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I.  INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The 2224 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 2224
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 2224 Piedmont Avenue and its surrounding
landscape. 2224 Piedmont Avenue is a Mission Revival structure constructed in 1909 as a single-
family home. Currently, the building is utilized primarily by the Multimedia Authoring Center for
Teaching in Anthropology (MACTIA).

\(^1\) 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.
United States Department of the Interior, 1997).
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 2224 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.”

---

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
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.\footnote{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.}

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.\footnote{Ferrier, 53-57.} A map of the College Homestead Association was recorded on May 15, 1866 (Map 1).

**FREDERICK LAW OLMS TED**

Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903) is considered to be the father of American landscape architecture. At his home, Fairsted, in Brookline, Massachusetts, Olmsted established one of the first professional landscape design firms in the world.\footnote{Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site website, \url{http://www.nps.gov/frol/} (accessed September 2005).} 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
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.\textsuperscript{16} 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.\textsuperscript{17} By February 1865, Olmsted was making progress on the two designs:

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

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.”\textsuperscript{19} In March, the two traveled to Berkeley to ride around the College Property hills despite rain and snow squalls.\textsuperscript{20} 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.”\textsuperscript{21}

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.”\textsuperscript{22} After receiving the letter, Olmsted wrote Miller about starting work on the project:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{16} Ranney, 571.
\textsuperscript{17} Ranney, 411.
\textsuperscript{18} 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 Feb 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 316.
\textsuperscript{19} FLO to his wife, 12 February 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 317.
\textsuperscript{20} FLO to his wife, 1 March 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 320.
\textsuperscript{21} 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.
\textsuperscript{22} Willey to FLO, 22 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 571.
\end{quote}
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 Olmstead [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. 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.” 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.” 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. Apparentley 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.

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

---

29 Ranney, 407.
30 FLO to Vaux, 1 August 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 421.
31 8 August 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
32 Ranney, 571.
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.”18 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.”19

---

18 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
16 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
19 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.\footnote{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, 546-573.}

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.”\footnote{Ibid., 548.}

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

\begin{quote}
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 \textit{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.\footnote{Ibid., 554.}
\end{quote}

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

\footnote{Ibid., 548.}
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. 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.” 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.” 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…” 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.” 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

---

46 Ibid., 564-566.
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

---

48 Ibid., 561-564.
49 Ibid., 565.
50 Beverage and Rocheleau, 6.
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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. 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
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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

---

56 *Ferrier*, 110.
58 3 April 1866 and 1 May 1866 meetings of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
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
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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.\footnote{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.\footnote{81} The arrival of the railroad caused the small business center of Berkeley to move west from Telegraph Avenue closer to Shattuck Avenue.\footnote{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.”\footnote{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).

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.”

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. 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.
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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 1890.87 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.88 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. 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.

Huggins planned to formalize Piedmont Way by incorporating oval medians containing tiny parks. The plan prepared by Huggins shows six median “parks” north of Dwight Way to the terminus of Piedmont Way (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.

The improvements to Piedmont Way proposed by Huggins were described by the 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.” 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
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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].”\footnote{Berkeley Daily Gazette, 1 March 1901.} 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.\footnote{Minutes of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, 11 March 1901. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.} 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.\footnote{Ferrier, 255.} 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.
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."™ 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.™

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.™ 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.™ 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 canon [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.™

™ Ibid., 38.
™ 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…”¹¹¹ 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.¹¹²

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.”¹¹³ 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 [sic].”¹¹⁴

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.

114 “New Design for the California Memorial Stadium,” The Architect and Engineer 72 (February 1923): 75.
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:

…the 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.\(^{117}\)

---

\(^{117}\) Warren Perry Papers, Bancroft Library, BANC MSS 82/97c, Box 11, folder “Committee on Campus Development.”
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)…” 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…” 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.”

118 Ibid.
119 Warren Perry Papers, Bancroft Library, BANC MSS 82/97c, Box 11, folder “University of California.”
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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.\(^\text{121}\)

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.

\(^{121}\) Ibid.
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.\(^\text{122}\)

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.\textsuperscript{124}

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.”\textsuperscript{125} 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.”\textsuperscript{126}

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.\textsuperscript{127}

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.

\textsuperscript{124} University of California, Berkeley, \textit{Art, Music and Professions, Phase I of Berkeley Campus Space Plan}, revised October 1991, III.7-II.8.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., III.3.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., III.13.4.
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 campus should “Preserve and enhance the rustic character of Gayley Road as the seam linking the

129 Ibid., 43.
130 Ibid., 3.1-30.
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."  

2224 PIEDMONT AVENUE

2224 Piedmont Avenue was constructed in 1909 as the home of Professor Charles A. Noble and his wife Florence. The house was constructed during the Berkeley building boom of the early twentieth century along with its neighbors at 2222 Piedmont (1908) and 2232 Piedmont Avenue (1909). 2224 Piedmont Avenue was designed by architect William A. Knowles and built by the firm of Kidder and McCullough.

Charles A. and Florence Noble

Charles A. Noble was born in California in 1867. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of California in 1889. After graduation, Noble taught briefly at a high school in the Bay Area, undertook graduate study in Germany—then an international center of mathematics theory—and returned to the University of California in 1896 as a Fellow in Mathematics. After finishing his Ph.D. in 1901, Noble was hired as an Instructor in Mathematics. Noble retired as Professor of Mathematics in 1937, but returned during World War II as a volunteer teacher in the Mathematics Department, replacing teaching faculty called away on military service. He was a founding member of Berkeley’s Faculty Club and the Kosmos Club. Noble was also an active member of the Sierra Club as early as the 1890s, and he frequently vacationed in the Sierras in both the winter and summer. He remained a University faculty member until his death in 1962.

Professor Calvin Moore, who is writing a history of the Department of Mathematics, describes Noble as “a respected member of the department” at a time when mathematics at Berkeley was known for its teaching, not for its research. Noble had trained in Germany under Hibert, described by Moore as “probably the most famous mathematician of his day.” Along with faculty colleague E.R. Hendrick, who had also studied in Germany, Noble translated into English an influential text by the German scholar Felix Klein titled *Elementary Mathematics from an Advanced Point of View*. Noble, according to Moore, was part of a group of scholars who “populated mathematics departments around the country” as instructors and professors.  

---

132 Calvin Moore, personal communication to Steven Finacom, 10 November 2004.
Noble married Florence N. Coleman in 1903, and they raised their son, Charles A. Noble, Jr., in the house at 2224 Piedmont Avenue. The Nobles likely chose to move to the neighborhood because of its proximity to campus. In addition, the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue was already home to one of Florence Noble’s relatives, Professor Walter Morris Hart, an influential member of the faculty who lived in a large home on the current site of International House. From the fragmentary descriptions that exist, the Nobles appear to have been fairly prosperous. Their house was spacious for one family, and a neighbor recalled that during the 1940s and 1950s, Charles Noble employed a cook, Emma, and a chauffeur/gardener who kept the grounds of the house perfectly maintained. The neighbor also recalled that Professor Noble rented a room to a male law student who was a member of the Deke fraternity; this likely occurred after the death of Florence Noble in 1947, since the student provided assistance to Noble as he became increasingly infirm. Regardless of the economic needs of the homeowner, renting rooms to students was not an uncommon practice for single or widowed faculty members during the twentieth century.

Professor Noble apparently had a wide social circle in the campus community, and the proximity of his home to the University grounds lent itself to both formal and informal gatherings: “The pre-Christmas gathering at his home was a notable occasion…Friends, old and new, would come to his house in the late afternoons, to join him in anecdote, argument, and jollity.” According to city directories, Professor Noble remained in residence at 2224 Piedmont Avenue through at least 1950 and may have lived there until his death in 1962. At his death, Professor Noble’s colleagues described him as “a person of great charm. He grew up in an uncrowded society, of which he preserved the virtues. At once the stranger would feel at home in his presence.”

**Architect William Knowles**

The Nobles hired architect William A. Knowles to design their home at 2224 Piedmont Avenue. William Andrew Knowles, Jr. (1875-1958) was a New York native who graduated from Stanford University with a degree in Engineering. He worked in architect Clinton Day’s office as a draftsman from 1893 to 1895. In 1897, Knowles started his own practice and had offices in both Oakland and San Francisco. He was a prolific architect who worked in many different styles. His buildings in Oakland include the Roos Brothers Building, the Central Bank Building, and the Athens Athletic Club. In Berkeley, he designed the Wright Block (1906), located on Shattuck Avenue. Knowles may

---

133 Lee (Denny) Palsak, personal interview with Steven Finacom, 8 August 2005 and 29 November 2005.
134 In Memoriam, 1962.
135 Ibid.
have gotten the commission for 2224 Piedmont Avenue because of his work on the Wright Block, or he may have been recommended by his old boss, Clinton Day, who lived on the 2200 Piedmont block.

**University Acquisition of 2224 Piedmont Avenue**

In 1962, the year that Professor Noble died, his son sold the house to the University for $91,500. It was the last house on the block to pass from private hands into University ownership. By that year, the adjacent houses—2222 and 2234 Piedmont Avenue—were already being used as offices, so acquisition of the Noble home would have filled in the remaining gap in University property ownership of the buildings on the block. It appears that the house was converted to offices soon after it was purchased by the University.

**University Uses of 2224 Piedmont Avenue**

The Center for the Study of Law and Society is listed in the University database as an occupant of 2224 Piedmont Avenue in 1963-64. Starting in 1968, the Center for the Study of Law and Society was assigned 22 rooms, the Institute for International Studies occupied five rooms, and Environmental Physiology occupied one basement storage room. By the fall of 1971, five rooms—possibly the same spaces used by International Studies—were assigned to the Department of Anthropology. In 1979, Anthropology expanded to occupy 10 rooms, and the Center for the Study of Law and Society remained in reduced quarters in the building. Between 1979 and 1980, the Center for the Study of Law and Society moved out.

By 1982, Anthropology was occupying 10 rooms while an otherwise unidentified “Computing Office” was assigned the remainder of the space. In 1984-85, Counseling and Psychological Services, a non-academic student service program, occupied 23 rooms in the building, presumably replacing the computing functions. In the fall of 1986, there was an eclectic mix of assigned uses in 2224 Piedmont, including the Institute for Social Change, Academic Computing (storage only), “General Admin. Inactive” (presumably vacant space), Career Planning and Placement, and Pre-Professional Advising, which occupied 22 rooms. These uses remained largely the same through the early 1990s, with the exception of the Institute of Governmental Studies offices, arriving around 1990 for a relatively short period of occupancy, and the student service/advising programs. By the early 1990s, the Department of Anthropology was occupying the majority of the building and remains the primary

---

174 There were two and possibly three architects named William Knowles working in the Bay Area during this time period. William Andrew Knowles, Jr. is the most likely “William Knowles” associated with 2224 Piedmont.
occupant today. Around 1993, 2224 Piedmont Avenue underwent a significant renovation to upgrade the office space in the building. The renovation is discussed in more detail in Part III.
**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.
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III. DESCRIPTION & CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT

The following section provides a description of the site, landscape, and structure at 2224 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). 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 2224 Piedmont Avenue appear to be in fair to good condition.
Landscape Elements

Vehicular ways and parking

Description:
A six-foot-wide concrete pathway and a lawn are located at the southern side of the house (Figure 86). Up to three vehicles park in this area. At the western (rear) side of the building, there are two concrete pads sized 19 by 30 feet and 12 by 34 feet (Figures 93, 94, & 96). One of the pads is covered with Canary Island Ivy (Hedera canariensis).

Condition: Fair

Pedestrian pathways

Description:
The main front entry pathway to 2224 Piedmont Avenue is a six-foot-wide brick path, which connects the sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue to the six mortared brick steps at the front entrance of the house. The path is constructed of pressed red clay bricks set in a mortared running bond field pattern flush with a mortared single brick stretcher edge course (Figure 82). The main path is likely original to the construction of the house.

On the northeast side of the building, there is a three-foot-wide brick service entry path (Figure 80); two mortared brick steps connect the path to the sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue. The service entry path, likely original to the construction of the house, is constructed of pressed red clay bricks set in an unmortared running bond field pattern. The field is set two inches below a mortared single rowlock edge course on each side (Figure 80). This path leads to the house and ends at a wooden access ramp in poor condition (Figures 113-116). The ramp is accessed via the concrete driveway at 2222 Piedmont Avenue.

On the south side of the structure, the six-foot-wide concrete path mentioned above connects the sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue to an accessible entrance area and several entrances on the western (rear) side of the building. An unimproved pedestrian desire-line runs from the concrete driveway to Boalt Parking Lot (Figure 102).

Condition: Fair to Good

Fencing and site walls

Description:
There is a two-foot-high concrete wall surrounding two sides of the accessible entry on the south side of the house (Figure 112).

Condition: Good

Vegetation at eastern side

Description:
Overgrown Fern Pine (Podocarpus gracilior), Tree Nos. 579 and 580, flank the main entrance stair on the east façade (Figures 82 & 83). These plantings likely date to the residential period of the property. A lawn lies between the house and the sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue.

Condition: Fair
Vegetation at western side

Description:
The west side of the house includes the following notable tree species (Figures 88-107):

- Coast Redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), Tree Nos. 541, 542, 543, and 544
- Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), Tree Nos. 497, 498, 499, 500, and 501
- Big Leaf Maple (Acer macrophyllum), Tree No. 516
- Black Locust (Robinia pseudoacacia), Tree Nos. 528, 530, and 533
- Pittosprum (Pittosporum tenuifolium), Tree Nos. 441 and 502
- Dracena (Cordyline australis), Tree No. 349

The ground plane of the west and south sides is covered with Canary Island Ivy (Hedera canariensis) and Bear’s Breeches (Acanthus mollis) (Figures 100-106).

Condition: Fair to Excellent
### 2005 Existing Condition Inventory Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Asphalt Pathway" /></td>
<td>Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Asphalt road or Parking Area" /></td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Concrete Paving" /></td>
<td>Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Brick Pathway" /></td>
<td>Existing tree shown on 1991 UCB provided survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Shrub Masses" /></td>
<td>Field located by PGA, not included on 1991 UCB Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Groundcover Masses" /></td>
<td>Tree no longer exists, was shown on 1976 UCB tree inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Unplanted Landscape Area" /></td>
<td>Specimen Tree per UCB Specimen Tree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Lawn Area" /></td>
<td>Unimproved pedestrian pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Concrete ADA Ramp" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Wooden ADA Ramp" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="symbol" alt="Aggregate Paving" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BUILDING EXTERIOR**

2224 Piedmont Avenue is a two-story-plus-basement, wood-frame residence with a flat roof capped by a sheet metal coping. The building was designed in the Mission Revival style with some Craftsman influences (Figures 1 & 2). Later alterations, including the removal of the original clay tile roof and the infill of the arched openings on the east façade, have diminished the Mission Revival characteristics of the building (Image 24). The exterior of the building features a textured stucco finish and is minimally accented with wood trim and ornamentation. Typical exterior features include wood-sash casement windows, wood trim and ornamentation, and stucco-clad sills.

**East Façade**

Facing Piedmont Avenue, the east façade is the primary façade of the building and contains the main entrance (Figure 3). The east façade is symmetrical in its configuration and is composed of a central two-story mass flanked by one-story, rectilinear wings (Figures 4 & 5). The main entry is approached by a short flight of brick stairs that lead up to a brick porch enclosed by the projecting wings of the building (Figure 6). The porch features two tapered, stucco-clad columns with wood *zapatas* (corbels) and simple wood capitals (Figure 7). At the rear of the porch is the main entry, composed of a glazed, divided-light, wood door with a non-historic brushed aluminum lever handle and plate. On either side of this door is a pair of fixed, multi-light windows. On the second floor above the main entry is a loggia with three arched openings. These openings are now infilled; plywood paneling has been placed in the center opening; anodized aluminum casement windows and plywood panels have been inserted in the remaining openings. The loggia was altered after 1958 (Image 27). The second floor also contains two multi-light casement windows. Each wing contains two three-light awning windows on the partially above-grade basement level and four multi-light casement windows on the first floor level of the east façade.

**North Façade**

Trees and vegetation obscure most of the north façade. The façade is composed of two sections: the one-story wing to the east, and the two-story central section to the west (Figure 8). At the intersection of the main building and the wing is a stucco-clad chimney. The north façade of the wing contains two pairs of divided-light, wood French doors opening onto wrought-iron balconettes (Figure 9). The central section contains five divided-light, double-hung Craftsman-style windows and two small air vents. A wood ADA ramp runs along the north side of the building and leads to a side entry on the north façade, which consists of a non-historic metal door with a brushed aluminum...
lever handle, plate, and kickplate (Figure 10). This ramp was constructed around 1993 and replaced an exterior stair.

**West Façade**

The west façade rises to three full stories in height because of a change in grade, so the basement level is fully above ground (Figure 11). At the northwest corner of the building is an addition consisting of a large, two-story exterior staircase and a utility area at the basement level enclosed by horizontal v-channel wood siding (Figures 12 & 13). The stair is also finished with horizontal v-channel wood siding and wood trim (Figure 14). The addition was constructed around 1993 to provide additional egress from the building, and attaches to the original building at the first and second floors, leading to two non-historic metal doors (Figure 15). Behind the stair addition on the west façade of the main building is a third non-historic metal door leading to the basement level; this door is accessed down a short set of stairs with a metal handrail. The north portion of the west façade also contains divided-light, wood casement windows with plain wood surrounds at the basement, first floor, and second floor levels.

At the center of the west façade is a two-story addition that consists of an arcaded porch on the basement level, and an enclosed conservatory on the first floor (Figure 16). According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, this addition appears to have been constructed between 1911 and 1929 (Maps 12 & 15). The central addition used to be accessed by an exterior stair, but this was removed around 1993. The central addition has stucco cladding, a wood cornice, and a composition shed roof. The arcaded porch has arched openings on the west and south sides and is supported by square wood columns on concrete footings. The porch is finished with a concrete floor that steps up from the ground level, exposed wood girders, and beadboard paneling on the north wall; the remaining walls are the original stucco exterior walls. The interior of the porch contains a glazed wood door on the east wall; on the north wall is a pair of four-light casement windows and a two-panel wood door leading to a toilet room. On the second floor of the central addition is a band of windows detailed with plain wood pilasters that wraps around the west and south façades; these windows are paired, four-light, wood casement windows with simple wood surrounds. The southern portion of the west façade contains two pairs of divided-light, wood casement windows with plain wood surrounds at the basement, first floor, and second floor levels.
South Façade
Like the north façade, the south façade is composed of two sections: the one-story wing to the east, and the two-story central section to the west (Figure 18). At the intersection of the main building and the wing is a stucco-clad chimney. At the western end of the north façade, the aboveground basement level contains four-light wood casement windows and a non-historic metal door leading to the basement. The first and second floors of the south façade contain divided-light, paired wood casement windows with plain wood surrounds. This façade also features a wall-mounted air-conditioning unit and electrical and mechanical equipment.

Exterior Condition
The residence at 2224 Piedmont Avenue appears to be in fair to good condition. The stucco exterior shows no signs of cracking or spalling. The doors and windows also appear to be in fair to good condition; the wood elements of the windows show some signs of deterioration and have worn to bare wood in places. Minor repairs and repainting of the sills and frames would increase the longevity of these elements. The cast iron balconettes on the north façade show signs of corrosion that should be addressed before it progresses further; the windows behind the balconettes are beginning to fail at the bottom. The wood ADA ramp on the north façade is in poor condition and has biological growth on its elements, indicating water infiltration.

Building Interior
2224 Piedmont Avenue is currently used for offices and meeting rooms. The building has three habitable levels at the basement, first floor, and second floor. Typical features include plaster walls and ceilings, wood trim, fluorescent light fixtures, single-panel wood doors with brass hardware, and carpeted or hardwood flooring. The hardwood flooring in much of the second floor is laid in a parquet pattern with a decorative cherry band near the perimeter.

Basement
The basement was heavily renovated around 1993 to upgrade the office space in the building. The basement stair was removed and a T-shaped corridor was inserted to create additional office space and improve the basement’s egress. Two exterior doors were added on the south and west ends of the basement. The southeast corner of the basement previously consisted of a large, L-shaped room that is now divided into Rooms 1, 3, 3A, a mechanical room, part of Room 8, and the south portion of the basement corridor. Other alterations were made to accommodate the construction of the east-west...
part of the corridor. There is currently no interior stair that links the basement to the upper floors of the building.

**Basement Corridor**

*Description:* The basement corridor is T-shaped; the east-west arm runs from the west façade to Room 10 (*Figure 19*), and the north-south arm starts at the south façade and terminates at Rooms 8 and 9. There are three steel-framed egress doors with crash bars on the basement corridor: one on the south façade, and two on the west façade. Located in the east-west arm of the corridor on the south wall is a pair of four-light casement windows (*Figure 20*). The basement corridor is plainly finished aside from a small piece of wainscoting on the east side of the corridor. The walls and ceiling of the corridor are clad in drywall that is painted white. The concrete floors are covered in carpeting. Mounted on the ceiling are fluorescent lighting fixtures, surface conduits, exposed plumbing, sprinkler pipes, and smoke detectors.

*Condition:* Good
This area and its elements appear to be in good condition.

**Mechanical Room**

*Description:* Located on the west side of the basement corridor is a small mechanical room that houses a fuse box (*Figure 21*). The walls and ceiling are plaster and the floor is linoleum. The room has a wood chair rail on the west wall and a rubber baseboard. The door to the room is of hollow-core wood construction with aluminum hardware. Metal surface conduit and piping run along the walls, and an incandescent bulb provides illumination.

*Condition:* Good
This area and its elements appear to be in good condition.

**Room 1: Office**

*Description:* Room 1 is utilized as an office (*Figure 22*). The room has a plaster ceiling and plaster and gypsum board walls with a vinyl baseboard. The floor is carpeted. Paired four-light, wood-sash casement windows are located in the south and west walls. The window frame and surrounds are wood. A non-historic, solid-core wood door set in a steel frame accesses the room. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and most of its elements appear to be in good condition. The wood of the windows is checked and shows signs of wear.

**Room 2: Office**

*Description:* Room 2 is utilized as an office (*Figure 23*). The walls and ceiling are clad with drywall, and there is a vinyl baseboard. In the middle of the south wall is the brick chimney base. The floor is carpeted. A pair of four-light, wood-sash casement windows is located near the southwest corner of the room. The window frame and surrounds are wood. A non-historic, solid-core wood door set in a steel frame accesses the room on the west wall. The door is equipped with aluminum hardware. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and most of its elements appear to be in good condition. The wood of the windows is checked and shows signs of wear.
Rooms 3 & 3A: Office & Closet

Description: Room 3 is utilized as an office (Figure 24). It has a plaster ceiling, plaster and gypsum board walls, and a vinyl baseboard. The floor is carpeted. A pair of four-light, wood-sash casement windows is located in the west wall of the room. The window frame and surrounds are wood. Room 3A is a small closet on the north wall of Room 3. The doors to Rooms 3 and 3A are non-historic, solid-core wood doors in steel frames. Each door is equipped with aluminum hardware. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

Condition: Good
These rooms and their elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 4: Office

Description: Room 4 is utilized as an office (Figure 25). It has gypsum board and plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The floor is carpeted and a wood baseboard runs around part of the room (Figure 26). In the east wall is a pair of four-light wood casement windows. The window frame, surrounds, and sill are wood. Room 4 has three non-historic, solid-core wood doors set in steel frames and equipped with aluminum hardware; these doors lead to the basement corridor to the west, to the crawlspace to the north, and to Room 4A to the south. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 4A: Storage/Utility Room

Description: Room 4A is a small, narrow space used for storage (Figure 27). It has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The floor is concrete, as are the walls to a height of 3 feet. A single panel wood door is in the north wall leading into Room 4. There is one three-light awning window in the east wall. The window has a wood frame, sill, and large surround. Mounted on the ceiling are an incandescent light fixture, pipes, and armored cables.

Condition: Fair
This room and its elements appear to be in fair condition. There are some signs of water intrusion and salt efflorescence on the east wall. A portion of the plaster on the south wall near the ceiling has spalled, revealing the underlying lath.

Room 5: Crawlspace

Description: Room 5 is unexcavated space under the first floor of the building (Figure 28). It is only accessible from Room 4 and is currently used for storage.

Condition: N/A

Room 6: Mechanical Room

Description: Room 6 is listed as a mechanical room on the University’s floor plans. It was locked and inaccessible at the time of the survey.

Condition: Unknown
Room 7: Computer Room  
*Description:* Room 7 is dedicated to housing computer hardware *(Figure 29).* It has drywall cladding on the walls and ceiling and a vinyl baseboard. The floor is scored concrete. A three-light, wood-sash awning window is located in the west wall. The window frame and surrounds are wood. Room 7 has two non-historic, solid-core wood doors set in steel frames and equipped with aluminum hardware that lead to the basement corridor and Room 8. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 8: Office  
*Description:* Room 8 is an office and appears to be also used for storage *(Figure 30).* It has plaster walls, a plaster ceiling, and a vinyl baseboard. The floor is concrete. A wood rail runs around the perimeter of the room. There are two three-light, wood-sash awning windows located in the north wall of the room. The window frames and surrounds are wood. The room includes two non-historic, hollow-core wood doors equipped with aluminum hardware that lead to the basement corridor and Room 7. There are incandescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 9: Storage  
*Description:* Room 9 is an L-shaped room used for storage *(Figure 31).* The west wall is plaster and the remaining walls and ceiling are gypsum board. At the northeast corner of the room is the brick chimney base. The floor is concrete covered with linoleum. One three-light, wood-sash awning window with a wood frame, surround, and sill is located near the northwest corner of the room. A solid-core, two-panel wood door with a wood frame and brass hardware leads to the basement corridor. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and steel surface conduits and outlet covers on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 10: Office  
*Description:* Room 10 is utilized as an office *(Figure 32).* The room has a plaster ceiling, plaster walls, a vinyl baseboard, and a wood rail on the north and east walls. The floor is linoleum over concrete. Two three-light, wood-sash awning windows with steel hardware are located in the east wall. The window frames and surrounds are wood. A wood-panel door with obscure glazing in the upper panel accesses the room. The door hardware is brass. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic outlet covers.

*Condition:* Fair
This room and its elements appear to be in fair condition. A leak in the southeast corner of the room has caused the plaster to deteriorate and spall, exposing the underlying lath on the wall and ceiling *(Figure 33).*
First Floor

The first floor was altered around 1993 to upgrade the office space in the building. The former service spaces in the northwest corner of the house—including the kitchen and likely the former servant bedrooms—were removed, as was the stair to the basement. Additional egress was provided through the construction of the north corridor and a new exterior door on the west wall leading to the rear stair addition. A third toilet room was constructed and the two existing toilet rooms were renovated. In addition, the former parlor (Room 12), which had been previously divided by the University into six rooms, was largely restored to one single room.

Room 11: Entry Hall & Main Staircase

Description: Room 11, which is the main entry hall for the building, is accessed from the exterior of the building by a wood door with divided lights on the east wall. Flanking the door are paired, fixed, multi-light windows. A staircase leading to the second floor originates in the center of the hall (Figure 34). The carpeted treads and risers lead to a low carpeted landing four steps above the hall level. Contemporary brass handrails have been installed between the first floor and the landing. At the landing, a paneled wood door flanked by nine-light wood-sash windows leads to Room 14 to the west. These windows were originally located on the west façade before the central addition—which contains Room 14—was constructed. The staircase completes a quarter turn to the north at the landing, and hardwood treads and risers with no-slip strips lead to the second floor. A wood open railing originates at the landing and proceeds to the second floor. The railing features carved wood newel posts capped with a wood cornice, turned wood balusters, and a wood handrail (Figure 35).

The entry hall has plaster ceilings, plaster walls, 8-inch redwood baseboards, and a 2-inch picture rail. The floor is carpeted. The hall is illuminated by a pole-mounted chandelier operated by a brass push-button switch (Figure 36). A painted cast-iron register covers a forced-air heating system vent.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 11A: Pantry

Description: Room 11A is a long, narrow room that serves as a connecting corridor between the entry hall (Room 11) and the north corridor (Room 37). The room was likely originally the pantry. It has a plaster ceiling and plaster walls, and the floor is carpeted. Along the east wall is built-in, wood casework with brass hardware (Room 38). The casework includes drawers capped by a countertop and cabinets with multi-light sliding doors. Beadboard paneling is located behind the counter and cabinets. At the north end of Room 11A is a formica countertop and a sink with built-in drawers that match the cabinets along the east wall. A multi-light, wood-sash casement window with brass hardware is located above the sink. On the east wall is a swinging wood door leading to Room 15, and on the west wall is a non-historic hollow-core wood door leading to Room 16. There are incandescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.
Room 12: Office

*Description:* Room 12 is utilized as an office and computer center (*Figure 39*). It was likely originally used as the parlor. Acoustic tiles cover the plaster ceiling and the floor is carpeted. The walls are plaster and feature a 1-inch walnut base molding and an oversized redwood box cornice. Room 12 is separated from Room 13 by a pair of pocket doors with 6-inch wood surrounds on the west wall. A pair of nine-light, wood-sash casement windows is located in the east wall of the room. On the south wall is a large fireplace with a red granite hearth (*Figure 40*). Adjacent to the fireplace is a window that has been replaced with an air-conditioning unit. There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Excellent
This room and its elements appear to be in excellent condition.

Room 12A: Office

*Description:* Room 12A was locked and inaccessible at the time of the survey. The room has been carved out of Room 12 by partition walls that do not reach the ceiling (*Figure 41*).

*Condition:* N/A

Room 13: Office

*Description:* Room 13 is an office and a continuation of the computer center located in Room 12 (*Figure 42*). It was likely originally used as a library or a rear parlor. Acoustic tiles cover the plaster ceiling and the floor is carpeted. The plaster walls feature a 1-inch walnut base molding and an oversized redwood box cornice. A 6-inch wood surround trims the pocket doors on the east wall (*Figure 43*). Paired nine-light, wood-sash casement windows are located in the south and west walls. In the northwest corner of the room is a small fireplace with ceramic tiles that surround the hearth (*Figure 44*). There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and plastic surface conduits on the walls.

*Condition:* Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 14: Office

*Description:* Room 14 is utilized as an office (*Figure 45*). The ceiling has exposed rafters and wood paneling. The walls are plaster and concrete and the floors are carpeted. Room 14 appears to have been originally constructed as a conservatory as part of the central addition on the west façade. Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps indicate that this addition was constructed between 1911 and 1929. On the east wall is a paneled wood door flanked by nine-light wood-sash windows; this door leads to the main staircase landing. Paired four-light, wood-sash casement windows with wood surrounds and brass hardware are located in the south and west walls. The room is lit with an overhead fluorescent light fixture.

*Condition:* Fair to Good
This room and its elements appear to be in fair to good condition. There is evidence of some water damage between the rafters, particularly near the western edge of the room (*Figure 46*).
Room 15: Meeting Room  
*Description:* Room 15 is currently used as a meeting room, but was originally used as the dining room (Figure 47). It has a plaster ceiling and a carpeted floor. The plaster walls feature a 12-inch wood baseboard and a large projecting cornice. A large wood cabinet is located on the south wall. The wood woodwork throughout the room is stained dark brown and contrasts with the white plaster walls and ceiling. The east wall of Room 15 is lined with four multi-light, wood-sash casement windows (Figure 48). The windows are set in wood frames and have simple surrounds and sills. The north wall has a pair of divided-light wood French doors that open onto wrought iron balconettes. The window hardware is brass. Also on the north wall is a fireplace with a red ceramic tile surround and built-in wood mantel (Figure 49). The mantel contains shelving and a hidden cabinet. Room 15 is accessed by a swinging wood door in the west wall that leads to Room 11A, and a solid wood pocket door with ornate brass hardware leading to Room 11 (Figure 50). There are fluorescent lights in the ceiling and a pair of incandescent sconces over the fireplace mantel.

*Condition:* Excellent  
This room and its elements appear to be in excellent condition.

North Corridor  
*Description:* The north corridor is located at the northern end of the first floor. This part of the house originally contained service spaces like the kitchen. The north corridor runs west from Room 11A, turns 90 degrees at Room 20, and runs north to terminate at the exterior of the house. The north corridor provides access to Rooms 11A, 17, 18, 19, and 20. The ceiling of the corridor is plaster and the floor is carpeted. The walls are plaster and gypsum board. The north corridor is simply finished with an 8-inch wood baseboard and a 2-inch wood picture rail.

*Condition:* Good  
The corridor and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 16: Toilet Room  
*Description:* Room 16 is an ADA-compliant unisex toilet room located under the main staircase (Figure 51). The walls are gypsum board with a vinyl baseboard. The ceiling slopes to follow the line of the staircase and is also clad in gypsum board. The floor is covered in linoleum. There are no windows in this toilet room. The room is accessed by a solid wood door with brushed aluminum hardware set in a wood frame in the east wall. The room contains a contemporary toilet and sink, and is lit with fluorescent lighting.

*Condition:* Good  
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 17: Toilet Room  
*Description:* Room 17 is a men’s toilet room (Figure 52). The walls and the ceiling are clad in gypsum board and there is a vinyl baseboard. The floor is covered in linoleum. A solid wood door with brushed aluminum hardware in a wood frame is located in the north wall. The room is equipped with a contemporary sink, urinal, and toilet, the latter of which is enclosed in a sheet metal stall. The windowless room is lit with fluorescent lighting.

*Condition:* Good  
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.
Room 18: Office

Description: Room 18 is an office (Figure 53). The walls and ceiling are clad with gypsum board and there is a vinyl baseboard. The floor is carpeted. A single-panel wood door with brushed aluminum hardware in a metal frame is located in the south wall. Three double-hung, Craftsman-style, wood-sash windows with brass hardware are located in the north wall (Figure 54). A ceiling-mounted fluorescent light fixture illuminates the room. There is surface conduit on the walls and ceiling, and the electrical outlet and light switch plates are plastic.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 19: Toilet Room

Description: Room 19 is a women's toilet room (Figure 55). The walls and ceiling are clad with gypsum board and there is a vinyl baseboard. A solid core wood door with brushed aluminum hardware set in a wood frame is located on the east wall. The room is equipped with a contemporary sink and a toilet, the latter of which is enclosed in a sheet metal stall. A double-hung, six-light wood window with obscure glazing and brass hardware is located in the north wall of the room within the toilet stall. The room is lit with fluorescent lighting.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 20: Office

Description: Room 20 is utilized as an office (Figure 56). The room is irregularly shaped and is angled at the northeast corner, possibly to allow the north corridor to be wide enough to be ADA compliant. Before 1993, Room 20 was divided into two rooms, likely formerly used as servant bedrooms. A small section of wall protrudes into the room on the east wall, a remnant of the wall that previously divided the space into two rooms. The walls of Room 20 are clad in both plaster and gypsum board, and there is a vinyl baseboard. The ceiling is plaster and the floor is carpeted. The room includes two solid-core wood doors. The door on the west wall is an exterior door with a crash bar and closer; the door at the northeast corner leads to the corridor and includes ADA-compliant aluminum hardware. A double-hung, aluminum-sash window with wire glass is located in the west wall of the room. The window frame and sill are wood. The room is lit with fluorescent lighting.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Second Floor

The second floor underwent minor alterations around 1993 to upgrade the office space in the building. The central and southern sections of the second floor were largely unchanged. In the northern section, the second floor corridor was extended to provide secondary egress by means of a new exterior door on the west wall leading to the rear stair addition. To accommodate the corridor extension, what is now Room 26 was reduced in size.
Second Floor Corridor

Description: The second floor corridor connects most of the rooms on the second floor (Figures 57 & 58). The corridor connects to the main stairway and runs both south and west. At the top of the main stairwell, one arm of the corridor runs east to Rooms 31A and 31B, turns 90 degrees, runs south to Room 34, turns 90 degrees again, and runs west to terminate at Room 36. The second arm of the corridor runs north from the top of the main stairway to Room 30, turns 90 degrees, and runs west to the egress door leading to the rear stair addition. The corridor has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The floor is oak hardwood laid in a parquet pattern with a cherry inlay border. This same pattern is used in many of the rooms on the second floor. The corridor is lit with fluorescent lighting.

Condition: Good
This area and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 25: Closet

Description: Room 25 is a closet located at the second landing of the main stairway. The walls and ceiling of the room are plaster. The closet is accessed by a wood-framed, multi-light, wood pocket door equipped with decorative bronze hardware (Figure 59).

Condition: Good
This area and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 26: Office

Description: Room 26 is utilized as an office (Figure 60). Its walls and ceiling are clad with gypsum board. The hardwood floor is a combination of oak with cherry inlay around the perimeter of the room. Room 26 has a wood baseboard and cornice. A non-historic solid core wood door with an ADA-compliant aluminum bar handle accesses the room on the south wall, and a single-panel wood door with brass hardware connects Room 26 to Room 29. A six-light, double-hung, wood-sash window with brass hardware is located in the west wall. The window is set in a wood frame and has wood trim and sills. A ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixture lights the room. There is surface conduit on the walls and ceiling of the room. The electrical outlet and light switch plates are plastic.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 27: Office

Description: Room 27 is utilized as an office (Figure 61). It has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The hardwood floor displays the typical oak and cherry pattern described above. There is a wood baseboard and picture rail running around the perimeter of the room. A double-hung, aluminum-sash window is located in the west wall. A double-hung, wood-sash window with brass hardware is located in the south wall. This window is set in a wood frame and has a wood sill. The door to Room 27 is in the north wall and is of solid-core wood construction with aluminum hardware. Ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures light the room, and there are plastic surface conduits on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.
Rooms 28 & 28A: Closets
Description: Rooms 28 and 28A are small closets off the second floor corridor. The doors are both of solid wood single-panel construction.

Condition: Good
These rooms appear to be in good condition.

Room 29: Office
Description: Room 29 is utilized as an office (Figure 62). Its walls and ceiling are clad with gypsum board and there is a vinyl baseboard. The floor is linoleum. There are two doors to Room 29, both of which are of solid wood, single-panel construction. The door in the south wall leading to the corridor is equipped with an ADA-compliant aluminum bar handle, while the door in the west wall leading to Room 26 has a steel and glass doorknob. On the north wall is a double-hung, multi-light, wood-sash window with chromed hardware. The frame, sill, and trim are wood. Ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures light the room. Plastic surface conduits are located on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 30: Office
Description: Room 30 is utilized as an office (Figure 63). It has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling, which is sloped to follow the roofline and contains a sealed skylight (Figure 64). In the light well of the skylight is a trapdoor that provides access to the attic. The floor is hardwood and contains a trap door that opens into a utility chase. There is a wood baseboard and molding cap around the perimeter of the room. Built-in wood shelving is located on the east wall. The east wall also contains a pair of multi-light, wood casement windows with brass hardware. The windows have wood trim, frames, and sills. Ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures light the room. Plastic surface conduits are located on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 31: Office
Description: Room 31 is utilized as an office (Figure 65). The room is irregularly shaped and is angled at the southwest corner. It has a plaster ceiling and a hardwood floor. The plaster walls feature wood baseboards and cornices. On the north wall is a wood shelving unit with a molded cornice. There are two multi-light, double-leaf wood casement windows on the east wall. Incandescent lights light the room. Metal switch plates are attached to the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Rooms 31A & 31B: Built-in Storage
Description: Rooms 31A and 31B are matching built-in cabinets set in a large alcove off the second floor corridor (Figure 66). Each cabinet consists of three large drawers at the bottom, a wood cabinet in the center, and horizontal leaf cabinets at the top. The cabinets are finished with a cornice and have brass hardware.

Condition: Good
These rooms and their elements appear to be in good condition.
Room 32: Office

Description: Room 32 is utilized as an office (Figure 67). Rooms 32 and 33 were once a single room, forming the second-floor loggia. A partition wall was inserted between the two rooms, dividing in half the central arched opening in the east wall. Room 32 has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The floor is scored concrete. There is an 8-inch wood baseboard running partially around the room. The doors to both Rooms 33 and 32 are set at an angle between the wall of the second floor corridor and the partition wall. The door is of wood construction with two panels in the lower half and a large single light with obscure glazing in the upper half. The door is equipped with brushed aluminum hardware. There is no trim or surround to the door and it is set in a steel frame. Currently, a double-leaf, steel-sash casement window in a wood frame is set in the lower portion of the formerly open arched opening in the east wall, and the semi-circular transom is infilled with painted plywood. The half of the central arched opening located in Room 32 is completely infilled with painted plywood (Figure 68). A multi-light casement window with a wood sill and surround is located in the east wall of Room 33. It is set within a recessed wall cavity that mirrors the arched opening seen on the exterior of the building. The room is lit by ceiling-mounted fluorescent light fixtures. Plastic surface conduits are located on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Room 33: Office

Description: Room 33 is utilized as an office and is the mirror of Room 32 (Figures 69). Rooms 32 and 33 were once a single room, forming the second-floor loggia. A partition wall was inserted between the two rooms, dividing in half the central arched opening in the east wall. The doors to both Rooms 33 and 32 are set at an angle between the wall of the second floor corridor and the partition wall. The steel-framed door is of wood construction with two panels in the lower half, and a single light with obscure glazing in the upper half. The door is equipped with brushed aluminum hardware and has no trim or surrounds. The walls and ceiling of Room 33 are plaster. The floor is scored concrete. Currently, a double-leaf, steel-sash casement window in a wood frame is set in the lower portion of the formerly open arched opening in the east wall, and the semi-circular transom is infilled with painted plywood. The center window in the former arcade is partially covered by the partition wall between Rooms 32 and 33, and has been completely infilled with plywood. A multi-light, casement window set in a wood frame with wood sills and surrounds is located in the west wall. Ceiling-mounted fluorescent light fixtures light the room. Plastic surface conduits are located on the walls.

Condition: Good
This room and its elements appear to be in good condition.

Rooms 34 & 34A: Office & Closet

Description: Room 34 is utilized as an office (Figure 70). It has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The hardwood floor displays the oak and cherry parquet pattern typical of many of the rooms on the second floor. There is an 8-inch wood baseboard and a 2-inch cornice molding around the perimeter of the room. A built-in, wood paneled wardrobe occupies the northeast corner of the room (Figure 71). There are three multi-light, wood-sash casement windows in the middle of the east wall. The windows have wood sills and frames and are equipped with brass hardware. On the south wall, there is a double-leaf, multi-light, wood-sash casement window with a wood surround. Room 34 contains two single-panel, wood doors with steel hardware, wood frames, and wood trim; the doors lead to the second floor corridor and Room 34A. The room is lit by ceiling...
mounted fluorescent lights. There are steel surface conduits on the walls of the room and the switch plates are brass.

Room 34A is a small closet that connects Room 34 to Room 36B. It has plaster walls, a plaster ceiling, and a wood chair rail. In the south wall of the closet is a small, six-light, wood-sash casement window.

*Condition:* Good

These rooms and their elements appear to be in good condition.

**Rooms 35 & 35A: Office & Closet**

*Description:* Room 35 is utilized as an office. It has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The hardwood floor displays the oak and cherry parquet pattern typical of many of the rooms on the second floor. There is a simple 11-inch wood baseboard and a wood cornice. An unusual feature of the room is a built-in, two-level, wood platform against the north wall, abutting the main staircase *(Figure 72).* The shape and location of this feature suggest that it may have been added to accommodate the slope of the staircase. A closet sits in the northeast corner of the room. The doors to the room and to the closet are both of solid wood single-panel construction with wood frames, surrounds, and trim. The doors have brass hardware and glass doorknobs. In the west wall are two six-light wood-sash casement windows with steel hardware set in a wood frame, and a smaller double-hung wood-sash window. A sink and a built-in mirror are located in the nook in the northwest corner of the room. Ceiling-mounted fluorescent light fixtures illuminate the room. Plastic surface conduits are located on the walls.

*Condition:* Good

These rooms and their elements appear to be in good condition.

**Rooms 36 & 36A: Office & Closet**

*Description:* Room 36 is utilized as an office *(Figure 73).* The room has plaster walls and a plaster ceiling. The floors are hardwood with an oak-and-cherry parquet pattern. There is a simple 11-inch wood baseboard and a wood picture rail running around the room. A pair of multi-light, wood-sash casement windows with wood frames, trim, and sills is located in the west wall. Room 36A is a small closet located in the northwest part of Room 36 *(Figure 74).* There are three solid wood single-panel doors in Room 36, which lead to the second floor corridor, Room 36B, and Room 36A. The door to the corridor has an ADA-compliant brushed aluminum bar handle. An overhead fluorescent fixture lights the room and plastic switch and outlet covers are attached to the walls.

*Condition:* Good

These rooms and their elements appear to be in good condition.

**Room 36B: Office**

*Description:* Room 36B is currently used as an office *(Figure 75).* It has no windows and was likely originally used as a large closet for Room 36. The ceiling and walls are plaster, and there is a tile-patterned wainscot. On the east wall is a pass-through to Room 34A with a wood surround *(Figure 76).* The room is lit by an overhead fluorescent light and has plastic surface conduits attached to the walls.

*Condition:* Good

This room and its elements appear to be in good condition, although the ceiling plaster exhibits minor cracking.
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 2224 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:\(^{137}\)

- **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.

\(^{137}\) 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.\(^{138}\)

LANDSCAPE

The following discussion evaluates the areas of significance for the landscape around 2224 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.

:\(^{138}\) 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 front entry pathway and the brick service entry path are significant features as they appear to be original to the period of construction of the house *(Figures 80, 82, & 83)*.

**Wooden ADA ramp**  
*Significance: Non-Contributing*  
The contemporary, non-compliant, wooden ADA ramp that terminates the service entry path is non-contributing.

**Concrete path**  
*Significance: Non-Contributing*  
The concrete path that leads to the compliant ADA entrance on the south side of the building dates to about 1980 and is non-contributing. It lies within the bed of the concrete drive that originally existed on the south side of the house and led to the now-demolished garage at the rear of the property *(Image 17)*. The curb cut of the drive remains intact, causing vehicles to park on the front lawn and partly on the pedestrian pathway.

**Front setback**  
*Significance: Significant*  
The building setback is significant, as in concert with similar setbacks of neighboring houses, it reflects planning and spatial characteristics of its time and the socio-economic status of its owners.
Landscape Character-Defining Features

Front lawn

*Significance:* Significant
The lawn that remains today is significant as it dates to the residential period of 2224 Piedmont Avenue. Generous front lawns were a hallmark of the neighborhood, where large houses were typically constructed with 50-foot setbacks ([Images 14 & 15].

Coast Redwoods at western side of house

*Significance:* Significant
The stand of three Coast Redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), Tree Nos. 541, 542, and 543, are significant. Based on their size, 50-inch diameter at breast height (dbh), the trees are attributable to the early 1900s.

*Specimen Trees:* Historical and Natural Area
The Coast Redwoods form part of the Southeast Campus woodlands area, thereby meeting the criteria for a Natural Area.

Coast Live Oaks at western side of house

*Significance:* Contributing
The Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifloia), Tree Nos. 497, 498, 499, 500, and 501, are considered contributing as they contribute to the Oak canopy of the area.

*Specimen Trees:* These trees are not considered specimens due to their size and health.

BUILDING EXTERIOR

The building’s exterior has remained largely intact and is reflective of the original massing, configuration, and appearance, with the exception of the missing clay tile roof and the infill of the loggia on the east façade.

*Significance:* Very Significant
*Character-Defining Features:*
- Building massing
- Building’s roofline and roof profile including chimneys
- Stucco siding
- Entry porch, including stucco-clad columns and other decorative elements
- Loggia
- Wood molding and trim
- Wood doors
- Wood-sash windows
- Cast-iron balconettes

BUILDING INTERIOR

Basement

Basement Corridor

*Significance:* Non-Contributing
*Character-Defining Features:* N/A
Mechanical Room

Significance: Non-Contributing
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 1: Office

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds

Room 2: Office

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds

Rooms 3 & 3A: Office & Closet

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood casement window and window surround

Room 4: Office

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Single panel wood door
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds

Room 4A: Storage/Utility Room

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Single panel wood door
- Wood awning window and window surround

Room 5: Crawlspace

Significance: Non-Contributing
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 6: Mechanical Room

Significance: Not Surveyed
Character-Defining Features: N/A
Room 7: Computer Room  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Wood awning window and window surround

Room 8: Office  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling  
- Wood chair rail  
- Wood awning windows, window surrounds, and hardware

Room 9: Storage  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster wall (on west wall)  
- Two-panel wood door and door surround  
- Brass door hardware  
- Wood awning window and window surround

Room 10: Office  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling  
- Wood chair rail  
- Wood door with glazed panel, door surround, and hardware  
- Wood awning windows, wood surrounds, and steel hardware

First Floor  
Room 11: Entry Hall & Main Staircase  
Significance: Very Significant  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling  
- Wood baseboards  
- Wood picture rail  
- Hardwood treads and risers  
- Carved wood baluster, turned newel posts, wood cornice, and wood handrail  
- Wood doors and surrounds  
- Wood-sash windows and window surrounds  
- Bronze chandelier  
- Brass push button light switches  
- Decorative register cover
Room 11A: Pantry

Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Built-in wood casework and brass hardware
- Beadboard paneling
- Wood swinging door and door surround
- Wood casement window, window surround, and brass hardware

Room 12: Office

Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Wood cornice
- Wood pocket doors, door surround, and bronze door hardware
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds
- Fireplace

Room 12A: Office

Significance: Not Surveyed
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 13: Office

Significance: Very Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Wood cornice
- Wood pocket doors, door surround, and bronze door hardware
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds
- Fireplace

Room 14: Office

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Exposed rafters in the ceiling
- Wood door and door surround
- Wood-sash windows, window surrounds, and brass hardware
Room 15: Meeting Room  
Significance: Very Significant  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling  
- Wood baseboard  
- Wood cornice molding  
- Wood pocket door, door surround, and bronze door hardware  
- Wood swinging door and door surround  
- Wood casement windows and window surrounds  
- Divided-light wood French doors, brass hardware, and wrought iron balconettes  
- Fireplace, including mantel with hidden compartment  
- Built-in cabinet  
- Mantel sconces

North Corridor  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling

Room 16: Toilet Room  
Significance: Non-Contributing  
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 17: Toilet Room  
Significance: Non-Contributing  
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 18: Office  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Single panel wood door  
- Double-hung wood windows, window surrounds, and brass hardware

Room 19: Toilet Room  
Significance: Non-Contributing  
Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 20: Office  
Significance: Contributing  
Character-Defining Features:  
- Plaster walls  
- Plaster ceiling  
- Wood window surround and sill
Second Floor

Second Floor Corridor
  Significance: Contributing
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Plaster ceiling
  • Parquet floor

Room 25: Closet
  Significance: Contributing
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Plaster ceiling
  • Wood pocket door, door surround, and bronze hardware

Room 26: Office
  Significance: Significant
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Parquet floor
  • Wood baseboard
  • Wood cornice molding
  • Single panel wood door, door surround, and brass hardware
  • Double-hung wood window, window surround, and brass hardware

Room 27: Office
  Significance: Significant
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Plaster ceiling
  • Parquet floor
  • Wood baseboard
  • Wood picture rail
  • Wood-sash windows, window surrounds, and brass hardware

Rooms 28 & 28A: Closets
  Significance: Non-Contributing
  Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 29: Office
  Significance: Significant
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Single panel wood door, door surround, and steel and glass doorknob
  • Double-hung wood window and window surround
Room 30: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
• Plaster walls
• Plaster ceiling
• Hardwood floor
• Wood baseboard
• Wood molding cap
• Single panel wood door
• Wood casement windows, window surrounds, and brass hardware
• Built-in wood shelving

Room 31: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
• Plaster walls
• Plaster ceiling
• Hardwood floor
• Wood baseboard
• Wood cornice molding
• Single panel wood door and door surround
• Wood casement windows and window surrounds
• Built-in wood shelving

Rooms 31A & 31B: Built-in Storage
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
• Built-in cabinets

Room 32: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
• Plaster walls
• Plaster ceiling
• Concrete floor
• Wood baseboard
• Glazed wood door and door surround
• Wood casement window and window surround
• Arched openings
Room 33: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Concrete floor
- Wood baseboard
- Glazed wood door and door surround
- Wood casement window and window surround
- Arched openings

Rooms 34 & 34A: Office & Closet
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Parquet floor
- Wood baseboard
- Wood cornice molding
- Single-panel wood doors and door surrounds
- Wood-sash casement windows, window surrounds, and brass hardware
- Built-in wood wardrobe

Rooms 35 & 35A: Office & Closet
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Parquet floor
- Wood baseboard
- Wood cornice molding
- Wood doors, door surrounds, brass hardware, and glass knobs
- Wood-sash windows and window surrounds

Rooms 36 & 36A: Office & Closet
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Parquet floor
- Wood baseboard
- Wood picture rail
- Single panel wood doors and door surrounds
- Wood-sash casement windows and window surrounds
Room 36B: Office

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Tile wainscot
- Pass-through and wood surround
- Single panel wood door and door surround
SIGNIFICANCE DIAGRAMS FOR BUILDING INTERIOR

The following diagrams assign levels of significance to the interior of 2224 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 for 2224 Piedmont Avenue date to 1993 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 2224 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.
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V. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

2224 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 2224 Piedmont Avenue has been found individually eligible for the National Register.

The section of Piedmont Avenue between Dwight Way and Gayley Road—which includes 2224 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.

140 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 2224 Piedmont is the second period of residential development in the Berkeley Property Tract (1901-1929). This period 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. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, a large single-family house designed in the Mission Revival style by well-known architect William Knowles, is an excellent example of this development.

Significance of 2224 Piedmont Avenue
The following discussion evaluates the individual eligibility of 2224 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)
2224 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)
2224 Piedmont Avenue does not appear to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion B (Person). Neither Professor Noble nor later University occupants appear to have been persons significant to our history.
Criterion C (Design/Construction)

2224 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, Mission Revival dwelling of the early twentieth century. This revivalist style was inspired by elements of Mission adobe architecture, including a sense of heavy massing, plain stucco cladding used to mimic plaster-covered adobe, arcades, and clay tile roofs. 2224 Piedmont Avenue was designed to incorporate many of these elements, including minimal exterior detailing, a second floor loggia with arched openings, and a clay tile roof (now removed). On the interior, the building was richly finished in the Arts and Crafts aesthetic of the time, representing the eclectic conglomeration of influences and styles popular in residential architecture at the turn of the century. The house is a good 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 2224 Piedmont Avenue for eligibility under National Register Criterion D (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report.

Integrity of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

2224 Piedmont Avenue retains a moderate degree of integrity. The building retains integrity of location, since it remains on its original site. The building has lost some integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling through alterations to the exterior and interior. The most significant alterations are the loss of the original clay tile roof; the infill of the arched openings in the second-floor loggia (a seemingly reversible alteration); alterations to the first floor lobby, especially to the main staircase; and the loss of the original service spaces in the north wing. The staircase addition at the rear of the building, although an alteration, does not impact integrity to a high degree. It is located at a rear elevation, was designed in a sensitive manner to be clearly differentiated from the original building, sits at a distance from the main west façade, and is only connected at the exterior doorways. It also appears that the stucco cladding on the building may have been reapplied after University acquisition, resulting in a rougher finish than was likely originally intended. However, the building does retain its original massing, fenestration patterns, and window sash, and the majority of the original finishes, detailing, and original cabinetry and trim.
2224 Piedmont Avenue has lost some integrity of setting and association. 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 original neighboring buildings at 2222 and 2232 Piedmont Avenue are extant, retaining the sense of a neighborhood made up of freestanding, single-family dwellings set on gracious lots along a landscaped boulevard. Overall, 2224 Piedmont Avenue retains sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing on the National Register.
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, UCRC PIC 14Q:5)
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. Hillegass 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 left-hand 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)
VI. Historic Photographs

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)
VI. Historic Photographs

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. Thoren House (2307 Piedmont) and Hicks House (2311 Piedmont) near the corner of Channing Way and Piedmont Avenue, 1915 (Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association website)
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 PIC 03:067)
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 222 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)
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. 2224 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 Piedmont Avenue, looking northwest toward 2222 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 2. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking southwest toward 2232 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 3. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, east façade

Figure 4. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, east façade

Figure 5. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, east façade

Figure 6. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, main entry on east façade
Figure 7. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, detail of columns on east façade

Figure 8. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 9. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 10. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, north façade

Figure 11. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, west façade

Figure 12. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, staircase addition on west façade
Figure 13. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, enclosed utility area on west façade

Figure 14. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, staircase addition on west façade, looking north

Figure 15. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, staircase addition on west façade, looking north

Figure 16. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, arcaded porch on west façade

Figure 17. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, west façade

Figure 18. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, south façade
VII. Existing Conditions Photographs

Figure 19. Basement hallway

Figure 20. Basement hallway, looking out on rear porch

Figure 21. Basement, mechanical room

Figure 22. Basement, Room 1

Figure 23. Basement, Room 2

Figure 24. Basement, Room 3
Figure 25. Basement, Room 4

Figure 26. Basement, Room 4

Figure 27. Basement, Room 4A

Figure 28. Basement, Room 5

Figure 29. Basement, Room 7

Figure 30. Basement, Room 8
Figure 37. First floor, Room 11A

Figure 38. First floor, Room 11A

Figure 39. First floor, Room 12

Figure 40. First floor, Room 12, detail of fireplace

Figure 41. First floor, Room 12

Figure 42. First floor, Room 13
Figure 43. First floor, Room 13

Figure 44. First floor, Room 13, detail of fireplace

Figure 45. First floor, Room 14

Figure 46. First floor, Room 14, evidence of water damage

Figure 47. First floor, Room 15

Figure 48. First floor, Room 15
Figure 49. First floor, Room 15

Figure 50. First floor, Room 15, detail of brass hardware on pocket door

Figure 51. First floor, Room 16

Figure 52. First floor, Room 17

Figure 53. First floor, Room 18

Figure 54. First floor, Room 18
VII. Existing Conditions Photographs

Figure 55. First floor, Room 19
Figure 56. First floor, Room 20

Figure 57. Second Floor Hallway
Figure 58. Second Floor Hallway

Figure 59. Second floor, Room 25
Figure 60. Second floor, Room 26
Figure 73. Second floor, Room 36

Figure 74. Second floor, Room 36A

Figure 75. Second floor, Room 36B

Figure 76. Second floor, Room 36B
LANDSCAPE PHOTOGRAPHS

Figure 77. Sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue, looking south

Figure 78. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, east and north façades

Figure 79. Sidewalk on Piedmont Avenue in front of 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking northwest toward 2222 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 80. Brick steps and service entry path on east side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking east

Figure 81. Sidewalk in front of 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking south

Figure 82. Brick front entry pathway on east side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue
Figure 83. Brick front entry pathway on east side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 84. Parking on south side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 85. Sidewalk at Piedmont Avenue, looking north

Figure 86. Concrete ADA pathway and parking on south side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 87. Concrete ADA pathway and parking on south side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking west

Figure 88. West side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue showing concrete pad that was formerly used as a garage pad
Figure 89. West side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue showing concrete pad that was formerly used as a garage pad

Figure 90. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 91. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 92. Redwood specimen trees on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 93. West side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue showing concrete pad that was formerly used as a garage pad

Figure 94. West side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue showing concrete pad that was formerly used as a garage pad
Figure 95. Detail of former garage pad

Figure 96. West side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue showing concrete pad that was formerly used as a garage pad

Figure 97. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 98. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 99. Dracena tree on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 100. Plantings between 2224 and 2232 Piedmont Avenue on west side
Figure 101. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 102. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 103. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 104. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 105. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 106. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue
Figure 107. Plantings on west side of 2224 Piedmont Avenue

Figure 108. Area between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking east

Figure 109. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, west façade

Figure 110. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, west façade

Figure 111. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, south façade

Figure 112. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, ADA entrance on south façade, looking east
Figure 113. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, wood ADA ramp at north façade

Figure 114. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, wood ADA ramp at north façade

Figure 115. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, wood ADA ramp at north façade

Figure 116. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, wood ADA ramp at north façade

Figure 117. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, ADA entrance at south façade

Figure 118. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, south façade
Figure 119. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, ADA entrance at south façade

Figure 120. 2224 Piedmont Avenue, west façade, looking south

Figure 121. Area between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking east

Figure 122. Area between 2222 and 2224 Piedmont Avenue, looking west
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)
Map 5. Map of Berkeley, ca. 1880 (University of California, Berkeley)
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 7. 1897 Map of the northern end of Piedmont Way (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
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 14. Campus Map of University of California, Berkeley, ca. 1927 (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 15. 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map showing west side of Piedmont Avenue
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 18. 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map
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

1909  2224 Piedmont Avenue is built for Professor Charles A. Noble of the Department of Mathematics. William Knowles is the architect, and Kidder & McCullough is the contractor.

1909-1950  Professor Charles Noble is living at 2224 Piedmont Avenue, according to city and campus directories.

1947  Florence Noble, Charles Noble’s wife, dies.

1940s/1950s  Professor Noble employs a cook and a chauffeur/gardener, and rents space to at least one male student.

1950  Professor Noble, listed as an Emeritus faculty member, has an office at 456 Wheeler Hall.

1962  Charles A. Noble, Jr. sells 2224 Piedmont Avenue to the University for $91,500. The property conveyance is recorded in August.

The campus FDX (building database) gives September 19, 1962 as the “date occupied.” Listings for other buildings give the same date, so this is possibly just an entry for the start of the database, not an actual date for the occupation of the building.

1963-68  The Center for the Study of Law and Society is listed as an occupant of the house.

1967  Professor Noble dies. Noble’s obituary statement, written by his colleagues, notes that he was known for hosting social gatherings at his house.

Fall 1968  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Center for the Study of Law and Society (22 rooms), Institute for International Studies (five rooms), and Environmental Physiology (one basement storage room).

Fall 1969  FDX notes the building is assigned to Institute for International Studies.

Fall 1970  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Center for the Study of Law and Society (22 rooms), Institute for International Studies (five rooms), and Environmental Physiology (one basement storage room).

Fall 1971  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Center for the Study of Law and Society (unknown number of rooms), Anthropology (five rooms), and White Mountain Research (unknown number of rooms).

Fall 1973  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Center for the Study of Law and Society (unknown number of rooms), Anthropology (five rooms), and “Chancellor’s Office” (one room).
Fall 1975—Fall 1978  FDX notes that five rooms are assigned to Anthropology. The remainder of the building is assigned to the Center for the Study of Law and Society.

Fall 1979  FDX notes that ten rooms are assigned to Anthropology, including one “academic office,” one research lab, storage space, graduate offices, and general office space. The remainder of the building is assigned to the Center for the Study of Law and Society.

Fall 1980  2224 Piedmont Avenue is identified as being occupied, in part, by an “Information Systems Office” for the campus.

FDX notes that Anthropology is assigned about one-third of the rooms in 2224 Piedmont Avenue; the remainder is occupied by the Center for the Study of Law and Society.

Fall 1982-Fall 1984  FDX notes that Anthropology is assigned ten rooms in the building and the remainder is assigned to “Computing Office.”

Issues of “dry rot conditions that may reach serious proportions” are being investigated.

Fall 1985  FDX notes that Anthropology is assigned ten rooms in the building; and 23 rooms are assigned to “Counseling and Psychological Services.” One room is assigned to Pre-Professional Advising.

Fall 1986  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Pre-Professional Advising (22 rooms), the Institute for Social Change (4 rooms), “Acad. Computing” (one storage room), “General Admin. Inactive” (2 rooms), Career Planning and Placement (3 rooms).

Fall 1988  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Pre-Professional Advising (19 rooms), the Institute for Social Change (4 rooms), Institute of Governmental Studies (one storage room), Career Planning and Placement (3 rooms).

Fall 1990  FDX lists the occupants of 2224 Piedmont Avenue: Pre-Professional Advising (about 23 rooms), Institute of Governmental Studies (5 rooms), Career Planning and Placement (3 rooms).
Memos from the Office of Physical Resources document plans to “divide room 1 into two spaces,” “furring out of entire south and west walls and north half of east wall with metal studs” (presumably in room 1), “remove and replace all (14) existing ceiling fluorescent fixtures,” and various electrical, carpeting, and heating changes to the basement. Other work listed included, “seal up openings in fireplace,” and “removal of ramp at entry stairs.”

Additional memos refer to “improvements to 2224 Piedmont required by the relocation of the Quantitative Anthro Lab and the Anthro offices” and various fire code violations.

Fall 1991

Anthropology offices, IS & T (Informational Systems & Technology), and QAL (Quantitative Anthropology Lab) are assigned space in the building.

1993

Internal memos from the Department of Anthropology refer to the relocation of a researcher from the basement to an upper room because of “health requirements which are compromised by his assignment to room 6,” and use of the building by at least one instructor in Anthropology and the Journal of Visual Anthropology. The health problems are apparently due to lack of heat in the basement.

Fall 1993- Fall 1995

Anthropology offices and IS & T are assigned to the building.

2005

Occupants include MACTIA (Multimedia Authoring Center for Teaching in Anthropology).
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 agrofolia 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

- **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 if 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).
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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>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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>NLE</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>NLE</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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Sweet Gum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Cupressus macrocarpa</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>NLE</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>NLE</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>NLE</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>NLE</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>NLE</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>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></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 P (2) 6&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C P 8&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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 G (3) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>NLE</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></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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></td>
<td>NLE</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 F shrub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td>NC F shrub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td>NC F shrub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td>NC F shrub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>'Torulosa'</td>
<td>NC F shrub</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 F (2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 G 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S G (3) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 E 24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 F 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>C P (2) 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 E (5) 6&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S E (3) 6&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</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>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></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; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</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>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 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>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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; severely leaning</td>
<td></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>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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>
### 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>477</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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></td>
<td>no trunk, sprouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484-485</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 tenuifolium</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</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></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>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>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2&quot; (6&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Aesculus californica</td>
<td>California Buckeye</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>42&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>26&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>44&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</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>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 platyphyllos</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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</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>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>NLE</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