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I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The 2222 Piedmont Avenue Historic Structure Report (HSR) has been completed at the request of the University of California, Berkeley (University) to inform planning for the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects (SCIP), initiated in 2005. The preparation of this report implements provisions of the UC Berkeley 2020 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report addressing cultural resources.¹ This HSR was undertaken as part of a larger study of the southeast campus area, specifically the landscape and streetscape of the Piedmont Avenue block between Bancroft Way and the Haas School of Business, the former single-family dwellings at 2222, 2224, 2232, 2234, and 2240 Piedmont Avenue, the former single-family dwellings at 2241 and 2243 College Avenue, Calvin Laboratory, and the landscape around California Memorial Stadium.

According to the National Park Service’s “NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline:”

A Historic Structure Report (HSR) is prepared whenever there is to be a major intervention into historic structures or where activities are programmed that affect the qualities and characteristics that make the property eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The report consists of the collection, presentation, and evaluation of anthropological/archeological, historical and architectural/engineering research findings on a historic or pre-historic structure, and their setting…It analyzes and records all periods of construction (not just significant periods), modifications, source materials, building techniques, other evidence of use, and setting.²

The primary goals of this Historic Structure Report are to analyze concisely the history of the site and building; document existing conditions of systems and elements; and examine the eligibility of 2222 Piedmont Avenue for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

SUBJECT OF THIS STUDY

The subject of this report is the building located at 2222 Piedmont Avenue and its surrounding landscape. 2222 Piedmont Avenue is a Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival structure constructed in 1908 as a single-family home for Charles and Miriam Bancroft. Currently, 2222 Piedmont Avenue is utilized primarily as offices for the Center for Organizational Effectiveness, an internal administrative unit of the University.

¹ UC Berkeley 2020 LRDP EIR Continuing Best Practice CUL-2-a states in part: “If a project could cause a substantial adverse change in features that convey the significance of a primary or secondary resource, an Historic Structures Assessment (HSA) would be prepared.” University of California, Berkeley 2020 LRDP EIR, Volume 1, 4.4-54.
METHODOLOGY

Utilizing standards established by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Page & Turnbull and PGAdesign conducted a conditions assessment and analysis of 2222 Piedmont Avenue and evaluated its eligibility for the National Register. The conclusions in this report are based on fieldwork and archival research led by Eileen Wilde of Page & Turnbull and landscape architects Cathy Garrett and Karen Krolewski of PGAdesign between April 2005 and December 2005.

Architectural Historian Eileen Wilde and University of California, Berkeley Planning Analyst/Historian Steven Finacom conducted research at repositories including the Bancroft Library; the University of California, Berkeley Capital Projects and Facilities Management Archives; the University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design Library; the University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design Archives; the University of California, Berkeley Earth Sciences & Map Library; the City of Berkeley City Clerk Department and Public Works Department; the Alameda County Public Works Department; the Berkeley Public Library; Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA); Berkeley Historical Society; the Oakland Public Library; the Oakland Museum of California; Oakland Heritage Alliance; San Francisco Architectural Heritage; California Historical Society; and the Library of Congress. Architectural Historians Richard Sucré and Christopher VerPlanck, Preservation Planner April Hesik, and Architectural Conservator Mark McMillan contributed to the completion of this report.
II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

EARLY HISTORY OF BERKELEY

The land that encompasses the present-day City of Berkeley was formally granted to Luis Maria Peralta by the King of Spain in 1820. Peralta named the 48,000-acre parcel “Rancho San Antonio” after Saint Anthony of Padua. After receiving the grant, Luis Maria Peralta continued to live in San José, and sent his four sons to live on Rancho San Antonio. In 1842, Luis Maria Peralta divided the rancho between his sons, giving most of what is now Berkeley to son José Domingo Peralta.

Less than a decade later, gold fever struck California, and “Forty-niners” flooded into the remote Mexican state. In 1850, the United States annexed California after winning the territory from Mexico under the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. Statehood brought about the demise of the ranchos. In April 1852, the California State Legislature passed a law stating that a squatter could gain possession of any land not reasonably known to be claimed under an existing title. The only provisions were that the squatter had to make at least $200 of improvements to the land and live on the land either within sixty days or within twelve months if a $15 fee was paid to the county treasurer. In reality, many squatters did not live on their land for years. Since American settlers generally viewed Spanish titles as illegitimate, the new law was used to claim land from the ranchos, resulting in costly and lengthy legal battles for the Spanish owners.

In the summer of 1852, William Hillegass, James Leonard, Francis Kittredge Shattuck, and Shattuck’s brother-in-law, George Blake, filed claims to a square mile of land in the central section of what is now Berkeley. As was common, these four men did not live in Berkeley for years after making their claims. At this time, the future City of Berkeley was almost uninhabited. Mrs. M.K. Blake, the widow of George Blake, wrote in 1896 of Berkeley in 1852: “Not a house between Oakland and Berkeley. Not a house in Berkeley except one small cabin; for, if the Americans attempted to erect a building, the Spanish would tear it down. The cabin they allowed to remain, as they had become friendly with the Americans.”

---

2 Susan Dinkenspiel Cerny, Berkeley Landmarks (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, 1994), 64.
3 Quoted in Ferrier, 28.
Vincente and José Domingo Peralta filed claims for ownership of their rancho lands in January 1852, and the U.S. Supreme Court would eventually confirm their titles in 1855 and 1856. During the intervening years, the Peraltas were unable to hold onto all of their land after suffering huge losses from lawsuits, the dwindling price of land, and cattle thievery. In 1852, Vincente Peralta sold 2,000 acres of his land for a townsite in Oakland, and additional land was sold by both brothers throughout 1852 and 1853. Captain Orrin Simmons gained squatters’ rights to 160 acres of Rancho San Antonio bounded by Strawberry Creek to the north, and the future site of the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind to the south, a tract that includes the present-day project site. In 1857, Simmons purchased the land now occupied by the Greek Theater and California Memorial Stadium from John Bonneron. Captain Simmons’ family lived in a house on the banks of Strawberry Creek approximately where Piedmont Avenue used to terminate (Map 2).

**COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA**

In 1853, the forerunner to the College of California, Contra Costa Academy, was established in Oakland; two years later, the College of California was incorporated. Soon thereafter, the trustees of the College of California began searching for a new campus site removed from the perceived unwholesome temptations of San Francisco and Oakland. One of the only settlers in Berkeley, Captain Orrin Simmons, invited the trustees to look at his land holdings as a possible site. Although Berkeley was still an isolated outpost, it had the advantages of a temperate climate, and a range of hills that provided spectacular vistas of San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate. After much consideration, the trustees decided to relocate the campus to the hills surrounding Strawberry Creek. On 16 April 1860, the future site of the College of California was dedicated at Founders’ Rock.

The process of raising money and acquiring land for the new campus proved to be arduous. Four years after dedicating the new site, the College of California purchased 40-acre tracts from F.K. Shattuck, G.M. Blake, William Hillegass, and James Leonard; each man was given $8,000 for their tract except for Hillegass, who received $9,000. At that time, only Leonard lived in Berkeley at a house on the corner of Telegraph Avenue and Dwight Way. Hillegass would move around 1871 to his land on College Avenue near Bancroft Way, just west of the project site. In August 1864, the

---

6 Ferrier, 26.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., 79.
8 Ibid., 80.
9 Ibid., 49.
10 Ibid., 49.
11 Ibid., 74-75.
12 Ibid., 109, 84.
College of California purchased a tract of land from Captain Simmons that encompassed part of what became the Berkeley Property Tract and the northern part of present-day Piedmont Avenue. The Simmons tract was particularly desirable because it came with water rights.\textsuperscript{13}

A key objective of the College of California trustees was to raise money for the school. To further this goal, the trustees decided to form a real estate group that would sell residential lots to provide financial support for the College. On September 1, 1864, the first real estate venture in Berkeley was launched with the incorporation of the College Homestead Association. 125 shares were offered at $500 apiece, and each share entitled the owner to a one-acre lot. The Association stipulated that a $25-per-share fee could be implemented for improvements like street grading and tree planting. The trustees actively promoted the new development, praising the ideal weather—warmer and sunnier than foggy San Francisco, but not as hot as central California—and noting that upstanding citizens associated with the College would inevitably become residents of the neighborhood.\textsuperscript{14} A map of the College Homestead Association was recorded on May 15, 1866 (Map 1).

\textbf{FREDERICK LAW OLmSTED}

Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903) is considered to be the father of American landscape architecture. At his home, Fairstede, in Brookline, Massachusetts, Olmsted established one of the first professional landscape design firms in the world.\textsuperscript{15} He is responsible for many of the foremost parks and park systems in the United States, including Central Park and Prospect Park in New York; the Metropolitan Parks System in Boston; and the park system in Buffalo, New York. Olmsted’s other notable projects include the grounds for the Biltmore Estate in North Carolina; the suburban residential community of Riverside, Illinois; the U.S. Capitol Grounds; and the grounds of the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition.

During the 1860s, Olmsted still had not committed to the field of landscape architecture. Although he had already designed Central Park with Calvert Vaux, he continued to experiment with different careers, including a position as the general secretary of the United States Sanitary Commission during the Civil War. In 1863, Olmsted decided to move to California to act as manager of the Mariposa Estate for the Mariposa Mining Company. After the mining enterprise began to fail, through no fault

\textsuperscript{13} Victoria Post Ranney, ed., \textit{The Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted: Volume V. The California Frontier, 1863-1865} (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 572; Ferrier, 81.
\textsuperscript{14} Ferrier, 53-57.
\textsuperscript{15} Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site website, \texttt{http://www.nps.gov/ftla/} (accessed September 2005).
of his own, Olmsted traveled to San Francisco in an attempt to straighten out the company’s finances. Left largely abandoned by his employers, he began to look for other work to support his family.

In 1864, Olmsted was hired by the directors of the Mountain View Cemetery Association to design a plan for their cemetery in Oakland. By October 1864, he had also been retained by the College of California to create a plan for their land north and east of the College Homestead Tract.\footnote{Ranney, 571.} It is unclear how Olmsted became associated with the College of California, but it is likely that Frederick Billings brought him to the attention of the trustees. Billings had applied for the original College of California charter, and was also a trustee of the Mariposa Company that was presently employing Olmsted.\footnote{Ranney, 411.} By February 1865, Olmsted was making progress on the two designs:

> I have an engineer at work putting my Cemetery plan upon the ground at Oakland, and as soon as this is done shall employ him in making a topographical survey of lands belonging to the University of California, with a view to laying them out in a park.\footnote{Olmsted mentions the “University of California” in his letter even though the University did not yet exist; it is likely he simply mixed up “College” and “University.” Frederick Law Olmsted (hereafter referred to as FLO) to his father, 11 February 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 316.}

The engineer mentioned above was Edward C. Miller, who had traveled to California with Olmsted. In a letter to his wife, Mary Perkins Olmsted, Olmsted described Miller’s role: “Miller is employed only as a mechanical agent in the Landscape Gardening. He is industrious & accurate, conscientious & zealous in his work.”\footnote{FLO to his wife, 12 February 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 317.} In March, the two traveled to Berkeley to ride around the College Property hills despite rain and snow squalls.\footnote{FLO to his wife, 1 March 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 320.} Apparently downhearted at the failure of the Mariposa Company, and living in a hotel away from his family for two months, Olmsted wrote to Calvert Vaux in mid-March: “I have…made a preliminary reconnaissance of a large piece of ground held by the College of California which I propose to lay out upon the Llewellyn plan. It is accursed country with no trees & no turf and it’s a hard job to make sure of any beauty.”\footnote{FLO to Vaux, 12 March 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 325. The “Llewellyn plan” refers to Llewellyn Park, a residential development laid out in the 1850s in present-day West Orange, New Jersey by Llewellyn S. Haskell. It was the “first residential park in the country to be laid out in the romantic or natural style of landscape architecture.” Ranney, 326.}

On June 22, 1865, College of California President Samuel Hopkins Willey wrote to Olmsted asking him to survey the College grounds and provide the trustees with a map and “ideas as to the general outlay.”\footnote{Willey to FLO, 22 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 571.} After receiving the letter, Olmsted wrote Miller about starting work on the project:
I have today a letter from Mr Willey asking what outlay would be required for the survey which I proposed should be made on the College grounds and which he thinks of having made at the same time with a survey and plat of an extension of the College Homestead Tract, which will soon be needed. I have replied that I have advised you fully what I should need with reference to a study for the “Park” grounds, and that I prefer that he should deal directly with you for the survey, which I presume that you will now be able to undertake whenever necessary on the same terms, as those made with the Cemetery Company.23

On July 7, at a meeting of the trustees of the College of California, a committee was appointed by the President and Secretary to “secure the services of Fr. Law Olmsted [sic] in laying out the College Park, and agreed with him as to terms, and the method of doing work.”24 Olmsted wrote his father on July 24 that he had “undertaken to lay out a village and grounds for the College of Calif. which will occupy what time I have to spare for a month or two.”25 The next day, he wrote Willey a detailed letter about possible names for the town that would become Berkeley, suggesting that a Spanish name be picked since it was appropriate to the region and most simple English names had been overused.26

While Olmsted was working on the plans for the College of California, Vaux was furiously campaigning to get him back to New York to work on Prospect Park in Brooklyn. During the spring of 1865, Vaux sent several letters to convince him to “[see] your destiny in our art” and return to New York to become a full-time landscape architect.27 But Olmsted resisted, saying:

I am sorry to say that I do not feel myself capable of being a landscape gardener—properly speaking—but I have a better and more cultivated taste in that department of art than any other, very much—having none in any other—and if I had the necessary quality of memory, or if my memory had been educated in botany and gardening when I was young, I might have been. But I can do anything with proper assistants, or money enough—anything that any man can do...But I don’t feel strong on the art side. I don’t feel myself an artist, I feel rather as if it was sacrilegious in me to post myself in the portals of Art...I should like very well to go into the Brooklyn park, or anything else—if I really believed I could get a decent living out of it—but in landscape work in general I never had any ground for supposing that I could.28

23 FLO to Edward C. Miller, 26 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 398-400.
24 7 July 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
25 FLO to his father, 24 July 1865. The Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted, Box 26, Reel 24, “City and Regional Planning, Berkeley, Calif., 1865-1866.” Held by the Library of Congress.
27 Vaux to FLO, 10 May 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 359.
28 FLO to Vaux, circa 8 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 390.
On July 19, the Central Park Commission Executive Committee reappointed Olmsted and Vaux as Landscape Architects for Central Park.\textsuperscript{29} Vaux hoped that the combination of the appointment and the tantalizing opportunity to design Prospect Park in Brooklyn would convince Olmsted to return east and accept his fate as a landscape architect.

By August, Olmsted had agreed to return to New York and take up his duties in Olmsted, Vaux, & Co., but warned Vaux that he could not rush home. Instead, he planned to stay in California to fulfill his responsibilities to the Mariposa Company; prepare his family for another move; try to convince San Franciscans to create a city park; work on protecting Yosemite from development; and finish the work for the College of California. Olmsted wrote Vaux: “I’m bound to go thro’ with the college, and I may want to do something more which would pay expenses of living here for a while.”\textsuperscript{30} He also asked Vaux to look at some sites in Paris that could help him with the Berkeley plan.

On August 8, the College of California trustees voted to “contract with [Olmsted] to make the survey and lay out the grounds agreeing to pay therefore, One thousand dollars in check, and fifteen hundred Dollars in land at the valuation placed on it for sale by the Trustees.”\textsuperscript{31} Olmsted continued to work on the “College park”—as he and Willey called the land between the branches of Strawberry Creek (as opposed to the land laid out in a grid for the College Homestead Association)—throughout the end of August, and on September 4, Olmsted presented his findings to Willey and the College committee.\textsuperscript{32} Apparently pleased with these findings, at the next trustee meeting, Willey bought a piece of land from the Simmons Tract for his new home. At the same meeting, the committee asked for additional time to survey the land.\textsuperscript{33}

On September 22, Willey asked Olmsted to lay out the northerly part of Piedmont Way—extending from Dwight Avenue to Strawberry Creek—because people were asking about purchasing lots and the College needed the income. In particular, a Mr. Palmer of Folsom wanted to buy a lot near Willey’s in the Simmons Tract and build on it that fall. Willey wrote Olmsted “I have written [Palmer] that I will inform him immediately on the receipt of the proper map from you, setting forth streets, dimensions, &c., of that particular vicinity...Others are looking that way with the idea of purchasing as

\textsuperscript{29} Ranney, 407.
\textsuperscript{30} FLO to Vaux, 1 August 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 421.
\textsuperscript{31} 8 August 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
\textsuperscript{32} Ranney, 571.
\textsuperscript{33} 5 September 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
soon as we get the map, i.e. the map of that particular part of the Simmons tract. For the other parts we are in no haste.”

While working on the plan, Olmsted was also packing to move back east. He reassured Vaux in a letter that he was committed to their partnership: “I shall bring work enough to keep Miller busy for fully a month after arrival I think. I only work out the park plan crudely here, so as to have your help on it. The profit of it I intend to share with you—also to put O. & V. to the engraved Cemetery plan if you approve. This latter also to be finished in N. York.”

By the October 3 meeting of the College trustees, Olmsted had apparently completed a draft survey of his plan:

The Secretary presented the draft of a portion of the Survey, from Mr. Olmsted, conveying that portion of the Simmons tract lying immediately East of the College Homestead Grounds, showing the Park and the Piedmont Way, as ground reserved for public purposes. By vote the Map was adopted...Messeurs Sherman, Simson and Willey were by vote, appointed a Committee to divide the portion of the Simmons land covered by the map just received from Mr. Olmsted, into lots for same, and determine the prices of the same.

This map had presumably been lost, but a copy of an 1868 map of the Berkeley Property Tract surveyed by Alameda County Surveyor William Boardman was recently discovered at the Alameda County Public Works Department with the original College of California seal; the seal appears to contain a date of 1865 (Map 2). Though unconfirmed, it seems possible that this is the version of the Berkeley Property plan as surveyed by Miller, and was handed in haste to the trustees immediately before Olmsted departed from California. Although the title block of the map indicates a date of 1868, the title block could easily have been a later addition. If this is the case, Boardman may have used the Olmsted/Miller plan as a base, confirming that Olmsted and Miller laid out the alignment and dimensions of this portion of Piedmont Way.

The three street names for the Berkeley Property Tract—Piedmont, Prospect, and Hillside—came into usage immediately after the October 3, 1865 meeting. It is assumed that Olmsted named these streets as they are typical of the naming conventions he used on other projects: “Piedmont,” meaning lying at the base of the mountains or hills; “Prospect” for the street located on higher ground and

---

34 Willey to FLO, 22 September 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 572.
35 Olmsted had not yet been hired by the City of San Francisco to design a park, so the “park plan” he refers to in this letter has to be for the College of California. FLO to Vaux, 28 September 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 444.
from where the best views could be obtained; and “Hillside,” a short street tucked into a steep corner of the Tract. In the case of naming, he had a practice of using words that were descriptive of the landscape, the land’s use, or archaic and somewhat poetic descriptions of topographic features of that particular locality. Examples include the North Meadow, the Ramble, Scholars’ Gate, and the Dene, all in Central Park; the Long Meadow and Lullwater in Prospect Park; and Deepdene in Druid Hills in Atlanta. Olmsted's unsuccessful suggestions for naming the Berkeley campus site followed similar themes. As he wrote to Willey:

I think the best way to form an English name is to find a word signifying something characteristic of the place to be named, or the name of a person, event or quality which would be satisfactorily associated with it; and if the word or name is not sufficiently agreeable in itself, complete it with some of the old English terminations of localities...

Among his campus name suggestions were Bushnellwood, Billingsbrook, Lincolnwold, Laurelwood, Shelterwood, and Blythhaven, and several Spanish names including La Vistora (the beautiful), Villapaca (place of observation or outlook), and Villa-hermosa (beautiful).

During that same October 3 meeting, it was noted that additional land had been purchased from Hillegass and Shattuck for the Homestead Tract, and a vote was taken that gave authorization to the Corporation to take title to land “lying Easterly of the College Site, known as the Hill or Mountain land not included in the Survey of the Ranchos of Domingo and Vicente Peralta by Julius Kellersberger, filed in the Recorders Office of Alameda County.” 38 Ten days later, Olmsted and his family sailed for New York.

**Olmsted's Report to the College of California**

Frederick Law Olmsted’s report for the College of California would eventually be completed and published in 1866. The Berkeley report was titled, “Report Upon a Projected Improvement of the Estate of the College of California, at Berkeley, Near Oakland by Olmsted, Vaux & Co., Landscape Architects,” with a cover that simply read “Berkeley Neighborhood.” 39

---

36 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
38 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
39 The report would be printed more than once; this version was printed by Wm. C. Bryant & Co. in New York in 1866.
In his report, Olmsted lays out his broad vision for the new residential neighborhood and for the campus. While he does give some specific information, the overarching intention appears to create a framework within which others can later make decisions. These later refinements would help fulfill his plan. Olmsted addresses the development of the College’s property by defining three main elements: first, the creation of a neighborhood of “refined and elegant homes,” close to the main body of the campus; second, establishment of a neighborhood that is tranquil, attractive to scholars, and discouraging of noisy, disruptive commerce; and third, a plan for showing the layout of campus buildings as needed by the College, with accommodations for future growth, along with sufficient grounds and gardens to permit exercising.40

Olmsted’s focus was on developing an exemplary residential neighborhood on the land known as the Berkeley Property Tract. Olmsted described the design as being complete in every feasible way and as one that would induce and attract the kinds of buyers that were likely to build the desired elegant houses. For some years, Olmsted had been developing an interest in environments that fostered what he saw as the best social qualities in creating idealized communities. Here he had an opportunity to help shape a community from its beginning. At the College of California, Olmsted felt that scholars would be amongst the buyers and they “… should be prepared to lead, not to follow reluctantly after, the advancing line of civilization. To be qualified as leaders they must have an intelligent appreciation of and sympathy with the real life of civilization.”41

Olmsted described the qualities he felt necessary for a fine development:

What, then, are the requisites (exterior to private ground) of an attractive neighborhood, besides good neighbors…? The most important, I believe, will be found in all cases to be that of good out-goings from the private grounds, whether with reference to social visiting, or merely to the pleasure and healthfulness of occasional changes of scene, and more extended free movement than it is convenient to maintain the means of exercising within private grounds. For this purpose the common roads and walks of the immediate neighborhood, at all times of the year, must be neither muddy, nor dusty, nor rough, nor steep, nor excessively exposed to the heat of the sun or the fierceness of the wind.42

As well as having roads and walks that provide for both comfortable and healthy enjoyment, Olmsted felt that the neighborhood should have lots sized to provide privacy from the houses, and good views

41 Ibid., 548.
42 Ibid., 554.
should be both available and contrived from the public and private domains by making best use of the landscape’s natural features.

Following within less than a decade of his successful entry to design New York’s Central Park, Olmsted’s work at the College of California can be considered among his early projects. His “Report upon a Projected Improvement” is his first compilation of thoroughly described thoughts on neighborhood roads and walks. As with his later residential neighborhood designs, it took decades before the Berkeley Property Tract was fully settled and his projections fulfilled. Indeed in Berkeley, the area became so successful that the land was subdivided into considerably smaller parcels of land than the one- to five-acre lots Olmsted envisioned.

The crucial first step in any new residential area is to lay out the roads so that their form and alignment could be preserved and reinforced as the population grows.\textsuperscript{43} In relation to the roads of the Berkeley Property Tract, Olmsted guides those who will follow him and who will implement his plan by drawing on East Coast memories of “shady old lanes running through a close and overarching bowery of foliage… such an ideal should be fixed before whoever is placed in charge of your improvements.”\textsuperscript{44} In relation to the edges of the lanes, he says: “the borders of the roads should be absolutely neat or even nice; there should be no raw banks or bare neglected looking places, nor drifts of rubbish by their side.”\textsuperscript{45} To achieve this effect, Olmsted recommends using native species of trees and shrubs as they are likely to prosper without irrigation, or if non-native plants are used, the trustees should make allowances for providing irrigation.

The phraseology that Olmsted uses in describing the public thoroughfares of his new neighborhood shed light on their intended character. He uses the phrases “shaded roads,” “sylvan lanes,” and “…thick plantation similar to that proposed to be formed by the sides of the lanes…”\textsuperscript{46} Getting down to specifics, he describes the width of what we think of today as Piedmont Avenue as being “generally… within a distance of a hundred feet or more.”\textsuperscript{47} Within this right-of-way, access is provided to the subdivided land “by lanes bordered, as already explained, on each side by continuous thick groves, and access to each private lot from these lanes is arranged by short approaches

\textsuperscript{43} Charles E. Beveridge and Paul Rocheleau, \textit{Frederick Law Olmsted, Designing the American Landscape} (New York: Universe, 1998), 106.
\textsuperscript{44} Frederick Law Olmsted, “Report Upon a Projected Improvement of the Estate of the College of California, at Berkeley, Near Oakland,” 29 June 1866. Reproduced in Ranney, 561.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 560.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 564-566.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 560.
branching from them.”

By using the plural “lanes,” the suggestion of a pair of vehicular lanes—in other words, a divided road—is there.

In part of the plan beyond the study area, Olmsted describes sinuous roads that connect to the ridgeline up Strawberry Canyon and to Oakland along the toe of the foothills. In the context of roads addressed by his plan in general, he recognizes that within the rights of way, shady lanes may be “sometimes allowed to divide into two parts.” While he is not specific about the location of possible divisions of lanes by medians, he had that concept in mind at the Berkeley Property Tract. He had certainly recognized the advantages of separating paths for different modes of transport in his work at Central Park where carriage roads, bridle paths, and pedestrian paths are laid out as individual entities.

With their successful entry in the design competition for New York’s Central Park, Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux helped the fledgling profession of landscape architecture take a leap forward. Olmsted was a passionate man, interested and active in political, literary, and social movements of his day. By the time he began discussions with the trustees of the College of California, he was 42 years old and had been a gentleman farmer, served as publisher of political and literary journals—one of which is still in circulation today—acted as executive of the U.S. Sanitary Commission (which evolved into the Red Cross), and had demonstrated his administrative abilities in efficiently running a large organization. While not all of his endeavors were considered highly successful, he undertook them with great commitment and serious-minded thought.

It is with this background that Olmsted had traveled to California in 1863 to manage the great mining endeavor at the Mariposa Estate. There he further developed his humanist thoughts about society and the civilizing influence that one’s surroundings, the landscape, could have. In relation to Central Park, Olmsted spoke of a natural environment providing relief to tired workers. In his “Report upon a Projected Improvement” for the College of California, Olmsted spends considerable time discussing the advantages of laying out the roads, lots, and views to provide a stage for controlled social discourse for scholars and others attracted to the new neighborhood. In California, unlike the
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long settled East Coast, Olmsted could apply his social and design attitudes in his approach to shaping a residential settlement from the ground up.

The layout of roads and lots at the Berkeley Property Tract gave Olmsted an opportunity to begin putting his thoughts about community and social life in tangible, physical form. His report to the trustees of the College of California about the nature of planned settlement is not a tentative first step in developing his ideas. This, the first significant text on the topic, describes Frederick Law Olmsted’s vision with passion and gusto.

The ideas described in his report form a well thought through vision; the result of the efforts of an experienced, traveled, and mature mind. Yet they form just an outline compared to later descriptions of residential planning projects in various parts of the country. Olmsted was in the first decade of what would become his life’s work: shaping and refining such ideas. As a designer, one tends to build and develop ideas over time. Olmsted’s work at the College of California may well have laid the groundwork for later designs, particularly in the areas of public thoroughfares and neighborhood planning.

In 1868, just three years after returning to New York from California, Olmsted had developed, for the City of Brooklyn, the design for the first parkway.\(^5\) This design was an extrapolation of thoughts initially discussed in his report for the College of California. It is not to say that Olmsted intended Piedmont Way to be a parkway; however, his descriptions of a public street planned and used as a pleasurable social environment—just as a continuous pleasure ground would be—and his intention for it to be connected to Oakland—particularly the vicinity of Mountain View Cemetery—via a scenic route along the foot of the hills demonstrate a common ancestry of Piedmont Way and parkways.

Also in 1868, Olmsted and Vaux prepared a plan for the layout of the residential neighborhood of Riverside, just outside Chicago. Perhaps the most comprehensive of Olmsted’s residential plans, Riverside was built on notions first explored in the layout of the Berkeley Property Tract. Roads and walks were to be well drained, for easy passage in all weather, and curvilinear to discourage through traffic and to enhance the experience and atmosphere of the neighborhood. The advantageous social effect of having good sidewalks was discussed at both Riverside and at Piedmont Way; they were to be designed to encourage a sense of community. Olmsted also saw Riverside connected with the City

\(^5\) Beverage and Rocheleau, 44.
of Chicago by a shaded parkway just as he described the connection between Piedmont Way and the Campus with the City of Oakland.  

The creation of residential neighborhoods came to be a subject of great importance to Frederick Law Olmsted. Later, as he bequeathed his practice to his sons on his retirement, he mentioned the work laying out residential subdivisions in Boston saying that the comprehensive improvement of the suburbs was “by far our most important work.”

**The Berkeley Property Tract**  
The original boundaries of the Berkeley Property Tract extended north to Strawberry Creek, east beyond Prospect Street, south to Dwight Way, and west to College Avenue (Map 2). The first house constructed in the Berkeley Property Tract was for College of California President Willey. Willey purchased a five-acre tract on Dwight Way between College (then Audubon) Avenue and Piedmont Way, and his house was completed in December 1865. Willey’s daughter, Mrs. Maria Willey Gray, later reminisced about her childhood in the home:

> We occupied the old cottage at 2709 Dwight Way as children and recall when ours was the only home with the exception of the farm houses within miles of the campus…No streets were made or used in our time not even Dwight Way. The only roads being those traversed by the farmers in going to and fro to Oakland. And even that only had sandy lanes…Personally, I used to run around with my sunbonnet on and tell the people where the streets were to be…

As can be inferred from the above quote, the process of developing the land around the campus was extremely slow, partially because people were wary about whether the College was going to succeed. It also did not help that the campus itself remained devoid of any development because of a lack of funds.

By April 1866, lots in the Berkeley Property were beginning to sell. C.T.H. Palmer had purchased lots on the east side of Piedmont just north of Bancroft Way, and A.G. Stiles bought the neighboring parcel to the north; on May 1, W.N. Slocum purchased land in the Simmons Tract near Strawberry Creek. Owners were to “bear their proportion of all expenses of constructing and keeping in repair
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such streets laid down on the plan of the College Grounds, as may be adjacent to the lands purchased,” but for some reason, Mr. Slocum was allowed to opt out of this arrangement. In May 1866, Mrs. Orrin Simmons purchased a little more than an acre of Slocum’s land facing Strawberry Creek for $1,160. The Simmons family had moved to Oakland after selling their land to the College of California, but Mrs. Simmons missed Berkeley and wanted to be able to return to the site of her former home. William Ferrier, in his 1933 history of Berkeley, wrote: “The old home site on the banks of Strawberry Creek, at the end of Piedmont Avenue, always was an attractive spot to the members of the Simmons family. The boys would come out from Oakland often for picnics on the banks of the stream…” In 1869, Mrs. Simmons would add to her Berkeley holdings by purchasing a one-acre tract in the Berkeley Property Tract from Professor Henry Durant, and after her husband died in Oakland in 1890, she moved back to Berkeley and lived at the north end of Piedmont Avenue until her death in 1895.

At the May 7, 1866 meeting, much discussion was devoted to the naming of the town and streets:

The committee on the matter of naming the town and streets reported, recommending that there should be scientific streets and literary ways—the streets to run north and south, the ways east and west; that the streets be called in alphabetical order after the names of American men of science, and the ways in like order after American men of letters; that the town should be called Peralta. The streets, beginning on the east side: Audubon [now College Avenue], Bowditch, Choate [now Telegraph Avenue], Dana, Ellsworth, Fulton, Guyot, [now Shattuck Avenue], Henry, Inman, John Jay, Kent, Lieber, Mitchell. The ways, beginning on the north side: Allston, Bancroft, Channing, Dwight, Everett, Felton, Goodrich, Hawthorne, Irving, Jarvis, Knap, Lowell, Motley.

Since “Piedmont Way” had been previously mentioned at the October 3, 1865 meeting, it appears that Frederick Law Olmsted might have chosen the name for this street. Regardless, the committee for streets was only charged with naming the streets in the grid pattern, thereby excluding Piedmont Way. The town name of “Peralta” was rejected by the trustees. At the May 24 meeting, adopting a suggestion from Trustee Billings, the town was named “Berkeley” after philosopher George Berkeley who famously wrote: “Westward the course of empire takes its way.”

By the end of June 1866, Olmsted had completed his report for the College of California with the help of Calvert Vaux, and the report was printed in New York and submitted to the trustees. By July,
the report for Mountain View Cemetery had also been completed. Olmsted was apparently very unhappy with his report and wrote to Charles Eliot Norton in September 1866:

I am so unhappy in my ability to say what ails me…The California College report especially is a mere hint and yet it is an over statement and an incoherent stumbling over statement of some ideas that I do possess and think of no little material importance. I don’t suppose that by six months later I could set them forth fairly, as they really govern me. Considerable parts of some of the reports were written by Vaux who knows what it is he thinks better than I.

Olmsted sent the trustees the report, a photograph of the map titled “Study for Laying Out the Berkeley Neighborhood Including the Grounds of the College of California” (Map 3), a plan of the site for the college, and a linen engineer’s plan to be used for laying out roads in the field.

One of the major obstacles to building new homes in the Berkeley Property and College Homestead Tract was the lack of water. Water was a problem for many new developments in California. In July 1866, the trustees voted to build water works to bring water from the springs to the College grounds. President Willey, who built the first house in the College development, reminisced in 1887 about the construction of the water works: “Early in the month of August [1867] the water-works were so far completed that they were ready for use. But few residences besides my own had at that time been built in all that region, though the owners of many lots proposed to improve them by the use of water and have them in readiness for future building.” The reservoir was built near the present-day location of California Memorial Stadium, and the water works opened with much fanfare on August 26, 1867. The *Alta California* reported on the opening of the water works:

When its attractions as a place for suburban residences are fully known people will make their future home there because within a reasonable distance of the city is there another place possessing so many desirable advantages: the city within sight, the bay and the Golden Gate in front, and the mountains for a background, sending down living water, with a foreground already the garden of the state, a college within speaking distance, and a climate of surpassing loveliness all the year around.
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During the same year, the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind (later the California Schools for the Deaf and Blind) relocated to Berkeley and built its campus southeast of the intersection of Dwight and Piedmont Ways.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

During the mid-1860s, California Governor F.F. Low moved to use money provided under the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act to start a new state university. After viewing the beautiful—albeit empty—College of California campus, Berkeley was chosen as the new home for an Agricultural, Mining and Mechanical Arts College to be built on land next to the College of California site.

At the 1867 College of California commencement, Governor Low proposed merging the College of California with the planned university—the College had the land, and the State had the money to develop an institute of higher learning. After some debate, the College of California trustees voted on October 7, 1867 to dissolve. The College of California assets were given to the State for the university with the stipulation that the new school must include a College of Letters for the study of humanities and liberal arts, instead of solely being an agricultural and mechanical school. The State agreed with these terms, and on March 23, 1868, California Governor Henry H. Haight signed the Organic Act, forming the University of California.

Shortly after the University was officially established, Alameda County Surveyor William F. Boardman completed the “Map of a Portion of the Berkeley Property Situated between the University of California and the State Deaf, Dumb and Blind Asylum, Oakland, Alameda Co., As Laid Out by F.L. Olmsted, Officially adopted by the Board of Trustees of the College of California, May 5, 1868” (Map 4). As mentioned previously, a copy of this map has recently been found with what appears to be an 1865 College of California stamp on it (Map 2). Interestingly, both the names “University” and “College” of California are used on the two maps as the transition from one to the other occurred in 1868. Certainly, Boardman recorded the survey; he may possibly also have checked, formalized and completed an extant survey. The legal descriptions of the parcels sold prior to May 1868 conform perfectly with the recorded plan, suggesting the plan predated Boardman.

The map commonly called the “Boardman Map,” that may more accurately be authored by Olmsted/Miller, shows three streets that are not part or extensions of the street grid established by the College Homestead Association Tract (Maps 1 & 4). They are shown as Piedmont Way, Prospect
Street, and Hillside Avenue. These streets deviate from the grid pattern seen at the College Homestead in their curvilinear alignment, general adherence to following the contours of the topography, and avoidance of Strawberry Creek. A comparison of these roads to road layouts in Central Park and Mountain View Cemetery—two Olmsted projects that both preceded the work at the College of California—as well as later Olmsted residential and park developments, support the notion that the alignment of these three streets is characteristically Olmstedian.

Boardman was hired by the College of California trustees to draw the map to increase sales. Only five lots in the Tract had been sold by 1867, but after the map was drawn, twenty-two lots were sold in the next year. Olmsted’s name was likely attached to the map for prestige, and in fact, a handbill advertising the Berkeley Property Tract also noted that Olmsted had laid out the neighborhood. On August 31, 1869, just before the College trustees disbanded, they recommended that Olmsted be paid $2,000 plus interest for his work on the campus.

The new University of California was slow to develop. The University first moved into the former College of California campus in Oakland while they embarked on a building campaign. By December 1872, University President Daniel G. Gilman wrote Frederick Law Olmsted to tell him that the University had decided to construct University buildings on the lots marked on Olmsted’s plan for the Berkeley Neighborhood (Map 3) as designated for residential use, undermining a key element in Olmsted’s vision for the college. However, Gilman was likely not referring to the Berkeley Property Tract. It appears that the Berkeley Property Tract was not transferred to the University of California when the College of California dissolved, likely because lots in the Tract had already been sold and no longer belonged to the College of California. This is further underscored by the title block on the 1868 Boardman map, which states that the Tract was situated “between” the University of California campus and the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind. Gilman was likely referring to other portions of the campus that had been marked for residential use, labeled with a “B” on Olmsted’s plan (Map 3). Gilman also asked Olmsted to return to work on the campus.

I have been greatly instructed by your printed report on the site. You know probably that the University has inherited these grounds from the college—that they have been partially laid out and planted with trees, and that large costly buildings are going
up…I wish every day that you were here that the University might avail itself of your
counsels during the development of the estate.\textsuperscript{73}

Gilman also remarked that Olmsted’s plat was missing, and Olmsted said he could not find the design
or topographical map in his papers.\textsuperscript{74} Just a few weeks later, Gilman asked Olmsted again: “The only
thing to be done is to get you here again. Would you consider the subject next summer?”\textsuperscript{75} But Olmsted
would never work on the campus again.

By the beginning of 1873, a topographical survey was being completed by the United States Coast
Survey and trees and plants donated by a Mr. Nolan “and other liberal nurserymen” were transplanted
on campus.\textsuperscript{76} Throughout the summer of 1873, campus buildings were constructed and the site was
graded, and in September 1873, the University of California officially moved from Oakland to their
new home in Berkeley. In 1874, William Hammond Hall was hired to create a new plan for the
University; Hall possibly used Olmsted’s report, or at least read his report, when he planned the
campus.\textsuperscript{77} Hall wrote Olmsted for advice on laying out the Berkeley campus and Golden Gate Park,
and mentioned to Olmsted that he thought the University gardener had Olmsted’s plat and took it
with him when he left.\textsuperscript{78}

The campus town grew very slowly, mainly because of a lack of public transportation to and from
Berkeley. Most of the students and professors continued to live in Oakland or other neighboring
areas. Oakland was burgeoning because it was the docking point for ferries traveling to San Francisco,
and in 1869, became the western terminus for the transcontinental railroad after the terminus
relocated from Alameda. In 1872, the horse-drawn streetcar had finally been extended to Berkeley
from Oakland but moved at a glacial pace.\textsuperscript{79} President Gilman reported to the University regents in
1875: “The neighborhood of Berkeley grows but slowly. There is in it no school, no practicing
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physician, and but few and indifferent stores. The walks and roads are in a bad condition most of the year, and the inconveniences of family life are great.80

In 1876, the railroad arrived in Berkeley with a station at the intersection of Center Street and Shattuck Avenue. By 1877, the trains were connected to San Francisco via ferry, and in 1878, cross-country trains were connected to the Berkeley stations.81 The arrival of the railroad caused the small business center of Berkeley to move west from Telegraph Avenue closer to Shattuck Avenue.82 On April 1, 1878, the Town of Berkeley was officially incorporated, combining the small academic village of Berkeley with the bayside manufacturing settlement of Ocean View (now West Berkeley). The University also expanded, and when Olmsted returned to California in 1886 to work on a plan for Stanford University, he wrote to Leland Stanford in dismay after seeing the Berkeley campus, saying that the college buildings and “all the grounds and offices about them betrays heedlessness of the requirements of convenience and comfort under the conditions of the situation and climate.”83

THE 2200 BLOCK AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Although the arrival of the railroad did spur some growth, at the end of the nineteenth century, Berkeley was still a small town. The 1891 Birdseye View of Berkeley map shows miles and miles of empty lots between the University core and Ocean View, with development clustered in three spots: around the University campus; at the pier on San Francisco Bay; and along University Avenue (Map 6). The Berkeley Property Tract had only been partially developed with several private homes and a few group living quarters and still had an almost rural feel in places (Images 1-5).

The 2200 block of Piedmont Way and College Avenue began to be developed in the 1870s. It was located very close to the University and had a beautiful setting next to Strawberry Canyon with spectacular views of San Francisco Bay, making it likely one of the more sought-after areas of the Berkeley Property Tract. Several structures on the 2200 block were residences of people associated with the University, including Professor Frederick Slate, future University Appointments Secretary May Lucretia Cheney, Dean of Mining Samuel Christy, and Professor Joseph LeConte. The Slate house (1883) stood in the vicinity of today’s Calvin Laboratory, immediately to the north of the Cheney house at 2241 College (1885). Dean Christy’s house (1887) was located on Piedmont Way, roughly east of the Cheney house. The LeConte house (circa 1884) was just west of Piedmont Way on
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Bancroft Way. The Zeta Psi fraternity, the first Greek letter collegiate organization formed at a college west of the Mississippi, occupied a large, Mansard-roofed house (1876) approximately where 2251 College (1911) stands today (Map 10).84

In addition, residents unaffiliated with the University owned or rented homes on the block. The lot at 2245 College was infilled around 1894-96 with a house built by Mrs. Harriet J. Lee. Lee does not appear to have had a direct University affiliation, although she appears to have rented space to students. Two cottages designed by Julia Morgan were later built on the back of this lot, just south of 2243 College Avenue. By 1900, the Berkeley Property Tract was becoming one of the most desirable neighborhoods in Berkeley, as evidenced by this remark in the Berkeley Daily Gazette: “M.L. Wurtz has lately finished three very beautiful and spacious houses on College avenue [sic], near Bancroft way [sic]. They form a superb addition to the architectural beauty of this choice residence district.”85

Some of the houses on the 2200 block of Piedmont Way were developed as Olmsted intended, especially the houses on the east side of the block, which were large single-family houses set far back on their lots to afford the best views of San Francisco Bay and the town below. The most notable of these homes were the two “Palmer Houses;” separate mansions designed for two prosperous brothers named H.A. Palmer and C.T.H. Palmer, by noted architect Clinton Day, who designed several early buildings on the University campus. The Palmer brothers and Day had a familial connection; both Palmer brothers had married sisters of Clinton Day.86 The Palmer Houses stood on the wooded slope on the east side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Way where California Memorial Stadium currently stands (Images 1, 2, & 4). Clinton Day owned a substantial home at the northwest corner of Bancroft and Piedmont Ways (1877) (Images 2 & 6).

Despite the presence of these large, ornate homes, by the end of the nineteenth century, it became common for large lots in the Berkeley Property Tract to be auctioned off to create smaller house sites. For example, in 1893, the Benton Property, located at the northeast corner of Piedmont and Channing Ways, was auctioned off and subdivided into 38 lots, which were far smaller in size than Olmsted’s ideal.

83 FLO to Leland Stanford, 27 November 1886. Reproduced in Ranney, 457.
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The lots on the 2200 block of College Avenue and Piedmont Way varied in size. This appears to be in keeping with the original layout of the area, since the 1868 map also shows an irregular pattern of lot sizes (Map 4). The two lots at the northeast corner of the block—owned by the Simmons family—were quite large and took up more than one-quarter of the block (Map 7). The Simmons family had moved to Oakland after selling their tract to the College of California, but re-purchased part of their land for recreational use, adding a house to the site in 1890.\(^7\) The west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue remained largely undeveloped during the nineteenth century, likely because the Simmons family owned most of the frontage on the west side of the street. Block books from the 1880s suggest that most of the lots along College Avenue were 100 feet wide and approximately 260 feet deep, but by 1887, the lots in the center of the block had been divided in half, resulting in 50-foot frontages along College Avenue (Map 8). On the northwest corner of the block, Bernard Moses had amassed three adjacent lots by 1902, giving him a large parcel with a 283' frontage along College Avenue.

**BERKELEY’S BUILDING BOOM**

The beginning of the twentieth century would bring phenomenal growth to Berkeley. By 1910, Berkeley had become the fifth largest city in California after its population tripled between 1900 and 1910, a pace only bettered by three other United States cities.\(^8\) Although a great deal of the expansion was due to the 1906 Earthquake and Fire in San Francisco, which drove many refugees to Berkeley, the town was expanding even before the Earthquake. The construction of the Key System ferryboat and streetcar network made transportation between San Francisco and the East Bay quick and affordable, spurring the development of numerous residential tracts in Berkeley and Oakland. This growth in turn led to more intensive commercial development in downtown Berkeley. Berkeley’s commercial and civic core evolved during this period from a district of low-rise, wood-frame buildings into a substantial urban district, with numerous large masonry buildings and stately public facilities. General economic prosperity, and the rapid growth of the University in enrollment, programs, and prestige under the leadership of President Benjamin Ide Wheeler (1899-1919), also factored in the physical growth of the town during this era.

The rapid population growth in Berkeley spurred new civic improvements for both the University and the town. Between 1898 and 1899, Phoebe Apperson Hearst sponsored an international competition to find an architect to design a master plan for the University campus. The contest
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brought international recognition to the University. The winning campus plan, submitted by French architect Emile Bénard, was laid out on the concept of thematically grouped buildings. Bénard’s plan was revised by fourth-place-finisher John Galen Howard, who was appointed Supervising Architect for the University. Interestingly, in 1895, Frederick Law Olmsted was approached about entering a contest for the campus planning in a letter from University Regent J.B. Reinstein:

I am informed by Secretary Bonté and President Kellogg, that you once made a plan for the laying out of the grounds and of the buildings as anticipated to be erected, and that certain of the roads now laid out are in pursuance of your plan. On every hand I have heard nothing but ecomiums [sic] for the excellence and desirability of that plan…I have hoped that possible you might have some notes, or even a copy of the plan, which might be of priceless value to us in this matter. I have been upon the ground with Mr. John McLaren, Superintendent of Golden Gate Park, and he has given me your address, and suggested to me the great advisability of communicating with you in this behalf…Should you have such plan and you desire to keep the same for the purposes of such competition, you would oblige me greatly by so stating, or you might send it to Mr. McLaren to be used by him in making certain temporary improvements in the laying out of the roads and approaches to the University which he is now contemplating.

Frederick Law Olmsted apparently did not consider entering the competition.  

During this same time period, the town of Berkeley embarked upon a series of civic improvements. Street improvements were a high priority; in 1889, there was only one mile of macadamized street, but by 1900, there were 46 miles of paved road. The passage of the Vrooman Act in the California State Legislature in 1887 authorized city councils to improve streets by financing street work through the issuance of bonds.

**Piedmont Way Improvements and Charles Loyal Huggins**

Talk of improving Piedmont Way began as early as 1890, when the *Oakland Enquirer* reported under Berkeley news: “The macadamizing of Piedmont way [sic] will be begun next spring.” Despite this report, it does not appear that Piedmont Way was substantially improved until 1900. Around February of that year, Berkeley Town Engineer Charles Loyal Huggins proposed a plan to make improvements to the road (Map 9).
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Charles Loyal Huggins attended the University of California, Berkeley and graduated in 1884. In 1885, Huggins designed the first major bridge to cross Strawberry Creek near present-day Sather Gate, replacing the existing wooden footbridge. “Huggins’ Bridge” served as the southern entryway to campus until 1908, when it was replaced by a concrete bridge.\footnote{Oakland Enquirer, 14 November 1890.} In 1894, Huggins was elected Berkeley Town Engineer. Huggins would eventually be lured away from town employment by noted real estate developer Duncan McDuffie of Mason-McDuffie. In fact, Huggins may be responsible for laying out Mason-McDuffie developments attributed to the Olmsted Brothers firm.\footnote{Harvey Helfand, \textit{The Campus Guide: University of California, Berkeley} (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2002), 37.}

Huggins planned to formalize Piedmont Way by incorporating oval medians containing tiny parks.\footnote{Various documents in the “Huggins” file held by the Berkeley Historical Society.} The plan prepared by Huggins shows six median “parks” north of Dwight Way to the terminus of Piedmont Way (\textbf{Map 9 & Image 10}). There area north of Bancroft Way contains one long park; another small park area is located almost directly opposite the western branch of Bancroft Way. The latter was installed but removed shortly afterward to permit easier circulation in this intersection. Huggins had previously worked with the idea of a divided road in his design for improving Hearst Avenue, which created a “unique street” of two parts separated by a masonry wall: one side ascended the hill, and the other side remained level.\footnote{Berkeley Daily Gazette, 5 February 1900.}

The improvements to Piedmont Way proposed by Huggins were described by the \textit{Berkeley Daily Gazette} in February 1900: “the street will be divided into two parts of 26 feet wide, with a 20-foot park in between them.”\footnote{Berkeley Daily Gazette, 8 February 1900.} To accomplish this, the road was realigned and graded, the road surface was macadamized, and wooden curbs were installed along both the road and park edges.

At a March 12th meeting of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, Trustee LeConte presented Huggins’ plan for the Piedmont Way improvements, and the clerk was told to send copies of the plan to the affected property owners and set up a meeting with them. On May 28, Trustee Turner reported that an agreement had been reached regarding improvements to Piedmont Avenue, as it was now being called, and directed a work resolution to be prepared. On June 11, Professor Christy, who lived in the neighborhood, petitioned with other neighbors to change the plan for the Piedmont Avenue improvements. Unfortunately, no record has been found of their particular objections, but protesting road improvements was common at that time in Berkeley because the residents of a road were
charged with paying for the improvements. The disagreement was apparently resolved or ignored, and on July 10, the Berkeley Board of Trustees unanimously passed Resolution 646-A “Establishing Street grades and the widths of sidewalks on Piedmont Avenue or Way from the northerly line of Dwight Way to the northerly terminus of said Avenue” (Image 9):

Be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of the Town of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That the official grades and the widths of the sidewalks and roadways on Piedmont Avenue or Way from the northerly line of Dwight Way to the northerly terminus of said avenue shall be as shown on the improvement map and cross-sections attached hereto.

Section 2. All elevations shown on said improvement map and cross-sections are curb elevations above the official base of the Town of Berkeley. Between consecutive points the elevations of which are given the rate of grade shall be uniform.98

The improvements were undertaken by the Oakland Paving Company, with sewer work going to the Plumber Improvement Company.99 Work progressed throughout the fall.

In October, the Berkeley Daily Gazette reported on the progress.

The most unique boulevard ever constructed in Berkeley is now in the process of construction in the extreme east limits of Berkeley, near the Blind Asylum extending toward the University site. This is Piedmont avenue [sic], from where the grandest panorama of the bay is obtained. Grading the street and removing of the old trees skirting the avenue is now in progress. A striking feature of the improvements of this avenue are the handsome little plots that are laid off in the center of the boulevard. These extend along the avenue from Dwight way to its most northern limit.100

By November, the curbs were being installed, and the water pipes were lowered to accommodate the new grading.

Added to the handsome attractions of beautiful trees and gardens of flowers on this avenue is the parking that is being provided for in the center of the avenue. Old residents of Berkeley will part reluctantly with the old walnut trees that have for so many years given that portion of the city an eastern and rural aspect, but are compensated in the plans for a handsome boulevard in the future.101

98 Resolution 646-A, 10 July 1900. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
99 Minutes of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, 13 August 1900; 14 June 1900. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
100 Berkeley Daily Gazette, 22 October 1900.
101 Note that “parking” here refers to the median parks, not automobile parking. Berkeley Daily Gazette, 12 November 1900.
It is notable that the description of the existing Piedmont Way strongly resembles the proposal laid out by Olmsted for the roads running through the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the campus: shady lanes that emulate roads on the East Coast, planted with native trees that require no irrigation.

In March 1901, trees and shrubs from San José were planted on Piedmont Way “in the plots which were set along the spacious thoroughfare. The planting of the trees is in line with the general improvements that have been taken up by the residents of upper Dwight way [sic].”102 These plantings are visible in historic photographs of the neighborhood (Images 12-15). The Oakland Paving Company petitioned to build sidewalks on the east side of Piedmont Avenue between Dwight Way and Kearney that same month.103 The improvements to Piedmont Avenue were likely completed in 1901.

**Development of the 2200 Block**

Berkeley’s population boom sharply increased the amount of new construction in the city, especially between 1905 and 1912; the majority of the building permits were issued in 1906, 1907, and 1908.104 One consequence of this flurry of construction was the infill of new private residences along Piedmont Avenue, consisting mainly of single-family homes along with some group living quarters and apartment buildings (Images 13-15). To accommodate demand for new residences, remaining larger tracts were subdivided into smaller lots. At the northern terminus of Piedmont Avenue, a tract formerly owned by the widow of Captain Orrin Simmons was subdivided into multiple lots, and in 1909, the road was extended to create a cul-de-sac known as Piedmont Place (Map 11).

Along the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue, three single-family homes were built in quick order on relatively small lots; 2222 Piedmont was built in 1908, and 2224 and 2232 Piedmont were both constructed in 1909. 2222, 2224, and 2232 Piedmont Avenue infilled the block between Piedmont Place to the north, and older homes—including the Christy and Day residences—to the south. On the east side of the 2200 block, the house currently located at 2234 Piedmont Avenue was constructed in 1908 on an infill lot at 2251 Piedmont, now the site of International House. In sum, four of the five extant Piedmont houses in the 2200 block were constructed on this block in 1908-1909 (Map 12). On the 2200 College Avenue block, several small cottages were added to existing properties to accommodate increasing housing demands, including the Cheney rental cottage at 2243

---

102 Berkeley Daily Gazette, 1 March 1901.
103 Minutes of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, 11 March 1901. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
104 Ferrier, 255.
College Avenue (circa 1902) and two cottages designed by Julia Morgan at the rear of the 2245 College lot.

The location of these homes was convenient not only to the University campus, but also to the Telegraph Avenue commercial district. Streetcar lines established during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries ran up College Avenue, down Bancroft Way, and along Telegraph Avenue. Like neighboring dwellings to the south and southeast in other parts of the old Berkeley Property Tract, the houses in the 2200 block of Piedmont and College Avenues stood against the base of the Berkeley Hills, in a district that was easily accessible yet somewhat removed from the bustle and through traffic of other neighborhoods. At that time, Piedmont Avenue dead-ended just south of Strawberry Creek at Piedmont Place and had not yet been connected to the north side of campus via Gayley Road. In addition, neither Tunnel Road to the southeast, nor a through road up Strawberry Canyon to the northeast, yet existed to draw traffic through the district. Homes in the area were thus very advantageously located in a pleasantly developed, secluded cul-de-sac, but within a short walk to shopping, transportation, and the University. It is no surprise that the area was appealing to prosperous single-family homeowners during the early twentieth century.

As the Berkeley Property Tract continued to develop during the early twentieth century, the neighborhood became increasingly populated by residents not connected to the University who found it a pleasant and convenient place to live. At least some of these residents moved from the lower parts of Berkeley, a pattern repeated throughout twentieth-century Berkeley history as residents moved from the “Flatlands” to the more exclusive view districts of “the Hills” after a gain in material prosperity. At least two of the original occupants of the Piedmont houses—Doctor Benjamin Wall at 2234 Piedmont and Walter Kellogg at 2232 Piedmont—apparently followed this pattern, the former moving from Atherton Street and the latter from Oxford Street to their more elevated, custom-built, Piedmont residences. The neighborhood also remained the home for University families and some private student residences, particularly fraternal groups and residential clubs.

Three of the Piedmont Avenue houses in the study area were occupied by the same family from the date of construction until University acquisition decades later. The residents of the four single-family houses—2222, 2224, 2232, and the future 2234 Piedmont Avenue—appear to have had relatively easy commutes to their places of work, which quite likely contributed to their long periods of residence. Charles Bancroft at 2222 Piedmont and Walter Kellogg at 2232 Piedmont had business interests and
offices in downtown Oakland; from their homes they would have only needed to walk a few blocks to the College Avenue or Telegraph Avenue streetcars that provided reliable transportation to and from the center of Oakland. Dr. Wall, at 2251 Piedmont (now 2234 Piedmont), appears to have maintained his professional practice in his former home/office on Atherton Street, where Edwards Track Stadium stands today. Dr. Wall could have reached his office via a ten-minute walk down Bancroft Way or a stroll through the campus. Professor Charles Noble at 2224 Piedmont worked on campus in the Department of Mathematics. During much of his working life, Professor Noble would have had a short walk north across Strawberry Creek and down South Drive to Wheeler Hall or other academic buildings.

UNIVERSITY EXPANSION INTO THE BERKELEY PROPERTY TRACT
During the 1920s, the University sought to expand its land holdings beyond the original campus boundaries. Properties in the Berkeley Property Tract adjacent to the campus were considered desirable, because they were contiguous to existing campus property.

California Memorial Stadium
The biggest change to the study area occurred in 1923 when California Memorial Stadium was constructed in Strawberry Canyon. In the early 1920s, the University had decided to construct a football stadium dedicated to the alumni and students who had died in World War I. The stadium site originally was going to be in the southwestern corner of campus, which would allow campus athletics to be grouped together as intended under the master plan. However, the cost of acquiring the necessary property proved high, and by January 1922, the University decided to build the Stadium on land already partially owned by the University in Strawberry Canyon, adjacent to Piedmont Avenue.

The choice to site the stadium in Strawberry Canyon was extremely controversial. Residents decried the anticipated loss to their property value and perceived destruction of their neighborhood. At that time, Strawberry Canyon was used primarily for horticulture and as a nature preserve. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as the residential neighborhood around Strawberry Canyon grew, paths and a carriage road were built to provide access through the Canyon to the ridge of the hills. In his report to the College of California, Frederick Law Olmsted had discussed the merits of providing comfortable access through the Canyon to provide both access to excellent views from the top and to enjoy the “great change of scenery within a short distance [which] will constitute a unique

105 The electric streetcars stopped running in Berkeley during the 1940s.
and most valuable appendage to the general local attractions of the neighborhood.""106 William Henry Smyth described Strawberry Canyon before the construction of California Memorial Stadium as a place with paths and benches placed to enjoy the views of Strawberry Creek, native vegetation including bracken, wild currant, oaks, and bay trees, and wildlife like quail and rabbits.107

Critics said building in Strawberry Canyon would result in a loss to California taxpayers, because instead of having the University raise money to buy land from private property owners, State-owned land would be used for the Stadium—land that had been earmarked for reservoir construction and was currently a nature sanctuary.108 A group known as the Campus Protective Association published a pamphlet protesting the choice. The objections were laid out in five arguments: 1) the stadium would be isolated from the remainder of campus athletics; 2) there would be serious problems with transportation and accessibility; 3) the size and orientation of the Canyon would make architectural design problematic—the equivalent of “crowding a large house on a small lot”; 4) the stadium would have a negative effect on the Greek Theatre; and 5) the construction would destroy an irreplaceable natural biology laboratory currently on the site.109 Many University faculty members opposed the siting.

Campus architect John Galen Howard was also unhappy with the choice of the site. Howard objected that the Strawberry Canyon site was inaccessible, currently contained a nature preserve, and was not in keeping with the master plan, designed to keep all athletic uses in one spot. In an August 29, 1921 letter to University President David P. Barrows, Howard wrote:

Strawberry Canon [sic] site. **Advantages:** Already owned. Beautiful region. Large area. **Disadvantages:** Far from center of University life (about half an hour’s walk up hill. Nothing west of the swimming pool is wide enough; the vicinity of the Such dairy is the only part of the cannon [sic] readily adaptable.) Very inaccessible for crowds at present, and difficult if not impossible to make conveniently accessible. No street cars or railway short of College Avenue. Very irregular, and mostly steeply sloping land, not favorable for stadium construction on the scale contemplated, and presenting great difficulties in handling crowds on account of lack of level space. Expensive for building operations; long uphill haul.110

---

110 Campus Protective Association pamphlet, located in Records of the California Memorial Stadium Executive Committee, 1920-1923. Held by the Bancroft Library.
Howard wrote a second letter in January 1922 outlining the difficulties of the site, warning about a potential catastrophe resulting from overcrowding and lack of access: “But most serious of all would be the impossibility of properly handling the crowds at the Stadium itself. The three approaches—from the campus, from Piedmont Way, and from Canyon Road—are utterly inadequate even for the west half of the bowl.” Howard was opposed by consulting engineers Edward E. Carpenter and George F. Buckingham, who told the University regents that the Canyon site was more feasible and economical than the site at the southwest corner of campus.

Despite Howard’s protests, on February 1, 1922, the Executive Committee of the California Memorial Stadium unanimously chose the Strawberry Canyon site because, in part, “The natural surroundings in Strawberry Canyon and the possibilities of attractive landscaping of the slopes of the proposed bowl, are particularly appealing to all.” In February 1923, the Board of Regents announced the new design for California Memorial Stadium. The stadium was to be a combination of earth bowl and coliseum construction. Access was through “tunnels and stairways radiat[ing] from the interior to portals in the coliseum wall, which open on a wide surrounding plaza. Inclined pathways and short, easy flights of steps connect with Piedmont avenue.”

In order to accommodate the construction of California Memorial Stadium, several houses on the east side of the 2200 block had to be removed. In January 1923, the houses and most of the trees on the site were cleared, and a massive culvert was built to divert Strawberry Creek. At least five structures on the Stadium site, including one of the Palmer houses, were moved to the 2200 block of College Avenue. The site for the relocated buildings included the rear of the Cory property at 2227 College and a parcel of land to the north of the Cory property that was purchased by the University from the Pacific School of Religion in 1922. These buildings were put into various uses for campus programs and services. One building functioned as an office for Greek Theatre operations, two others were Music Department classrooms, and a fourth was used for “storage.” The relocated buildings were grouped near the rear, east side of the lots, rather than along the street front as was typical of the residential houses originally built on this stretch of College Avenue. The large lot

112 Sally Woodbridge, John Galen Howard and the University of California (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002), 154.
113 Executive Committee of the California Memorial Stadium to Board of Regents, 4 February 1922, Records of the California Memorial Stadium Executive Committee, 1920-1923, “Correspondence, 1920-1923.” Held by the Bancroft Library.
containing the moved buildings was accessed by its own, irregularly shaped driveway that ran east from College Avenue, turned at right angles to the north, and curved around to meet College Avenue again (Maps 14 & 15).

The removal of the houses on the east side of the block was not the only major change to occur to the neighborhood as a result of the stadium construction. In order to increase access to the Stadium site, Piedmont Avenue was connected on its northern end to a new road called Stadium Avenue, essentially ending Piedmont Avenue’s life as a dead-end street (Images 17 & 20). Piedmont Place, the cul-de-sac that previously terminated Piedmont Avenue, was retained as an offshoot to the northwest (Image 19). The opening of the Stadium, the introduction of through traffic, and the advent of events at the Stadium likely considerably altered the character of the formerly secluded neighborhood.

By 1929, the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Way included the following structures starting from Bancroft Way and running north: the Clinton Day house at 2747 Bancroft Way; the “Bachelordon,” a residential house designed by Reed & Corlett in the Tudor Revival style and constructed at 2250 Piedmont in 1924; the former Zeta Psi fraternity house, which had been moved to the rear of the 2240 Piedmont lot around 1911; the former Christy property at 2234 Piedmont; 2232 Piedmont; 2224 Piedmont; 2222 Piedmont; the Kappa Sigma fraternity at 2220 Piedmont; and a cluster of buildings around Piedmont Place (Map 15).

**University Expansion: 1930 to Present**

In 1930, International House was constructed at the intersection of Piedmont Avenue and Bancroft Way (Map 17 and Images 20-23). In order to clear the site, the remaining houses on the east side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue (Map 16) were removed in the late 1920s. Dr. Wall’s house was removed from the International House site and relocated to its present lot at 2234 Piedmont. Cowell Hospital was also constructed in 1930 on the east side of the 2200 block of College Avenue, replacing at least some of the houses that had been moved there from the California Memorial Stadium site (Map 17).

Between 1942 and 1947, the layout of Piedmont Avenue was altered. The northern end of Piedmont Avenue was rerouted further west to connect to Gayley Road, cutting off the gracious arc of Stadium Drive (Image 25 and Maps 17 & 19). As a result, Piedmont Place was removed.

---

In 1950, the Boalt School of Law was constructed on the northeast corner of Bancroft Way and College Avenue (Map 19 & Image 29). To allow for the School of Law expansion, the fraternity house at 2731 Bancroft Way (1923) had to be moved to the lot at 2240 Piedmont. The former Zeta Psi house, which had been at the rear of the 2240 Piedmont lot, apparently at some point became a rooming house known as the Piedmont Lodge and was destroyed by fire in 1947.

By 1950, the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Way included the following structures from Bancroft Way running north: the Clinton Day house at 2747 Bancroft Way; the former “Bachelordon” at 2250 Piedmont; the current 2240 Piedmont building; the Dr. Wall house at 2234 Piedmont; 2232 Piedmont; 2224 Piedmont; 2222 Piedmont; the Kappa Sigma fraternity at 2220 Piedmont; and a private home at 2218 Piedmont (Map 18). The Cowell Hospital Annex was at the approximate location of now-removed Piedmont Place.

During the mid- to late twentieth century, the University continued to build new University structures in the 2200 block. Construction of Wurster Hall and Calvin Laboratory in the 1960s led to the demolition of the houses north of 2241 and 2243 College and the closure of College Avenue north of Bancroft Way (Image 28). The stretch of College Avenue from Bancroft Way to just north of the future Calvin Laboratory site was completely removed between 1962 and 1964, but a truncated block of the street remains today as a campus roadway between Minor Hall and the Haas Business School complex. Around 1965, the Boalt School of Law expanded at the northwest corner of Bancroft Way and Piedmont Avenue, resulting in the demolition of the former Clinton Day and LeConte residences on Bancroft Way, and likely 2250 Piedmont as well (Map 21). In the early 1990s, the Haas School of Business complex was constructed at the approximate intersection of Piedmont Avenue and Gayley Road, resulting in the demolition of Cowell Hospital and 2220 Piedmont Avenue.

UNIVERSITY PLANS FOR THE SOUTHEAST CAMPUS

The history of the study area, which is approximately bounded by the Haas School of Business to the north (close to where Strawberry Creek originally ran above ground), the east side of California Memorial Stadium to the east, Bancroft Way to the south, and the remnants of College Avenue to the west, is intertwined with the expansion of the central University campus and “off-campus” acquisitions. The University plans for the campus and development in and around the study area are discussed below.
University Land Acquisitions and Planning: Founding to 1890s

The campus proper that was gifted by the College of California to the University in 1867 was about two-thirds the size of today’s Central Campus. The remaining one-third, which consisted of the areas lying north of Bancroft Way and south of the south fork of Strawberry Creek, was generally still in private ownership when the University moved its campus to the Berkeley site in the early 1870s. The College of California’s Berkeley Property Tract and College Homestead Tract subdivisions were part of this “off-campus” area.

At this time, the campus grounds ended to the north and northwest of the current study area. Bancroft Way did not touch the edge of the campus anywhere along its length. College Avenue (formerly Audubon Street) originally extended two full blocks north of Bancroft Way and would eventually become lined with private lots and buildings (Maps 2 & 5). Located on the west side of the 2200 block of College Avenue was the Hillegass Orchard or Hillegass Tract; this area remained primarily undeveloped through the end of the nineteenth century, except for a few lots and homes along Sylvan Way, a small, dead-end street that ran for a short block west from College Avenue (Map 8).

The southern campus border to the west of College Avenue at that time was the southern edge of Faculty Glade, located approximately where the Music Department buildings now stand. A historic photograph dating to the 1890s shows part of the undeveloped Hillegass Tract; in the distance, a low fence is visible at the edge of the campus with the trees of Faculty Glade and South Hall behind it (Image 5). East of College Avenue, the campus boundary largely paralleled the uneven, southern edge of the Strawberry Creek ravine. Thus, throughout the nineteenth century, the entire study area was in private ownership outside the campus proper.

During this era, there were several plans or diagrams of campus development prepared by a succession of designers: Olmsted in 1866; Wright and Sanders in 1868; Kenitzer and Farquharson in 1869, which resulted in the construction of South Hall, the first Berkeley campus building; and William Hammond Hall in 1874. None of these plans delineated any campus development on the study area. Olmsted’s plan for the Berkeley Neighborhood specifically designated the study area for residential use, and the remaining plans did not cover the project area since it was already in private hands and not part of the campus.
University Land Acquisitions and Planning: 1890s to 1920s

During the late nineteenth century, the University made some land acquisitions near the mouth of Strawberry Canyon, close to the study area. In 1900, the University and the Associated Students of the University of California acquired the Hillegass Tract property from the heirs of William Hillegass, who was the first American landowner of the parcel. This undeveloped parcel was designated for athletic facilities, in keeping with the Phoebe Hearst Architectural Plan approved that same year. Therefore, the first University planning undertaken in the twentieth century for the general vicinity of the project area intended that the area to the west of the 2200 block would be used for athletics.

The Bénard Plan, and Howard’s subsequent plans for the campus up through 1917, show the campus grounds extending up to the west side of the 2200 block of College Avenue but not extending into the study area. College Avenue remained a city street.

University Development

The first University building in the vicinity of the study area was Hearst Hall, erected on the west side of the 2200 block of College Avenue in 1901. Hearst Hall stood on the current site of the southern end of Wurster Hall, across College Avenue from the present-day section of parking lot between 2241/2243 and 2251 College Avenue (Map 12). The structure was donated by Regent Phoebe Apperson Hearst, and placed on a private lot she had purchased as a gift to the University. Hearst Hall was designed by Bernard Maybeck as a private reception hall, and originally constructed in 1899 on Channing Way, next to a house where Hearst resided during her visits to Berkeley. After Hearst Hall was disassembled and moved to the College Avenue lot, it was converted into a gymnasium for female students, a purpose it would serve until it was destroyed by fire in 1922.

In 1905, the University built the first campus football stadium, California Field, on the Hillegass Tract using ASUC funding. This field, which was partially enclosed with wooden bleachers, stood approximately where Hearst Gymnasium and North Field are located today. Around 1915, a running track with its own bleachers was added west of California Field on the site where the temporary Hearst Field Annex stands today.

---

In the area near Strawberry Creek west of College Avenue and northwest of the study area, the first elements of the Faculty Club were completed in 1902. The log-cabin-style Senior Hall was completed adjacent to the Faculty Club in 1906 (Map 14).

These four projects—Hearst Hall, California Field, the Faculty Club, and Senior Hall—were the primary University-built facilities near the study area in the early twentieth century. As the century drew on, additional University uses of the area immediately west of College Avenue occurred (Map 14). According to Harvey Helfand, the former Hillegass Tract became quite crowded:

…several temporary buildings designed by Howard were built for a variety of academic uses. These included the wooden Spreckels Physiological Laboratory…one of the first campus research labs, in 1903 and, the following year, the corrugated-iron Anthropology Building called the “tin bin” that housed Phoebe Apperson Hearst’s collections. West of these stood the wooden Fertilizer Control building…and the corrugated-iron Museum of Vertebrate Zoology (renamed the Decorative Art Annex 1930-1964), both built in 1909. And between California Field and Hearst Hall, the wooden Hygiene and Pathology Laboratory was inserted in 1908. Two wooden buildings designed by Clinton Day and originally built in 1898 were also moved to this congested area in 1921: the zoology laboratory East Hall and the Botany Building from the present sites of LeConte and Stephens Halls, respectively.\footnote{Ibid., 198-199.}

Another early University development in the vicinity of the study area occurred in 1906, when the campus opened a temporary hospital for victims of the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake in an old residence, the Meyer House, located to the northwest of the project area on the present-day site of Minor Hall. The Meyer House had been acquired possibly in 1900 when the Hillegass Tract was purchased and had been used for campus storage prior to the Earthquake. This temporary hospital grew into the first students’ infirmary.

Thus, the pattern of University development in the vicinity of the study area limited itself in the early decades of the twentieth century to various utilitarian and student service facilities built or sited as the need arose, all standing west of College Avenue. The cluttered and congested aspect of the area described by Helfand above, and visible in photographs of the area, implies that campus administrators at the time saw this corner of the campus as a convenient piece of land to site various peripheral campus facilities rather than an integral part of the permanently developed campus containing large, stately, academic buildings.
In 1888, 1895, and 1909, the University also purchased pieces of property, ranging in size from .84 acres to 20 acres at the mouth of Strawberry Canyon, in the vicinity of present-day California Memorial Stadium. One of these purchases—possibly a gift—was apparently the more southern of the two Palmer Houses on the future Stadium site, and its grounds east of Piedmont Avenue, in 1909. This property subsequently shows up on campus maps in University ownership. The acquisition of one of the Palmer Houses and its grounds would be the first expansion of the University into the study area.

Acquisitions on the 2200 Block

In the early 1920s, the University made its first major land acquisition on the 2200 block of Piedmont and College Avenues when it purchased a parcel owned by the future Pacific School of Religion on the east side of the 2200 block of College Avenue. At the same time—around 1922—the University began purchasing land on the east side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue to be used as a site for California Memorial Stadium. At least five structures were moved from the Stadium site to the newly acquired parcel on College Avenue, and were placed in a row running north-to-south on and north of the current site of Calvin Laboratory, behind wood houses already existing on the site. The uses of these buildings—none of which are still extant on campus—seem to repeat the pattern of small, miscellaneous facilities development described on the former Hillegass Tract. A circa 1927 map of the site shows the buildings designated as “Greek Theatre Office,” “Public Health,” “Music #1,” and “Music #2” (Map 14).

Also in the early 1920s, as noted above, the old Hearst Hall on College Avenue was destroyed by fire. Gift funds from William Randolph Hearst allowed the University to build a new and more elaborate women’s gymnasium surrounded by playing fields and courts. It was located to the west of the Hearst Hall site on the old California Field site that no longer needed for football after the 1923 completion of California Memorial Stadium. This project became the present-day Hearst Memorial Gymnasium (Map 14).

During the late 1920s and 1930s, the University began to actively acquire additional individual properties in the study area. These included:

- The present-day site of 2234 Piedmont Avenue, the old Professor Christy family home site, was purchased from a fraternity in 1925 (it is unclear if this purchase included just the land, or a house as well; also unknown is when the Christy house was removed).
• 2223 Bancroft Way (formerly the Professor Wickson family home on the present-day site of the Law School) was purchased from Wickson heirs in 1926.

• The former Harriet Lee property at 2245-2249 College Avenue was purchased from Glennie Davis for $7,000 in 1926.

• A fraternity house at 2220 Piedmont Avenue (demolished in the 1990s to clear land for the Haas School of Business) was purchased in 1927.

• The old Professor Joseph LeConte family home at 2739 Bancroft Way was in University ownership by 1928. At this time, it became the headquarters of the newly established Institute of Child Welfare, which included a campus-run nursery school.

• The old Clinton Day family home at 2747 Bancroft Way was purchased in 1931 from Day’s daughter.

• In 1935, the University purchased 2250 Piedmont Avenue (north of the Day House) from a fraternity.

• In 1937, the old Professor Frederick Slate house at 2239 College Avenue (just north of 2241/43 College) was purchased.

• In 1939, both of the Cheney houses at 2241/43 College Avenue were purchased from May Cheney.

• In 1941, 2222 Piedmont Avenue, the Charles Bancroft home, was purchased by the University.

• In 1943, the Sigma Phi fraternity house on Bancroft Way was purchased (it would be moved later that decade to its present site at 2240 Piedmont Avenue).

• Sometime during this general period, a vacant lot at the northeast corner of Bancroft Way and College Avenue was also acquired.

After 1943, there seems to have been somewhat of a hiatus in acquisitions on the block, perhaps due to World War II. In the 1950s, acquisitions resumed:

• In 1955, 2251 College Avenue (the old Zeta Psi fraternity house, now the Archaeological Research Facility) was acquired. The University provided the fraternity with the old Hilgard family home on the south side of the 2700 block of Bancroft Way, across from the 2200 block. It was removed, and the fraternity built a new chapter house on the lot.

• In 1958, 2232 Piedmont Avenue, the Kellogg House, was purchased from the Kellogg estate.
• In 1962, the Professor Noble house at 2224 Piedmont Avenue was purchased. The Noble house appears to have been the last privately owned property in the 2200 block.

In addition to the acquisitions listed above, the University also purchased several private properties at the extreme northeast corner of the 2200 block, north of 2220 Piedmont. These were all private homes and fraternal houses fronting on Piedmont Place, which had been formally laid out in 1909 (Map 11). The acquisition history of those properties has not been researched. All of the buildings acquired on Piedmont Place were later removed, and their lots are now part of either Gayley Road or the Haas School of Business complex.

University Planning: 1920s to 1940s

During the 1920s and 1930s, no specific plan was formulated for incorporating the 2200 block into the central campus. Part of this may have had to do with the location of the block, which was then regarded as the extreme outer edge of the campus zone. Up through at least the early 1940s, when ample areas of developable land still remained on the original core campus north of Strawberry Creek, both University administrators and academic department heads were likely skeptical of adding the 2200 block to the central campus—viewing it as inconveniently distant from the campus core and impractical as a site for comprehensively planned academic facilities. During the early 1930s, however, University administrators and planners began informally discussing the 2200 block. Materials found in the Warren Perry Papers indicate that the pattern of acquisition on the 2200 block was consistent with the broad goal of ultimately adding the block to University ownership.

Architect Warren Perry served as Dean of Architecture at the University and designed buildings on campus including Edwards Track Stadium, the expansion of the Faculty Club, and the new School of Law building. He also provided periodic planning consulting to the University administration. In 1933, Perry was chairing the President’s Committee on Campus Development and Building Location: a three-member body that also included University Controller Luther Nichols and Professor Baldwin Woods. In a memorandum dated October 1, 1933 and titled “A Re-Study of the Central Area of the Campus – University of California, Berkeley, California,” the Committee reported to the President on the arrangement and expansion of the physical campus. The memo noted:

> As the permanent buildings on the Campus increase in number it becomes possible to assign given areas to given uses with greater certainty than ever before. With the removal of the Physical Education plant (except for tennis courts) and the probably location elsewhere of the University Auditorium and Fine Arts Museum, what we
have called the “Academic Area” between the two branches of Strawberry Creek is cleared for fairly logical and clean-cut segregation.\textsuperscript{117}

The memo then delineates the arrangement of academic groups north of Strawberry Creek and identifies preferred locations for other activities, including “Faculty and Student Welfare,” “Administration,” and “Circulation.”

The study block is mentioned in the memo under a section titled “Roadways and Entrances,” which contains a list of vehicular roadways on campus including “the Cross-Campus Road connecting College and La Loma Avenues (the future may well see the suppression of College Avenue within the Campus and the Cross-Campus road connecting Piedmont Avenue with Highland Place or La Loma Avenue)...”\textsuperscript{118} The “Cross-Campus Road” refers here to the future Gayley Road. It is clear from this memo that the present-day alignment of Gayley Road—which runs from Hearst and La Loma Avenues to Piedmont Avenue—had already been envisioned in the 1930s. The statement also implies that the incorporation of the study block into the central campus was already being contemplated in the early 1930s, since that would be the most likely motivation for “suppressing” College Avenue as a city street north of Bancroft Way. At this time, Cowell Hospital had been completed just to the north of the study block, but the Institute of Child Welfare, occupying a converted home, was the only University facility on the block itself. There is no clear indication in the 1933 report that specific campus facilities were contemplated for the remainder of the 2200 block.

Five years later, on August 31, 1938, Acting President Monroe E. Deutsch sent a quick note to Professor Perry asking “if I might secure from you a very full statement of the reasons prompting the recommendation for the proposed site of the new Administration building and a general statement concerning plans for the future...”\textsuperscript{119} In this case, the Administration Building referred to the future Sproul Hall (completed in 1941). Deutsch was apparently being asked by University Regents to explain why University staff members were proposing to site the building south of Strawberry Creek along what was still a commercial block of Telegraph Avenue, rather than elsewhere on the traditional campus. Perry replied to Deutsch with a letter on September 2, 1938, reaffirming the concept of siting primary academic facilities north of Strawberry Creek and keeping the central campus area “free for teaching.”\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{117} Warren Perry Papers, Bancroft Library, BANC MSS 82/97c, Box 11, folder “Committee on Campus Development.”
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{119} Warren Perry Papers, Bancroft Library, BANC MSS 82/97c, Box 11, folder “University of California.”
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid.
Perry then discussed the 2200 block:

…the area east of College Avenue and north of Bancroft Way has been thought of as the proper location of smaller self-contained units such as Child Welfare, Public Health and similar “institutes” which would be extended to include even the Law School; such units have little to do with the rest of the Campus, even with the Main Library.\footnote{Ibid.}

This statement reveals three major points. First, the University was considering the acquisition of the study block as early as the mid- to late 1930s. This provides clarity to the seemingly scattered sequence of individual house acquisitions by the University that began in the 1920s and accelerated through the 1930s. Secondly, the block was being considered as a site for University units that didn’t need to be located in the academic core of the campus. Finally, from at least the late 1930s, the study block was being considered as a site for the relocation of a major campus facility: the Law School. During the late 1940s, Perry would prepare several studies of possible sites for the Law School, including the southern edge of Faculty Glade where the Department of Music buildings now stand, and various configurations at the southern end of the study block. The new Law School building, which was designed by Perry, was ultimately sited on the southern end of the 2200 block along Bancroft Way, and was completed in 1950.

Therefore, although there was not yet an official plan to formally incorporate the study block into the central campus during the 1920s and 1930s, the materials in the Warren Perry Papers help explain why the University was willing to acquire properties parcel by parcel on the study block. There prevailed in this era a pattern of buying houses as the opportunity arose on the 2200 block and either renting them out to private residents, or putting them into use as offices. In contrast, the University elsewhere made comprehensive land purchases targeted with specific development proposals in mind.

After World War II, as the University began to rapidly expand, the 2200 block would have become much more desirable as a development area. One factor that probably hastened the migration of properties from private to University ownership on the 2200 block in that era is the fact that properties, at least on the south and west sides of the block, were also passing from the original owners into the hands of heirs who did not necessarily have the same attachment to the houses, and may not have used them as their primary residences.
Several of the properties—the Slate House, the Wickson House, and the LeConte House—appear to have been purchased from the children of the original residents, all of whom had been faculty members at the University. This is also the era when the elderly May Cheney, just three years before her death, sold her two houses to the University. In all of these cases, it is reasonable to speculate that the private owners might have either approached the University about acquiring the property or been receptive to University offers, remembering the original residents’ close affiliations with the campus. Those acquisitions recorded in University property records are presented as straightforward purchases, not condemnations.

**University Development in the Vicinity: 1920s and 1930s**

During the 1920s and 1930s, another major physical change took place that may have had an impact on the future of the 2200 block and the way its private residents perceived it. The University began developing large facilities in a horseshoe around the residential properties on the 2200 block. To the west, across College Avenue, as noted earlier, there was an increasingly dense cluster of University storage and other utilitarian buildings and facilities. To the immediate north, Cowell Hospital, an impressive, multi-story concrete building, was completed in 1930 as the new home for the University Infirmary. To the east, California Memorial Stadium was completed in 1923; International House was completed in 1930, after purchase and removal of the several remaining houses southwest of the Stadium (Map 17).

In one respect, this incremental encirclement by University facilities was accidental, not planned. While the Hearst Gymnasium development to the west fit in with the Hearst/Howard campus plans from the early twentieth century, the development of a major stadium at the mouth of Strawberry Canyon was not originally planned. Howard had projected stadium sites at other locations on or near the campus. However, when California Memorial Stadium was proposed, the University ultimately decided to use the Canyon site. The practical consequence of this siting decision was that the campus, for the first time, had a major facility to the east of City-owned Piedmont Avenue, making the 2200 block appear as an extension of private development into the campus, rather than an area fully beyond the campus edge. A few years later, prompted by a private gift, the acquisition of land and construction of International House adjacent to the Stadium further extended the encirclement of the block by University facilities.

For a resident of the block in the late 1920s and early 1930s, a walk in the neighborhood would have revealed a dramatically different neighborhood scene than twenty or even ten years before. Four
large, new, and permanent University facilities—California Memorial Stadium, International House, Hearst Gymnasium, and Cowell Hospital—had arisen, three of them literally “next door” to or “across the street” from the remaining private homes.

In addition, during the 1920s, the University purchased several blocks southwest of the campus and developed the Edwards Stadium/Evans Baseball Diamond complex, followed shortly by the new Men’s Gymnasium (now Haas Pavilion) in the early 1930s. This moved the campus boundary south to Bancroft Way along a broad front, leaving only two relatively small areas of private ownership projecting into the newly enlarged campus: the 2200 block of College and Piedmont Avenues; and the blocks adjacent to Telegraph Avenue where it ran north to Sather Gate.

Given these cumulative developments, private owners on the 2200 block during the 1920s and 1930s would have been keenly aware that Bancroft Way, not Strawberry Creek, was now functioning as the southern border of the campus, and that University development and acquisition was likely, if not inevitable, on the remaining blocks north of Bancroft. Therefore, it is not surprising that several of the private properties on the block were sold to the University during the 1920s and 1930s.

1940s and Post-World War II Plans
The first public University plan for the 2200 block appears to have come in the early to mid-1940s. Alumnus and architect Arthur Brown, Jr., appointed as University Supervising Architect in May 1938, prepared a 1944 General Plan for the campus that appears to be the first plan envisioning the entire 2200 block in University ownership, cleared of private dwellings, and built up with large academic structures. This, in various forms, would remain the planning vision for the 2200 block through the remainder of the century. Brown projected three new buildings labeled “Jurisprudence,” “Art – Household Art,” and “Unassigned,” as well as an expansion of Cowell Hospital. His plan, however, appears to have retained College Avenue as a public street on the west side of the block.

In 1950, presumably following the 1944 General Plan, the first unit of the current Law School—an “L” shaped building at the southwest corner of the block—was completed, after removal of the houses that had stood along the Bancroft Way frontage. This building would be expanded to the east in 1958/59 and again in 1965/67 until all of the old houses on Bancroft Way were removed, including the old LeConte house (later the Institute of Child Welfare) and the Clinton Day House (Maps 19 & 21).
The 1956 and 1962 Long Range Development Plans (LRDPs) for the campus showed variations on Brown’s 1944 General Plan for the 2200 block. As with Brown’s Plan, acquisition and removal of all the existing buildings was assumed, with various new academic buildings infilling the sites. The details of the 1956 and 1962 plans for the block differ slightly in the placement and the nature of proposed buildings, but the general theme remained the same; the block was now clearly regarded as part of “the campus,” not a nearby neighborhood or transitional zone. The main difference between the two plans was that the 1956 Plan showed generic academic building footprints on the site, while the 1962 Plan incorporated the cylindrical Laboratory of Chemical Biodynamics (Calvin Laboratory) design and the Wurster Hall design to the west. A significant element of the 1956 Plan was that College Avenue north of Bancroft Way was eliminated as a public street, thus for the first time making the 2200 block into a fully contiguous “southeast corner” of the central campus, not simply a block filled with University buildings outside the traditional campus bounds.

**Campus Development in the 1950s and 1960s**

During the 1950s and the 1960s, the interior of the 2200 block—which consisted of the rear yards of the College and Piedmont Avenue houses—was quickly being converted to parking. The surviving houses were converted to office uses. Between 1958 and 1959, 2220 Piedmont, 2222 Piedmont, 2232 Piedmont, and 2234 Piedmont all began being used for offices. In the case of two and perhaps three of these houses, residential renters were removed to make way for the office use, as is explained in more detail in the descriptions of the individual houses. The reason for the conversions was likely due to pressure from the University Regents and the City of Berkeley. Both wanted the increasing needs of the University to be met on campus, rather than having the University continue to expand outside its boundaries while supporting non-University uses—like rental properties or fraternity houses—on the campus proper.\(^{122}\)

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, demolition of existing houses began again with removal of the old Slate house at 2231 College, and most probably its northerly neighbor, 2229 College, to allow for the construction of Calvin Laboratory, which was dedicated in 1964. At the same time, the section of College Avenue immediately north of Bancroft Way was removed to allow for the construction of Wurster Hall, and the roadway was realigned to the east as a curving pedestrian path.

Campus Planning in the Study Area: 1960s to 1990s

The 1962 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) designated all of the older houses on the block as temporary, ultimately to be cleared for the construction of permanent buildings and installation of a uniform landscape, which Consulting Landscape Architect Thomas Church laid out in his complimentary 1962 landscape plan (Map 20). The specific terminology in the 1962 LRDP was that the campus expected to remove “buildings that have been acquired through campus expansion and put to interim use pending permanent development of their sites...” The 1962 LRDP remained in force, with amendments, through 1990 when a new LRDP was adopted. In the early 1980s, the campus also undertook a space planning effort that had some elements of master planning, but was much more detailed than an LRDP in terms of focusing on existing building conditions, uses, and specific programmatic needs.

The 1981 Berkeley Campus Space Plan and 1990 LRDP continued to plan the same general type of development for the 2200 block as earlier LRDPs, and generally assumed that the smaller, older houses would be removed to allow for the construction of new, larger academic buildings. By the early 1980s, when the Campus Space Plan was completed, the 2200 block was being referred to as part of the “Arts, Music, and Professions” precinct of the campus, encompassing the existing programs which had facilities in the area at that time: the Department of Music, University Art Museum, Department of Art Practice, College of Environmental Design, School of Optometry, and School of Law. There were also some existing disciplines and departments in the vicinity that did not fit clearly with this designation, such as biochemical research in Calvin Laboratory, and the Department and Museum of Anthropology in Kroeber Hall. The “professions” aspect of the precinct would be strengthened in the late 1980s with the removal of Cowell Hospital and its replacement with the new, three-building complex of the Haas School of Business Administration.

The 1981 Plan noted:

Projects which have been proposed and could be considered in this precinct include a fourth floor central addition to Wurster… an underground addition to Calvin Laboratory on the east… a new building for the School of Business Administration, an addition to the University Art Museum, and major changes in Cowell Hospital… The precinct as a whole lacks a sense of cohesion… The spaces east of Wurster Hall and east of Cowell Hospital are crying for attention. A relocated School of Business Administration in some portion of these spaces has been proposed… completion of this project would liberate considerable space in Barrows Hall, thus absorbing the activities now housed in many of the residences on College

---

and Piedmont which would have to be demolished or relocated because of their old age and deteriorated condition.  

However, the 1981 Plan also noted that “because of their diversity of architectural style, and their domestic scales the buildings along Piedmont Avenue in particular provide an attractive edge to the precinct and the campus.” The Plan did not specifically propose permanently preserving any of the houses on their current sites. In the case of one of the buildings, it suggested long-term relocation. The description of 2234 Piedmont stated, “should the University ever need the area for a larger building, this structure should be moved…and, if possible, restored.”

Following the 1981 Campus Space Plan, and as a prelude to the 1990 LRDP, a set of “Working Papers” were prepared by the campus and private consultants in the late 1980s outlining issues and opportunities for central campus development. The 1990 LRDP largely adopted the recommendations of the Working Papers for the study area. The removal of Cowell Hospital and 2220 Piedmont were planned, along with their replacement with the Haas School of Business complex. Some renovations were projected for the Law School complex. The Piedmont houses and 2251 College were identified as a “Piedmont Avenue Reserve Site” in a slightly more complex “L” shape than what was shown in the 1988 Working Papers:

Designated reserve sites include the site occupied by the remaining Piedmont buildings and 2251 College. In conjunction with this site, the parking lot to the east of Wurster Hall is designated as an open space reserve site for the possible future development of a new glade.

Actual physical changes in the immediate study area in the 1980s and 1990s included the demolition of Cowell Hospital and 2220 Piedmont (the former Kappa Sigma fraternity house), and shifting of the adjacent access road south, next to 2222 Piedmont, to create a site for construction of the three-building Haas School of Business complex. Other changes involved construction of a northern addition to the Law School, completed in 1996, which filled in the parking lot space between 2240 Piedmont and 2251 College and made some alterations to the remainder of the parking lot. The last remaining freestanding garage associated with the houses, located behind 2232 Piedmont, was demolished, and the brick foundations of 2241 and 2243 College were replaced. In 2001, an
extensive seismic retrofit and renovation of 2251 College was undertaken; work was completed early in 2004.

Uses of some of the buildings in or adjacent to the study area changed, including conversion of the Law School’s Manville Hall residential annex into Simon Hall, used as an office wing for the Law School. 2243 College was left vacant by the Space Assignments & Capital Improvements Committee (SACI) in 2003.

2020 Long Range Development Plan

The 2020 Long Range Development Plan, adopted by the University Regents in 2005, does not perpetuate the precinct planning of the earlier era but plans holistically for the “historic 180 acre Campus Park, defined by Hearst on the north, Oxford/Fulton on the west, Bancroft on the south, and Gayley/Piedmont on the east.” The illustrative concept completed for the UC Berkeley New Century Plan, and included as Figure 2 in the 2020 LRDP, anticipates the removal of the College Avenue houses and Calvin Laboratory, and their potential replacement with new buildings. 2251 College and the Piedmont Avenue houses are shown as continuing campus buildings through the life of the Plan.

The landscape of the California Memorial Stadium environs is shown as rustic hill woodlands in the diagram of Campus Park Preservation Areas in Figure 7 of the Plan, while Figure 8 shows the area west of Piedmont Avenue as part of the “picturesque ensemble.” According to the 2020 LRDP:

The campus identity is also shaped by another, more subtle ensemble: the variety of picturesque buildings along the creek, which also includes a number of historic structures. In contrast to the formality of the classical core, these picturesque buildings are designed as informal, highly articulated volumes that respond to the natural contours and features of the site. As exemplified by the Haas School of Business, new projects within the areas of picturesque influence should respect and continue these traditions.

With respect to the landscape, the 2020 LRDP references the UC Berkeley Landscape Master Plan. As indicated in Figure 6 of the 2020 LRDP, “The Landscape Master Plan…designates the entire perimeter of the Campus Park as the Edges and Gateways Initiative: this group includes initiatives for each of the four perimeter roads and the entry points to the Campus Park.” For Gayley Road, the university-owned extension of Piedmont Avenue, the University’s New Century Plan states the

---

129 Ibid., 43.
campus should “Preserve and enhance the rustic character of Gayley Road as the seam linking the campus and the hills…[including] working with the City of Berkeley [to] refurbish the historic Olmsted streetscape from Haas Business School to Bancroft Way, improving the plantings and accommodating stadium crowds.”

2222 PIEDMONT AVENUE

2222 Piedmont Avenue was constructed in 1908 for Charles and Miriam Bancroft. At that time, as discussed in more detail above, the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue was still largely undeveloped, likely because most of it was owned by the Simmons family. 2222 Piedmont Avenue appears to be the first structure constructed on the west side of the block during the Berkeley building boom of the early twentieth century. Its neighbors to the south at 2224 and 2232 Piedmont Avenue were constructed in the following year.

Charles and Miriam Bancroft

Charles E. Bancroft was the brother of Hubert Howe Bancroft, founder and namesake of the University’s Bancroft Library. H.H. Bancroft came to California in 1852, apparently accompanied by other family members. One source attributes Charles Bancroft as the baby in the mining camp who figures in Bret Harte’s short story, “The Luck of Roaring Camp.” If so, Charles Bancroft would have been substantially younger than his brother. H.H. Bancroft had his home, business, and literary interests in San Francisco, where he built a thriving commercial enterprise as a bookseller, printer, and publisher. He also became an avid collector and historian. In 1905, his private research library was acquired by the University as the core of a research collection on Western Americana; it survived the 1906 Earthquake and Fire in San Francisco and was moved to Berkeley that same year.

Charles Bancroft also appears to have relocated to Berkeley around the time of the Earthquake. He does not appear in the 1903 directory, but he is listed in Husted’s 1906 city directory for Oakland and Berkeley as living at the Berkeley Inn, a guest and residence hotel that stood at the corner of Haste Street and Telegraph Avenue in Berkeley. Although it is not clear if the directory data was compiled before the Earthquake, it is possible that this was a temporary residence for Bancroft after the Earthquake. Charles Bancroft is also listed in the 1906 directory as a vice president of Holcomb, Breed and Bancroft, an Oakland real estate and development firm. This business involvement appears
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to have continued through his working life; later directories list him simply as involved in “Real Estate.”

By 1908, according to city directories, Charles was married to Miriam F. Bancroft. From 1908 through 1940, the couple appears to have lived continuously at the house at 2222 Piedmont Avenue, since both Charles and Miriam are listed in city directories as late as 1939. The Bancrofts apparently did not have children, and the exact date and location of their deaths has not been established.

Census records for some years between 1908 and 1939 document a female servant living at 2222 Piedmont. During the early twentieth century, substantial homes were often designed with one or two bedrooms for live-in servants, since many well-to-do families often employed maids, housekeepers, or cooks. At 2222 Piedmont Avenue, the house was designed to separate servant spaces from public spaces, as was typical. The kitchen, pantry, and laundry were placed at the rear of the house, where the servants could easily travel to and from the service spaces via the back stairways that led to the basement and the second floor. The finished room in the attic containing a closet and a sink (Room 31) was likely used as the servant’s bedroom.

**Architect F.D. Voorhees**

In 1908, Charles Bancroft commissioned Oakland architect F.D. Voorhees to design the house at 2222 Piedmont Avenue. Bancroft’s involvement in the Oakland real estate business likely caused him to cross paths with Voorhees. The contractors for 2222 Piedmont Avenue were Peterson and Pearson.

F.D. Voorhees was born in Illinois and moved to California when he was six years old. His first job was working in the civil engineering department of the Mare Island Naval Yard in Vallejo. In 1893, he began working as a civil engineer and architect. Voorhees designed many single-family homes, apartment buildings, and commercial buildings in Oakland, including the Reed block on Clay Street, the Blake block on Thirteenth Street, and the Powell Hotel at Thirteenth and Webster Streets. By the 1910s, Voorhees was specializing in school buildings and designed the Grove Street and Manzanita schools in Oakland, and high schools in Centerville and Vallejo. He also served as architect for the school district in Fruitvale.  

---

University Acquisition of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

In late 1940, Charles Bancroft sold 2222 Piedmont Avenue to the University of California for $12,000. By 1940, the University owned the property on the east side of the block—acquired for the construction of California Memorial Stadium and International House—as well as several land parcels to the west of the Bancroft house and along College Avenue, including 2241 and 2243 College Avenue, acquired from May Cheney in 1939. The properties to the north of 2222 Piedmont Avenue on Piedmont Place, including the substantial brick fraternity house immediately next door at 2220 Piedmont, had also been acquired by the University. Thus, 2222 Piedmont Avenue was surrounded on three sides by University property. Although a definitive reason for University acquisition of the house has not been documented, the acquisition of the property would have been a logical step for the University. In addition, given the University's continued expansion into the formerly residential neighborhood, the value of the house as a single-family dwelling may have decreased.

University Uses of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

The University apparently did not convert the house to office use immediately after acquisition; instead, it may have become a residential rental property. Lee Palsak, who grew up in the house at 2234 Piedmont Avenue, recalled that in the late 1940s and early 1950s, a couple named “Tait” or “Tate” lived at 2222 Piedmont Avenue, next door to the Noble family at 2224 Piedmont. No written documentation of these residents has been discovered, but the house does not seem to be listed as an office or academic address in University records of the same period. Since 2220 and 2234 Piedmont Avenue remained privately occupied residences during this era despite the fact that they were owned by the University, it is quite possible that 2222 Piedmont was also used as a rental property.

University Architects & Engineers staff prepared floor plans for 2222 Piedmont Avenue in 1958, suggesting that the University was making plans to convert the dwelling to offices. This is consistent with documented University plans to convert 2220 and 2234 Piedmont Avenue to campus office use during the same period to accommodate new and growing academic programs. In October 1959, 2222 Piedmont Avenue first appeared in a Berkeley campus directory listed as the home of the “Institute of Social Sciences” and the “Computer Center – Machine Language Translation Project,” a
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subset of the Linguistics program. The Institute of Social Sciences continued as an occupant of 2222 Piedmont through the mid-1960s, but appears to have moved out around 1968.\textsuperscript{135}

The Linguistics program had a much longer tenancy at 2222 Piedmont Avenue. The program occupants are identified in various ways in the campus directories and the Facilities Data System (FDX): “Machine Language Translation Project” (1959); “Mechano Linguistics Project” (1963-64); “International Data Library and Reference Service” (1963-64); “Mechano-linguistics” (1967); “Phonology Lab” (1968-1969); “Linguistics” (1970 through at least 1995); and “Project in Linguistic Analysis” (1981). Although the exact name varies, most or all of these titles appear to describe essentially the same occupant. In 1981, a brief description of building occupants included this statement:

The building is now the location of the Project in Linguistic Analysis under the director of a professor in the Linguistics Department who has been in the building since 1966. In the late 1960s the research project was called Mechanolinguistics and 2222 Piedmont was the site of machine translation work involving at times fifteen to twenty staff. The project has had almost continual funding since then from the National Science Foundation and the Rome Air Development Center. The focus of research in the building has been shifting to other areas such as psycholinguistics, and the building is now used by fewer people, principally the director, three to eight students, a couple of visiting scholars, a half-time secretary, and sometimes one or two other faculty. The building is also the headquarters of the \textit{Journal of Chinese Linguistics}.\textsuperscript{136}

Throughout this period of use, Professor William Shi-Yuan Wang of the Department of Linguistics directed the various research occupants in 2222 Piedmont Avenue. Professor Wang came to Berkeley in 1966 and retired in 1994, and is thus associated with the entire period of the Linguistics Department’s occupation of 2222 Piedmont Avenue. After retiring, Professor Wang relocated to the City University of Hong Kong.

2222 Piedmont Avenue also housed a small number of offices for graduate students in the Department of Anthropology from 1970 through approximately 1975, when Linguistics began occupying the entire structure. 2222 Piedmont Avenue is currently used primarily as offices for the Center for Organizational Effectiveness, an internal administrative unit of the University.

\textsuperscript{135} The Institute was listed at 2222 Piedmont Avenue in the University’s Centennial Record, published in 1967, and the 1966-67 campus directory.

\textsuperscript{136} University of California, Berkeley, \textit{Berkeley Campus Space Plan}, October 1981, III-15.1.
COMPOSITE PLANS

The following composite plans detail the evolution of the College Avenue and Piedmont Avenue project area from the mid-nineteenth century to 2005.

1868

The 1868 composite plan shows a portion of Olmsted’s 1866 map for the Berkeley Neighborhood overlaid with W.F. Boardman’s 1868 map of the Berkeley Property. This section of Olmsted’s plan includes two roads: one road running south from the campus to Oakland; and a second road leading east up Strawberry Canyon. The road to Oakland closely correlates with Olmsted’s conception of Piedmont Way and the surveyed alignment of Piedmont Way as shown by Boardman in 1868. It is notable that the Boardman Map appears to be a copy of an 1865 map by Edward Miller, Olmsted’s surveyor, with a title added later. Prospect Street, although unnamed, aligns with Olmsted’s eastbound road. Audubon Street (now known as College Avenue) and Bancroft Way are both included in the survey. The surrounding lots, some which are shown to be a half-acre in size, were likely subdivided more than once since they are smaller than Olmsted’s envisioned one- to five-acre lots.

1911

On the 1911 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, houses fill all but one of the lots in the study area. Houses show a diversity of setbacks from Piedmont Avenue and College Avenue, although a pattern of 50-foot setbacks from Piedmont Avenue is emerging within the study area on the west side of the block. Houses on the east side of Piedmont are set high on the rising slope rather than along the street frontage.

C.L. Huggins’ 1900 layout of Piedmont Avenue, showing the medians, aligns with the 1911 Sanborn Map with the exception of the appearance of a cul-de-sac at the northern end of Piedmont Avenue known as Piedmont Place. Piedmont Place was mapped as a street in 1909 to provide access to eleven parcels subdivided from a single parcel owned by the widow of Captain Simmons.

Victorian-era houses fill the lots on the east side of College Avenue, with multiple structures occupying some of the larger lots. A large fraternity building just south of the study area replaced an older fraternity house that appears on the 1903 Sanborn Map. Outside the study area to the west along Sylvan Way, houses are closely spaced to form a denser residential street edge than within the study area. The center line of College Avenue defining the study area appears to also demark the limit.
of the University in this time period; residential buildings occupy the east side of College Avenue, while the west side of College Avenue is occupied by several University facilities including Hearst Hall and the girls’ basketball courts.

1929
The significant element in the 1929 plan is the completion of California Memorial Stadium and the subsequent loss of residential character on the east side of Piedmont Avenue north of Bancroft Way. Other changes have occurred beyond the study area and include the loss of Hearst Hall in a 1922 fire, culverting of Strawberry Creek, and the expansion of University facilities to the west and north.

1950
The 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows increasing development around the project area. International House has been constructed at the intersection of Piedmont Avenue and Bancroft Way, and the Boalt Hall School of Law and the Garret McEnerney Memorial Law Library have replaced houses along Bancroft Way. To the north, the Cowell Hospital Annex has replaced Piedmont Place.

Within the project area, road and lot alignments remain the same, but some buildings have either been demolished or moved. The fraternity house located deep in the lot now occupied by 2240 Piedmont Avenue has been destroyed by fire and replaced by the fraternity house that was moved from Bancroft Way. Dr. Wall's house at 2234 Piedmont Avenue has been moved from its former location on the International House site. Buildings neighboring the project area are increasingly large in scale and mass.

2005
The 2005 plan shows the increasing encroachment of large-scale University buildings on the former residential street. The section of College Avenue within the project area is closed to vehicular traffic and has become a curvilinear pedestrian and bike path. Surface parking lots affect the front and rear landscapes of the College Avenue houses and the rear of several of the Piedmont Avenue houses. The houses north of 2241 College Avenue have been demolished for Calvin Laboratory. Beyond the project area, the Law School has also expanded, resulting in the demolition of the former Clinton Day House and other buildings at the northwest corner of Bancroft Way and Piedmont Avenue. The Haas School of Business has replaced Cowell Hospital and 2220 Piedmont Avenue. Piedmont Avenue has been connected to Gayley Road, causing the northern end of Piedmont Avenue to be realigned.
Key to Plans:

Red line: Project study area
Orange lines: Olmsted, Frederick Law. Plan of Berkeley Neighborhood Including the Grounds of the College of California [map], 1866. From University of California Archives.
Black lines: William F. Boardman Co. Surveyors. Map of a Portion of the Berkeley Property Situated between the University of California and the State Deaf, Dumb and Blind Asylum, Oakland Alameda County, as Laid Out by F.L. Olmsted. Officially Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the College of California [map], May 1868. From City of Berkeley Archives.
Key to Plans:

Red line: Project study area
Blue lines: Huggins, Charles L., Berkeley Town Engineer. Improvement Map of Piedmont Avenue [map]. 1900. from City of Berkeley Archives.
1929 - Just prior to construction of International House

Key to Plans:
Red line: Project study area
Blue lines: Piedmont Avenue, Dwight Avenue to Piedmont Place, Concrete Curbs [map], ca. 1928. City of Berkeley Department of Public Works.
Key to Plans:

Red line: Project study area
Blue lines: Piedmont Avenue, Dwight Avenue to Piedmont Place, Concrete Curbs [map], ca. 1928. City of Berkeley Department of Public Works.
III. DESCRIPTION & CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT

The following section provides a description of the site, landscape, and structure at 2222 Piedmont Avenue, including a room-by-room inventory of the building. The conditions assessment identifies the condition of each element based on the following rankings:

- **Excellent (E)** – The element is in near original condition.
- **Good (G)** – The element is mostly intact.
- **Fair (F)** – The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration.
- **Poor (P)** – The element is badly damaged, missing, or not functioning.
- **Unknown (U)** – The element was not accessible for inspection.

SITE AND LANDSCAPE

The character of the site surrounding the five houses fronting Piedmont Avenue is fairly consistent. All five of the houses are set back approximately 50 feet from Piedmont Avenue on generous lots (Figures 1, 2, & 4). The east façade of each house faces its own large lawn with a selection of trees, shrubs, and foundation plantings. A concrete sidewalk and tree-planting strip separate the front lawns from Piedmont Avenue. Each house has a path leading to the front door from the sidewalk. Some houses also have narrow side paths and driveways that extend to the rear of the lots. According to historic Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, garage structures were originally located behind most of the dwellings. Although the garages have been removed, two concrete pads are still visible today at the rear of 2224 Piedmont Avenue.

The Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape (III. Description & Conditions Assessment) provides further elaboration on the location of hardscape and vegetation. The tree numbers below are references to the 2005 Tree Inventory (X. Appendix). Ratings for the condition and size of each tree can also be found in the Inventory.

Site Condition

During the early twentieth century, the houses along Piedmont Avenue characteristically had highly maintained residential landscapes, as shown in historic photographs (Images 14, 15, 21, & 24). In 2005, maintenance of these former residential landscapes is less meticulous than it was during the early to mid-twentieth century. Overall, the landscape elements at 2222 Piedmont Avenue appear to be in fair to good condition.
Landscape Elements

Vehicular ways and parking

Description:
An 8-foot-wide concrete drive on the south side of the building leads to an area at the rear of the 2222 Piedmont Avenue lot containing parking for six vehicles and several unenclosed dumpsters (Figures 76, 78, & 80). According to a former neighbor, this paving at the rear of 2222 Piedmont Avenue was in place by the 1940s or 1950s.¹³⁷

Condition: Fair

Pedestrian pathways

Description:
A 6-foot-wide pathway constructed of pressed red clay bricks connects the sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue to a stepped brick landing at the front door (Figure 65). The field pattern is a mortared running bond set 1 inch below the outer edge courses on each side. There are three edge courses; from interior to exterior, first, a single rowlock edge course, then a single header edge course, and lastly, a slightly raised rowlock stretcher edge course (Figure 66). At the brick landing adjacent to the house, a set of four brick steps sits perpendicular to the brick pathway and connects to the concrete drive (Figure 74). On the north side, an asphalt walkway leads from Piedmont Avenue toward Calvin Laboratory. This walk is level with the grade of the adjacent roadway and separated from it by an extruded asphalt curb (Figures 75, 76, & 77).

Condition: Fair to Good

Fencing and site walls

Description:
An unpainted split rail wood fence located on the north side of the building separates the planting bed from the adjacent walkway (Figures 75 & 76).

Condition: Good

Vegetation

Description:
At the front of the house is a lawn. Two overgrown shrubs are planted close to the eastern façade: Victorian Box (Pittosporum undulatum) and Pittosporum (Pittosporum tenifolium), Tree Nos. 441 and 444 (Figure 64). At the front entry stair there is a recently planted Wisteria vine along with other shrubs that border the south side of the house. Between the front walk and the concrete drive, there is a row of shrubs. The west and north façades have no vegetation.

Condition: Fair to Good

¹³⁷ Lee (Denny) Palsak, personal interview with Steven Finacom, 29 November 2005.
2005 EXISTING CONDITION INVENTORY LEGEND

- Asphalt Pathway
- Asphalt road or Parking Area
- Concrete Paving
- Brick Pathway
- Shrub Masses
- Groundcover Masses
- Unplanted Landscape Area
- Lawn Area
- Concrete ADA Ramp
- Wooden ADA Ramp
- Aggregate Paving
- Wall
- Fence
- Sign
- Existing tree shown on 1991 UCB provided survey
- Field located by PGA, not included on 1991 UCB Survey
- Tree no longer exists, was shown on 1976 UCB tree inventory
- Specimen Tree per UCB Specimen Tree Program
- Unimproved pedestrian pathway
BUILDING EXTERIOR

2222 Piedmont is a two-story, wood-frame structure on a reinforced concrete foundation. The former single-family residence was designed in the English Tudor Revival style. The first floor of the exterior is clad in shingles; the second floor is clad in applied half-timbering embedded in a smooth stucco finish that has been troweled flush with the wood (Figure 3). A wood belt course separates the first and second stories. The gable roof is clad in asphalt shingles but probably was originally clad in wood shingles. The roof is an important feature of the dwelling’s picturesque appearance with its carved wood brackets and exposed rafter tails. Fenestration is generally of wood construction with 1/1 double-hung sash on the first floor and 6/1 double-hung sash on the second floor. Metal brackets that were likely used for securing shutters are extant near some windows, although a historic photograph from 1939 does not show any shutters on the main façade (Image 24).

Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival Style

The English medieval revival mode has been known by many different names following its introduction to the United States around 1900. The term “Jacobethan” was coined by architectural historian Henry Russell Hitchcock to define one particular period revival style. The Jacobethan style appropriated architectural elements and proportions from the hybrid Medieval/Renaissance architecture that evolved in England during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I. It was popularized as a style for upper-middle-class housing in England during the 1890s and served largely the same purpose in suburban areas of the United States. Affluent streetcar suburbs in most large eastern and Midwestern cities feature developments of “Stockbroker Tudors” on large verdant lots.

As realized in Southern California during its brief period of popularity, the Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival style was frequently rendered in the “Hansel and Gretel” cottages of Hollywood. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the style usually achieved a higher level of verisimilitude, frequently emulating the informal picturesque cottages of the Cotswolds or the half-timbered dwellings of East Anglia. The hallmark characteristics of the Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival style in Northern California include informal plans and picturesque massing, steeply pitched cross-gabled roofs and dormers, pointed arch windows with leaded muntins, tall, faceted chimneys, and brick, stucco, and/or hand-adzed half-timbering. The overall effect is that of picturesque informality and age. Due to its expense, picturesque styles such as the Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival were used almost exclusively in the design of expensive single-family housing, particularly in affluent tracts developed in the 1910s and 1920s, such as Forest Hill and St. Francis Wood in San Francisco, and the Berkeley and Oakland Hills. Not surprisingly, the Berkeley Property Tract once featured many Jacobethan/English Tudor
Revival structures; the two extant properties in the 2200 block are 2222 and 2240 Piedmont Avenue. Other examples, now occupied by fraternities and sororities, survive on Prospect Street, Warring Street, and further south on Piedmont Avenue.

**East Façade**

The east façade of 2222 Piedmont Avenue is its primary façade and is given a slightly more robust architectural treatment than the other three façades since it faces the street (Figures 4 & 5). In regard to its massing, the east façade is comprised of two sections: a large gable wall closer to the street, and a projecting wing containing a recessed porch. Both sections are clad in shingles on the first floor and half-timbering and stucco on the second floor. On the main section of the east façade, a large brick chimney bisects the gable wall and penetrates the roof eave. At the top of the chimney are two rectangular flue vents, and at the base of the chimney is an iron access panel with a label that reads, “Judson Manufacturing, Oakland.” On the first floor, two 1/1 double-hung windows flank the chimney. On the second floor, two 6/1 double-hung windows flank the chimney; anchored to the wall below these windows are small decorative wood balconies with ornately turned balusters (Figure 6).

The main entry is sheltered beneath a large porch constructed on the south wall of the dwelling, accessed by a brick path leading from the sidewalk. The porch features wood box columns with simple Tuscan capitals and a balustrade consisting of scroll-sawn balusters and a simple square handrail. Originally, the porch had a rooftop balustrade that enclosed the rooftop deck, but this is now missing (Image 24). The main entrance is located at the north end of the porch and consists of a non-historic plain solid core wood door. On the west end of the porch is a pair of six-light wood panel doors that lead into the former dining room (Figure 7). The recessed portion of the east façade above the porch on the second floor features a half-timbered gable containing a one-panel, six-light wood door leading to the rooftop deck.

**North Façade**

The north façade faces the roadway that separates the property from the adjacent Haas School of Business (Figures 8 & 9). Until 1992, a former fraternity house was located at 2220 Piedmont Avenue adjacent to 2222 Piedmont to the north, but this building was demolished for construction of the Haas School of Business. The north façade of 2222 Piedmont is slightly more restrained than the east façade. It is clad in shingles on the first floor and plain stucco on the second floor, with a wood belt course separating the two levels. In regard to its massing, the rectangular wall is articulated by a
A two-story bay window capped by a wood denticulated cornice and a cement stucco crenellated parapet. Beyond the bay window, fenestration is relatively sparse, consisting for the most part of 1/1 double-hung windows or six-light casement windows. Anchoring the west end of the north façade is a small, one-story, enclosed porch with a hipped roof that is possibly an addition, although it is shown on the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (Map 15). Non-contributing elements on the north façade include a steel electrical junction box toward the east end and a metal downspout near the bay window.

**West Façade**

Facing the rear of the property, the west façade continues the decorative scheme of the north façade, with shingles on the first floor and half-timbering and stucco on the second floor (Figures 10 & 11). Due to a significant change in grade from Piedmont Avenue to the rear of the lot, the west façade is actually three stories in height, with the basement at grade at the rear of the dwelling. In regard to massing, the west façade is composed of a gable wall with a small projecting wing on the south side. The one-story enclosed porch mentioned above extends westward from the primary wall plane in the north bay. The fenestration on the west façade consists of three 1/1 double-hung wood windows on the first floor (including a small window on the addition), two 6/1 double-hung windows on the second floor, and one 6/1 double-hung window at the apex of the gable.

**South Façade**

Due to the narrow spacing between 2222 Piedmont and its neighbor to the south, 2224 Piedmont, and the lush canopy of trees, the south façade is largely concealed from view. Similar to the other three elevations, the south façade is clad in shingles at the first floor level and stucco and half-timbering on the second floor level. Its massing is more complicated, with a gabled-roof wing intersecting the main body of the house toward the west, and the large entrance porch toward the east (Figures 12 & 13). Moving west to east, the fenestration of the south façade consists of the following elements. The westernmost bay features a five-panel wood door leading to the basement, and a four-light casement window on the second floor. The gable-roof wing features a 1/1 double-hung window illuminating the basement, a window with a security screen on the first floor, and a 6/1 double-hung window on the second floor. The gable is half-timbered and the projecting eaves are supported by carved brackets. The porch is described above in the description of the east façade (Figure 14). Above the porch, on the second floor, are two gable-roofed, half-timbered and bracketed dormers; one gable contains a casement window and the other contains a one-panel, six-light wood door leading to the rooftop deck.
Exterior Condition

The structure at 2222 Piedmont Avenue appears to be in good condition overall. The paint on the exterior trim is beginning to delaminate, exposing bare wood. This is especially true on the main entry porch, which is suffering from extensive wear, revealing the bare wood on the stairs and decking. The plaster is water-stained in several areas, possibly because the original aggregate was improperly rinsed before it was mixed with the plaster. The plaster is also showing signs of deterioration, especially along the parapet on the north side, which is marked by organic growth, fed by missing downspouts and clogged gutters. Water damage also appears on the one-story enclosed porch on the west façade, which has extensive biological growth on its foundation, indicating that there is water permeating the concrete. The copper gutters on the structure have been secured with galvanized straps; the incompatibility of the materials will eventually lead the straps to fail because of galvanic corrosion. On the east façade, the large exterior brick chimney is in good condition, but does not appear to have any seismic bracing. At the apex of the gable on the west elevation, there appears to be a failing adhesive patch, perhaps applied in the past in an attempt to repair the sheathing. The basement door on the south façade is in poor condition and exhibits wood deterioration.

Building Interior

2222 Piedmont Avenue contains two stories over a partial basement with an attic above. The main entrance to the building is located on the south façade within an entry porch, a configuration shared by its neighbors at 2232 and 2234 Piedmont. A second entrance is located at the rear, west elevation. The main circulation in the building is achieved through a staircase in the entrance hall with a secondary staircase in the former service spaces. Although the original layout appears to be largely retained, the first floor plan was altered by the addition of partition walls sometime after 1978.

The interior finishes of 2222 Piedmont are typical of early twentieth-century East Bay houses and are highly influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. The woodwork is constructed of redwood originally finished with a dark stain, most of which has now been painted. Historic wood trim consists of a 6-inch wood baseboard, a narrow wood cornice in some rooms, 4-inch wood casings around the doors, and sash with 4-inch wood casings and 3-inch sills. The historic interior doors are either five-panel wood doors or single-panel wood doors, both with brass knobs and back plates. Historic windows are generally double-hung wood sash with some casement and other types of windows. In general, the sash pattern is 1/1 on the first floor, and 6/1 on the second floor. The original floors are oak with oak thresholds; floors in more ornate spaces also display cherry trim around the perimeter.
Walls and ceilings were originally finished with plaster. The windows in the former library and the cabinetry contain leaded glass, another typical feature of Arts and Crafts interiors.

**Basement**

**Room 1: Basement**

*Description:* The basement of 2222 Piedmont Avenue contains the building’s systems and also serves as storage space. The basement is accessed by an interior wood staircase on the east side and an exterior five-panel wood door on the south side (now nailed shut) ([Figures 15 & 16](#)). It is a partial basement and only extends under the former dining room, kitchen, and pantry. The structure is supported by 6-inch square wood posts and wood beams ([Figure 17](#)). The base of an internal brick chimney sits near the center of the basement. The basement walls consist of unfinished concrete, wood beadboard, plywood, and exposed sheathing boards. A chicken wire and wood cage has been inserted in the southern part of the basement ([Figure 18](#)). The ceiling of the basement is unfinished with exposed 2-inch by 9-and-a-half-inch joists. The floor is scored concrete. On the east wall is a small beadboard door that leads to a large unexcavated space. There are small windows on the north, west, and south walls; the north sash is a two-light, wood casement window, and the remaining sash are 1/1 wood windows. There is currently no lighting in the basement, but an older push-button switch plate is extant at the top of the stairs.

There are two other small basement spaces that can only be accessed from the exterior of the building, but these spaces were inaccessible at the time of the survey.

*Condition:* Fair

Overall, the basement is in fair to good condition. The plaster along the basement stairway is badly cracking and exhibits some material loss. The beadboard paneling is broken in places. The exterior door on the south side is rotting at the bottom and part of the frame is missing. The windows and window frames are in fair condition.

**First Floor**

**Room 10: Main Corridor**

*Description:* The main corridor in 2222 Piedmont Avenue serves as the primary circulation space on the first floor ([Figure 19](#)). The main entrance to the house is located on the south side of the corridor and consists of a replacement solid core wood door in the original wood frame; hardware consists of a non-historic brushed aluminum lever handle and plate ([Figure 20](#)). The main staircase is directly west of the entrance. Although the corridor appears to extend between the former pantry (Room 11A) to the west, and to the former parlor (Room 15) to the east, it originally only extended from the front door to just beyond the closet under the stairway; these are the boundaries used in describing Room 10. Originally, the main corridor led directly into the dining room (Room 11), the library (Room 14), and the parlor (Room 15). These entrances were marked by three wide pass-throughs, but the pass-throughs to Rooms 14 and 15 have since been partially infilled with gypsum board to accommodate standard-size wood door frames and solid core wood doors, although the original pass-through frames have been retained.

The walls and ceilings of the main corridor are plaster. The floor retains what appears to be its original oak floor inlaid with two cherry bands that run along the perimeter of the room ([Figure 21](#)). The under-stair closet has a heavily worn wood floor with wider boards set perpendicularly to the corridor floor. The main corridor is finished with wood trim that includes a picture rail, a
cornice, a baseboard, and paneling with 4-inch battens (Figure 22). The lighting in the corridor consists of fluorescent light fixtures.

The main staircase runs east-west to a landing and then makes a 90-degree turn to the north. A fixed single-light wood sash window is located to the west of the main door and a 9/1 double-hung wood sash window with a brass latch provides light at the landing. The staircase consists of oak treads and risers with cherry trim on the landing. The staircase has a stepped solid balustrade that serves as the back of a window seat on the north side of the stair; on the other side of the stair is a contemporary metal railing (Figure 23). The balustrade is finished on both sides with wood paneling and 4-inch battens. The window seat is constructed of wood and has a hinged seat. A closet sits under the stair and is accessed by an original single-panel door with a brass plate and knob. An original brass heating vent is inserted in the floor directly north of the window seat; a second metal vent sits in the base of the window seat.

Condition: Good
Room 10 is in good condition.

Room 11: Office
Description: Room 11, the former dining room, is currently being used as an office. The original dimensions of the room have been altered by the insertion of a gypsum board wall that cut off approximately one-third of the northern portion of the room, creating a rear corridor (Room 11B). Room 11 is accessed by a contemporary solid core wood door with a brushed aluminum level handle and plate inserted into the partition wall. The original trim in Room 11 is redwood finished with a dark stain, likely the original color of the paneling in the main corridor (Figure 24). The ceiling is plaster and the original walls are also plaster with wood wainscoting. The wainscoting is similar to the vertical paneling in the main corridor. The floor is covered in carpet but likely has its original wood floor underneath. On the east wall, a pair of double-leaf glazed wood doors with brass hardware leads out to the side porch (Figure 25). The west and south walls both contain a single 1/1 wood sash window with brass hardware. Lighting fixtures consist of non-historic fluorescent lighting and plastic switch plates. Room 11 contains a large redwood hutch with a mirrored back flanked by finely carved wood scrolls and two Ionic columns supporting a wood entablature (Figures 26 & 27). The bottom part of the hutch contains drawers and cabinets with plain brass knobs, and the top part contains leaded glass cabinets with beadboard backing.

Condition: Good
Room 11 is in good condition. The only sign of deterioration is on the south window, where the top sash is missing and has been replaced with a plain piece of glass (Figure 28). The original hutch, wainscoting, and doors are in excellent condition.

Room 11A: Storage
Description: Room 11A was formerly the pantry and is currently being used for storage (Figure 29). The room originally communicated with the dining room (Room 11) through a swinging door on the east wall; the wood door is still extant but has been fitted with a brushed aluminum lever handle and plate. Room 11A also opened into Room 13, which was likely the original kitchen, but this door has been infilled. In addition, a new door was installed in the opening to Room 12; this door is a non-historic solid core wood door with a brushed aluminum level handle and plate. The walls and ceilings of Room 11A are plaster and the baseboard is wood, plastic, or plastic glued to wood. The floor of Room 11A is contemporary linoleum identical to the floor covering in Rooms 12 and 12A. A single 1/1 wood sash window is located on the west wall. The lighting fixture is a ceiling-mounted fluorescent light. Room 11A is dominated by a built-in wood
desk and cabinetry. The cabinets towards the north end have leaded glass doors; the remaining cabinets have clear glass doors (Figure 30).

**Condition:** Good
Room 11A is in good condition.

**Room 11B: Rear Corridor**
*Description:* Room 11B was originally part of the former dining room (Room 11) (Figure 31). The south wall of Room 11B is a non-historic gypsum board partition wall; the remaining walls are plaster as is the ceiling. The floor in Room 11B is carpet over oak with metal-over-oak thresholds to Room 11A. Room 11B is accessed by doors to Rooms 11, 11A, and 13, and a pass-through to the main corridor (Room 10). Room 11B contains original elements of the former dining room (Room 11). On the northern wall, a former fireplace entirely enclosed by gypsum board protrudes into the corridor; it is unclear if the fireplace itself remains extant, but the original mantel and mantel scroll brackets appear to be stored in the attic of the house. The western wall of Room 11B is finished with wood paneling, now painted, that matches the paneling in Room 11 (Figure 32).

**Condition:** Good
Room 11B is in good condition.

**Room 12: Office**
*Description:* Room 12 is an L-shaped, windowless room used for storage (Figure 33). The room was originally rectangular in plan but a toilet room (Room 12A) was inserted at some point after 1978. The walls are plaster except for the walls bordering Room 12A, which are gypsum board. The ceiling is also plaster. The floor is covered in the same linoleum used in Rooms 11A and 12A. Room 12 has a plastic baseboard and a non-historic wood cornice. Lighting consists of ceiling-mounted fluorescent lights with plastic switch plates. Room 12 is accessed by two non-historic interior doors leading to Rooms 11A and 13, and an exterior historic five-panel wood door on the south wall.

**Condition:** Good
Room 12 is in good condition.

**Room 12A: Toilet Room**
*Description:* Room 12A is a toilet room that has been carved out of Room 12. The exterior walls of Room 12A—which are the west and north walls—are plaster, while the remaining walls are gypsum boards. The room has a plastic baseboard and the floor is covered in the same linoleum used in Rooms 11A and 12. Room 12A has a plaster ceiling and a simple non-historic wood cornice. The door is located on the south wall and is a solid core wood door in a wood frame with a brushed aluminum level handle and plate. Room 12A has two windows on the west and north walls, which are original 1/1 double-hung wood sash windows with brass hardware. The lighting consists of a fluorescent ceiling-mounted fixture and a plastic switch plate. Room 12A is fitted out with a contemporary toilet, sink, countertop, and under-sink cabinet constructed of particleboard (Figure 34).

**Condition:** Good
Room 12A is in good condition.
Room 13: Office

**Description:** Room 13 was likely the original kitchen but is currently used as an office (Figure 35). The room retains its original floor plan, but the door opening between Rooms 13 and 11A has been infilled. The walls and ceiling of Room 13 are plaster and the floor is covered in carpet. The room has a wood baseboard and a non-historic wood cornice. Room 13 contains four original wood door frames: two contain doors leading to Room 12 and the rear corridor (Room 11B, formerly part of the dining room) and are non-historic solid core wood doors with brushed aluminum hardware; the third contains a five-panel wood door with a plain brass knob and plate leading to Room 13A; and the fourth contains a single-panel wood door with a plain brass knob and plate leading to the back stairway. The back stair is carpeted wood with a wood railing. Room 13 has two windows on the north wall: a fixed, six-light, wood casement window, and a 1/1 double-hung wood window. Lighting consists of fluorescent ceiling-mounted fixtures with plastic switch plates. On the south wall, an original brass heating vent is located in the baseboard; this wall also has what appears to be the remains of a bell call system mounted near the ceiling (Figure 36). Also along the south wall is an enclosed L-shape structure that may contain the remnants of a heating element (Figure 37).

**Condition:** Good
Room 13 is in good condition.

Room 13A: Kitchen

**Description:** Room 13A likely originally served as a laundry room and currently contains a very small kitchen (Figure 38). The windowless room is tucked under the back stairs, and as a result, has a steeply sloped plaster ceiling. The walls are also plaster with a plain wood baseboard. The floor is covered in the same linoleum as Rooms 11A, 12, and 12A. Room 13A has two five-panel wood doors with plain brass knobs that lead to Room 13 and the basement. The lighting consists of ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures with a plastic switch plate. There are wood cabinets on the south wall and a non-historic sink with a wood under-sink cabinet on the north wall; open wood shelving sits above the cabinets on both walls. The south cabinets appear to be original and feature two tilt-out drawers with brass hardware.

**Condition:** Good
Room 13A is in good condition.

Room 14: Office

**Description:** Room 14 was formerly the library and is currently used as an office (Figure 39). On the north wall is a three-sided bay window containing three 1/1 double-hung wood windows with leaded glass in the upper sash and clear glass below. The woodwork in Room 14 is redwood finished in a dark stain, similar to the color used in the former dining room (Room 11), and likely the original finish. The walls and ceiling are plaster and the floors are wood, similar to the floors in the main corridor (Room 10). The room is finished with a wood baseboard and wainscoting. On the west and east walls are built-in wood bookcases with beadboard backing (Figure 40). A non-historic wood cornice is also present, but the original room probably had no cornice. Room 14 is accessed by two doors: one leads to the main corridor (Room 10), and the second leads to Room 15. The door to the main corridor is a solid core wood door with a brushed aluminum lever handle and plate in a non-historic wood frame set into the original pass-through (Figure 41). The door to Room 15 is an original wood door and frame with a plain brass knob and plate (Figure 42). Lighting is achieved by a ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixture and a plastic switch plate. In the southwest corner of the room is a tile fireplace with a redwood mantel and surround finished with a cornice matching the window and door surrounds. Although partially obscured now by a cabinet, the fireplace appears to contain a brass insert for a gas fireplace (Figure 43).
Room 15: Conference Room  
*Description:* Room 15, the original parlor, is now used as a conference room (Figure 44). The wood trim is painted but was likely originally stained like the trim in Rooms 11 and 14. The parlor historically extended the width of the house but has since been divided into two rooms (Rooms 15 and 16) and a small antechamber. The exterior walls (north and east) and the west wall bordering Room 14 are original walls finished with plaster and a wood baseboard; the south wall and the walls bordering the antechamber are gypsum board walls with no baseboard. The ceiling of Room 15 is plaster with a non-historic wood cornice and the floor is covered in carpet over wood. The room is accessed through two doors: the door to the antechamber is a non-historic solid core wood door with a brushed aluminum lever handle and plate; and the door to Room 14 is an original single-panel wood door with a plain brass knob and plate (Figure 45). There is a single 1/1 double-hung wood window on the east wall. Lighting consists of incandescent track lighting with plastic switch plates. The east wall has an ornately decorated fireplace surround featuring an entablature supported by three scroll brackets; the fireplace is now blocked off (Figures 46 & 47).

The small antechamber leading to Rooms 15 and 16 was originally part of Room 15 and still retains its oak flooring. The antechamber has gypsum board walls.

*Condition:* Good  
Room 15 is in good condition.

Room 16: Office  
*Description:* Room 16 is currently used as an office but was originally part of Room 15, the former parlor (Figure 48). The room is accessed by a non-historic solid core wood door with a brushed aluminum level handle and plate on the north wall. The north wall is a gypsum board partition wall and the remaining walls are plaster with wood baseboards. Near the northwest corner of the room is an original brass heating vent inserted into the baseboard (Figure 49). The ceiling is plaster with a non-historic wood cornice. There are two original 1/1 double-hung wood sash windows in Room 16 on the south and east walls. The floor is carpeted but the original wood floor is likely extant underneath. Lighting consists of ceiling-mounted fluorescent lighting with plastic switch plates.

*Condition:* Good  
Room 16 is in good condition.

Second Floor  
Room 20: Second Floor Corridor  
*Description:* The Second Floor Corridor extends east-to-west through the center of the second floor, terminating at a closet on the western end and Room 24 on the eastern end (Figure 50). The corridor is connected to both the main stairway to the south and the back stairway to the north; both stairs are carpeted at the top and the back stair has a decorative wood balustrade with turned balusters (Figure 51). The walls and ceiling in the Second Floor Corridor are plaster. The floor is covered in carpet over oak flooring. There is an 8-inch-high wood baseboard and a wood cornice that is 2 inches high on the flat ceilings and 3 inches high on the sloped ceilings. The doors off the corridors are five-panel wood doors with some oak thresholds. Door hardware
consists of plain brass knobs set on rectangular back plates. The Second Floor Corridor has no windows. Lighting consists of flush-mount fluorescent fixtures with steel switch plates.

**Condition:** Good
Room 20 is in good condition.

**Room 20A: Toilet Room**

*Description:* Room 20A contains a toilet room. The walls and ceiling are plaster and there is a 6-inch wood baseboard. The floor is covered in linoleum over oak. The doorway to the toilet room is located on the east wall and consists of a five-panel wood door with a brass knob set into a brass back plate, 4-inch wood trim, and an oak threshold. A single 4/1 double-hung wood window with brass hardware is located on the north wall. Lighting is provided by a sconce with a plastic switch plate. Room 20A also contains a non-historic toilet.

**Condition:** Good
Room 20A is in good condition.

**Room 21: Office**

*Description:* Room 21 is currently used as an office. The walls and ceiling are plaster with an 8-inch wood baseboard and a 2-inch and 3-inch wood cornice. The floor is covered in carpet over linoleum over oak. Room 21 has four doors leading to the corridor (Room 20), Room 21A, a closet, and the roof deck on top of the main porch. The interior doors are five-panel wood doors; the exterior door is a six-light paneled wood door. All of the doors have brass knobs set into brass back plates and three of them have oak thresholds. Room 21 has two windows on the west and south walls; both are 6/1 double-hung wood windows with brass latches. Lighting consists of four contemporary fluorescent fixtures with a brass switch plate. Room 21 also contains one brass register for forced air and a closet containing a small window (Figure 52).

**Condition:** Good
Room 21 is in good condition. The plaster ceiling and the wood sash are showing some signs of deterioration.

**Room 21A: Toilet Room**

*Description:* Room 21A was previously used as a toilet room. The walls are plaster and linoleum and the ceiling is also plaster. The floor in Room 21A is carpet over linoleum over oak. There is an 8-inch wood baseboard and a linoleum wainscot with molding above the wainscoting. Room 21A is accessed from both Rooms 21 and 22 and has a five-panel wood door with a brass knob and back plate. On the west wall, Room 21A has a single 3/1 double-hung wood window with a brass latch. Lighting consists of contemporary fluorescent fixtures with plastic switch plates. The room contains one sink, a medicine cabinet, and no toilet (Figure 53).

**Condition:** Good
Room 21A is in good condition.

**Room 22: Office**

*Description:* Room 22 is currently used as an office. The walls are plaster and gypsum board with an 8-inch wood baseboard and a 2-inch wood cornice. The ceilings are plaster and the floor is carpet over linoleum over oak. Room 22 is accessed by two doors that lead to the Second Floor Corridor (Room 20) and Room 21A; both are five-panel wood doors with brass knobs and back plates. There are two 6/1 double-hung wood windows on the north and west walls with brass
latches. Lighting consists of fluorescent fixtures with brass switch plates. There is one brass register for forced air (Figure 54).

**Condition:** Good  
Room 22 is in good condition.

**Room 23: Office**  
**Description:** Room 23 is currently used as an office. The room sits above the library and also has a three-sided bay window on the north wall. The bay window in Room 23 contains a wood window seat. The walls in Room 23 are plaster and gypsum board with an 8-inch wood baseboard and a modified 1-inch wood cornice. The ceiling is gypsum board and the floor is covered in sheet linoleum over oak. Room 23 is accessed by two doors leading to the Second Floor Corridor (Room 20) and Room 24A; both doors are five-panel wood doors with brass knobs and back plates. The bay window has one 9/1 double-hung wood window flanked by two 6/1 double-hung wood windows with brass latches. The lighting in Room 23 consists of 1940s fluorescent fixtures with brass switch plates (Figure 55).

**Condition:** Good  
Room 23 is in good condition.

**Room 24: Office**  
**Description:** Room 24 is currently used as an office. The room extends the width of the house and is accessed by three doors leading to the Second Floor Corridor (Room 20), Room 25, and Room 24A. The door to the corridor is a five-panel wood door with a brass knob and back plate. The walls and ceiling are plaster with an 8-inch baseboard, and a 2-inch wood cornice on the flat ceiling and a 3-inch cornice on the sloped ceiling. The floor is covered in sheet linoleum likely over oak. There are three windows on the south and east walls that are 9/1 double-hung wood sash windows with brass latches. Lighting consists of 1940s flush-mounted fluorescent fixtures with brass switches. On the east wall is an ornamental fireplace with a wood mantel supported by pairs of Tuscan order engaged columns, and egg-and-dart and denticulated moldings. Room 24 also contains one sink and one wood window seat (Figure 56).

**Condition:** Fair to Good  
Room 24 is in fair to good condition. The plaster walls and ceiling are cracking and the wood sash and linoleum floor are deteriorating.

**Room 24A: Closet**  
**Description:** Room 24A is a large closet accessed by both Rooms 23 and 24. The walls and ceiling are plaster with a 6-inch plain baseboard and 6-inch wood nailer. The closet contains wood shelves. The floor is covered in sheet linoleum. The door to the closet is a five-panel wood door with brass hardware. There is a small four-light wood casement window with a brass latch on the north wall. Lighting consists of flush-mounted incandescent light with a brass switch plate (Figure 57).

**Condition:** Good  
Room 24A is in good condition. The plaster walls and linoleum floors are showing some signs of deterioration.
Room 25: Office

Description: Room 25 is currently used as an office. The walls and ceiling are plaster with an 8-inch wood baseboard, a linoleum wainscot, and a 3-inch molding above the wainscot. The room also contains one built-in cabinet. Room 25 is accessed by a five-panel wood door with a brass knob and back plate leading to Room 24. A single-panel, six-light wood door in poor condition leads to the exterior roof deck above the main porch. Lighting consists of 1940s flush-mounted fluorescent lighting with a brass switch plate (Figure 58).

Condition: Fair to Good
Room 25 is in fair to good condition. The plaster walls and ceiling are cracking and the linoleum floor is also showing signs of wear.

Room 27: Closet

Description: Room 27 is a closet. The walls and ceilings are plaster with a 6-inch wood baseboard. The floor is covered in linoleum over oak. The entrance to the closet is on the north side and consists of a five-panel wood door with brass hardware. There are no windows in Room 27. Lighting consists of one incandescent fixture.

Condition: Good
Room 27 is in good condition.

Third Floor

Room 30: Attic Stairway/Corridor

Description: Room 30 is the stairway to the attic and the attic corridor. The treads and risers are wood with cork over the treads. The walls and ceiling are plaster with a wood baseboard. The floor is also wood. The doors to Rooms 31 and 32 are five-panel wood doors with brass hardware (Figure 59).

Condition: Poor
The attic stairs and corridor are in poor condition. There is evidence of water damage and the plaster on the walls and ceiling is badly cracked.

Room 31: Attic

Description: Room 31 was likely originally used as a servant’s bedroom. It is located in the western part of the attic and is accessed through a door leading to the attic corridor and stairs (Figure 60). The ceiling, clad in plaster, steeply slopes on the north and south sides to follow the line of the gable roof. The walls are also plaster and there is an 11-inch wood baseboard. Room 31 contains two closets along the south wall. The doors are five-panel wood doors with brass hardware, wood trim, and a painted wood threshold. Room 31 contains a single 6/1 double-hung wood window with steel hardware on the west wall. Lighting consists of a brass S-curved bulb fixture with a brass switch plate. There is also a porcelain sink near the window on the west wall (Figure 61). Room 31 is used for storage and contains many salvaged elements from the interior of 2222 Piedmont, including five wood doors, a wood fireplace mantel (possibly from the dining room fireplace), built-in wood drawers, and some wood paneling.

Condition: Good
Room 31 is in good condition. Although the plaster on the walls and ceiling is cracked, and the windowsill is showing deterioration from water and sun, overall, the room elements are in good condition.
Room 32: Attic

*Description:* Room 32 is located in the eastern part of the attic and is accessed through a door leading to the attic corridor and stairs. Room 32 is unfinished and the peaked ceiling and the walls consist of exposed studs and rafters. The floor in Room 32 is wood. The door on the west wall is a five-panel wood door with brass hardware. Two triangular screened vent openings flank the exterior brick chimney on the east wall (*Figure 62*). Room 32 contains an incandescent lighting fixture (*Figure 63*).

*Condition:* Good
Room 32 is in good condition.
IV. AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following section identifies the building’s character-defining features and assesses their historical significance. The landscape is assessed in a similar manner, describing character-defining features that contribute to the historic landscape character of 2222 Piedmont Avenue and the broader Southeast Campus area. When evaluating the significance and condition of a resource, a scale is often used to rate the landscape architectural and historic value of the resource and its individual elements. The typical rating scale employs four categories: “Very Significant,” “Significant,” “Contributing,” and “Non-Contributing.” The definitions of these categories are included below.138

- **Very Significant (VS)**
  - The building/element was built during the period of significance.
  - It is architecturally significant.
  - It is associated with a significant individual or event.
  - It remains intact or with only minor alterations.
  - It is physically in good to excellent condition.
  - It is highly sensitive to change.

- **Significant (S)**
  - The building/element was built during the period of significance.
  - It is of secondary importance.
  - It has been altered.
  - It is in deteriorated condition.
  - It was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally significant.
  - It is sensitive to change.

- **Contributing (C)**
  - The building/element was built during the period of significance, but is not architecturally significant.
  - It is of secondary importance.
  - It has been altered.
  - It is in deteriorated condition.
  - It was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally significant.
  - It is sensitive to change.

- **Non-Contributing (NC)**
  - The building/element was not built during the period of significance.
  - The building/element has been subjected to major additions or incompatible alterations.
  - It is incompatible in style, material, scale, character or use with the original building.
  - It is in poor to deteriorated or critical condition.
  - It is not particularly sensitive to change.

138 Please note that the use of the terms in this rating scale does not equate the meaning as used by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to determine a project’s potential impact on the environment.
Specimen Trees
The rating of trees as Specimen is based upon the Campus Specimen Tree Program established by the University. The specimen rating can be applied to trees and other plants such as shrubs and grasses. In general, the specimen should be in good health and not pose a hazard to traffic, existing buildings, or utilities. This specimen must possess one or more qualities in the following categories: Aesthetics, Historical, Educational, Strawberry Creek, or Natural Area. The Historical quality, which is most relevant for this report, is described as follows:

Historical: The tree was planted as part of a memorial planting or is a particularly outstanding example of the original botanical garden plantings. The tree is identified by landmark status, named with a plaque, is identified as a contributing feature in an historic structures report and/or identified in the LHP [Landscape Heritage Plan] as a character defining feature of the landscape.\(^{139}\)

LANDSCAPE
The following discussion evaluates the areas of significance for the landscape around 2222 Piedmont Avenue. Ratings for the historical value and condition of each tree can be found in the 2005 Tree Inventory (X. Appendix).

Landscape Summary
The section of Piedmont Avenue north of Bancroft Way undoubtedly represents a good deal of what Frederick Law Olmsted originally envisioned for the Berkeley Property Tract. As described in more detail in Part II, the current road alignment is the result of this vision and the more detailed, tangible work of later surveyors. Although the use of the road has changed over time, especially when Piedmont Avenue became a through road rather than one ending in a cul-de-sac, the dominant character-defining qualities of a verdant, shaded, divided road remains.

The first lots sold in the Berkeley Property Tract were large in size, in keeping with the parcel size recommended by Olmsted. These parcels included the Palmer, Stiles, and Slocum lots on the east side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Way. Large lots permitted more choice for house placement, and significant elevation changes offered good views. These qualities invited siting dwellings both high and back from the street, as the Palmer brothers did with their houses in the 1870s (Images 1, 2, & 4). The houses on the east side of the 2200 block took advantage of the small ridge that permitted views both west to the bay and north into Strawberry Creek canyon. These houses had large park-like gardens running down to Piedmont Avenue.

\(^{139}\) University of California, Berkeley, 2020 Long Range Development Plan, 4.3.
On the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue, the majority of the remaining houses were developed in a two-year period between 1908 and 1909. As discussed above, the population and construction boom in Berkeley led to pressure for further land subdivision. Few of the available parcels had elevated locations that provided views, and most of them were substantially smaller than the parcels purchased in the nineteenth century. As a result, the parcels on the west side were developed with houses that had smaller and more uniform setbacks. The houses at 2222, 2224, and 2232 Piedmont Avenue are the most intact surviving examples of this development on the 2200 block. Although the buildings at 2234 and 2240 Piedmont Avenue were not originally located on the west side of the block, they accurately reflect the setback, scale, mass, and architectural character of the original three houses. This group of five buildings is critical in establishing the character of one of the edges of the 2200 block and represents a condition that was, at one time, similar to much of the rest of Piedmont Avenue south of Bancroft Way, where large private homes with generous front gardens were established.

Pressure for development ultimately increased on the east side of Piedmont Avenue as well. On the Palmer parcel, an additional house was built fronting the street, and to the south of the Palmer lot, three houses were constructed on smaller parcels closely fronting Piedmont Avenue. These four houses, added by 1911, were related to the extant houses on the opposite side of the 2200 block in their date of construction, placement on their lots, and architectural scale. The construction of International House resulted in the removal of these four houses, one of which was relocated to the lot at 2234 Piedmont Avenue.

However, pressure to build additional houses closer to the street front did not reach the parcels north of the Palmer Houses. In this part of the block, there were three large houses located between the Palmer Houses and Strawberry Creek, and all three were located deep and high on their lots. There is no record of development between these buildings and the street other than landscaping for house gardens. These houses were removed as part of the construction of the Stadium in the early 1920s. Today, the Stadium’s paths, promenades, and plantings lie at the original locations of these front gardens. As a result, this land has been open space since before American or Mexican times; first as native ground, then as private gardens of gracious Victorian houses, and currently, as a public landscape associated with California Memorial Stadium. This is distinguishing, as it appears that all other parts of the Berkeley Property Tract were developed.
Lot sizes varied within the Berkeley Property Tract. Lots on the west side of the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue were between 60 and 85 feet wide. Most of the buildings in the Tract were set back approximately 50 feet from the street (Images 14 & 15), but several were set back considerably more, such as the former fraternity house that originally occupied the lot at 2240 Piedmont Avenue (Images 17, 18, & 20, Map 12). It was set deep into a wide lot and was accessed by a 120-foot-long driveway that culminated in a circular turnaround at the building. The setback might be explained, however, by the fact that this building was moved from the 2251 College Avenue lot just behind the 2240 Piedmont Avenue lot (Maps 10 & 12). It may have simply been easier to move the building to the rear of the lot because of the sloping topography; this may also explain why the building was turned 90 degrees in its new location. The original house occupying the lot at 2234 Piedmont Avenue, and two of the houses north of 2222 Piedmont Avenue (now demolished), had semicircular drives or walks that came to the front entries of the houses (Image 17). This pattern of varied lot sizes, large houses with generous setbacks, and elegant curved entry drives and walkways, is highly characteristic of the houses along Piedmont Way during the peak of the Berkeley Property Tract in the first third of the twentieth century.

**Hardscape Character-Defining Features**

**Brick front entry pathway and stair**

*Significance: Significant*

The brick pathway and brick stair at the front (eastern) side of the house at 2222 Piedmont Avenue are significant features (Figures 65, 66, 67, & 72). They appear to be original to the construction of the house and exhibit the pattern of front entry walks shown in aerial photographs from the 1920s.

**Concrete driveway**

*Significance: Significant*

The concrete driveway leading from Piedmont Avenue to the no-longer-extant garage structure at the rear of the property also appears to be original to the construction of the house (Figures 68 & 80). It exhibits the pattern of side drives shown in aerial photographs from the 1920s.

**Front setback**

*Significance: Significant*

The building setback, in concert with similar setbacks of neighboring houses, reflects planning and spatial characteristics of its time and the socio-economic status of its owners (Figure 64).
Landscape Character-Defining Features

Front lawn
  *Significance:* Significant
  The lawn that remains today is significant as it dates to the residential period of 2222 Piedmont Avenue. Generous front lawns were a hallmark of the neighborhood, where large houses were typically constructed with 50-foot setbacks. The lawn is the only significant landscape feature that remains intact today at 2222 Piedmont Avenue (Figure 64).

Victorian Box
  *Significance:* Contributing
  The Victorian Box (Pittosporum undulatum), Tree No. 441, is considered a contributing feature, although it is currently overgrown. All other plants are considered non-contributing.

Specimen Trees
  There are no specimen trees present on the 2222 Piedmont Avenue property.

BUILDING EXTERIOR

The exterior of 2222 Piedmont Avenue has remained intact and is reflective of the original massing, configuration, and appearance of the dwelling.

  *Significance:* Very Significant
  *Character-Defining Features:*
  - Building massing
  - Cladding materials: wood shingles, half-timbering, and stucco
  - Building’s roofline and roof profile inclusive of dormers, parapet, and chimneys
  - Large exterior chimney on east façade
  - Main entry porch, including roof deck, columns, and balustrades
  - Balconies on east façade
  - Wood molding and trim
  - Original wood doors and door surrounds
  - Wood windows and window surrounds

BUILDING INTERIOR

Basement

Room 1: Basement
  *Significance:* Contributing
  *Character-Defining Features:*
  - Wood framing members (i.e., posts and beams)
  - Brick chimney base
  - Wood beadboard sheathing
  - Wood treads and risers
  - Original wood doors and door surrounds
  - Wood windows and window surrounds
First Floor

Room 10: Main Corridor
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceilings
- Wood paneling, picture rail, cornice, and baseboard
- Main staircase, including oak treads and risers; oak and cherry landing; wood balustrade
- Window seat
- Oak and cherry floors
- Pass-through openings
- Door surround of main door
- Closet door, door surround, and hardware
- Wood windows, window surrounds, and hardware
- Brass heating vent

Room 11: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood trim, including baseboard and wainscot
- Redwood hutch and hardware
- Original wood doors, door surrounds, and hardware
- Wood windows, window surrounds, and hardware

Room 11A: Storage
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Built-in wood desk, cabinets, and hardware
- Swinging wood door to Room 11B and door surround
- Wood window and window surround

Room 11B: Rear Corridor
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood paneling on west wall
- Wood baseboard
- Oak floors
- Enclosed fireplace (if fireplace is still extant)

Room 12: Office
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Exterior wood door and door surround
Room 12A: Toilet Room
   Significance: Contributing
   Character-Defining Features:
   • Plaster walls and ceiling
   • Wood windows, window surrounds, and hardware

Room 13: Office
   Significance: Significant.
   Character-Defining Features:
   • Plaster walls and ceiling
   • Wood baseboard
   • Door surrounds, Wood doors and hardware to back stair and Room 13A
   • Wood windows and window surrounds
   • Brass heating vent
   • Bell call system

Room 13A: Kitchen
   Significance: Contributing
   Character-Defining Features:
   • Plaster walls and ceiling
   • Wood baseboard
   • Wood cabinets on south wall
   • Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware

Room 14: Office
   Significance: Very Significant
   Character-Defining Features:
   • Plaster walls and ceiling
   • Wood trim, including wainscoting and baseboard
   • Built-in bookcases
   • Fireplace and mantel
   • Oak floors
   • Pass-through to corridor
   • Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware on door leading to Room 15
   • Bay window with wood sash and leaded glass

Room 15: Conference Room
   Significance: Significant
   Character-Defining Features:
   • Plaster walls and ceiling
   • Wood baseboard
   • Fireplace and mantel
   • Oak floors
   • Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware on door leading to Room 14
   • Wood window and window surround
Room 16: Office

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Oak floors
- Wood windows and window surrounds
- Brass heating vent

Second Floor

Room 20: Second Floor Corridor

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and cornice
- Wood balustrade on back staircase
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surrounds, oak thresholds, and brass hardware

Room 20A: Toilet Room

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Oak floors
- Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware
- Wood window, window surround, and brass hardware

Room 21: Office

Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and cornice
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surrounds, oak thresholds, and brass hardware
- Wood windows, window surround, and brass hardware
- Closet
- Brass register
Room 21A: Toilet Room
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and molding above wainscot
- Linoleum wainscot
- Oak floors
- Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware
- Wood window, window surround, and brass hardware
- Medicine cabinet
- Sink

Room 22: Office
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and cornice
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware
- Wood windows, window surround, and brass hardware
- Brass register
- Brass light switch plate

Room 23: Office
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Wood baseboard and cornice
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surround, and brass hardware
- Wood windows, window surround, and brass hardware
- Brass light switch plate

Room 24: Office
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and cornice
- Window seat
- Ornamental fireplace and mantel
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surround, and brass hardware
- Wood windows, window surround, and brass hardware
- Sink
Room 24A: Closet
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and shelves
- Sheet linoleum
- Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware
- Wood window, window surround, and brass hardware
- Brass light switch plate

Room 25: Office
Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard and molding above wainscot
- Linoleum wainscot
- Oak floors
- Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware
- Built-in cabinet
- Brass light switch plate

Room 27: Closet
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Oak floors
- Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware

Third Floor
Room 30: Attic Stairway/Corridor
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Wood treads and risers
- Wood floors
- Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware
Room 31: Attic

Significance: Contributing

Character-Defining Features:

- Plaster walls and ceiling
- Wood floors
- Wood baseboard
- Wood doors, door surrounds, and brass hardware
- Wood window and window surround
- Brass lighting fixture and switch plate
- Porcelain sink

Room 32: Attic

Significance: Contributing

Character-Defining Features:

- Wood framing members
- Wood floors
- Wood door, door surround, and brass hardware
- Vent openings
SIGNIFICANCE DIAGRAMS FOR BUILDING INTERIOR

The following diagrams assign levels of significance to the interior of 2222 Piedmont Avenue using the categories defined at the beginning of this section. The diagrams are based on floor plans provided by the University. The floor plans on file generally date to the 1981 Campus Space Plan and do not necessarily reflect the layout of the building in 2005. Page & Turnbull made minor changes to the floor plans to more accurately represent the layout of 2222 Piedmont Avenue; however, creating up-to-date floor plans was not part of the scope of work for this HSR, and the floor plans on the significance diagrams should not be used as entirely accurate representations of the layout of the building in 2005. Instead, the building description provided above should be used as the baseline documentation.
V. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

2222 Piedmont Avenue is currently assigned a National Register of Historic Places status code of “3S” by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). National Register Status Codes are assigned to properties listed in or under review by the OHP. The ratings, which range from “1” to “7,” are given to properties in order to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register or California Register. The code “3S” signifies that 2222 Piedmont Avenue has been found individually eligible for the National Register.

The section of Piedmont Avenue between Dwight Way and Gayley Road—which includes 2222 Piedmont Avenue—was designated as California Historical Landmark No. 986 in 1989 for its association with noted landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. In 1990, it was listed as a City of Berkeley Landmark. This section of Piedmont Avenue is currently assigned a National Register of Historic Places status code of “7L.” The code “7L” signifies that the resource is a state historical landmark or point of historical interest designated before January 1998 that needs to be reexamined under current standards.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. Typically, determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register applies to resources over fifty years of age; however, resources under fifty years of age can be eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance,” or if they are contributors to a potential historic district.

According to the National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, a property qualifies for the National Register by: 1) “Being associated with an important historic context”; and 2) “Retaining historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance.” There are four criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National Register. The four criteria are as follows:

---

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

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

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

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

In addition to qualifying for listing under at least one of the National Register criteria, a property must be shown to have sufficient historic integrity. The concept of integrity is essential to identifying the important physical characteristics of historical resources and hence, in evaluating adverse changes to them. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.” According to the National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, the seven characteristics that define integrity are as follows:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed.
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.
- **Setting** addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s).
- **Materials** refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.
- **Feeling** is the property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

---

141 California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 11.5
EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Historic Context
The first step in determining the significance of a resource is to identify its historic context to provide a framework for evaluation. A resource can be considered significant on a national, state, or local level, and must be significant in the history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture of an area. As described in Part II of this HSR, the historic context for 2222 Piedmont Avenue is the second period of residential development in the Berkeley Property Tract (1901-1929). This second period of development was marked by rapid growth and land subdivision as a result of the population boom in Berkeley during the early twentieth century. The formalization of Piedmont Avenue in 1900 by Charles Loyal Huggins heralded the ascension of the Berkeley Property Tract during the early twentieth century to become one of the most desirable residential areas in the city. During this time period, the elegant, secluded, upper-middle-class neighborhood was characterized by large, single-family houses designed by prominent architects and sited on spacious lots with front lawns and gardens. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, a refined single-family house designed in the popular Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival style, is an excellent example of this development.

Significance of 2222 Piedmont Avenue
The following discussion evaluates the individual eligibility of 2222 Piedmont Avenue for the National Register. It does not evaluate the property’s eligibility as a contributor to a potential historic district. The boundaries of this potential historic district would possibly conform to the original boundaries of the Berkeley Property Tract: north to Strawberry Creek, east beyond Prospect Street, south to Dwight Way, and west to College Avenue (Map 2).

Criterion A (Event)
2222 Piedmont Avenue does not appear to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion A (Event). No significant events appear to have been associated with this building.

Criterion B (Person)
2222 Piedmont Avenue does not appear to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion B (Person). Neither Charles Bancroft nor later University occupants appear to have been persons significant to our history.
Criterion C (Design/Construction)

2222 Piedmont Avenue appears to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion C (Design/Construction). The building exhibits the distinctive characteristics of an upper-middle-class Jacobethan/English Tudor Revival dwelling of the early twentieth century. Its picturesque massing, cladding in shingles, stucco, and half-timbering, and Arts and Crafts interior detailing are qualities associated with the English Tudor Revival style. In 2222 Piedmont Avenue, these elements were combined with a Bay Area aesthetic to provide outdoor space while retaining privacy, evident in the dwelling’s side porch and side entrance, a configuration also used by the architects of 2232 and 2234 Piedmont Avenue. The house is a fine example of the type of dwelling constructed in the wealthier streetcar-suburb neighborhoods of the East Bay during the post-Earthquake construction boom.

Criterion D (Information Potential)

Criterion D is most commonly applied to properties that contain, or are likely to contain, information relating to the field of archeology. The analysis of 2222 Piedmont Avenue for eligibility under National Register Criterion D (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report.

Integrity of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

2222 Piedmont Avenue retains a moderate-to-high degree of integrity. The building remains on its original site, and thus, retains integrity of location. Although the building has undergone some alterations, the exterior is largely unchanged with the exception of the missing balustrade on the side entry porch, and the replacement of some elements like shingles, porch supports, and exterior stairs due to general wear-and-tear. 2222 Piedmont Avenue retains its original massing and fenestration pattern and most of its original detailing and materials. On the interior, the main alterations have been the insertion of partition walls, a change that is largely reversible. Even in the cases where gypsum board walls have been added, original materials have been retained in situ, or stored in the attic. Therefore, 2222 Piedmont Avenue retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling. In terms of setting and association, 2222 Piedmont Avenue has lost some integrity. Changes to the neighborhood due to the expansion of the University, especially the removal of the houses on the east side of Piedmont Avenue, and the construction of the Haas School of Business, which destroyed the houses on the northern end of the block, have degraded the feeling of a secluded, upper-middle-class residential neighborhood. However, the retention of the buildings to the south along Piedmont Avenue allow 2222 Piedmont Avenue to retain the sense of a neighborhood made up of large, freestanding, single-family dwellings set on gracious lots along a landscaped boulevard. Overall, 2222 Piedmont Avenue retains sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing on the National Register.
VI. **Historic Photographs**

Image 1. The two Palmer Houses above Piedmont Avenue, on the California Memorial Stadium site, ca. 1882. Note apparent divided median on Piedmont Avenue at bottom of the photograph. (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 14Q:4Q:25)
Image 2: View of Clinton Day house at the corner of Piedmont and Bancroft Ways looking east, with the Palmer Houses in the background, ca. 1885
(Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 3: View of Piedmont Way looking south from present day Gayley Road, ca. 1890 (Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 4. View of Piedmont Way and the Palmer Houses looking east from the Clinton Day House, ca. 1890 (Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 5. Hillegas Tract near the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, looking north towards campus, 1890s.

(Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 03:074)
Image 6. The Clinton Day House at the corner of Piedmont and Bancroft Ways, looking northwest, ca. 1890 (Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 7. View from Panoramic Hill with buildings on Piedmont Avenue in the foreground, 1890s. The house with a tower in the lower lefthand corner is one of the Palmer Houses. (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 03:265)
Image 8. View from the vicinity of present-day Le Conte Hall on the University campus, looking south, ca. 1899. East Hall in the foreground. In the middle right is the Hillegass Tract, and at the far left of the photograph is College Avenue. (University of California, Berkeley)
Establishing street grades and the widths of sidewalks on Piedmont Avenue or Way from the northerly line of Dwight Way to the northerly terminus of said Avenue.

Be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of the Town of EH Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That the official grades and the widths of the sidewalks and roadways on Piedmont Avenue or Way from the northerly line of Dwight Way to the northerly terminus of said avenue shall be as shown on the improvement and cross-sections attached hereto.

Section 2. All elevations shown on said improvement map and cross-sections are curb elevations above the official base of the Town of Berkeley.

Between consecutive points the elevations of which are given the rate of grade shall be uniform.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Town of Berkeley this 10th day of July, 1900, by the following vote:

Ayes, Trustees

LeConte, Turner, Frame, Staats, Dowd, Hoff and President Marston.

Nays, None.

Absent Trustees: Love

Att: President Board of Trustees.

Image 9. Resolution authorizing work on Piedmont Way, July 1900 (Berkeley City Clerk Department)
Image 10. Cross-sections of Piedmont Way noted by Charles Loyal Huggins, 1900 (Berkeley City Clerk Department)
Image 11. View of Berkeley looking west towards San Francisco Bay, ca. 1903 (University of California, Berkeley)
Image 12. Piedmont Avenue at Bancroft Way, ca. 1905 (Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 13. Looking south on Piedmont Avenue from Bancroft Way, ca. 1908
(Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 14. 2200 Block of Piedmont Avenue looking north, ca. 1910
(Postcard image obtained from University of California, Berkeley)
Image 15. Thorsen House (2307 Piedmont) and Hicks House (2311 Piedmont) near the corner of Channing Way and Piedmont Avenue, 1915 (Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association website)
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Image 16. Aerial view of campus looking east, ca. 1920. College Avenue is running through the center of the photograph; the northern part of the 2200 block of College and Piedmont Avenues is at the right (Bancroft Library, UARC PCH-05067)
Image 17. 1928 aerial of Piedmont Avenue and California Memorial Stadium
(University of California, Berkeley, Earth Sciences & Map Library)
Image 18. California Memorial Stadium, 1928. 2222, 2224, and 2232 Piedmont Avenue are visible at the top of the photograph. The future 2234 Piedmont Avenue is to the left of the Stadium near the intersection of Bancroft Way, and the future 2240 Piedmont Avenue is at the top left corner on Bancroft Way behind the semi-circular drive. (Bancroft Library, photo number Brk00004295_24a)
Image 19. View of Piedmont Avenue and Piedmont Place looking west likely from California Memorial Stadium, late 1920s. The Haas School of Business is currently at the site of the large fraternity house (2220 Piedmont Avenue) in the center of the photograph; the future site of Calvin Laboratory is to the left behind 2222 Piedmont Avenue (photograph from undated newspaper article courtesy of the Denny Family)
Image 20. Aerial view of campus looking east, ca. 1931. Piedmont Avenue is running parallel to the Stadium; the 2200 block is to the left of International House (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 03:041)
Image 21. View of International House and Piedmont Avenue from 2234 Piedmont, 1934 (courtesy of the Denny Family)
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Image 22. View of International House and Piedmont Avenue from 2234 Piedmont, 1934 (courtesy of the Denny Family)
Image 23. View of International House and Piedmont Avenue from 2234 Piedmont, 1934. Note the median steps and high curbs (courtesy of the Denny Family).
Image 24. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, 1939
(Ormsby Donogh Real Estate File, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 25. Gayley Road under construction. View looking south near the intersection of Stadium Rim Way and Gayley Road, 1940s (courtesy of the Denny Family.)
Image 26. 2224 (left) and 2222 Piedmont Avenue (right), looking north, 1950s (courtesy of the Denny Family)
Image 27. 2232 (left) and 2224 (right) Piedmont Avenue, 1958
(Ormsby Donogh Real Estate File, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 28. Calvin Laboratory, ca. 1964. The radial structures in the foreground are part of the Cowell Hospital Annex; to the left is 2220 Piedmont. (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 26V:6)
Image 29. Northwest corner of Bancroft Way and Piedmont Avenue, 13 January 1965. The Clinton Day house is still extant at the corner next to the new Law School. The Le Conte House appears to be hidden by trees. 2250 Piedmont is also extant to the right of the Day House. (Boalt School of Law Archives, William Benemann, Archivist)
VII. Existing Conditions Photographs

Building Photographs

Figure 1. 2224 (left) and 2222 (right) Piedmont Avenue, looking west

Figure 2. 2222 Piedmont Avenue and the Haas School of Business, looking northwest

Figure 3. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, looking southeast

Figure 4. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, east façade

Figure 5. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, south and east façades

Figure 6. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, detail of balcony on east façade
Figure 7. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, entry porch on east façade

Figure 8. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 9. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 10. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, north and west façades

Figure 11. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, west façade

Figure 12. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, west and south façades
Figure 13. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, south façade

Figure 14. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, south façade

Figure 15. Basement, Room 1

Figure 16. Basement, Room 1

Figure 17. Basement, Room 1

Figure 18. Basement, Room 1
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Figure 19. First floor, Room 10

Figure 20. First floor, Room 10

Figure 21. First floor, Room 10, detail of wood flooring

Figure 22. First floor, Room 10

Figure 23. First floor, Room 10

Figure 24. First floor, Room 11
VII. Existing Conditions Photographs

Figure 25. First floor, Room 11
Figure 26. First floor, Room 11, wood hutch
Figure 27. First floor, Room 11, detail of wood hutch
Figure 28. First floor, Room 11, evidence of window damage
Figure 29. First floor, Room 11A
Figure 30. First floor, Room 11A
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Figure 31. First floor, Room 11B

Figure 32. First floor, Room 11B, original dining room paneling

Figure 33. First floor, Room 12

Figure 34. First floor, Room 12A

Figure 35. First floor, Room 13

Figure 36. First floor, Room 13, remnant of bell call system
Figure 43. First floor, Room 14, detail of fireplace

Figure 44. First floor, Room 15

Figure 45. First floor, Room 15

Figure 46. First floor, Room 15, detail of fireplace

Figure 47. First floor, Room 15, detail of fireplace bracket

Figure 48. First floor, Room 16
Figure 49. First floor, Room 16, detail of brass heating vent

Figure 50. Second floor, Room 20

Figure 51. Second floor, Room 20

Figure 52. Second floor, Room 21

Figure 53. Second floor, Room 21A

Figure 54. Second floor, Room 22
Figure 55. Second floor, Room 23

Figure 56. Second floor, Room 24

Figure 57. Second floor, Room 24A

Figure 58. Second floor, Room 25

Figure 59. Stairs to third floor

Figure 60. Third floor, Room 31
Figure 61. Third floor, Room 31, detail of sink

Figure 62. Third floor, Room 32

Figure 63. Third floor, Room 32
LANDSCAPE PHOTOGRAPHS

Figure 64. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, east façade

Figure 65. Brick entry path on east side of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 66. Brick entry path on east side of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 67. Brick entry path on east side of 2222 Piedmont Avenue, looking west

Figure 68. Concrete entry drive between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking west

Figure 69. Sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue in front of 2222 Piedmont Avenue
Figure 70. Sidewalk in front of 2222 Piedmont Avenue, looking south

Figure 71. Concrete entry drive at south façade

Figure 72. Brick entry steps on south façade connecting concrete drive to main entrance

Figure 73. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, front lawn, looking north

Figure 74. Brick entry steps on south façade connecting concrete drive to main entrance

Figure 75. Walkway to the north of 2222 Piedmont Avenue with rolled asphalt curb, looking west
Figure 76. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, west façade and parking

Figure 77. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 78. Dumpsters at west side of 2222 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 79. Concrete drive between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking east

Figure 80. Concrete drive between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking east

Figure 81. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, south and west façades
Figure 82. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, west façade and specimen redwood trees at rear of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 83. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, west façade and specimen redwood trees at rear of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 84. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, parking area and specimen redwood trees at rear of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 85. 2222 Piedmont Avenue, parking area and specimen redwood trees at rear of 2224 Piedmont Avenue
VIII. Maps

Map 1. 1866 Map of the College Homestead (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
Map 2. Map of the Berkeley Property marked with the College of California Seal (in the lower right corner) with the date of 1865 (Alameda County Public Works)
Map 3. Frederick Law Olmsted's 1866 Map for the Berkeley Neighborhood (Bancroft Library)
Map 4. 1868 W.F. Boardman Map of the Berkeley Property (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
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Map 6. 1891 "Birdseye View of Berkeley, Cal." The project area is in the center foreground just to the left of the large buildings on campus.

(University of California, Berkeley, Earth Sciences & Map Library)
Map 8. 1899 map of Berkeley with overlay of modern map (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
Map 9. C.L. Huggins' 1900 Plan for Improvements to Piedmont Avenue (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
Map 10. 1903 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map showing southern portion of 2200 block of College and Piedmont Avenues.
Map 11. 1909 map of the northern end of Piedmont Avenue, establishing Piedmont Place (Alameda County Public Works Department)
Map 13. 1926 Street Improvements to Piedmont Avenue (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
Map 14. Campus Map of University of California, Berkeley, ca. 1927 (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 16. 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map showing east side of Piedmont Avenue
Map 17. 1942 map of the University of California, Berkeley campus (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 19. 1961 map of the University of California, Berkeley campus (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 20. 1962 Thomas Church Landscape Plan for the Campus Long Range Development Plan (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 21. 1988 Roma Study of existing conditions of the southeast part of campus (University of California, Berkeley)
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X. APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY

1906  Husted’s city directory lists Charles E. Bancroft as a vice president of Holcomb, Breed, and Bancroft, located in Oakland. Bancroft is listed as living at the Berkeley Inn (a hotel at the corner of Haste and Telegraph in Berkeley, since demolished). It is unclear whether this directory dates from before or after the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire, which displaced many San Francisco residents.

1908  2222 Piedmont Avenue is constructed as residence for Miriam F. Bancroft and Charles E. Bancroft. F.D. Voorhees is the architect, and Peterson and Pearson is the contractor.

1911  Husted’s city directory lists “Charles E. Bancroft, Real Estate, r(esidence) 2222 Piedmont.”

1939  Both Charles and Miriam Bancroft are shown in Polk’s directory living at 2222 Piedmont; this is presumably a continuous period of residence since the house was built.

1940  Pacific Bell telephone book lists Charles E. Bancroft as residing at 2222 Piedmont. University property records indicate house is purchased from Charles E. Bancroft for $12,000 at the end of December.

1940s/1950s  A couple with the last name of Tate apparently rents the house from the University.

1958  In September, the Department of Grounds and Buildings prepares (or hires someone to prepare) hand-drawings of the house’s floor plans, including the basement/crawlspace level. This implies that the campus was documenting the space in the building and likely studying it for a particular use. The plans are only labeled with room numbers, not with any University uses, and show some clearly residential features such as “laundry tub” and kitchen sink on the main floor and three upstairs bathrooms.

October 1959  Campus directory lists “Computer Center – Machine Language Translation Project” and “Institute of Social Sciences” as occupying this address.

1962  The campus FDX (building database) lists September 19, 1962 as the “date occupied,” although clearly this date is preceded by the 1959 directory listing above. Listings for other buildings give the same 1962 date, so this is possibly just an entry for the start of the database, not an actual date for use of the building.

1963-64  The campus directory for this academic year lists “Mechano Linguistics Project,” “International Data Library and Reference Service,” and “Institute of Social Sciences, Hubert Blumer, Director” at this address.

1966-67  “Institute of Social Science” is listed at this address, including the office for Director Herbert Blumer.
The 1967 *Centennial Record* lists 2222 Piedmont as “occupied by Institute of Social Sciences, Mechano-linguistics.”

**Fall 1968** FDX lists “Phonology Lab.” as the building occupant, presumably a variant on Linguistics.

**Fall 1969** FDX lists Phonology Lab as occupant.

**Fall 1970** FDX lists Linguistics as occupant of the building, with two rooms assigned to graduate student offices for Anthropology.

**Fall 1971-1975** 2222 Piedmont is listed in the FDX as having two rooms assigned to Anthropology as “Grad Offices.” The remainder is assigned to “Linguistics,” primarily as non-academic offices.

**Fall 1976-1995** Linguistics is the sole occupant of 2222 Piedmont.

**1978** The house is described in the Campus Historic Resources Survey as “now the Project on Linguistic Analysis…This simple house remains essentially unaltered, though the dining room is filled with computer equipment.”

**1981** The Berkeley Campus Space Plan (1981) states, “Linguistics has been working in the same space for fifteen years…The interior of [2222 Piedmont] is generally in good condition, minimal alterations having been made from the original plan. The lower floor includes a large seminar-conference room with a fireplace to the east (the former living room), an office for research staff to the north (the former library), and research laboratories to the west (the former dining room, kitchen, and pantry). These latter spaces include a computer room, facilities for psychological and visual testing, a sound booth for work requiring sound insulation, a shop, and several storage and service areas…above the conference room is a large room housing a Chinese typewriter and work space for graduate students. The rest of the upper floor largely comprises four offices used for the Journal of Chinese Linguistics, visiting faculty, the secretary, and the project director. Also on this floor are toilet facilities and the interior back stairs up to the attic and down to the first floor. The attic contains two long rooms used for storage of old furniture, equipment, papers, and pamphlets. The room to the west is finished and the one to the east has exposed rafters.” (III 15.1-15.3)

“The isolation of the occupants from the Department of Linguistics does not appear to be a problem; rather it has the advantage of permitting undisturbed work. These activities have little involvement with the instruction program…maintenance is needed on the exterior…The roof requires extensive repair work or complete reproofing…”

**1985** An audit form from the Department of Facilities Management indicates that the building coordinator is “Professor Wang,” and that the roof, front porch, and stairs are all new [presumably this refers to the main porch floor and stairs], and that work on “walls, windows, doors” has been deferred. There is a note “exterior now good for 10 years.” A separate form listed as a “FY 1986/87 update” implies that $30,000 has been spent on “exterior renovations.” A purchase order dated March 11, 1985 authorizes $16,000+ of work by ARC Roofing Corporation of Oakland to “remove
dry rot, treat and replace damaged deck and supports…” A May 15, 1985 work order to McGraw Construction authorizes “remove and replace dry rotten exterior steps…replace wood shingles adjacent as required.”

2005 Occupants include Center for Organizational Effectiveness.
2005 TREE INVENTORY

Surveyed on July 19, 2005 by PGAdesign.
See 2005 Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape for tree locations.

Legend:

NNU  Number not used
NLE  Tree no longer exists, but was previously shown on the 1976 UCB tree inventory or 1991 UCB survey. If species is named, the species name came from the 1976 UCB tree inventory.

Historic Rating

Historic Rating is based on the following Evaluation Criteria for Architectural and Historical Value.

VS (Very Significant):
- The building/element was built during the period of significance.
- It is architecturally significant.
- It is associated with a significant individual or event.
- It remains intact or with only minor alterations.
- It is physically in good to excellent condition.
- It is highly sensitive to change.
- This include Quercus agrifolia that are 30" or greater diameter at breast height (dbh).

S (Significant):
- The building/element was built during the period of significance, but…
- It is of secondary importance.
- It has been altered.
- It is in deteriorated condition.
- It was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally significant.
- It is sensitive to change.
- Includes Quercus agrifolia that are 12" to 30" diameter at breast height (dbh)

C (Contributing):
- The building/element was built during the period of significance, but is not architecturally significant.
- It is of secondary importance.
- It has been altered.
- It is in deteriorated condition.
- It was not built during the period of significance, but is architecturally significant.
- It is sensitive to change.

NC (Non-Contributing):
- The building/element was not built during the period of significance.
- The building/element has been subjected to major additions or incompatible alterations.
- It is incompatible in style, material, scale, character, or use with the original building.
- It is in poor to deteriorated or critical condition.
- It is not particularly sensitive to change.
- Includes Quercus agrifolia that are less than 10" in diameter.
2005 TREE INVENTORY

Surveyed on July 19, 2005 by PGAdesign.
See 2005 Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape for tree locations.

Legend:

Health Rating

Health of tree is a general health assessment; it is not full horticultural assessment. Ratings are based on the following criteria for condition.

E (Excellent): The element is near original condition, i.e. The tree is a specimen quality tree in excellent form and health.

G (Good): The element is mostly intact, i.e. The tree is in good form and health.

F (Fair): The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration. i.e. The tree is in moderate health and form is poor.

P (Poor): The element is badly damaged, missing or not functioning. i.e. The tree is in poor health and form and should be considered for removal.

Specimen Tree

The rating of trees as specimen is based upon the University of Berkeley’s Campus Specimen Tree Program. A full description of this policy can be found on page 4.3-22 of the 2020 LRDP EIR; an abbreviated description is below.

The rating includes trees but can also be applied to evaluate other plants such as shrubs and grasses. In general the tree or group of trees needs to be in good health, not pose a hazard, and should possess one or more qualities under the following categories:

· Aesthetics
· Historical
· Educational
· Strawberry Creek
· Natural Area

Tree Caliper

As recorded on 1991 UCB survey or as field approximated, measured at DBH (diameter at breast height).
## 2005 TREE INVENTORY

Surveyed on July 19, 2005 by PGAdesign.
See 2005 Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape for tree locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313-315</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Sweet Gum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Cupressus macrocarpa</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327-332</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Ulmus americana</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Topped off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335-339</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>36&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344-346</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>Camphor Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Cordyline australis</td>
<td>Dracena</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-353</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(5) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Crataegus oxycantha</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2005 TREE INVENTORY

Surveyed on July 19, 2005 by PGAdesign
See 2005 Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape for tree locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-364</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Eriobotrya deflexa</td>
<td>Bronze Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366-369</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373-375</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Eucalyptus ficifolia</td>
<td>Red Flowering Gum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377-379</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Eucalyptus robusta</td>
<td>Swamp Mahogany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>English Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387-389</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395-397</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>Glossy Privet</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Sweet Gum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-404</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Magnolia campbellii</td>
<td>Campbell Magnolia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406-409</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(2) 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412-414</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(5) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(3) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(6) 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418-419</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Persea americana</td>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421-423</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Phoenix canariensis</td>
<td>Canary Island Date Palm</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425-429</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434-438</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457-458</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(4) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463-466</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468-470</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475-476</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481-482</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana</td>
<td>Ornamental Pear</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no trunk, sprouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486-485</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana</td>
<td>Ornamental Pear</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana</td>
<td>Ornamental Pear</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>Common Pear</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>trunk hollow in center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>16&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>16&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(2) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Pittosporum tenufolium</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>16&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC F 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC F 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC F 2 (6&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC F 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534-538</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S G 4&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 6&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 3&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 3&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>C S 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>C G 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Aesculus californica</td>
<td>California Buckeye</td>
<td>S G (2) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 42&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 32&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 36&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 26&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 44&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S E 8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2005 TREE INVENTORY
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>34&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>Taxus baccata 'Stricta'</td>
<td>Irish Yew</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Tilia platyphloios</td>
<td>Largeleaf Linden</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571-575</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>Fern Pine</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>Fern Pine</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596-598</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(2) 15&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610-619</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2005 TREE INVENTORY

Surveyed on July 19, 2005 by PGAdesign.
See 2005 Existing Conditions Inventory for Landscape for tree locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(2) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627-629</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A NEW PERSPECTIVE IN PRESERVATION