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Cover: Ornamental, ceramic tile grille at Building 14 Lobby
The specific subjects of this HSR are a portion of a building complex referred to as Building 14 of the University of California's Clark Kerr Campus (CKC).

The subject landscape and buildings were originally part of the former California School for the Deaf (CSD). The CSD was a kindergarten through twelfth grade boarding school for the relatively long time that it occupied its Berkeley campus, the 1870s through the 1970s. For just less than half of that period, from the late-1870s until 1915, the CSD was conjoined with the California School for the Blind (CSB), its companion institution on this Berkeley site. Together they were referred to as the State Asylum for the Deaf and the Dumb and Blind.

After 1915, the two schools were institutionally separated. Over the course of the next several decades, the two institutions became physically separate, via the construction of separate campuses, on contiguous parcels, yet with a boundary line between. First completed were the CSB buildings, followed by those of the CSD. Such were the consequences that the CSD — the larger of the two institutions — took several decades to complete its rebuilding campaign begun in the late-1920s. During this duration, there were two essential eras of construction, one from 1929 to 1931, which included the construction of Building 14; and another centered about the immediate, post-WWII years of 1948 to 1952, though in reality a period that lagged until 1960.

Completed by 1960, the CSD’s Berkeley campus sustained only through the 1960s. By the early 1970s, plans were again afoot to address the school’s advancement, resulting in the decision to relocate the CSD (and, separately, the CSB) to its present location in Fremont.

In 1980, the former CSD and CSB property was conveyed to the University of California at Berkeley. In November 1986, the complex was named the Clark Kerr Campus (CKC) in honor of Dr. Clark Kerr, who served as Berkeley’s first Chancellor from 1952 to 1958 and President of the University of California from 1958 to 1967.

In 1989, the CA School for the Deaf and Blind Historic District (CKC Historic District) was successfully nominated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
Historic Places. The NR record identifies 20 former CSD and CSB buildings as contributors to the CKC Historic District, Building 14 included. That record also identifies several buildings as non-contributors to the District.

In summary, the historical significance of the CKC Historic District is based on its being:

- An important setting, site and landscape within the context of the development of the San Francisco Bay Area;
- A state educational institution — the CSD/CSB — which was allied with this site for the course of a century, from the 1870s to the 1970s;
- A unified manifestation of California architecture of the 1920s, as well as a representative example of both the continuum and the alteration of architectural style over the course of several decades, from the 1920s through the 1950s.

The historical significance of the CKC Historic District spans the 1910s to the 1960s, as this is the historical period that is physically represented by the present landscape and buildings. Although its narrative history is far longer, thus adding weight to its overall significance.

As an historical place, the CKC is rooted in its regional setting, the East Bay foothills; and in an educational institute, the CSD/CSB. The former — a native landscape — is outward, hilly, open and generous. The latter — an institution — is uniform, structured, cultivated, yet necessarily spare. Its historical character, without the overlay of a relatively lush landscape (planting beds, mature and flowering trees), was that of a relatively unembellished place — its form given over to the needs of deaf and blind students.

Even the individuals who made this place — both the State Office of Architecture (Architects Roeth and Eichler, in particular) and the CSD/CSB (Superintendent Stevenson) — are largely hidden behind the cause of the institution. Whereas the State institutional setting and context tend to overshadow the personalities and skills that underlie such institutions, the quality of Building 14 and its principal spaces, as well as their survival for contemporary use with few alterations, reminds us of the architectural skill behind the CSD.

The person apparently most responsible for the character and quality of the CSD design is that of state architect Alfred Eichler, though individual attribution is not a simple matter; since, for example, Eichler’s name does not show up on many of the drawings for the CSD, including those for Building 14. On the State of California Department of Public Works drawings sheets for Building 14 (CSD Primary School Building), the signature is W. K. Daniels, Deputy Chief, Division of Architecture. And the architect is separately identified as Charles F.B. Roeth, who was in private practice in Oakland.

Daniels’ involvement is consistent throughout the 1930 period of design and construction, as he is identified as the Deputy Chief for Building 10, 11, 12 and 14. In fact, he retains this role through the 1940s.

However, Roeth’s involvement is curious. He is identified above the title block on the overall site plan of this structural grouping, and also on the Building 14 drawings, but on no others. Little else is known about him, despite his being a local architect, and there is no evidence that he was a designer of the caliber of these buildings, suggesting that his involvement was that of drawing production.

As for the responsible designer, Eichler’s name arises, time and again, with respect to both the CSB the CSD, including on original sketches for buildings directly associated with Building 14 (Building 10). An article about the adjoining CSB, published in the Architect and Engineer in 1932, identifies a range of architects and engineers involved in the design and construction of that school, including the State Architect, George B. McDougall, and concluding with a sentence that “the buildings illustrated were designed by Alfred Eichler.” Moreover, a definitive attribution for his direct involvement at the CSD is an article published in the California News in April of 1958, titled “Architect’s Resume of the Building Program,” by Alfred Eichler, Supervising Architect. In a parenthetical remark at the opening of this article, the editor notes that “through the years Dr. Stevenson [the CSD Superintendent] and the State Supervising Architect, Mr. Alfred Eichler, kept close together.” Eichler’s own sentences reinforce his lead position, stating that “in 1929 when we started planning... we were authorized to master plan and rebuild the school according to modern thinking and in the past 29 years we have been doing this...”.

The California State Archives contain a variety of CSD drawings and photos by Eichler. Some of these show sketches for the ornamental features that graced
these otherwise fairly spare, institutional buildings, and in particular humanized them for the students who lived there. Looking at these drawings and resulting details, one is able to guess that this architect was particularly suited to such empathetic work. In fact, towards the end of this research effort, it came to light that Mr. Eichler had been deaf since childhood, as the following biographical passage by the California State Library makes clear:

"Born in Missouri in 1895, Alfred Eichler grew up in San Francisco. At age 13, he suffered from spinal meningitis, which left him deaf for the rest of his life. He persevered and went on to study architecture at the Beaux Arts Institute of Design.

Eichler began work for the Division of Architecture of the Department of Public Works in 1925, becoming a supervising architect in 1949. Like most architects of state buildings, his name is not widely known, yet the structures he designed are a part of everyday life for many Californians — schools, colleges and universities, hospitals, office buildings, bridges, prisons, border stations and parks facilities. Sometimes he produced the drawings that showed how a building designed by someone else would look; other times he took the project from concept to completion. Occasionally his designs would not be built, or would be modified prior to construction.

Upon retiring in 1963, Eichler expressed the hope that he and his wife of thirty-seven years, Virginia, would travel the world, but she died the following day. Eichler spent much of his free time painting watercolors of scenes in Sacramento and surrounding counties. He died in 1977." (from: http://www.learncalifornia.org/)

Purpose and Methodology

This HSR is the last of a grouping of historical evaluations for the landscape and buildings of the CKC. As it turns out, two important building units bookend this overall effort: Building 10, the CKC dining hall complex, and Building 14, its public assembly hall.

Each of the buildings in between required substantial alterations of their interiors and uses to make them into a dormitory complex for University students. Yet, these two buildings retain their original distinctions and, as it turns out, Building 14 above all. Its primary spaces are remarkably unchanged, attesting to the quality of their design. The Entry Lobby is an excellently designed room of Hispanic inspiration. It is one-of-a-kind on a campus that was designed to appear and function as a unit. It is also, gratefully, little changed. Which isn’t to belittle the quality of Building 10’s Main Dining Hall or, for that matter, Building 14’s Assembly Hall, the latter being the companion of the Building 14 Entry Lobby, and also remarkably unchanged.

These two spaces, the Entry Lobby and Assembly Hall, are the most character defining areas of Building 14, even moreso than its exterior, which is of quite equal character to the surrounding buildings, excepting for its more prominent setting.

The primary purpose for this HSR is to document historic building significance, and to specifically identify the relative significance of building areas, spaces and features, in order to provide and disseminate such information to those responsible for future projects that may affect the property. No treatment recommendations are included.

This HSR is otherwise generally intended to provide:

- Baseline historical information summarizing the significance subject property
- Detailed description of the subject resource
- Preservation planning in the form of the identification of characteristic features of the subject historical resource

Primary historical research has been limited, as previous historic documentation has been generally relied upon to provide the historic record. Caroline Burnes’ and Catherine Marshall’s History of the California School for the Deaf, Berkeley, 1860-1960 and David Gebhard’s The Architectural/Historical Aspects for the California Schools for the Blind and Deaf, Berkeley, 1867-1979 both provide information on the development of the 19th century campus and should be consulted for information about that era.

Nonetheless, selected additional research has provided some further historic documentation, including sets of original construction drawings located at and provided by the California Department of General Services Plan Vault Room in Sacramento. Sets of drawings of the 1980 conversion project were also made available by UC. Selections from the architectural sections of these sets of documents are attached for reference.

This HSR work required numerous site visits in
order to photograph and record the character of these landscapes and buildings. Hundreds of photos have been taken, and while only a selection are incorporated here-in, a separate disk is to be submitted containing all photos, for the record.

The campus and library of the California School for the Deaf, relocated to Fremont, was also visited, at which time copies of selected historic documents and photographs were collected.

Finally, as over the years there have been differing numbers assigned to these buildings, this report identifies buildings by their currently assigned numbers (see attached plan), even when discussing them as historical resources.
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**Fig.2: Clark Kerr Campus (in foreground)**
View from hills above, looking west
BACKGROUND

The construction for the Berkeley campus of The California Institution of the Deaf and Dumb, and the Blind (as the school was then called) began on 26 September 1867. The 130-acre tract met the criteria that the school's Board had listed for a new site. It was located within proximity of San Francisco, was only four miles north of Oakland, and would be near the site of the new College of California (the University of California at Berkeley campus) as it developed. However, the area was still rural enough in character to allow for the purchase of a tract of land that would be large enough to meet the current and future needs of the school. The grounds needed to be able to accommodate not only the academic and residential buildings, but also a large orchard and garden (that provided both food and a source of vocational training) and the facilities for a number of vocational trades that were taught at the school. The development of the site and landscape for this new campus will be summarized below in order to set the description and analysis of the individual components of this landscape (entrances, circulation, courtyards, yards, and playfields) into a context.

The impetus for the new campus began with planning that occurred between 1915 and 1921. In 1915, the state passed legislation that provided the framework for separating the instruction and administration of the California School for the Blind and the California School for the Deaf, the separation of which was enacted in 1921. During this period, the possibility of moving the two schools from the Berkeley site was also discussed, but in 1921, a commitment was made to remain in Berkeley. Having made this decision, the Berkeley site was divided on paper into two campuses - one for each school - and the northern two-thirds of the campus given to the CSD, and the southern one-third to the CSB (Fig.4). This division of facilities would allow the two schools to provide...
instruction and care for the two populations — each with their own special needs (Gebhard 1979: 75). However, the existing facilities did not support this physical separation, and the two schools had to continue to share the same facilities for a number of years. The Office of State Architect developed separate site plans for the two schools so this conceptual division could, in fact, be realized. By 1929, key buildings for the CSB campus were completed, and a full physical separation of the two schools was finally achieved (Burnes/Ramger 1960: 45).

Development of the CSD Campus

In 1928, a report prepared by the Office of State Architect, examined the conditions of the existing facilities and concluded that the buildings were all out-dated, unsafe, and that remodeling was not practical (Gebhard 1979: 115). Additionally, the existing facilities did not have the space for all of the deaf students within the state who were entitled to services (Burnes and Ramger 1960: 50). In 1929, a Special Legislative Committee was appointed to “prepare recommendations on how the needs of the School could best be met” (Gebhard 1979: 115). The Committee recommended that new facilities be constructed for the CSD over a 10-year period, and in the 1929 Report of the Special Legislative Committee outlined the building program and presented a site plan prepared by the Office of State Architect. However, the planned 10-year construction program ended up lasting through the 1950s due to limitations resulting from the Great Depression and World War II.

The 1929 Report specified that the plans for the new campus should adhere to these guidelines:
1. Complete separation of Deaf and Blind Schools.
2. Destroy old buildings in general order of obsolescence.
3. Destroy old buildings and erect new ones, so the school population can grow.
4. Develop into a compact plant that is:
   a. Easy to get about for general supervision,
   b. Connected together, so children can remain under cover during the school day,
   c. Do not use dormitory halls for cross plant circulation
5. Provide living quarters for:
   a. President.
   b. Steward (business manager) where he can have general supervision of academic unit.
   c. Assistant Steward, where he is available for emergency call.
   d. Engineer, where he is available for emergency call.
   e. House help (in various dormitories) needed for plant supervision.
   f. House other help, separated by sex, on the site.
6. Gather administrative offices near together.
7. House chief house mother central to each dormitory group, to have:
   a. Parent reception rooms common to the group.
   b. Trunk rooms in common.
   c. Mending rooms in common.
8. Hospital, central to the common group, and:
   a. Served by utility drive.
   b. Connected to a dormitory of each sex.
9. Have one central commissary serving:
   a. A kitchen or kitchens for school groups.
   b. Dining facilities for school groups, faculty and help.
10. Have one steam plant for both schools, with provision when steam may be sold the Blind School.
   a. Engineer responsible to Dr. Stevenson alone.
   b. Engineer living nearby, for emergency call.
11. Properly relate green-house to agricultural areas.
12. Have main auditorium connected to school but usable by [others] with necessaries available.

These objectives acknowledged some of the logistical needs of operating a school that provided both instructional and living environments for children of different ages.

The 1929 site plan that accompanied the report (Fig.5) provided a schematic or conceptual layout for the buildings (the 1929 site plan was not signed so the designer cannot be identified with certainty; although it seems likely that Alfred Eichler, State Architect, was involved.) There is also the possibility that Charles Roeth, architect for the 1931 (Fig.6) and 1933 site plans (Fig.7), was in some way involved [Gebhard 1979: 117].

The 1929 plan included the following concepts:
- Maintain the designation of Warring Street as the front of the property and set back the building facades along Warring in a uniform line;
Fig. 6: CSD Site Plan, c1931 (north at left)
Highlighting new Buildings 10 (Academic Dining Hall) at top; 11 (Primary Classroom) at center right; & 14 (Assembly Hall) at bottom
• Create a "Forecourt" that would serve as the entry to the site and serve as the formal transition space between the campus and the surrounding community;
• Place buildings on a grid pattern so that quadrangles for outdoor spaces or outdoor rooms were defined or enclosed by the facades of the buildings;
• Delineate the different types of outdoor spaces (forecourt entry, enclosed courtyards — labeled "patio" on the 1929 site plan — play areas, athletic field, and food garden and orchards; although not labeled on the plan, there was also space allotted for the service aspects of operations.)

The first phase of building was funded in 1929 and included:
• A portion of CKC Building 10 (CSD Elementary Dining Hall, Kitchen, and Commissary), and
• CKC Building 12 (CSD girls' and boys' dormitories).

In 1930, funding was provided for:
• CKC Building 11, the Caldwell Elementary School
• CKC Building 14, the D'Estrella Assembly Hall.

At this juncture, the new CSD campus was the confined grouping illustrated in the 1931 site plan (Fig.6, above).

Ideas from the 1929 plan were refined in a 1933 site plan, again authored by Oakland architect Charles F.B. Roeth (Fig.87). The 1933 site plan showed:
• The placement of the two buildings (CKC Building 11 and Building 12) completed in 1931 (and whose actual siting were slightly different than what was shown on the 1929 plan).
• A row of buildings along the north boundary of the site, including a row of faculty housing facing Dwight Way, and four additional buildings above (east) of North Street.
• Roads, including the two existing roads (today called North Street and Southwest Place); a new road that entered the campus from Dwight Way above (east of) the athletic field and then turned west to connect to the two roads (today's South Street and Southwest Place) that entered the campus from Derby Street (this road basically following the present-day alignment of Sports

Fig. 7: c1933 Site Plan, Charles Roeth, Architect (north at left)
With extant, new buildings highlighted at bottom right
Lane); and a new road that was to provide access to the east side of the site below the athletic field.

- Clear locations of the proposed courtyards.

Due to the more definite footprint of the buildings, the buildings formed a series of rectangular-shaped courtyards. The center of the campus included an entry courtyard [labeled the "Forecourt" on the 1929 plan] with another large courtyard located behind [east of] the new Administration Building. The buildings on each side of this center spine of development formed additional courtyard spaces. This arrangement addressed the need for a "compact" campus, while the use of the loggias that Roeth and Eichler designed for the buildings addressed the circulation needs (keeping children out of the weather, facilitating supervision, and keeping the circulation patterns between destinations out of the interior hallways in the dormitories). This plan provided for a proportionate balance of outdoor space throughout the campus. The arrangement of the buildings into rectangular courtyards favored formal and symmetrical designs, complementary to the Spanish Colonial Revival imagery of the buildings.

These original plans for the subsequent development of the CSD's 20th century campus "abandoned the nineteenth century ideas of separate structures scattered about in a suburban/semi-rural environment" (Gebhard 1979: 118), in favor of a compact arrangement that used geometry as a means to define the space. When the campus was developed during the mid-to-late nineteenth century, it reflected the current design vocabulary for both architecture and landscape architecture, as well as the existing educational philosophy within a setting that was basically a rural environment. The 19th century buildings were traditionally constructed of brick and stone. Likewise, the school's grounds needed to have a garden, orchard, and livestock barns for providing food for students and staff. At that time, the property was spacious and surrounded by largely undeveloped land. The wall that was built between 1896 and 1901 was used in part to differentiate the pastoral campus from surrounding open land.

However, by the 1930s, this wall was serving the purpose of separating the campus from what was becoming a relatively dense, residential development that had grown up to its boundaries [Fig.3]. Also, by the 1930s, design and educational philosophies had changed, and the new CSD campus reflected these changes. Eichler's use of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture followed a design vocabulary that was then common in public architecture throughout California (Gebhard et al. 1985: 573).

The site and associated landscape developed incrementally such that for almost 30 years, portions of the old and the new campus existed and functioned side-by-side. Throughout this period, Alfred Eichler of the State's Department of Public Works and Division of Architecture remained the CSD's chief architect and planner. His oversight resulted in cohesion in the planning and development of the site. At the same time, he responded to developments (both educationally and stylistically) that did not exist when the 1929 and 1933 site plans were prepared. Though modern planning and design concepts crept into the campus as planning resumed in the wake of WWII, Eichler basically adhered to Spanish Colonial Revival imagery until 1952, and with it the courtyard scheme that provided the organizing principle for the outdoor spaces in the 1929 and 1933 plans for the site. As Gebhard noted:

"The most appreciable changes involved the area north of the entrance forecourt and north of the Administration Building. Here Eichler abandoned a courtyard scheme which would basically match that already constructed south of the entrance forecourt. He also abandoned the upper northeast courtyard scheme projected in Roeth's 1933 site plan. A study of the plans and orientation of Buildings D-2, D-3, and D-7 [CKC Buildings 2 and 4] does not reveal any appreciable utilitarian [functional] advantage to be gained by this oblique angling in relation to the rectangular geometry of the other buildings. One is left with the feeling that the architect departed from the traditional classical balance and rectilinearity of the 1929 [and 1933] scheme[s] because such an oblique placement conveys a Modern image. Such a placement had been used close by in the hillside siting of Stern Hall of the University of California (designed in 1942 by Corbett and Murray and William W. Wooster)." (Gebhard 1979: 123).

Eichler's decision to abandon the right-angled orientation of the buildings on the north side of the campus after WWII had implications for the organization of the outdoor spaces. CKC Buildings 2, 3, and 4 did not form...
enclosed courtyards. Rather, the landscape around these buildings would more accurately be described as yards with carefully graded slopes that defined changes in grade (that previously had been dealt with through retaining walls). The key landscape materials — concrete, grass lawns, limited use of foundation plantings and trees, light fixtures — remained fairly constant over the 30-year period of development. Some of this consistency was probably attributable to the budgetary priorities of such an institution. However, the predominance of concrete in buildings and landscape features helped to unify the appearance of the features that were constructed at different times throughout the 30-year construction period.

Gebhard pointed out that the CSD's buildings directly expressed their concrete frame by leaving the pattern of the board forms visible. This visible pattern "accomplished two purposes of imagery - it conveyed that the buildings were of 'Modern' construction, and the rough tactile nature of their surfaces suggest[ed] a sense of the primitive and provincial" (Gebhard 1979: 119). In California, exposed concrete surfaces had been used in public buildings since the early 1900s and were increasingly used in the 1920s through 1930s (Gebhard 1979: 119-20). The characteristics of this material (flexibility, relative seismic safety, relative durability, and low maintenance costs) allowed it to remain a viable material choice and to span both the 30-year construction period at CSD and the changing architectural styles. Concrete was also the predominate material for the hardscape features (sidewalks, walls, seat-walls, steps, courtyard paving) in the landscape. Concrete provided the same construction and visual advantages to the landscape features as it did to the buildings, allowing for the expression of Modern design sensibility within a more conservative landscape architectural layout. This choice of concrete for the predominate material reinforced the transition between the buildings and outdoor spaces, which the design of the courtyards and loggias had established.

In 1979, both the CSD and CSB left their Berkeley campus for separate new facilities in Fremont, and the Berkeley campus was transferred to the University of California.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The former California Schools for the Deaf and Blind (CSDB) is listed as the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP #1982-10-14); in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), which incorporates resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places; and is also a designated City of Berkeley Historic Landmark District (#42, 1981). A single version of the NRHP Inventory–Nomination Form, prepared by the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, dated May 4, 1981, serves as the basis and record for each of these designations, so there is no substantive difference in the historical resources listing from one jurisdiction to another.

While the historical resource designation is constant — and before we summarize the designated resource — it is otherwise the case that the different jurisdictions present differing historical resource obligations.

In general, a property that is listed in the NRHP is afforded certain protections as well as incentives. Within the federal regulations, the “effects of listing” include the requirement that federal and state agencies “undertaking a project having an effect on a listed or eligible property” must allow for “comment pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act…” (from CFR, Title 36, Part 60, Section 60.2 Effects of Listing).

While federally owned resources require the federal
Section 106 review, State owned resources such as the CSDB/CKC are reviewed pursuant to Sections 5024 and 5024.4 of the California Public Resources Code. Section 5024 requires consultation with the California State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) when a project may impact historical resources located on State owned land.

Additionally, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that public agencies consider the effects of their actions on historical resources listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR. In the context of proposed projects, such consideration may require environmental review, but at the very least requires a determination of effect.

As the CSDB/CKC is State owned, the jurisdiction having authority over discretionary actions (such as proposed projects) are the State and the University of California (UC). Thus, planning and building permit authority do not reside at the local jurisdiction, the City of Berkeley. Nevertheless, the City is regularly given the courtesy of reviewing and commenting on pertinent UC projects. In fact, in the case of the CKC, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was drafted between the City and UC when the property was transferred to the latter, in 1982. At the time of its transference, a specific project to add senior housing to the site was in the works, and this project is given a good deal of attention in the city planning records and in the MOU.

General project-related provisions are also included in this MOU:

4. **Demolition.** Existing buildings will be demolished only if such action would:
   a) Permit construction of housing for the elderly.
   b) Remove a serious hazard to life safety; or
   c) Not involve buildings with significant architectural or historical merit which can economically be rehabilitated and reused.

5. **Reconstruction.** Existing buildings destroyed by fire, earthquake or other disasters or removed due to hazards or infeasibility of rehabilitation could be replaced by buildings of similar size and scope.

6. **Preservation of Landmarks.** The University will notify the Landmarks Preservation Commission and provide 60 days to comment on any proposal to:
   a) Construct new buildings;
   b) Demolish or significantly modify existing structures of architectural or historical importance; or
   c) Remove existing landscaping or other significance site improvement.

**Summary of Designation**

The NRHP defines an historic district as:

"...a geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district may also comprise individual elements separated geographically but linked by association or history." [from Code of Federal Regulations 36 CFR PART 60]

The **CSDB/CKC Historic District** identifies a 50 acre site and 20 contributing buildings. Of the identified, contributing buildings, 13 were CSD buildings (4 of which are today identified as Bldg. 10, and another 2 as Bldg. 12), including:

- CKC Bldg. 1 – CSD Administration Bldg., 1949
- CKC Bldg. 2 – CSD Secondary School, 1949
- CKC Bldg. 3 – CSD Jr. High School for Boys, 1948
- CKC Bldg. 8 – CSD Intermediate Girls Dorm, 1950
- CKC Bldg. 10 – CSD Main Dining Room, 1931/1950; Kitchen and Commissary Bldg., 1930; Elementary Dining Hall, 1930; and Commissary Building, 1932
- CKC Bldg. 11 – CSD Elementary School, 1931
- CKC Bldg. 12 – CSD Halls for Elementary Girls and Elementary Boys, 1930
- CKC Bldg. 14 – CSD Assembly Hall, 1931
- CKC Bldg. 15 – CSD Elementary Gymnasium, 1940

The other 7 contributing buildings were of the CSB. Of those, 6 retain their association to the CKC, whereas 1 (CSB Bldg. 2) is now part of the housing complex constructed amidst the two former schools. The 6 CKC contributing buildings are:

- CKC Bldg. 16 – CSB Infirmary, 1940
- CKC Bldg. 17 (east) – CSB Classrooms and
Children’s Residence, 1940
• CKC Bldg. 19 – CSB Admin., Assembly and Library Bldg., 1926/1930
• CKC Bldg. 20 – CSB Annex, 1930
• CKC Bldg. 21 – CSB Boys Residence, 1924
• CKC Bldg. 22 – CSB Gymnasium, 1914

The NRHP record also identifies non-contributing resources, which include 14 buildings, parts of buildings, or structures. All CKC resources identified in the NRHP record are graphically summarized on the attached plan.

The NRHP Statement of Significance reads as follows:

“The buildings of the California School for the Deaf and Blind, and their settings, maintain a park-like ambience which has long been a landmark for the residents of Berkeley. The continued use of the site for one hundred and fourteen years has made it one of the principal public institutional open spaces in the area. Educationally the California School for the Deaf and Blind is significant for being the first such institution in California and on the West Coast. Along with the University of California (which arrived three years later), the school was one of the first public educational institutions in Berkeley. The well-planned arrangement of buildings, the use of landscaping to define exterior spaces, and the stylistic unity of the buildings has created a campus which is both functionally and aesthetically successful.”

Specific dates of significance are identified as 1914-1949 – the earlier date corresponding to initial discussions that renamed the institution, in 1915, as the California School for the Deaf and Blind, and which
enabled the separation into two schools for the blind and deaf, in 1921. Also in 1921, according to Gebhard, “it was decided that the two schools should remain at their present site. A loose north/east–south/west diagonal line was drawn, giving the northern two-thirds of the site to the School for the Deaf, and the southern third to the School for the Blind” (Gebhard 1979: 75).

Physical planning for the School for the Blind began in 1923, and planning for the School for the Deaf in 1927. By 1929, funds were allotted for the first phase of construction of the School for the Deaf’s dining, kitchen and commissary buildings, which are, today, CKC Building 10. Importantly, the School for the Deaf and Blind plans called for the removal of the former buildings, all of which were sequentially removed from the site.

According to the authors of the NR nomination record, the latter date of significance, 1949, corresponded to the end of the period during which the planning, design and construction of the two schools adhered to a unified and overall architectural concept.

In the NRHP, the CSDB/CKC Historic District is identified as significant under NR Criterion A, Event, and specifically as a public, institutional open space in continuous use for 114-plus years; and for its being the first such institution in California and on the West Coast. The CSDB Historic District is also identified as significant under NR Criterion C, Design and Construction, and specifically for its architecture. Finally, it is identified in the NRHP as being significant at the state level.

The City of Berkeley identifies the significance of the California Schools of the Deaf and the Blind Landmark Historic District for its architectural, historical and cultural merits.
Evaluation of Historical Significance

With respect to historical resources with an identified period of significance spanning a duration of time, it stands to reason that relatively older parts of a given resource have a tendency to be found the more significant. However, in the case of the CSD/CKC, it may well be not only the more recent parts of the historic campus that are the most significant, but the most significant areas may well have been realized outside the period of significance identified in the NR, as it was the very last thing built, yet around which the entire campus was planned and constructed.

At the center of the CSD/CKC campus lies the Main Courtyard, which is surrounded and largely enclosed by the campus’ main buildings and primary features. The courtyard itself, while designed in the 1948-49 timeframe, was constructed in 1953, by which time all of the buildings and spaces of the CSD’s central campus were complete. That is, all of the 20th century CSD campus.

Though there are few vestiges of the 19th century CSD campus (CKC Bldg. 22, the original gym; and the perimeter stone walls), both the 19th and 20th century campuses share their geographic centers, though in very different realizations. The 19th century campus had, at its center, a stone building (the Education Building) of monumental character, whereas the 20th century campus has, at its center, an open plaza. One might think that this duality -- with one era defining its center in the form of a stoic and supervisorial building, and the other with that of a public open space -- is a consequence of differing eras and their ideologies. Except that the latter CSD campus was dictated by the former, meaning that the 20th century re-creators could not afford the luxury of sweeping away the older buildings, en masse, but resorted to doing so incrementally. Such that the first 20th century buildings were constructed on the site’s periphery, where there were no extant buildings. Subsequently, the 20th century campus grew inward, filling the spaces.
amidst the older buildings by removing the older buildings as they were no longer needed. Such that one of the last buildings to go was the original administration building at the center of campus, the removal of which followed the completion of the new administration building, and which left a very meaningful void behind that new building and at the very center of campus.

When the older Education Building was removed, it didn't simply swap places with the quad. Rather, the earlier building straddled the site of the quad and the site of current Building 8, which completed the quad's eastern side, and also preceded its construction.

This discussion is intended to argue that the spaces (the quad and the entry forecourt and drive, together with the individual courtyards of the adjoining buildings 10, 11 & 14) and buildings (1, 8, 10, 11 & 14) at and surrounding the geographic center of campus are those of primary significance, regardless of their age or chronology. This is also in keeping with the NR record, which, at least with regard to the buildings, appears to recognize as contributors to the historic district those resources that directly connect to the central campus (excepting Building 15, the original CSD gym, which doesn’t connect to any of the other buildings, yet garners contributing status).

Within the NR record, exactly what the criteria was for recognizing a given building as an NR contributor is difficult to discern. For example, all of the buildings directly connected to the central campus are given contributor status, yet several are more recent than the ending date of the defined period of significance, which is given as 1949. But, then, Building 2—a fully skewed building constructed in 1949-50—is a contributor, whereas the other fully skewed Building 4, built in 1948-49, and thus within the period of significance, is a non-contributor, perhaps on the basis of its being in the outer ring of buildings, unlike Building 2, which is directly connected via a loggia. And then there’s the further point that Building 4 is also connected via a loggia and porch, albeit a route of greater distance and remove.

Neither are the quad, the forecourt, nor any of the formal courtyards specifically identified as NR contributors, as few landscapes were yet designated within NR records at the time this nomination was written, in 1982. Still, in this instance, how could such spaces not be so recognized? Moreover, how could some equivalent buildings not be?

At this juncture, given these considerations, the NR record should be slightly reconsidered, the facts being that the CSD/CKC campus is an integral place, geographically, physically, socially, and historically. Most of its original parts contribute—although not equally, of course—yet also including both remnant and ghost spaces, buildings and features of the 19th century campus.

The CSD/CKC is integral to the extent that the loss of its landscapes or buildings, with some but few exceptions (Buildings 5, 6, 13, NW Lot…), would diminish its character, and thus its integrity. Such exceptions are illustrated in the attached Historic Landscape and Building Plan. This plan also illustrates a more detailed approach to the identification of the various landscapes and buildings within the CSD/CKC Historic District, by assigning degrees of historical significance.

The CSD/CKC campus is divided into front, center and back. The separation into front and back having everything to do with the precept that the more public the entity, the more potentially significant, on the basis that historical resources are culturally beneficial—i.e., they benefit the public. Thus, building exteriors are more historically consequential than building interiors, with rare exception. And the yards of buildings fronting the public way are also the more exceptional. In this case, the Warring and Dwight Way frontages are the most historically significant areas of the CSD/CKC. Whereas those properties most away from the streets are less so.

Therein lies the power of setting. At the CSD/CKC, the setting dictates a topography of placement and historical importance.

Therefore, what is primarily significant of the CSD/CKC is its setting—that being a very early and long established place in the scheme of historical Bay Area settlement. To the extent that several not just generations but eras of institutional use and buildings have existed on this acreage, yet without forfeiting its essential character as a signal property and setting. In these respects the CSD/CKC campus, is historically equivalent to the nearby UC Berkeley campus.

The two institutions are likewise equivalent in that most of the original capital infrastructure of each has
been replaced by more contemporary facilities. In fact, practically all of their respective 19th century facilities have been replaced. Their geographic places and settings remain, while the buildings and, to a degree, their users and purposes have changed.

Though the 19th century campuses are history, both the UC and CSD/CKC campuses are well represented by the early-20th century. Especially so at the CSD/CKC, where a unique manifestation exists in the form of a prolonged implementation of a master planning process, begun in the 1920s and concluded some thirty years later.

Moreover, once the CSD was complete, it remained practically unchanged for nearly 30 more years. Altogether, the CSD/CKC campus, as it presently stands, effectively represents more than 50 years of property and building development, atop and alongside more than 150 years of historical settlement.

**HISTORIC BUILDING EVALUATIONS**

Historic preservation evaluations establish a framework for treatment of an historic property by zoning the property and buildings into logical areas, primarily based on the integrity of original use and design — with integrity meaning that a critical mass of essential uses and physical features are intact and visible — as well as on the degree of public access. The delineation of a property into historic zones seeks to identify the differences between more and less significant exterior and interior areas. Exterior and interior areas are herein divided into three historic zones — Significant, Contributing and Non-Contributing.

An historic resource, whether a district or an individual building, is an integrated whole consisting of site and landscape, building exterior and interior spaces, features and materials. That resources are so considered is not to say that each of those landscape and building entities are equally historic. Indeed, historic properties are generally considered from the outside in. We also look at historic properties from the perspective of public versus private, with greater significance granted to the former based on the understanding that historic resources generally benefit society over-and-above individuals. One can, therefore, generally conclude, especially in the context of an historic district, that formal and public exteriors or spaces and building elevations are of the greatest significance, and that significance recedes towards the rear of a property, as well as towards the interior — increasingly so with more and more utilitarian and back-of-house uses and their spaces. This method of interpretation parallels the way that landscape and architectural design acknowledge the relative importance of public place and form, resulting in greater formality and consequence at primary public spaces and facades, versus simplification and utility at, for example, service areas, which relatively few might appreciate, and where utility is the expedient.

It is therefore understood that there are degrees of significance within any given historic resource, regardless of scale. As well, that such degrees are measured by a general grading system that implicitly identifies exterior landscapes, elevations, spaces and features as more significant and thus of greater sensitivity than interior spaces.

The intent of historic zoning is to prioritize an historic property by defining zones of greater and lesser historic significance and, therefore, greater and lesser sensitivity to maintenance, alteration, rehabilitation or change. Relative significance is important in the context of planning for the future of existing and, especially, historic resources. Giving consideration to the relative importance of one space to another, or one material to another, allows for the prioritization of individual landscapes, buildings, spaces, elements and materials. It is an attempt to define what is most important, in this case to the potential significance of a resource, and thus what deserves the greatest attention with respect to preservation. Conversely, designating relative significance allows for the consideration of what is of lesser significance and least sensitive to change, thus suggesting where necessary alterations are best focused.

It is not the intent of this effort to prohibit alteration and additions to this historic property. All active properties necessarily undergo change in order to maintain uses, or adapt new uses in order to sustain existence. In fact, the former CSD and CSB already experienced a change of primary ownership and use when it was adapted to a collegiate dormitory campus in the 1980s, though that change, from an adaptive reuse perspective, was very appropriate, since doing so required very minimal alteration.

Such actions as are required to maintain and sustain
Historic properties are allowed under the guidance of the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards*. The two applicable treatment standards are:

“Preservation, [which] places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made.”

“Rehabilitation, [which] emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work.” (from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation)

In this case, as the property was previously adaptively reused, as there has already been comprehensive material alterations, and since additional repairs are anticipated, Preservation is not the applicable standard, since it emphasizes protection and conservation. Rather, the relevant treatment Standard is Rehabilitation.

“When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment.

In Rehabilitation, historic building materials and character-defining features are protected and maintained as they are in the treatment Preservation; however, an assumption is made prior to work that existing historic fabric has become damaged or deteriorated over time and, as a result, more repair and replacement will be required. Thus, latitude is given in the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation to replace extensively deteriorated, damaged, or missing features using either traditional or substitute materials.” (from http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/rehab/rehab_approach.htm)

Our specific rating system is applied from the perspective of the historic district. In this overall historical context, the Very Significant designation is intended to identify the spaces and features that are of primary significance to the whole — i.e., the designated historic district — so this designation is limited to exterior yards, courtyards and arcades, as illustrated in the zoned Site Plan.

Historic Preservation Zones are further described below, followed by floor plan diagrams applying these zoning principals to Building 14.

**Significant Historic Preservation Zone**

Exterior and interior areas that are of secondary importance to the historic property, or of less public prominence than Very Significant zones, or potentially very significant spaces that have suffered past alterations affecting their significance, are herein identified as Significant.

Like the Very Significant zone, Significant spaces, elements and materials are recommended to be retained and repaired rather than replaced, and missing or altered historic features may be restored. Where past alterations have been made that are identified as non-historic, such alterations may be removed or further altered based on the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation*.

New additions and alterations to Significant areas may be allowed, but must be guided in order to strictly meet the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. In particular, new work shall not destroy identified historic fabric, and is also recommended to modestly differ from the identified historic character, elements and material while, at the same time, being compatible.

With respect to Building 14, given its primary location, along with its important and intact original use, a wide range of exterior and interior areas and spaces are herein identified as significant, including principal exterior or building elevations, original porch and terrace spaces, and primary interior spaces such as lobbies, the Assembly Hall and its stage and balcony.

**Contributing Historic Preservation Zone**

Exterior and interior areas of secondary importance to the overall historic resource, or of less public prominence than Significant zones, or potentially significant spaces that have suffered past alterations affecting historic significance, are herein identified as Contributing.

Like the Significant zone, Contributing exterior and interior spaces and features are recommended to be retained and preserved, or repaired rather than replaced, and missing or altered historic features may be restored. Whereas preservation is the goal within Significant zones, rehabilitation is recommended within Significant areas.
Non-Contributing Historic Preservation Zone

Non-Contributing areas are primarily areas or spaces, exterior or interior, that may be original to the resource but are of tertiary importance, or are areas and spaces that have been altered so that their historic identity is absent, or else are additive alterations. Non-Contributing zones are not specifically limited by preservation recommendations. Their uses and elements may be altered or changed, but not without consequence to the historic property and, therefore, the Standards generally apply. Where alterations have been undertaken, their removal is allowable.
Building 14 was the assembly hall portion of the first building group of the 20th century CSD, that group consisting of the Building 10 Elementary Dining Hall, its courtyard, the Servery (kitchen), and the Primary School Building 11. That original construction project also included the covered passage that forms the east boundary of the Building 11/14 Courtyard, and which extended Building 11’s south stair in such a way as to separate Buildings 10 and 11. Building 12, an original CSD Boy’s and Girl’s Dormitory, also joins into this integrated unit.

Buildings 11 and 14 were designed and built as a single edifice, and are together the most representative of the Spanish Colonial design style on campus, practically unadulterated at their exteriors by the Modernism of the later CSD buildings. Yet, Building 14 has an interior with a rich design mix. Its Entry Lobby is excellently adorned with Hispanic-style tilework, and is the most elaborate space on campus. The Assembly Hall also embodies Hispanic styling, yet equally presents design features that are specifically Art Deco — seemingly the only such stylistic features on campus — probably indicating the influence of an individual designer, whoever that may have been.

Although its exteriors are, relative to its companions, no more distinctive in their treatments, Building 14 is prominently sited at the Warring Way frontage and just inside the entry drive. Its north, south and east facades all front historically significant public spaces, while its architecture reflects the important public assembly uses within. And in its current realization as an auditorium building for conference uses, its uses and meanings have been retained.

The following provides a summary of Building 14’s exterior features, and identifies the relative significance of each. The few exterior changes that have been made to this building are identified as Non-Contributing.
BLDG 14 – South Elevation
Significant Materials and Elements:
• Painted, board formed concrete walls and trim
• Formed concrete vent screens/grilles
• Concrete balcony structure
• Wood doors, windows and frames
• Clay tile roof and roof edge
• Metal gutters and downspouts
Contributing Materials and Elements:
• Metal louvers and vents
Non-Contributing Materials and Elements:
• Concrete/metal stairs and railing assemblies, including metal balcony rails
• Light fixtures

BLDG 14 – North Elevation
Very Significant Materials and Elements:
• Formed concrete entry portal with incised signage (“Assembly Hall”)
• Wood entry doors
Significant Materials and Elements:
• Painted, board formed concrete walls and trim
• Patterned and stained concrete paving and steps
• Formed concrete vent screens/grilles
• Clay tile roofs and roof edges
Non-Contributing Materials and Elements:
• Original ornamental grilles at door lites removed
• Concrete ramp
• Misc. equipment/furnishings
• Lighting
**BLDG14 - East Elevation**

**Significant Materials and Elements:**
- Painted, board formed concrete walls and trim (@ Southeast Entry)
- Wood entry doors (@ Southeast Entry)
- Clay tile roof (@ Southeast Entry)

**Contributing Materials and Elements:**
- Painted, board formed concrete walls and trim
- Patterned and stained concrete paving and steps
- Formed concrete vent screens/grilles
- Clay tile roofs and roof edges
- Metal gutters and downspouts

**Non-Contributing Materials and Elements:**
- Exit doorway and door
- Wood roof penthouse
- Misc. site equipment/furnishings
- Light fixtures

**BLDG14 - West Elevation**

**Contributing Materials and Elements:**
- Painted, board formed concrete walls and trim
- Formed concrete vent screens/grilles
- Wood windows and trim
- Clay tile roofs and roof edges
- Metal gutters and downspouts
CKC Building 14 was originally an Assembly Hall building for the CSD, housing a set of assembly spaces throughout the first floor, including the Assembly Hall with a stage and balcony, and directly served by formal lobbies and corridors. Original support spaces also included what was labeled a Gymnasium, located behind the stage and connected directly thereto, so this space would have otherwise served as a rehearsal room. Other stage support spaces were a Shop, and a set of class-like rooms labeled Musical Rhythm and Activities Rooms.

Building 14’s original, assembly uses have not changed, although its users have, since it now largely functions as a conference facility. Nonetheless, most of the original, first floor spaces are intact, one exception being the Gymnasium. Originally a 2-story high volume, this space has been subdivided into a set of rooms at the first level, and bisected into two floors with the addition of a new story above, along with a stair and an elevator.

An original Shop space at the south end of the First Floor, while largely intact, has been converted to a classroom, requiring the removal of its original, built-in features, including two small spaces that were labeled Lumber Room and Stain Room.

The only other substantive changes at the first floor was the removal of toilet rooms situated in small spaces adjoining the Main Lobby.

In addition to the First Floor, a very small basement level is located under and connected to the stage via a winding stair, and which was labeled storage. In 1980, that space was remodeled into dressing rooms, and a small storage/mechanical space.

And a small, second floor level was also stacked above the original Shop at the south end of the structure, which is accessed via the open stair from the Lower Lobby. Labeled a Sewing Room, this space was, like the Shop, built-out with casework and a set of storage rooms, all since removed for the reuse of the room as another classroom. What’s more, this space is now connected to the added floor area adjacent, with another classroom, stair hall, and elevator.

Most of these changes have not significantly altered the building. Perhaps the only change that did so is the construction of a wall to disconnect Buildings 11 and 14, where the corridors of the two were once connected.

The following provides descriptions of the building’s interiors, including summaries of their individual characteristics in the form of a prioritized listing of features. This summary of elements does not identify features such as exterior doors, windows and balconies, as those elements are addressed under the exterior descriptions of this HSR. As with exterior elements, most of those identified as Non-Contributing are alterations.
Fig. 19 Building 14

First Floor Plan (from 1931 construction drawings)

Building 11 at bottom left, Building 14 at right (bold line indicates line of segregation)
Lobby

**Historic Designation:** Significant

**Contributing Elements:**
- Ceramic tile wainscots, floors, steps, bases, grilles, niche and drinking fountain
- Ornamental plaster ceilings and ceiling arches
- Flat plaster walls and archway
- Dual, metal handrailings
- Wood interior doors and casings (to Assembly Hall, Ticket Office and Janitor’s)

**Non-Contributing Elements:**
- Acoustic tiles at ceiling
- Light Fixtures
- Signage and bulletin boards
- Operating hardware at doors
- Emergency lighting and signage

**Description:**

Building 14’s Lobby is a beautiful space, and entirely unique on this campus, as it is ornamented with elaborate, Hispanic-style tilework. Although it is from the initial phase of construction of the 20th century CSD, this room also introduces another period, architectural style of the late-1920s, Art Deco, in its semi-arched and stepped ceiling form.

Two sets of wood panel doors enter the Lobby from the exterior Porch, and another two pairs lead from its opposite wall into the Assembly Hall. There is also an arched opening to the balcony stair at the west end of the room, a semi-arched opening up to the corridor at the east end, and two smaller wood doors and frames into the small spaces flanking the exterior entry doors.

Along with the colors of this room (a 1951 schedule of paint colors indicated the walls were to be “peach blossom” and the ceiling “ivory”), other changes include the light fixtures, and the removal of the built-in casework and tilework from the central section of the south wall.

Of further interest here, as well as elsewhere in this building, are the dual handrails at the stairs, one of the few remaining pieces of evidence that this was originally a building that served schoolchildren.
**Assembly Hall**

*Historic Designation: Significant*

**Contributing Elements:**
- Wood wainscots, stage platform and trimwork
- Ornamental plaster ceilings; ceiling, proscenium and balcony arches; balcony rail; wall grilles.
- Flat plaster walls
- Wood flooring
- Wood doors and casings
- Metal railing atop Balcony rail

**Non-Contributing Elements:**
- Acoustic tiles at ceilings and walls
- Light Fixtures
- Draperies and valences
- Theater and sound equipment
- Emergency lighting and signage

**Description:**

Aside from the application of acoustic tiles, colors, and lighting and theatrical equipment — all entirely reversible improvements — the Assembly Hall is an unaltered space, attesting to its original design quality. Like the Lobby, it also introduces the Art Deco style, in fact in greater proportion, to the extent that the room may be described as Deco in character; though its original colors (which included “green gray” walls, and all of the ornamentation, including the ceiling, were “gold bronze” so that the room was far darker - see c1980 snapshot, below) added a greater dose of tradition.

---

*Fig.22: Building 14*

*Assembly Hall*

*Fig.23: Building 14, c1980*

*South end and Balcony of Assembly Hall*
Stage

*Historic Designation: Significant*

*Contributing Elements:*
- Wood stage floor
- Painted, board formed concrete walls, floor and stair structures
- Metal pipe railings
- Flat plaster walls
- Radiator

*Non-Contributing Elements:*
- Light Fixtures
- Theater and sound equipment
- Emergency lighting and signage

Balcony and Balcony Stair

*Historic Designation: Significant*

*Contributing Elements:*
- Concrete floors, floor risers, and wall bases
- Flat and textured plaster walls
- Plaster ceilings
- Wood and metal theater seats
- Dual, metal handrailings
- Radiator
- Projection openings at projection booth

*Non-Contributing Elements:*
- Acoustic tiles at ceiling
- Carpeting at floors and walls
- Interior glazing at windows
- Light fixtures
- Emergency lighting and signage

Lower Lobby

*Historic Designation: Significant*

*Contributing Elements:*
- Painted, board formed concrete walls, archway, ceiling beams and vault
- Stained and patterned concrete floor, and base
- Concrete stairs (concealed)
- Dual, metal handrailings
- Flat plaster walls

*Non-Contributing Elements:*
- Wood base/raceway
- Gyp. board partition
- Flush wood door and metal casing
- Carpeting
- Acoustic tiles at ceiling
- Light fixtures
- Radiator
- Emergency lighting and signage

*Description:*

The Lower Lobby is another elegant entry space, this one tall and crowned by an octagonal, vaulted concrete
ceiling with squinches.

Two pairs of doors enter from terraces at the south and east. From this entry level, a stair ascends to the corridor at the main floor level, and an open stair also ascends from there to the second floor.

This Lobby space is graced, in particular, with multiple shapes — arches, diagonals, an octagonal, and even a circular window.

Hall and Corridor

_Historic Designation: Contributing_

**Contributing Elements:**
- Plaster walls (east/ exterior wall)
- Concrete ceiling beams and archways
- Dual, metal handrailings

**Non-Contributing Elements:**
- Wood base/ raceway
- Acoustic tiles at ceiling
- Carpeting
- Gyp. wallboard and vinyl wallcovering
- Flush doors
- Light fixtures
- Radiator
Classrooms

Historic Designation: Contributing

Contributing Elements:

- Plaster walls
- Wood paneling, trims and casings
- Concrete ceiling beams (at Rm.104)
- Radiators (at Rm.102)

Non-Contributing Elements:

- Wood base/raceway
- Acoustic tiles at ceiling
- Carpeting
- Gyp. wallboard
- Flush doors
- Light fixtures
- Radiators (at Rm.104)
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