area provided here.

Name Robert B. Marquis, FAIA Telephone ( 415 ) 788-2644

Title President

Organization Marquis Associates Architects (formerly Marquis and Stoller)

Address 243 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, CA 94111

Signature Robert B Marquis

1. What role did you or your organization play in the development of this project?

We were the architects retained by the sponsor (ILWU-PMA Pension Fund) to enter the Redevelopment Agency's competition. After developing the winning scheme, we carried out the design through preparation of construction documents, negotiations with the contractor and construction administration.

At the time, there were few precedents to draw on. We were mostly influenced by Jane Jacob's "Eyes on the Street" but we had to develop our own approach. All other models, such as Easter Hill, were suburban in nature.

2. From your perspective, how was this project intended to benefit the urban environment?

- o The only charge was to provide safe moderate cost family housing the could be built within the F,H.A. construction cost limitation for 221d-3.
- o At the time, the emphasis was on attracting families that were fleeing to the suburbs. We attempted to incorporate suburban ideas in an urban setting.
- o Ideas for contextural design, sense of place, open space, and the importance of the landscape design, were developed by the architects.

3. What is your impression of the project's impact on its surroundings and people in the project area? Do you have data that documents its effect? Attach supplementary material as appropriate.

The impact on further low and moderate income housing was dramatic. Almost all subsequent redevelopment housing in San Francisco was modelled on this successful project. Low-rise housing became recognized as the most viable solution for family housing. "St. Francis-like" became the slogan for all redevelopment projects done since 1964.

4. What trade-offs and compromises were required during the development of the project? How did your organization participate in making them? With hindsight, what would you now do differently?

Almost all the compromises were due to limited construction costs (extremely low budget of \$11.60 a square foot in 1964). This obliged us to build small units, using inexpensive materials. The largest trade-off was cutting architectural amenities to keep the important exterior landscape features that contributed so greatly to the urban environment.

Shortcomings were the small apartment-type kitchens. Dining space should have been provided in the kitchen. We had hoped that the existing YMCA and adjacent school would provide the necessary community facilities. For political reasons this failed to take place.

5. How might this project be instructive to others in your profession?

The instructions have been drawn by architects, redevelopment agencies, and housing authorities throughout the country.

Clare Cooper Marcus's study of St. Francis Square and Oscar Newman's book *Defensible Space*, together with many awards and publications, brought this project to international attention as a model for successful low/moderate income housing (see section "Other Perspective" in this submission).

6. If five years from now you judge this project to be still successful, what characteristics would you be looking at?

The project has been successful for 24 years and is continuing to be so. There is currently a waiting list for units.

---

**PUBLIC  
AGENCY  
PERSPECTIVE**



## PERSPECTIVE/Public Agency

This sheet is to be filled out by the staff of public agencies who were directly involved in the financing, design review, or public approvals that affected this project.

If possible, answers to all questions should be typed directly on this form or a photocopy. If the form is not used and answers are typed on a separate page, each answer must be preceded by the question to which it responds. The length of answers should be limited to the area provided here.

Name Edmund W. Ong Telephone ( 415 ) 771-8800 x275

Agency San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Title Chief, Architecture

Address 939 Ellis St., San Francisco, CA 94109

Signature *Edmund W. Ong*

**1. What role did your organization play in the development of this project?**

The Agency: assembled the land for development; required that it be developed as low-to-moderate income housing; established the maximum permitted density; reviewed the design as part of the Agency design review process and assisted the developer in processing the project through the various local and federal agencies.

**2. Describe what requirements your agency made of this project? (Such as zoning, public participation, impact statements, etc.)**

The Agency:

1. required that the project be for low-to-moderate income families.
2. established planning consideration including maximum permitted density and parking requirements.

**3. From your perspective, how was this project intended to benefit the urban environment? Describe how, if at all, the intentions changed over the course of the project? What trade-offs and compromises were required? How did you participate in making them? With hindsight, what would you now do differently?**

The project was of benefit, socially, by providing much needed housing for low-to-moderate income families which the developers, in their sales program, assured was racially integrated. From a physical standpoint, the project benefitted the urban environment by creating a low-scale, high density, architecturally distinguished project. The Agency was involved in the process of reviewing the project design throughout its inception.

4. Describe any data you have that documents the impact that this project has actually had on its surroundings and the people in the project area. Attach supplementary material as appropriate. If no data is available, what is your impression of the project's impact and what have you observed that supports that?

A walk through the area would indicate that the project has had a dramatic impact on the area because it has served as the anchor for an ethnically and economically integrated neighborhood.

5. What about this project would be instructive to agencies like yours in other cities?

It is possible, although extremely difficult, to develop a low scale, high density moderate income housing project of high quality design. Additionally, the ultimate long term physical success is dependent on the quality of the management and maintenance team.

6. If five years from now you judge this project to be still successful, what characteristics would you be looking at?

The Agency would look at the physical maintenance of the project and its continued economic viability.

---

**COMMUNITY  
REPRESENTATIVE  
PERSPECTIVE**

## PERSPECTIVE/Community Representative

This sheet is to be filled out by someone who was involved, or represents an organization that was involved, in helping the project respond to neighborhood issues.

If possible, answers to all questions should be typed directly on this form or a photocopy. If the form is not used and answers are typed on a separate page, each answer must be preceded by the question to which it responds. The length of answers should be limited to the area provided here.

Name David Brigode Telephone (415) 931-7363  
Organization and Title (if applicable) Manager - ST. Francis Square Apts, Inc.  
Address 10 Bertie Minor Lane  
SF 94115  
Signature David Brigode

1. How did you, or the organization you represent, become involved in this project?

The Original sponsors, the I.L.W.U. - P.M.A., organized the ST. Francis Square as the Governing body for the Cooperative Apartments.

2. What were the major issues from the community's point of view?

Affordable + decent housing  
Multi-Racial Community  
Family housing  
Self-governing  
Limited Equity

3. What other community organizations or institutions, if any, were involved? What relationship did they have to the project?

I. L. W. U., P. M. A. pension funds  
F. H. A. - 221-d-3 program  
R. D. A. - Land

4. If there was a public review process, did you or your organization participate in it? Describe your involvement.

1962 - no info

5. From your perspective, how has this project made the community a better place to live? Please be as specific as possible.

- Created stable + affordable housing for families in a City with a shortage of both.
- Helped to stabilize a community - the Western Addition - which was in transition

6. If a community group interested in doing a similar project came to you, what advice would you give them?

- Consult with professionals + experier experienced housing organizations re: construction, design, financing, and ongoing operations.
- Build for families, not yuppies
- Involve residents in all phases of operations

7. Why do you think the project should win this award?

The proven success + affordability of ST. Francis  over the last quarter century