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I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The 2241 College Avenue Historic Structure Report (HSR) for 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 2241 College Avenue for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

SUBJECT OF THIS STUDY

The subject of this report is the building located at 2241 College Avenue and its surrounding landscape. 2241 College Avenue is an Eastlake/San Francisco Stick style structure constructed in 1885 as a single-family home in a residential neighborhood known as the Berkeley Property Tract. By examining other buildings within the geographic limits of the Berkeley Property Tract (Map 2), it appears that 2241 College Avenue is the oldest surviving structure still in its original location, the

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.
second oldest structure overall, and the oldest largely unaltered building in the Tract. Therefore, it is a rare survivor of the first period of residential development in the area south and east of the University campus. Currently, the building at 2241 College Avenue houses the College of Letters & Sciences/College Relations and Development Office, and the Tanner Lectures program.

**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 2241 College 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.

---

1 There are approximately ten other nineteenth-century houses remaining in the Berkeley Property Tract: 2431 College Avenue (1897, altered 1913); the McFarland Houses at 2708 and 2710 Haste Street (circa 1895); 2721 Channing Way (1890, altered); the Ford-Hall House at 2425 Hillside Avenue (circa 1890, altered); the Smyth House at 2451 Hillside Avenue (possibly circa 1870s, altered 1911); the Perkins-Hayne House at 2421 Piedmont Avenue (1886, altered); the Sarah M. Goodrich House at 2498 Piedmont Avenue (1893); the George H. Maxwell House at 2405 Prospect Street (1883, moved from 2401 Piedmont Avenue and altered); and the John F. Sims House at 2422 Prospect Street (1892, moved from Warring Street and altered). Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, *Frederick Law Olmsted's Berkeley Legacy—Piedmont Way and the Berkeley Property Tract* (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, [1995]), n.p.
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.”

---

6 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

---

1 Ferrier, 26.
2 Ibid., 79.
3 Ibid., 80.
4 Ibid., 49.
5 Ibid., 74-75.
6 Ibid., 109, 84.
College of California purchased a tract of land from Captain Simmons that encompassed part of what became the Berkeley Property Tract and the northern part of present-day Piedmont Avenue. The Simmons tract was particularly desirable because it came with water rights.\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 OLMSSTED**

Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903) is considered to be the father of American landscape architecture. At his home, Fairstid, in Brookline, Massachusetts, Olmsted established one of the first professional landscape design firms in the world.\footnote{Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site website. Viewed online at \url{http://www.nps.gov/frla/}.} 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.\(^17\) 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.\(^18\) 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.\(^19\)
\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.”\(^20\) In March, the two traveled to Berkeley to ride around the College Property hills despite rain and snow squalls.\(^21\) 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.”\(^22\)

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.”\(^23\) After receiving the letter, Olmsted wrote Miller about starting work on the project:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\(^{17}\) Ranney, 571.
\(^{18}\) Ranney, 411.
\(^{19}\) 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.
\(^{20}\) FLO to his wife, 12 February 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 317.
\(^{21}\) FLO to his wife, 1 March 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 320.
\(^{22}\) 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.
\(^{23}\) Willey to FLO, 22 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 571.
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.24

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.”25 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.”26 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.27

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.28 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.29

---

24 FLO to Edward C. Miller, 26 June 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 398-400.
25 7 July 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
26 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.
28 Vaux to FLO, 10 May 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 359.
29 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. Apparently pleased with these findings, at the next trustee meeting, Willey bought a piece of land from the Simmons Tract for his new home. At the same meeting, the committee asked for additional time to survey the land.

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

---

30 Ranney, 407.
31 FLO to Vaux, 1 August 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 421.
32 8 August 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
33 Ranney, 571.
34 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

---

3 Willey to FLO, 22 September 1865. Reproduced in Ranney, 572.
4 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.
5 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
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.” 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.”

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

---

39 3 October 1865 meeting of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
40 The report would be printed more than once; this version was printed by Wm. C. Bryant & Co. in New York in 1866.
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:

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.}

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 should be both available and contrived from the public and private domains by making best use of the landscape’s natural features.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 548.
\item Ibid., 554.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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 branching from them.” By using the plural “lanes,” the suggestion of a pair of vehicular lanes—in other words, a divided road—is there.

---

46 Ibid., 560.
47 Ibid., 564-566.
48 Ibid., 560.
49 Ibid., 561-564.
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 long settled East Coast, Olmsted could apply his social and design attitudes in his approach to shaping a residential settlement from the ground up.

---

50 Ibid., 565.
51 Beverage and Rocheleau, 6.
52 Wendy Hallinan, *Frederick Law Olmsted’s First Residential District: The Significance of the Berkeley Property* (submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, Archaeology and Heritage School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester, October 2004), 7.
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 of Chicago by a shaded parkway just as he described the connection between Piedmont Way and the Campus with the City of Oakland.
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54 Beverage and Rocheleau, 44.
55 Ibid., 102.
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 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
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56 Ibid., 107.
57 Ferrier, 110.
59 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.
60 7 May 1866 and 10 July 1866 meetings of the College trustees. Documents of the College of California, 1850-1869. Held by the Bancroft Library.
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…” 61 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. 62

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. 53

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. 64 Olmsted was apparently very unhappy with his report and wrote to Charles Eliot Norton in September 1866:
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53 Quoted in Ferrier, 57.
64 Ranney, 457-458.
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.\textsuperscript{65}

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.\textsuperscript{66}

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.”\textsuperscript{67} 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.\textsuperscript{68} 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.”\textsuperscript{69}

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.

\textsuperscript{65} Olmsted to C.E. Elliot, 12 September 1866. The Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted, Box 46, Reel 40, “California, University of, Berkeley, Calif., 1865-1866,” held by the Library of Congress.

\textsuperscript{66} These maps would be turned over to the newly formed University of California at the end of 1868. Hallinan, 14.

\textsuperscript{67} Quoted in Ferrier, 315.

\textsuperscript{68} Ferrier, 315-316.

\textsuperscript{69} *Alta California*, 27 August 1867, quoted in Ferrier, 316.
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
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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.\(^71\) 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.\(^72\) 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. This undermined a key element in Olmsted’s vision for the college: surround the campus with residential areas.\(^73\) However, Gilman was likely not referring to the Berkeley Property Tract. It appears that the Berkeley Property Tract was not transferred to the University of California when the College of California dissolved, likely because lots in the Tract had already been sold and no longer belonged to the College of California. This is further underscored by the title block on the 1868 Boardman map, which states that the Tract was situated “between” the University of California campus and the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind. Gilman was likely referring to other portions of the campus that had been marked for residential use, labeled with a “B” on Olmsted’s plan (Map 3). Gilman also asked Olmsted to return to work on the campus.

I have been greatly instructed by your printed report on the site. You know probably that the University has inherited these grounds from the college—that they have been partially laid out and planted with trees, and that large costly buildings are going up…I wish every day that you were here that the University might avail itself of your counsels during the development of the estate.\(^74\)
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\(^71\) Hallinan, 21.
\(^72\) Ibid, 19.
\(^73\) Ranney, 571.
Gilman also remarked that Olmsted’s plat was missing, and Olmsted said he could not find the design or topographical map in his papers. 75 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?”76 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. 77 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. 78 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. 79

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. 80 President Gilman reported to the University regents in 1875: “The neighborhood of Berkeley grows but slowly. There is in it no school, no practicing 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.”81

75 Olmsted’s missing plans have not been found. In a 26 December 1949 letter, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., wrote that he had “searched in vain for this plan and for several others prepared by my father when in California in the 1860’s…I assume that his copies of these plans must have been lost before his papers and other records of that period…were put for safekeeping in the files of the Olmsted firm in Brookline.” Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., to A.L. Sylvester of the University of California, 26 December 1949. Records of the Olmsted Associates, Box B107, project number 2047. Held by the Library of Congress.
76 FLO papers, 21 December 1872, quoted in Stevenson, 315.
78 John Emerson Todd, Frederick Law Olmsted (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982), 129.
79 Stevenson, 315.
80 Ferrier, 117.
81 Gilman himself might have been frustrated by the lack of civic growth, because that same year he took a job as the president of the newly formed Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Quoted in Ferrier, 122.
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. The arrival of the railroad caused the small business center of Berkeley to move west from Telegraph Avenue closer to Shattuck Avenue. 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.”

**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 in 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. In its original layout, College Avenue—formerly Audubon Street—extended two long blocks north of Bancroft Way to the current vicinity of the Girton Hall childcare center. Thus, the homes on the 2200 College Avenue block were conveniently located near the University campus, but still within a private residential city district. West of College Avenue and south of Strawberry Creek was the Hillegass Tract, the undeveloped area now known as Faculty Glade. Extending off of College Avenue to the west was a now-vanished, dead-end street known as Sylvan Way, which had a small enclave of private homes (Map 8).

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,
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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 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).85

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. 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.”86

Some of the houses on the 2200 block were developed as Olmsted intended, especially the houses on the east side of Piedmont Way, 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.87 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

86 Berkeley Daily Gazette, 30 January 1900.
Channing Ways, was auctioned off and subdivided into 38 lots, which were far smaller in size than Olmsted’s ideal.

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. 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-foot 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. 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.
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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 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 ecumiums [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.\(^{91}\)

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.\(^{92}\) 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.

\(^{90}\) J.B. Reinstein to Frederick Law Olmsted, 15 November 1895. Records of the Olmsted Associates, Box B107, project number 2047. Held by the Library of Congress.

\(^{91}\) In 1911, John Galen Howard wrote to the Olmsted Brothers to consult with the University about a landscape plan, but again, nothing seems to have come from this. John Galen Howard to the Olmsted Brothers, 7 October 1911. Records of the Olmsted Associates, Box B107, project number 2047. Held by the Library of Congress.

\(^{92}\) Ferrier, 252.
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).

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, and in fact, there is some possibility that Huggins laid out many of the developments attributed to the Olmsted Brothers firm, which also prepared plans for Mason-McDuffie.

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). 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.
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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”:

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.99

The improvements were undertaken by the Oakland Paving Company, with sewer work going to the Plumber Improvement Company.100 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.101

99 Resolution 646-A, 10 July 1900. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
100 Minutes of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, 13 August 1900; 14 June 1900. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
101 Berkeley Daily Gazette, 22 October 1900.
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.102

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].”103 These plantings are visible in historic photographs of the neighborhood (Images 10 & 11). The Oakland Paving Company petitioned to build sidewalks on the east side of Piedmont Avenue between Dwight Way and Kearney that same month.104 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 1908.105 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 (Image 11). 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).

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

---

102 Note that “parking” here refers to the median parks, not automobile parking. *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, 12 November 1900.
103 *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, 1 March 1901.
104 Minutes of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, 11 March 1901. Held by the Berkeley City Clerk Department.
105 Ferrier, 255.
Avenue (circa 1902) and two cottages designed by Julia Morgan at the rear of the 2245 College lot between 1903 and 1911. The Morgan cottages were apparently constructed on excavated land, resulting in an approximately 6-foot drop from the rear of the 2234 Piedmont lot (Map 12). By the early twentieth century, the 2200 block north of the Cheney property consisted of the Slate property at 2231-39 College; 2227 College, a single-family house that appears to have been owned by Professor Clarence Cory (Engineering); and a parcel of undeveloped land that was owned by the Pacific School of Religion. The Pacific School of Religion at one point intended to build a seminary campus on the property, but would eventually sell the land to the University in 1922.

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).

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.

---

106 Lee (Denny) Palsak, personal interview with Steven Finacom, 29 November 2005.
107 The electric streetcars stopped running in Berkeley during the 1940s.
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.

**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
and most valuable appendage to the general local attractions of the neighborhood.\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, 565.} 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.\footnote{William Henry Smyth, \textit{The Story of the Stadium: California Memorial Stadium} (Reprinted from \textit{The Berkeley Gazette}, copyright by W.H. Smyth, 1923), 33.}

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.\footnote{Ibid., 38.} 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.\footnote{Campus Protective Association pamphlet, located in Records of the California Memorial Stadium Executive Committee, 1920-1923. Held by the Bancroft Library.}

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. \textbf{Advantages}: Already owned. Beautiful region. Large area. \textbf{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.\footnote{John Galen Howard to President D.B. Barrows, 29 August 1921, Records of the California Memorial Stadium Executive Committee, 1920-1923, “Correspondence, 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…”\footnote{John Galen Howard to President D.B. Barrows, 12 January 1922, Records of the California Memorial Stadium Executive Committee, 1920-1923, “Correspondence, 1920-1923.” Held by the Bancroft Library.} 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.\footnote{Sally Woodbridge, \textit{John Galen Howard and the University of California} (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002), 154.}

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.”\footnote{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.} 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 radiating 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.”\footnote{“New Design for the California Memorial Stadium,” \textit{The Architect and Engineer} 72 (February 1923): 75.}

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 structures 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 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 13 & 15). Piedmont Place, the cul-de-sac that previously terminated Piedmont Avenue, was retained as an offshoot to the northwest (Image 14). 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 east side of the 2200 block of College Avenue included the following structures starting from Bancroft Way and running north: the fraternity house at 2251 College, constructed in 1911; the former Harriet Lee property at 2245-2249 College, purchased by the University in 1926; the Cheney property at 2241-2243 College; the Slate property at 2231-2239 College; the Cory property at 2227 College; and finally, the group of buildings moved to College Avenue from the Stadium site (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 Image 16). 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 (Maps 17 & 19). As a result, Piedmont Place was removed.

In 1950, the Boalt School of Law was constructed on the northeast corner of Bancroft Way and College Avenue (Map 19 & Image 21). 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 1955, all of the buildings on the east side of the 2200 block of College Avenue had been acquired by the University. Starting from Bancroft Way and running north, the buildings were: the Boalt Hall of Law at the northeast corner of Bancroft Way and College Avenue; the former fraternity house at 2251 College; the former Harriet Lee property at 2245-2249 College; the former Cheney property at 2241-2243 College; the former Slate property at 2231-2239 College; the former Cory property at 2227 College; the group of buildings moved to College Avenue from the Stadium site; and Cowell Hospital (Map 18).

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 20). 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 22). 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. Today, only 2241, 2243, and 2251 College Avenue remain standing on the 2200 College Avenue block, and 2241 College is the only extant nineteenth-century structure in the Berkeley Property Tract north of Channing Way.

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). A circa 1899 photograph shows the Hillegass Tract looking south from East Hall (Image 8). East of College Avenue, the campus boundary largely paralleled the uneven, southern edge of the Strawberry Creek ravine. Thus, throughout the nineteenth century, the entire study area was in private ownership outside the campus proper.

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

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

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

University Development

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

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

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

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

...several temporary buildings designed by Howard were built for a variety of academic uses. These included the wooden Spreckels Physiological Laboratory...one of the first campus research labs, in 1903 and, the following year, the corrugated-iron Anthropology Building called the “tin bin” that housed Phoebe Apperson Hearst's collections. West of these stood the wooden Fertilizer Control building...and the corrugated-iron Museum of Vertebrate Zoology (renamed the Decorative Art Annex 1930-1964), both built in 1909. And between California Field and Hearst Hall, the wooden Hygiene and Pathology Laboratory was inserted in 1908. Two wooden buildings designed by Clinton Day and originally built in 1898 were also moved to this congested area in 1921: the zoology laboratory East Hall and the Botany Building from the present sites of LeConte and Stephens Halls, respectively.118

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.

118 Ibid., 198-199.
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 Laboratories, 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 2231-2239 College Avenue (just north of 2241/43 College) was purchased.

• In 1939, the Cheney property at 2241/43 College Avenue was 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.\(^{119}\)

\(^{119}\) 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.”

120 Ibid.
121 Warren Perry Papers, Bancroft Library, BANC MSS 82/97c, Box 11, folder “University of California.”
122 Ibid.
Perry then discussed the 2200 block:

…the area east of College Avenue and north of Bancroft Way has been thought of as the proper location of smaller self-contained units such as Child Welfare, Public Health and similar “institutes” which would be extended to include even the Law School; such units have little to do with the rest of the Campus, even with the Main Library.\(^{123}\)

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.

\(^{123}\) 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 (Image 16).

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 (Image 17).

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 & 22).
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 projected to be 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.\(^\text{124}\)

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, demolition of existing houses began again with removal of the old Slate house at 2231-2239 College, and most probably its northerly neighbor, 2227 College, to allow for the construction of Calvin Laboratory, which was dedicated in 1964. Calvin Laboratory was sited in the southeast part of campus so that Melvin Calvin and his staff could be close to their colleagues in the Chemistry complex.\(^\text{125}\) The idea of placing closely related academic disciplines in the same sector of campus—in other words, in academic “precincts” of related buildings and disciplines—is a common principle in Berkeley campus planning documents, dating back to Emile Bénard’s 1899 plan.


Therefore, it was a logical decision to site Calvin Laboratory near related science buildings. In addition to the proximity issues, the Calvin site presumably was suitable to the University because it was not occupied by important existing academic buildings whose users would be displaced by a new building. Instead, the site contained two or three small, nineteenth-century residential buildings. The 1962 LRDP was fairly explicit about the temporary nature of these buildings:

> The Berkeley campus contains a number of structures built originally for short term use, other structures that have outlived their period of usefulness, and some buildings that have been acquired through campus expansion and put to interim use pending permanent development of their sites. Evidently, if the quality of the campus and its facilities is to keep pace with future need, most of these buildings must be removed and new space found for their occupants.\(^{126}\)

Under this definition, the houses at the proposed site of Calvin Laboratory would have fallen into the category of “acquired through campus expansion and put to interim use pending permanent development…” In fact, several structures with addresses from 2227 to 2251 College Avenue were listed as “Buildings To Removed” in the LRDP.\(^{127}\)

Around 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 path. Although it has been difficult to pinpoint exactly when the portion of College Avenue north of Bancroft Way was removed, a note on the 1962 site plan for Calvin Laboratory labels the road as “College Ave (to be closed off by others),” and shows the future Wurster Hall building footprint sitting partially on top of College Avenue. This suggests that this section of College Avenue was closed between 1962 and 1964, prior to the completion of Wurster Hall and Calvin Laboratory.

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

The 1962 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), as discussed above, designated all of the older houses on the block as temporary, ultimately to be cleared for the construction of permanent buildings. Consulting Landscape Architect Thomas Church prepared a 1962 landscape plan to complement the 1962 LRDP. One of the goals of the 1962 LRDP was the removal of vehicles from much of the campus, and Church planned to implement this in part by closing College Avenue north of Bancroft Way, as discussed above. Church’s 1962 plan showed the alteration of this section of College Avenue from a vehicular street to a curvilinear pedestrian and bike path (Map 20).

---

\(^{126}\) University of California, Berkeley, 1962 Long Range Development Plan, 19.

\(^{127}\) Ibid., 20.
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:

[128] 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. 129

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.” 129 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.

128 University of California, Berkeley, Art, Music and Professions, Phase I of Berkeley Campus Space Plan, revised October 1991, III.7-III.8.
129 Ibid., III.3.
The description of 2234 Piedmont stated, “should the University ever need the area for a larger building, this structure should be moved…and, if possible, restored.”

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

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

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

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

130 Ibid., III.13.4.
131 University of California, Berkeley, 1990 Long Range Development Plan, 36.
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 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.”

---
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2241 COLLEGE AVENUE

2241 College Avenue was constructed in 1885 as the family home of Warren (born Lemuel Warren, 1858-1921) and May Lucretia Cheney (1861-1942). The Cheneys likely purchased the land from Bela Wellman, who is listed in the 1884 Block Book as owning two adjacent 100-foot-wide parcels corresponding approximately to 2231-2245 College Avenue. The Cheneys purchased at least 1½ of these parcels—corresponding to the addresses of 2241-2245 College—giving them a parcel that measured approximately 150 feet by 260 feet, or about .90 of an acre. Olmsted’s ideal size of a house site in the Berkeley Property Tract was one to five acres, so the Cheney lot was close to the lower end of that scale. In fact, the Cheney property was almost three times as large as most of the neighboring properties to the north, which only had 50-foot street frontages (Map 8).

Professor Frederick Slate purchased the property directly north of the Cheney property at 2231-2239 College from Bela Wellman in 1884, likely at the same time the Cheneys purchased their land from Wellman. In 1873, Slate had become one of the first two graduate students enrolled at the University of California. Slate subsequently became a member of the faculty as Professor of Physics, a title he assumed after the death of Professor John LeConte in 1891. He remained chair of Physics for twenty-seven years until his retirement in 1918. The Slate house was constructed around 1883 and stood back from the street, midway on the lot, approximately in line with the façade of 2241 College.

In 1887, the improvements to the 2241 College property were assessed at $1500, the same assessment given to the Christys. Clinton Day’s improvements were assessed at $2500, the LeContes were assessed at $3500, and the Slates were assessed at $1000. Around 1894-96, the Cheneys sold the southern 50-foot x 258-foot parcel of their property, likely to Harriet J. Lee.

The Cheney House was well positioned on its lot to allow for a generous front yard. The lot was apparently well landscaped; an account from the early 1900s briefly mentions an ornamental fish pond on the property, and Warren Cheney, the grandson of the original owner, recalled that his grandfather used to grow roses in front of the house, as did their neighbor to the north, Professor Slate. The property also had multiple outbuildings. Although outbuildings such as stables were common, the Cheneys had almost a miniature farm on their property. In addition to the rental cottage at 2243 College Avenue (built in 1902, and discussed in more detail below), the 1903 Sanborn Fire

---
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Insurance Map shows at least four outbuildings: a stable; a windmill; a water tank; and one unnamed building (Map 10). Sheldon Cheney, one of the Cheney sons who grew up at 2241 College, recalled that a few years prior to the 1906 Earthquake, his father was out of town and his brother, Charles, convinced Sheldon to help convert their stable to an automobile garage.¹³⁹ This stable/garage is shown on the 1911 Sanborn map as 2243½ College, just behind 2243 College (Map 12). By 1911, the Cheneys had added three additional outbuildings and converted or rebuilt the outbuilding immediately to the north of the main house into a two-story addition. None of the outbuildings on the property—aside from the addition—are still extant.

**Warren and May Cheney**

Warren and May Cheney were alumni of the University of California from its earliest decades. Warren graduated in 1878, and May graduated with the Class of 1883, just fifteen years after the University was chartered and not much more than a decade after the first buildings were finished on the Berkeley campus. To place them in the context of that time, the University had a total of 261 undergraduate students in 1879, and even fewer—215 undergraduates—in 1883, the year in which May graduated. Assuming that a quarter or less of enrolled undergraduates received their diploma each year, the Cheneys could be among the first 500 graduates of the University of California and were certainly among the first 1,000.

According to Sheldon Cheney, May Cheney had lived near campus since the late 1870s:

> My mother [May] graduated from the University, my father graduated from the University. Then they liked it so much that they decided to build just off in the campus. In fact, my mother and her mother lived in one of two or three little cottages that were built along the edge of Strawberry Creek. One was up where Senior Hall is now, one was down about Dana Street, and I think there was one down near Oxford Street. They were rented out by the University, and they lived there, apparently, about the time she came to college or was preparing for college. My father had graduated five years before, in 1878; he was an early graduate.¹⁴⁰

The Cheneys decided to construct a house at 2241 College Avenue near the University campus shortly after returning from a European trip, during which their son, Charles, was born in Rome.

**Warren Cheney** began his career as a writer; he worked for *Sunset Magazine* and the *Overland Monthly*, and served as editor of *The Californian*. According to his son Sheldon, Warren also wrote fiction—

---


¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 5-6.
including at least three novels—and might have pursued a literary career if his eyesight had not been poor.\(^\text{141}\) As a college student, Warren had been inspired by the poet Edward Roland Sill, one of the early notable University faculty members in humanities.\(^\text{142}\) Sheldon Cheney also indicated that Warren had studied engineering and earned a law degree at Hastings College of Law, although he apparently never practiced.\(^\text{143}\)

Ultimately, instead of continuing his writing career, Warren entered the real estate and insurance businesses. Around 1900, Warren created the Berkeley Building Association, later renamed the Warren Cheney Real Estate Company. City directories list the company’s offices in downtown Berkeley, and advertisements indicate the company acted as the representative for various insurance companies. Warren Cheney was active in developing the area in and around the Berkeley Property Tract, including the Benton Property subdivision, the Panoramic Hill development, and Orchard Lane and the Bancroft Steps.\(^\text{144}\) Thus, Warren played an important role in the urban development of Berkeley, and the development of the Berkeley Property Tract and the adjacent neighborhood of Panoramic Hill—now a National Register Historic District (2005)—were due to his direct involvement and leadership.

Warren Cheney’s personal life intersected with his literary interests, and family members reported that he operated an informal literary salon at 2241 College with friends and guests, including author Jack London, who dropped by the house to socialize and converse. Sheldon Cheney recalled in his unpublished oral history that “Father had a kind of a center for, particularly, writers, but also for any of the artists; they used to drift in.”\(^\text{145}\) The State Historic Resources Inventory (SHRI) form for the house notes: “The Cheney home was a gathering place for intellectual and creative people in the University community such as Charles S. Greene, Mary Austin and John Galen Howard.”\(^\text{146}\)

**May Cheney** was a long-term employee of the University and played a significant role in the early-twentieth-century development of the University and its relations with other educational institutions and systems. May was also one of the few women in the early decades of the University who had an important and influential formal position on the staff.

\(^{141}\) Ibid., 40-41.
\(^{142}\) Ibid., 16; 41.
\(^{143}\) Ibid., 53.
\(^{144}\) Cerny, 171; 208.
\(^{145}\) Sheldon Cheney, “Conversations With Sheldon Cheney,” 47.
\(^{146}\) Anthony Buffington Bruce, “State Historic Resources Inventory: Cheney, (Warren) House, 2241 College Avenue, Berkeley, California,” 27 June 1978.
May Cheney’s work focused on matching qualified teachers with rapidly expanding employment opportunities in California’s public schools. In 1890, there were only about twenty high schools in California; seven years later, there were 110 high schools.147 This rapid growth—which continued as California’s population soared in the early twentieth century—led to a high demand for qualified individuals and the improvement of educational standards at the elementary and secondary levels. The University was actively involved in the development of the educational system in California:

…on one hand through the training and provision of teachers, and on the other by the active participation of its pedagogy faculty in shaping high school curriculum and in the organizing institutions for the K-12 system such as the State Board of Education…one practical, farsighted individual, May L. Shepard Cheney ’83, clearly understood the nature of these needs and worked to create the university offices which could satisfy them.148

May’s central and leading role in this development makes her an important figure in both University and California educational history.

After graduating from the University, May started a private employment bureau in San Francisco named the Pacific Coast Bureau of Education. The firm found jobs for teachers and took a percentage of their salaries as a fee. According to Sheldon Cheney, May felt that she had to work in order to provide income for her growing family while her husband pursued a writing career. May’s employment bureau was the only one of its kind in California at the time, and it was “frequently used” by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to find teachers particularly for the “the many newly organized schools in Southern California”149

In 1897, May approached University President Martin Kellogg about setting up a similar bureau on campus. She suggested a uniform strategy for the University to use when recommending teachers to high schools; prior to this time, University faculty members or the Recorders’ Office had simply provided suggestions when individually contacted by local school districts. President Kellogg asked May to review the procedures of the Harvard University Appointments Committee, established in 1895 as the first university-affiliated job placement program of its type in the country. May was ultimately appointed effective January 1, 1898 to operate a similar program at Berkeley, making the Berkeley program the second in the country.150 In this position, May was classified as “Appointments

---
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Secretary,” a title sometimes misunderstood as denoting a clerical position. However, May acted as the Secretary of an organization (rather than a clerical worker), and the term “appointments” referred to arranging the appointments of teachers to jobs.

At the time that May was appointed, the University had few faculty members. In the fall of 1899, when President Benjamin Ide Wheeler assumed office, there were only 108 faculty members, including eight emeriti. Most likely there were even fewer non-academic, administrative employees (excluding staff like custodians, clerical workers, night watchmen, groundskeepers, etc.), so May would have been part of a relatively small cohort at the University. May was initially paid just $55 per month (later raised to $1,000 per year by 1904).

May’s work had far-reaching effects throughout California. In 1919, her office processed over 3,000 “requests for teachers and other ‘professional workers’” and handled 15,000 pieces of correspondence. By 1925, her office had files on 3,217 registered teachers who could be referred to appropriate jobs. May Cheney gradually expanded the work of the office into the rudiments of a campus career center for other professional graduates. Off campus, May’s work served a vital function in the development of California’s public education system. The qualified teachers she recommended populated schools throughout the American West and were a force in raising local educational standards and preparing and encouraging their most capable students to go to college. Thus, May’s work not only resulted in jobs for graduates, but helped spread the values and standards of the University throughout what was still a largely educationally unformed region. Many University students from those early decades remembered being motivated to attend college by a favorite high school teacher who had graduated from Cal.

In addition to leading an active job placement department, May also eventually became extensively involved in many other University activities. She was influential in establishing and effectively staffing several functions that would later become full-fledged University departments, including the campus career center, the Office of Relations with Schools, and the Public Information Office. May was a central figure in the University administration:

[May Cheney] also served as secretary to the president, and collected and disseminated information about and for other institutions, augmented by providing speakers and lecturers for high schools, creating the groundwork for what became
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the Office of Relations with Schools. She further handled the “accrediting relation” with high school principals for the recorder (registrar), in reference to the university’s certifying of high school programs of study as adequate for the admission of graduates to Berkeley. In addition, May Cheney undertook the certification of teachers; while related to appointment work, it was an extra time-consuming process involving working with faculty, securing recommendations, and issuing the actual certificate…If this were not enough, she collected and distributed to the press what she calls “authentic news in regard to University affairs,” developing a practice of news collection from faculty which would become the Public Information Office...she laid the logical groundwork for evolving university functions.”

Sheldon Cheney noted that May’s office was always physically located next to the President’s office (first in South Hall, then in California Hall), which would have put her at the center of campus administrative and community life, and enhanced her on-campus status.

May was considered an expert in the placement of teachers in public schools, and she was “called upon as a recognized national leader in teacher development to suggest ways to improve the quality of teaching in the United States, and the placement of teachers in appropriate positions.”

She is credited with founding the American College Personnel Association in 1924, “an association whose members are dedicated to enhancing the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of each individual within post-secondary educational institutions and thus to the service of society.” She was also a member of several national boards and commissions.

May Cheney remained in her position as Appointments Secretary for forty years, “leaving an indelible imprint not only on the encouragement and development of teaching in the state, but on university structure and policy.” Her obituary noted: “As long as the spirit of the university endures, the Spirit of May L. Cheney will be a living force in that most important of functions for higher education, the teaching of teachers, and their distribution to the schools and colleges of the State, the National, and far distant lands of the world.” In the late 1950s, in recognition of May Cheney’s service, the University named one of its new women’s residence halls for her.
The Cheney Sons

Warren and May Cheney had four sons: Charles H. (1884-1943), Sheldon W. (1886-1980), Marshall C. (1888-1972), and John A. Cheney (1890-1906). The four children grew up at 2241 College Avenue. The youngest son, John, apparently died around age sixteen, but the cause of his death has not been discovered. Charles, Sheldon, and Marshall all graduated from the University of California. This was not atypical for that era; many California residents moved to Berkeley so their children could live economically at home while attending the state university, which did not charge tuition.

Sheldon Cheney indicated that his parents believed in providing free housing for their children while they attended the University, and city directory listings (although confused for some dates) do appear to show the Cheney sons lived fairly consistently at 2241 College at least until the end of their college years. Census records indicate that other individuals—possibly servants—lived at 2241 College over the years for short periods of time. At least one other person with the last name of Cheney also appears to have lived in the house at some point.

Charles Cheney graduated from the University of California in 1905, earning the first degree in Architecture awarded by the new School of Architecture. Charles Cheney had apparently become interested in studying architecture in part after meeting University Supervising Architect John Galen Howard—the founder and head of the program—and his wife at one of the artistic gatherings held at 2241 College Avenue by Warren Cheney.

Charles Cheney was a leading pioneer in the development of modern city planning and zoning regulation in the western United States. He studied at the prestigious École des Beaux-Arts in Paris following his Berkeley education in architecture and engineering. After returning to the United States in 1910, Charles worked as a draftsman in New York in the office of Charles Platt. He moved back to California in 1912 and worked at Lewis Hobart’s office where he became interested in city planning. In 1914, Charles was elected to the California Conference on City Planning. A year later, in 1915, Charles moved to Southern California, where he remained for the rest of his life.

Charles was the author of numerous town plans and model zoning ordinances in an era when communities throughout California were trying to rationalize and manage burgeoning urban and
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159 Various City directories for Berkeley and Oakland from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, generally Husted’s or Polk’s directories. Archived at the Berkeley Historical Society.

160 Sheldon Cheney, “Conversations With Sheldon Cheney,” 47.

suburban growth and mitigate some of its least desirable aspects. He acted as consultant to several
cities including Santa Barbara, Monterey, Long Beach, Alameda, Berkeley, and Palo Alto, as well as
Chandler, Arizona, Portland, Oregon, and Spokane, Washington. Charles often worked with
Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. on projects including the East Cabrillo Boulevard Parkway and the 1924
“Major Street Traffic Plan for Los Angeles,” which included a proposal for a suburban grade-
separated parkway named the Arroyo Seco Parkway (now the Pasadena Freeway), based on parkways
in New York. Charles also worked with the Olmsted Brothers on the Palos Verdes development
south of Long Beach, where he eventually lived until his death.

Charles Cheney was the father of Warren D. Cheney (1907-1979), who would also study architecture
at the University of California. Warren D. Cheney became an artist, psychologist, and marriage
counselor, and the founder and first editor of the Transactional Analysis Journal. Warren Cheney lived
at 2241 College Avenue while he attended the University of California; his grandmother provided him
with free college housing, as she did with his father and uncles.

It does not appear that Charles Cheney lived at 2241 College Avenue from about 1905 onward, and
certainly not after 1915, although he may well have visited his family at the house; his mother lived at
2241 College Avenue as late as 1939. However, Charles Cheney’s early formative years are quite
closely associated with the house since he lived there both as a child and during college.

Sheldon Cheney graduated from the University of California in 1908. Over the next quarter century,
Sheldon was periodically in residence in Berkeley and, in particular, at 2241 College Avenue. He
would live for much of his adult life on the East Coast, but later returned to Berkeley and lived on
Panoramic Hill until his death.

Sheldon Cheney pursued a life at the cutting edge of modern culture, particularly in the visual and
dramatic arts. Sheldon worked as an author and art and theater critic, and founded the influential
Theater Arts magazine in 1916. He wrote The Theatre: Three Thousand Years of Drama, Acting and Stagecraft,
considered to be “the first comprehensive English-language history of theater.” He was also the
author of New World Architecture (1930), Expressionism in Art (1934), and New World Art History (1956),

162 Ibid., 119-120.
164 San Francisco Examiner, 12 July 1978.
165 The James A. Michener Art Museum website, “Sheldon Cheney.” Viewed online at
among other books. He helped write the autobiographies of architect Frank Lloyd Wright and Isadora Duncan. According to The James A. Michener Art Museum:

Sheldon Cheney was regarded as one of the most significant figures in the modernist movement in American drama in the 1920s and the 1930s. Cheney's writing on the history of theater influenced such personalities as playwright Eugene O'Neill and set designer Robert Edmund Jones…As an art and drama critic for many magazines, his writing included contributions to Encyclopedia Britannica, the *New Caravan* and *Theatre Arts* magazine. 166

Events of Sheldon’s life that appear to be specifically associated with 2241 College Avenue include his childhood and college years, and his early research and writing work, including preparation of a book about outdoor theatres in the United States and the founding of *Theatre Arts* magazine in 1916. Sheldon also hosted a Berkeley lecture visit of architect Frank Lloyd Wright at 2241 College in 1932, during which Wright commented on the view of the campus from the front porch of the house. 167 Sheldon sought to establish a private educational institution called the “School for Openmindedness,” and recalled that he held the initial classes on College Avenue across from the campus, which implies the classes were held on the family property at 2241/43 College; unfortunately, he did not have the financial resources to continue the enterprise. 168

**Marshall Cheney** was the third of the Cheney sons to live to adulthood. Like his brothers Charles and Sheldon, he graduated from the University of California. Marshall became a physician and practiced in Berkeley. He also served as a physician at the University Infirmary/Health Service and apparently was a team doctor for the collegiate athletes; his brother, Sheldon, rather irreverently described Marshall in his oral history: “He’s the one that’s been here [in Berkeley] all these years. He’s the man…that went to all the football games and ran out when anybody got hurt.” 169

Marshall appears to have continued to live at—or returned to live at—2241 College Avenue after graduation, since he was a resident of the house when his mother sold it to the University in 1939. In addition, a building permit for electrical improvements to 2241 College from 1933 lists “Dr. Marshall Cheney” as the owner of the property. 170 Living at 2241 College would have been quite convenient for Marshall Cheney; his off-campus medical offices were nearby in the south campus neighborhood, and

166 *Ibid*.
168 Cheney’s oral history does not note the year when he attempted to start the school. *Ibid*.
170 Building permit #37625 dated 28 February 1933, filed under 2241 College Avenue, City of Berkeley Planning & Development Department.
the University Infirmary—and later, Cowell Hospital—were located along College Avenue just north from the family house. In addition, California Memorial Stadium, where his athletic duties would have taken him, was just uphill. By 1939, Marshall’s wife, Penelope M. Cheney (1895–1980), was also living at 2241 College.

2243 College Avenue

In 1902, the Cheneys hired contractor Carl Ericsson to design and build a freestanding second house on their property, to the southeast of the main house. It was given the address of 2243 College Avenue. An article in the June 21, 1902 issue of the Berkeley Gazette reported on the construction of the cottage: “Contractor Carl Erickson [sic] is now engaged upon a two-story dwelling of six rooms for W. Cheney. It is located on College Avenue, near Bancroft Way. The plans are by the contractor. The cost is $1,660.”

2243 College bears remarkable similarities to the George Boke House in Berkeley, designed by noted architect Bernard Maybeck and constructed in 1902 on Panoramic Way. According to the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA), 2243 College is the first house in Berkeley built to resemble the Swiss Chalet styling of the Boke House and is “an early example of the influence that architect Bernard Maybeck had on early home-builders and how his designs caught the imagination of the public.” George Boke was a law professor at the University and may have known May Cheney. It seems fairly certain that the Cheneys saw the Boke House, which was located in their neighborhood, and asked Ericsson to create a similar design for their rental cottage. Ericsson would go on to build several other chalet-style houses in Berkeley, including his own home in 1909. Currently, at least one other Ericsson house appears to be extant in Berkeley at 1625 Jaynes Street.

2243 College was apparently built to be a rental property, which was not uncommon in the area. While the 2200 blocks of College Avenue and Piedmont Way were generally characterized by owner-occupied, single-family homes, with a few fraternities and other student residences scattered here and there, census data for houses in the neighborhood indicate that there were a number of buildings on the block that were consistently rented out by the early twentieth century.
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171 The estimated date of construction for 2243 College Avenue has previously ranged from the mid-1890s to the early 1900s. However, it is almost certain that the cottage mentioned in the 1902 article is 2243 College Avenue, since the description matches the building perfectly, including the number of rooms, and it is the only other house on the Cheney property on the 1903 Sanborn map. “Contracts are let for new dwellings,” Berkeley Gazette, 21 June 1902.

The first residents of 2243 College appear to have been Professor James Turney Allen (1873-1948) and his wife, Amelia Sanborn Allen (1874-1945). James Turney Allen was born in Cleveland, Ohio in 1873 and grew up in California. He earned his A.B. from Pomona College in 1895, his M.A. from the University of California in 1898, and his Ph.D. from Yale in 1898. Early in 1899 he married Amelia Sanborn. Amelia Sanborn Allen was a writer, self-taught naturalist, and lover of nature.

Professor Allen began his teaching career at Berkeley in 1898 when he accepted a position as an instructor in Greek and Classical Archaeology. By 1903, he was promoted to Assistant Professor, and by 1919, he became a Full Professor. He retired in 1943. During his long career, Professor Allen was twice appointed as visiting professor at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. He helped organize the Pacific Coast Philological Association and served as president from 1914 to 1915. He also served as president of the Classical Association of the Pacific States (1924) and the San Francisco Archaeological Society (1939-1948). Professor Allen was the author of *The First Year of Greek* (1917, revised 1931)—which was used extensively in University teaching—*The Greek Theatre of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1920), and *Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and Their Influence* (1927). After his death in 1948, Professor Allen’s faculty colleagues wrote about his work:

For the last forty years of his life he worked, as he found freedom from other demands, on a concordance of the dramas of Euripides, covering all the extant plays and fragments, including the finds in the papyri. This vast labor, carried on partly in association with the Dutch scholar Gabriel Italie, was, fortunately, brought to completion and will be published in due course by the University of California Press. It is destined to supersede, beyond all question, all previous compilations in the same field.

Professor Allen's influence as a teacher deserves particular emphasis...Hundreds of students who had no Greek attended his course in Greek drama in translation, and from his enthusiasm for the drama as a living art, his eloquent reading of pointed passages, and his gift for interpretative expression, gained an enduring appreciation of these masterpieces. Such students still speak with warm gratitude of this genuinely great scholar who was willing to share his treasures with sophomores ignorant of the original tongue. To him, indeed, the Greek heritage was so vital and inspiring that he could not be content to share his knowledge of it with the few who in these days study classical Greek; he chose to go out into the highways and the byways and compel them to come in. He is remembered in this connection with special gratitude by students whose interests lie particularly in the field of the drama and the theater, because he faced the drama as a living, vibrant thing and not merely as another avenue of aestheticism.  
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One of the offshoots of Professor Allen’s expertise in Greek drama was his staging of the first performance at the Hearst Greek Theatre: a production of “The Birds” in the original Greek in 1903.

Professor Allen and his wife lived at 2243 College until at least 1911, when they commissioned local architect Walter Ratcliff to build a house for them on Panoramic Hill. Their new house was a few blocks uphill to the east of 2243 College in the district that Warren Cheney had developed on the edge of Strawberry Canyon.

The names of the immediate occupants of 2243 College after the Allens moved have not been found, but by 1920, census records show that Israel Boasberg, his wife Helena, and daughter Sylvia were living at the house and presumably renting it from the Cheneys. Israel is listed on the census as a “cleaner,” while his wife worked in a grocery. The 1930 census records show Harold Cummings, his wife, stepson, and an unnamed fourth tenant living in the cottage; no occupations are given for any of the residents.

From at least 1932 to at least 1937, the house was rented to Elizabeth Price. In one city directory, Price is listed as a “UC teacher,” although that occupation is not identified in other listings. Price family descendants have indicated that this particular Elizabeth Price was the ex-wife of Clifton Price, a Professor of Latin at the University. The Prices divorced early in the twentieth century; Professor Clifton Price remarried, to Wilson Holden. Strangely enough, he eventually purchased the Boke House on Panoramic Hill and constructed another house and a rental apartment building. Elizabeth Price appears to have known Amelia Allen through a bird-watching club. It is also likely that Elizabeth Price knew the Cheneys in the then-small world of Berkeley and campus society, since her ex-husband was a professor at the University during the same time May Cheney was on staff.174

University Acquisition of 2241 and 2243 College Avenue

University property acquisition records show that 2241 and 2243 College Avenue were purchased by the University from May Cheney in 1939; the sale was finalized in December of that year. In the 1940 local telephone directory, May Cheney and her son Marshall are still shown living at 2241 College Avenue, but the listing information may have been compiled prior to the sale. May Cheney, Marshall, and his wife Penelope appear to have relocated together to another Berkeley house after the sale. In
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174 As noted above, there are some gaps in the chronology of private renters at 2243 College Avenue. In the 1990s, an older woman identifying herself as the daughter of a professor who used to live at 2243 College visited the house, and asked to see the upstairs bedroom that had been hers. Unfortunately, her name was not noted. Personal communication, Eric Ellisen to Steven Finacom, 3 August 2005.
1941, the local telephone directory listed both May and Marshall as living at 116 Tunnel Road, confirming that the family moved from 2241 College Avenue around 1940. It appears that May Cheney lived at the Tunnel Road address until she died in 1942.

The University’s purchase of 2241 and 2243 College Avenue was part of a sequence of acquisitions on the 2200 block of College Avenue. Two years earlier, in 1937, the campus had purchased the residential property to the north, the old Slate family home, from Slate family members. Professor Slate, a respected early member of the faculty, had died in 1930. In 1926, the University had purchased the original Harriet Lee property to the south of the Cheney property—which included 2245, 2247, and 2249 College—from Glennie Davis for $7,000. Thus, by the time May Cheney sold her houses to the University, the immediately surrounding properties were already owned by the University.

It is difficult to definitively document the University uses of 2241 and 2243 College during the 1940s. Campus directories and campus maps do not show an identifiable use of the house until 1950. This does not mean, however, that the houses were not being used by the University; campus directories tended to list only the main or mailing address of a department and not secondary locations, and campus maps usually only showed building names and/or addresses rather than current uses. Accordingly, the buildings could have been associated with a program that was headquartered at a larger site, or they could have been used for something too physically small to be listed in the campus directories. A 1978 newspaper interview with Warren Cheney, the grandson of Warren and May Cheney, noted that he “remembers that the University first used it to house the Institute for Human Development after purchasing it from May Cheney.”

The University could have also rented out 2241 and 2243 College for private residential use between 1939 and 1950, although no supporting documentation has been discovered. The neighboring three-home complex on College Avenue to the south, 2245-47-49 College, was purchased by the University in 1926, but apparently rented out to residential tenants. Lee Palsak, who grew up in the house at 2234 Piedmont, remembers the main house on the former Lee property occupied by a Mrs. Fish at some point during the 1940s and 1950s, and the rear cottages occupied by Professor Philip Selznick (Law/Sociology) and Professor Cesar Grana (Sociology). Palsak also recalls that the Slate house to the
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175 University of California, Berkeley “Green Book.”
176 San Francisco Examiner, 12 July 1978.
north of the Cheney property was rented out at this time. \footnote{Lee (Denny) Palsak, personal interview with Steven Finacom, 29 November 2005.} Anthony Bruce, a Berkeley native, recalls visiting the front house at 2245-47-49 College to visit his babysitter, Mrs. Fish, around 1955. At this time, the two back cottages on the lot were occupied by families with children (possibly the professors mentioned above), and according to Bruce, all three structures appeared gray, tired, and worn. \footnote{Anthony Bruce, personal interview with Steven Finacom, September 2005.} In addition, at least three properties on the 2200 block of Piedmont Avenue were used as rental properties after University acquisition: 2220 Piedmont, 2222 Piedmont, and 2234 Piedmont. 2220 Piedmont was rented to a fraternity for about a quarter century after the University bought the structure. Similarly, 2234 Piedmont was rented to private tenants, including a professor and his family, for more than a quarter century after acquisition.

Although these examples provide evidence that the University did buy houses on the block and rent them out for residential use—often for considerable periods of time—it appears that 2241 College was likely converted to office space for the Institute of Child Welfare sometime in the 1940s. The Institute is the first University program that is definitively connected to the house through a 1950 campus map.

**University Uses: Institute of Child Welfare**

The Institute of Child Welfare was established at the Berkeley campus in 1927/28 under the direction of Professor Harold Jones. The Institute was assigned headquarters at 2939 Bancroft Way, the old Joseph LeConte family house, located on the south end of the 2200 block of College Avenue. 2939 Bancroft was adapted to include a nursery school facility, which was used to study child behavior and staffed by trained psychologists and other professionals: “[the] preschool…occupied part of a turn-of-the-century villa on Bancroft Way…The home’s garage was converted into a classroom and its garden became a playground. It primarily served the children of Berkeley faculty and staff.” \footnote{Berkeleyan, 23 April 2003.} The nursery school was a rare, early, effort of its type; in the 1920s, not many nursery schools existed, and fewer still were associated with academic research programs.

The Institute also undertook several “longitudinal studies” of children, including the Berkeley Growth Study and the Oakland Growth Study. In these projects, local children were enrolled in the study—some as infants—and their parents regularly brought them to the Institute where staff would evaluate and interview them, and keep records on their physical, emotional, intellectual, and social growth. Over a period of years and decades, the careful record keeping enabled the Institute staff to
identify behavioral patterns, and generate research papers and studies analyzing how children mature, and how human behavior changes or remains consistent over time. These studies were pioneering efforts in the study of child development and psychology and human behavior.

The work of the Institute was spearheaded by Harold Jones and his wife, and fellow researcher, Mary Cover Jones. Mary Cover Jones was called “one of the great pioneers of the field of developmental psychology” and “the mother of behavior therapy.”180 Other notable researchers in behavioral sciences associated with the Institute include Nancy Bayley and Katherine Landreth. The Institute, and its associated nursery school and research programs, played a significant role in the history of behavioral studies and child development research, as well as the evolution of childcare facilities in the United States.

By 1950, the Institute had expanded to occupy both 2241 and 2243 College, while maintaining their headquarters at the former LeConte house. The Cheney houses, with their close proximity to 2939 Bancroft, were a logical choice to house additional Institute staff and researchers. According to campus directories, some of the Institute staff members were also placed in the Life Sciences Building (where “Psychology” is incised into the façade), but the individuals identified with that building seem primarily to have been Institute staff members who held senior faculty appointments.

The Institute’s uses and occupants of the Cheney buildings are largely unknown.181 A hand-drawn floor plan of 2241 College from January 1950 labels rooms as “office,” “office service,” conference, “Fac” (presumably “Faculty”), and “T.A.’s” (teaching assistants, usually graduate student instructors), suggesting that the original Cheney House was being used for offices. Since 2241 and 2243 College retain much of their original floor layout and do not show extensive interior modifications, it is likely they were used for office space, rather than converted to active childcare facilities.

The Institute building at 2939 Bancroft Way was later demolished to clear land for additions to the adjacent Law School. In 1957, the nursery school facility moved to a new building on Atherton Street in the South Campus area, where it was named the Harold Jones Child Study Center in honor of its faculty founder. The Institute itself had also been renamed the Institute of Human Development (now the Institute of Human Learning). Although the nursery school relocated to another part of campus, the Institute continued to occupy 2241 and 2243 College Avenue through the 1966/1967

180 Academic Senate of the University of California, Obituary of Mary Cover Jones, In Memoriam, 1993. Viewed online at http://texts.cdlib.org/srf/view?docId=hl0b4e959rbk&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=dv00036&toc.depth=1&toc.id
181 Oral histories of Institute leaders and other available records do not identify the exact use of these two houses.
academic year, as evidenced by photographs, campus directories, and the University’s 1967 *Centennial Record.*

By the time the 1967 campus directory was published, the Institute had moved to quarters in Tolman Hall, and appears to have vacated 2241 and 2243 College. After 1967, the two houses on the former Cheney property—paired together since their construction—would be occupied by separate users. The use of 2241 College is described below.  

### Changes to the Site Context of 2241 & 2243 College During the 1960s

During the 1960s, the site and landscape in the area around 2241 and 2243 College was heavily altered when the University began constructing new large buildings in the southeast part of the campus. The former residential character became dominated by Calvin Laboratory, the Boalt Parking Lot, and Wurster Hall. In addition, the section of College Avenue north of Bancroft Way was reconfigured into a pedestrian pathway. Plans developed by landscape architect Thomas Church—including the Landscape Plan for the 1962 Long Range Development Plan (Map 20) and the 1964 construction documents for the Bio-Organic Laboratory (Calvin Laboratory)—show the conversion of this section of College Avenue from a street into a curvilinear pedestrian path and bicycle route.

### University Uses of 2241 College Avenue After 1967

In 1968, it appears that the English as a Second Language (ESL) program moved into 2241 College. As its name implies, the ESL program provided instruction to students who came from foreign countries and had not learned English as their primary language. ESL occupied 2241 College through fall 1977, although three second-floor rooms at the front (west end) of the house appear to have been left vacant due to concerns about fire and life safety.

In 1978, six rooms were listed as vacant and programmed for “alteration,” and in 1979, a fire alarm system was installed and the electrical system was upgraded, apparently making the unused upstairs rooms habitable.

In fall 1979, the offices of the “Subject A” program are listed as occupants of 2241 College. “Subject A” work involved remedial instruction in writing for incoming students who had failed to pass proficiency tests or meet other qualifications. While some of these students would have been foreign
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182 The use of 2243 College after 1967 is discussed in the “2243 College Avenue Historic Structure Report” (Page & Turnbull and PGAdesign, 2006).
born, overlapping with the earlier ESL use, Subject A also instructed native-born students who needed to improve their writing skills.

In 1980, the upper floor of 2241 College was reassigned to a component of the Near Eastern Studies Department (NES), while ESL/Subject A remained downstairs. NES faculty, students, and other researchers who occupied the building appear to have been principally involved with the study of ancient cuneiform languages. NES was apparently unhappy with the space at 2241 College; in 1981, the NES use was defined as “temporary until additional spaces for humanities programs becomes available as a result of space reassignments in other campus buildings…NES considers the location and consequent isolation undesirable and temporary until more space is available in Dwinelle (Hall) or at another permanent location.”

By fall 1982, the Near Eastern Studies occupants had moved out, and the building was divided between Subject A, Business Administration, and “Computing Affairs.” This eclectic mix of uses continued through 1984. By 1985, the Business Administration offices had disappeared. Subject A and “Computing Facilities” apparently continued to occupy 2241 College for the remainder of the decade.

In 1990, part of the building was reassigned for use by Women’s Studies, which was relocating from Campbell Hall. The Berkeley Women’s Studies Program (now the Department of Gender and Women’s Studies) was established in 1976, but would not be formalized as an academic department until 1991. Thus, during its formative years as an official academic department, Women’s Studies occupied 2241 College. Key faculty, researchers, and others associated with Women’s Studies in the 1990s would have been connected with this building. Women’s Studies remained in 2241 College for several years and partially used the space for faculty offices; for example, in 1995, Women’s Studies was assigned twelve rooms in 2241 College, and five of these rooms were listed in campus space inventories as “academic offices.” The building was shared with “IS&T – ITP,” which apparently was an acronym for “Instructional Services and Technology – Instructional Technology Project,” and may have been programmatically related to the earlier “Computing Affairs” occupant.

By 2005, the building was occupied both by various offices related to the College of Letters & Sciences, and the Tanner Lectures program.

183 Berkeley Campus Space Plan, 1981.
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.
Composite Plan

Key to Plans:
Red line: Project study area
Orange lines: Olmsted, Frederick Law. Plan of Berkeley Neighborhood Including the Grounds of the College of California [map]. 1866. From University of California Archives.
Black lines: William F. Boardman Co. Surveyors. Map of a Portion of the Berkeley Property Situated between the University of California and the State Deaf, Dumb and Blind Asylum, Oakland Alameda County, as Laid Out by F.L. Olmsted. Officially Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the College of California [map]. May 1868. From City of Berkeley Archives.
Key to Plans:
Red line: Project study area
Blue lines: Huggins, Charles L., Berkeley Town Engineer. *Improvement Map of Piedmont Avenue* [map]. 1900. from City of Berkeley Archives.

PRESENT DAY 2234 PIEDMONT AVENUE
Key to Plans:

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

II-68
Key to Plans:

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

The following section provides a description of the site, landscape, and structure at 2241 College 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

2241 College Avenue is sited in a largely unplanted landscape area flanked by asphalt parking lots to the south and east. To the north of the structure is Calvin Laboratory. A liquid nitrogen storage tank associated with the Laboratory is stored at the eastern side of the Cheney House, surrounded by a sixteen-foot-high chain link fence. To the southeast is 2243 College Avenue, built in 1902 as a rental cottage for 2241 College Avenue. Both 2241 and 2243 College Avenue were originally situated on the same parcel facing west towards College Avenue. The stretch of College Avenue north of Bancroft Way is no longer a vehicular street and is now a Campus Park bicycle and pedestrian path. Following the University's acquisition of residential properties on College Avenue north of Bancroft Way during the 1930s, the property lines were erased and much of the individual lot landscaping was removed to provide surface parking. As a result, the demarcation of property boundary lines is no longer evident.

During the early twentieth century, 2241 College and 2243 College were generously surrounded with vegetation and had modest areas of lawn to the west. A diagonal walk led from College Avenue to the front of 2241 College, and a straight path ran at a 90° angle perpendicularly from College Avenue to 2243 College (Images 13 & 15). Currently, an asphalt path runs northeast from the former College Avenue to the front, west steps of 2241 College, and then veers slightly north to connect with Boalt Parking Lot to the east. The alignment of the path approximates the walk that originally led from College Avenue to the front steps of 2241 College Avenue but is not as sharply diagonal as the original. The unpaved area west of 2241 College is mostly unplanted, compacted soil with a few Coast Live Oaks (Quercus agrifolia) and Redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens). The eastern side of the building has a series of asphalt paths leading to an exterior stair and ADA ramp.
Some vestigial landscape from the initial residential period still remains on the site. An overgrown privet hedge thrives along the north side of 2241 College Avenue. Four specific tree species are of note: the Common Pear on the southeast side or rear garden area, and the California Buckeye (Aesculus californica), Coast Live Oak, and Redwoods at the southwest or front of the house. The 1928 aerial and 1931 oblique aerial views (Images 13 & 15) show the landscape that existed prior to the creation of the parking lots. Although the resolution of the photographs does not permit identification of each tree, it is probable that the remaining Common Pear (Pyrus communis), Elm (Ulmus Americana), and Linden (Tilia platyphellos), and some of the Coast Live Oak and Redwoods were present when these photos were taken.

Between 1962 and 1964, the stretch of College Avenue north of Bancroft Way was replaced with the curvilinear pedestrian path shown on Thomas Church’s 1962 master plan (Map 20). As part of this landscape plan, the steps leading from the sidewalk to two former residential properties immediately north of 2241 College were removed and replaced with a path and a naturalist stonewall. A new curving walk connected the front steps of 2241 College Avenue to the newly completed Calvin Laboratory. Thomas Church’s 1964 Bio-Organic Lab (Calvin Laboratory) landscape plans indicated that trees on the northern edge of 2241 College’s garden were to be retained—specifically the Deodar Cedar (Cedrus deodar), American Elm (Ulmus Americana), Linden (Tilia platyphellos), and Oak—and these trees are still extant. The Church plan also indicates that a Loquat should be protected at the rear of the building, but it is no longer extant (Map 21).

**Site Condition**

Overall, the landscape elements at 2241 College Avenue appear to be in fair to good condition. The shrub canopy on the eastern side of the structure and the tree canopy on the western side are both overgrown.

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 of each tree can also be found in the Inventory.
Landscape Elements

Vehicular ways and parking

Description:
Boalt Parking Lot is located at the eastern side of the building. It connects to 2241 College Avenue through a series of pedestrian paths and ADA ramps (Figures 84 & 88).

Condition: Good

Pedestrian paths

Description:
The Cheney House is linked to what was formerly College Avenue by a six-foot-wide asphalt path that leads to the front porch of the building (Figure 76). This pathway also extends around the north side of the house, connecting the house to Calvin Laboratory (Figure 79). The eastern side of the house has two five-foot-wide asphalt paths that link the parking lot with several entrances on the east façade, including a wooden ADA ramp (Figures 83 & 84).

Condition: Fair
The asphalt paving on the pedestrian paths is in fair condition and exhibits some cracking.

Fencing and site walls

Description:
At the eastern side of the Cheney House is a liquid nitrogen storage tank area enclosed by a sixteen-foot-high chain link fence (Figure 82).

Condition: Good

Vegetation – northern side

Description:
To the north side of 2241 College Avenue is an area planted with overgrown Privet shrubs (Ligustrum sp.) and Cherry Plums (Prunus cerasifera), and underplanted with Ivy (Hedera canariensis) (Figure 81).

Condition: Fair

Vegetation – eastern side

Description:
A Black Locust (Robinia pseudoacacia), Tree No. 532, is located near the rear stair among an unplanted landscape area (Figure 82).

Condition: Fair

Vegetation – southern side

Description:
An unplanted former lawn area exists at the southern side of the structure. Within this landscape is a Common Pear (Pyrus communis), Tree No. 489 (Figure 84).

Condition: Poor
Vegetation – northwestern side

**Description:**
The tree plantings at the front of the house are somewhat more ornamental in nature. The size and location of these trees suggest they were part of the garden plantings planned for 2241 College Avenue. These include trees that are located in the landscape area on the northwest side of the house: American Elm (Ulmus Americana), Tree No. 334; Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), Tree No. 503; Deodar Cedar (Cedrus deodar), Tree No. 566; Large Leaf European Linden (Tilia platyphellos), Tree No. 570; and Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum), Tree Nos. 623 and 624. The ground plane beneath these trees is covered in Canary Island Ivy (Hedera canariensis) (Figure 77).

**Condition:** Poor to Excellent

Vegetation – southwestern side

**Description:**
At the southwestern corner of 2241 College Avenue, there are two Coast Live Oaks (Quercus agrifolia), Tree Nos. 505 and 506 (Figure 75). Further from the house, there is a California Buckeye (Aesculus californica), Tree No. 558, and a large Coast Redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), Tree No. 559 (Figures 74, 77, 78, & 86).

Across the former College Avenue pathway, there are four mature Coast Redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens), Tree Nos. 560, 561, 562, and 563. These are part of the grove of Coast Redwood that extends up the former College Avenue pathway toward Calvin Laboratory.

**Condition:** Poor to Excellent
2005 EXISTING CONDITION INVENTORY LEGEND

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

The Cheney House at 2241 College Avenue is an excellent and increasingly rare example of the Eastlake/San Francisco Stick style. The building is a two-story, wood-frame dwelling with an above-grade basement under the western portion of the structure. The basement is only partially excavated with compacted soil as a floor surface and is solely used for housing mechanical equipment and utilities. The first and second floors of the Cheney House are currently occupied by University offices. Although no longer well-maintained, 2241 College Avenue appears to be in fair condition. Furthermore, it retains a moderate-to-high degree of integrity.

Eastlake/San Francisco Stick Style

The Eastlake, or “Stick style,” flourished for a brief period in the United States from the 1860s to the early 1880s. Although the term “Stick style” was not coined until the 1950s by architectural historian Vincent Scully, the term is now almost universally accepted. In his seminal work, *The Shingle Style and the Stick Style*, Scully argues that the Stick style emerged from a variety of foreign and domestic influences, including the writings of tastemaker Andrew Jackson Downing. Considered to be a “modern” style by its contemporaries, the Stick style thrived in the years leading up to the American Centennial celebration of 1876. Its practitioners merged Gothic, Swiss, Tudor, and Colonial American influences to create a bold, imaginative, and unique “American” style. Predominantly used for residential buildings, the Stick style reached the height of its popularity during the 1870s as the result of the publication of dozens of pattern books by Holley, Gardner, the Palliser Brothers, and many others.

The Stick style flourished throughout the nation, but the best-known examples are concentrated in the Northeast; the seaside resort of Newport, Rhode Island is particularly known for its Stick style houses, including Richard Morris Hunt's Griswold House (1861-64). In its high-style guise, the Stick style is characterized by asymmetrical plans, picturesque massing and rooflines, and abundant surface ornamentation, in particular multi-textured wall surfaces and applied “stickwork.” The stickwork faintly mimics the exposed structural members of Late Medieval English half-timbered houses or nineteenth-century Swiss chalets; Japanese and Gothic derived details can often be observed as well. Although proponents often lauded the structural honesty of the Stick style, the visible stickwork, unlike true half-timbering, was merely applied decoration with no structural relation to the underlying balloon-frame construction. Regardless of the source, the visual impression conveyed by most Stick style houses was extremely picturesque, resulting from the varied massing and from detailing like the
lightweight, basket-like, applied stickwork, incised ornament, contrasting shingle patterns, and turned balusters.

Although lagging behind the Northeast by a decade or more, the urban centers of the West Coast emerged as a hotbed of a regional variation of the Stick style during the 1870s and 1880s. Making use of the ubiquitous and easily workable redwood, the cities of the San Francisco Bay Area—including San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, and San José—witnessed the construction of thousands of Stick style rowhouses and large-lot suburban villas. In the Bay Area, the style is primarily distinguished by the exuberant application of flat strips of wood around windows, doors, and other parts of the exterior to express the underlying structural frame. The ornamentation is often much more florid than typical Eastern examples, incorporating so-called “Eastlake” millwork detailing including sunburst-motif brackets, bull’s-eye medallions, and vegetal motifs. Most of the exterior detailing was mass-produced and obtained from local lumberyards. The roofline of the San Francisco Stick style house typically received a great deal of attention, with applied ornamental truss work and false gable roofs.

Berkeley retains fine examples of Stick style architecture. One of the best examples of Stick style work in Berkeley is the Church of the Good Shepherd, located at Ninth Street and Hearst Avenue. The Church of the Good Shepherd was designed by architect Charles L. Bugbee and constructed in 1878. The oldest extant church in Berkeley, the Church of the Good Shepherd is a City of Berkeley Landmark and is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Cheney House is one of the only Stick style residences still extant in the Berkeley Property Tract, and very likely the best-preserved and finest example of this style in the Tract.

**West Façade**

The west façade of the Cheney House is its primary façade. The main entry, sheltered within the integral porch, was originally connected to College Avenue by a brick path. The west and south façades were easily seen by passersby, and both façades were therefore given the most substantial and expensive decorative treatment (*Figure 1*). The west façade is roughly divided into three bays. In keeping with its Stick style design, the façade’s massing is defiantly asymmetrical. Also characteristic of its period of construction are the varied exterior cladding materials: the first floor level is clad in both rustic channel siding and decorative stickwork; the second floor is clad in various shingle patterns; and the attic gable is clad in a woven basket-like pattern of stickwork framing “bull’s-eye” moldings (*Figure 2*).
In regard to fenestration, the north bay has a three-sided chamfered bay window on the first floor and a double-hung wood window on the second floor. The bay window contains five double-hung wood windows of various widths. It is capped by a hip roof and features scroll saw-cut casings. The north bay is capped by a wide, projecting eave supported by scroll-sawn brackets. The center bay consists of a wood stair with turned baluster caps and molded hand rails (Figure 3). The balustrades and railings appear to be original. The porch is recessed three feet into the main structure of the house. It features narrow Douglas fir decking and chamfered posts with sunburst motif brackets, a characteristic detail of the San Francisco Stick style. The rear wall of the porch, which is clad in rustic channel siding, is punctuated by a single-light, wood panel door with original brass hardware and a single-light transom above. The porch is bounded on the south by a three-sided chamfered bay window clad in diagonally nailed decorative stickwork, and articulated by three, double-hung wood windows. The lower part of the bay window features a small double-hung wood window, which provides light and air to the partial basement.

A decorative frieze embellished with bull’s-eye moldings divides the first and second floors. Bounded within the triangular volume formed by the projecting gable roof, the second floor is clad in a combination of shingle patterns, including fish scale, rounded butt-sawn, and standard butt-sawn. Fenestration consists of a pair of double-hung wood windows on axis with the ridgebeam and a small decorative window to the left. The smaller opening has been retrofitted to accommodate a box-unit air conditioner. Occupying the apex of the gable is a projecting pediment embellished with a basket-weave stickwork motif containing bull’s-eye moldings. Several of the bull’s-eye moldings have separated from the substrate and are now missing.

Overall, the west façade retains a very high degree of integrity and is in good condition, although it is missing some historic wood detailing; in particular, the bull’s-eye moldings in the gable.

**South Façade**

Due to the dwelling’s complicated plan, the south façade is composed of four distinct sections that recede back in space from west to east (Figure 4). The westernmost portion of the south façade is the front part of the main house and therefore more highly elaborated than the rear portions, which are more utilitarian in character (Figure 5). The water table and first floor are clad in rustic channel siding. Located at the center of the first floor is a pair of double-hung wood windows with decorative casings and a bracketed hood. A decorative frieze divides the first and second floors, as it does on the
west façade. Above the frieze is the shingled second story, featuring three different shingle patterns. The second story is punctuated by a band of three narrow, double-hung wood windows with plain casings. The windows are surmounted by an elaborate carved sunburst motif that is sheltered beneath a bracketed gable clad in fish scale shingles (Figure 6).

To the east of the main part of the Cheney House is a shed-roofed section that, at first glance, appears to be an addition (Figure 7). However, a close examination of the building’s plan and structural system indicates that it is an integral part of the original house. Because it is not visible from the street, the original architect or builder deliberately gave it a much simpler appearance. Entirely clad in wood rustic channel siding, this section of the house is extremely plain, with only a single double-hung wood window breaking up the wall. Above the roof line is a large box dormer clad in rustic channel and board and batten siding. Its only fenestration consists of a pair of small double-hung wood windows with plain wood casings.

To the east of the shed-roofed section of the Cheney House, the south façade terminates and jogs north approximately 15 feet. At this point, the south façade resumes at the south wall of the kitchen wing, which also appears to be an original component of the house (Figure 8). A short wood stair and a wheelchair ramp partially obscure the south façade of this element. Similar to the rest of the rear portion of the Cheney House, the kitchen wing is completely unadorned and utilitarian in appearance. It is clad in rustic channel siding and capped by a hip roof. The first story is articulated by a band of three six-light, wood casement windows with simple wood casings. A shed-roof porch shelters the door on the east wall of the main house west of the windows. The second floor level features a pair of double-hung wood windows with simple wood casings.

The south façade temporarily terminates at the east wall of the kitchen wing and jogs north approximately 7 feet. At this point, the south façade resumes along the south wall of what appears to have been an early twentieth-century addition (Figure 9). Currently, the easternmost surviving component of the Cheney House, this rear addition, appears to have been constructed between 1905 and 1911. Evidence for this construction date derives both from physical evidence—especially the interior trim on the second floor—as well as information provided by Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. Sheltered beneath a two-story deck, the south façade of the rear addition appears to have been extensively altered. The first floor level is clad in rustic channel siding. The fenestration on this level consists of three fixed-light contemporary single-light windows and a solid-core wood door. The second floor level of the south façade, which opens onto a deck, is clad in tar paper attached with thin
board battens. Fenestration consists of a pair of contemporary single-light windows flanking a solid-core door. A second door is located at the west end of the south façade.

In general, the south façade is in fair condition. Extensive ultraviolet damage and attendant paint delamination has deteriorated the rustic channel siding, windows, and other wood detailing.

**East Façade**

The east façade is composed of two distinct sections: a small section at the rear of the original house, and the rear elevation of the early twentieth-century addition (Figure 10). The section at the rear of the house is utilitarian in character. The first floor level is clad in rustic channel siding and contains a single double-hung wood window with plain wood casings. This section of the façade also features a non-historic wood stair providing access to what appears to be a historic wood panel door sheltered beneath a porch. The hardware on the door is non-historic. Based on its materials and rather jarring intersection with the main body of the house and the kitchen wing, the second floor level appears to have been added at a later time than the first level.

The east façade of the rear addition is partially obscured behind a non-historic stair that provides access to the upper level of the deck on the south façade. The east façade is clad in tarpaper with thin battens applied over the joints. Aside from a louvered vent at the apex of the gable, it features no openings (Figure 11).

In general, the east façade appears to be in fair condition. Partially shaded, it does not suffer from continuous exposure to the sun. However, vegetation has been allowed to encroach on the wall and cause moisture to become trapped in the siding. The condition of the wood siding beneath the tarpaper is unknown.

**North Façade**

Like the south façade, the north façade is composed of four distinct sections corresponding to the separate components of the Cheney House. The easternmost section of the north façade, which corresponds to the rear addition, is clad in rustic channel siding. It has no openings aside from a single double-hung wood window with plain wood casings, a downspout, and a security light (Figure 12).
The next component of the north façade to the west is the kitchen wing (Figure 13). Recessed 3 feet from the façade of the rear addition, the north wall of the kitchen wing is also sparse; it is clad in rustic channel siding and has no ornamental detailing or discernable fenestration pattern. At first glance, the north wall of the kitchen wing appears to have been expanded northward between 1905 and 1911 in order to enclose the back stair. The interior south wall of the stair is clad in rustic channel siding, suggesting that it was originally an exterior wall. However, unless the roof was entirely reframed when the stair was enclosed, the existing roof framing indicates that the back stair was always enclosed because the framing fully encompasses the stair. Currently, the first floor level of this section of the façade features a single, six-light wood casement window, and two windows beneath the stair, both of which appear to be non-historic; one is enclosed behind plywood, and the other is fitted with obscure glass. On the second floor level there are two windows: one containing a wood slider and the other a wood casement sash; neither appears to be historic.

The next section to the west on the north façade, which corresponds to what was most likely the dining room, is recessed 3 feet behind the façade of the kitchen wing. Today, this section of the façade is almost entirely concealed behind trees and shrubs (Figure 14). Clad in rustic channel siding, it features a pair of double-hung wood windows on the first floor. On the second floor, there is a light well on the east side and a double-hung wood window on the west side.

The westernmost segment of the north façade corresponds to the front portion of the Cheney House. Because this section of the façade was originally visible from the street, the architect or builder embellished it to the same degree as the west, or street, façade. Today, due to the overgrown thicket of the trees and shrubs on this side of the house, it is barely visible (Figure 15). Clad in rustic channel siding on the first and second floor levels, this portion of the façade does not have much fenestration, most likely because the north side of the house abutted the former property line. Fenestration consists of a single, double-hung wood window on the first floor level and another double-hung window on the second floor, centered beneath the shingled gable. The windows feature ornate scroll-sawn trim boards beneath the sills.

Unlike the south and east façades, the north façade of the Cheney House does not suffer from ultraviolet damage. However, its northerly exposure, coupled with inadequate grading and drainage and overabundant vegetation growing adjacent to the façade, has resulted in extensive moisture damage, biological growth, and water-infiltration problems.
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III. Description & Conditions Assessment

Exterior Condition
In general, the exterior of the Cheney House appears to be in fair condition. Deferred maintenance has caused deterioration of the exterior materials and features, especially on the south façade, which bears the brunt of the midday sun, and the north façade, where overgrown vegetation and inadequate drainage has allowed water to infiltrate the siding, causing significant damage. Periodic routine maintenance would help resolve many of these issues. Regularly scheduled painting would significantly reduce the extent of ultraviolet damage, particularly on the sections of the façade that receive prolonged exposure to the sun. Repairing and cleaning gutters and downspouts on a regular basis would allow them to work properly and carry water away from the building. Cutting back the dense vegetation along the north façade would allow the wall to fully dry. Re-grading to eliminate soil contact with the wood siding would reduce the occurrence of wet rot. Finally, efforts should be made to repair or replace damaged or missing wood elements, in particular the bull’s-eye moldings that have separated from the gable on the west façade.

Building Interior
The interior of 2241 College Avenue, although altered somewhat to accommodate offices, still retains a substantial amount of original finish materials and Stick style ornamentation. Typically, the rooms are square in plan, have plaster walls and ceilings, and are illuminated with fluorescent lighting. Among the character-defining elements of the house are its many Stick/Eastlake wooden details: the base trim, cornices, and wainscoting; the main stairs and balustrades, which have elaborate scroll-sawn balusters and diagonal beadboard paneling; and chamfered and incised doors and window casings. The door and window frames typically have vertical stiles that extend above the lintel to form “ears” (Figure 16). The original doors are four-panel, solid wood doors—the upper two panels are roughly four times the length of the lower two panels. Some of the doors retain their original brass knobs and hinges, which are elaborately decorated with Arts and Crafts detailing (Figures 17 & 18). The windows themselves are typically double-hung, 1/1 wood windows with brass hardware.

The walls and ceilings of the interior of the Cheney House are currently painted white or yellow. Some wood elements, such as the staircase, the floors, and the upstairs doors, are painted reddish-brown. Although the original color scheme of the house is presently unknown, these wooden elements were probably originally stained, rather than painted, to accentuate the wood grain. The door to the closet under the main staircase on the first floor retains what may be the original greenish finish (Figure 19).
Basement

Crawlspace

Description:
The crawlspace of 2241 College Avenue is accessed from the south façade of the building. It is mostly unexcavated and currently houses wiring and plumbing for the house. The original foundation has been replaced with new wooden members and a concrete perimeter foundation (Figure 20).

Condition: Good
The crawlspace appears to be in good condition.

First Floor

Main Corridor and Stair

Description:
The Main Corridor is rectangular in plan and contains the Main Stair (Figure 21). Three rooms open off the Main Corridor: Room 1 on the north side, and Rooms 11 and 12 on the south side. There is an original partition wall with a doorway on the east wall that separates the Main Corridor from the Rear Corridor (Figure 22). The Main Corridor is decorated with beadboard paneling that is installed in 3-foot-wide sections separated by vertical chamfered stiles. Within these sections, the battens are installed at a 45-degree angle, the direction of which alternates from section to section. The upper two feet of the walls are plastered and separated from the paneling by a cornice. There are exposed beams in the ceiling of the Main Corridor, between which are battens that run east-to-west. With the exception of the staircase and the floors, all of the wooden elements of the Corridor are painted white. The Main Corridor is lit by three globe pendants connected by surface conduit cable; the light fixtures are not original to the house.

The Main Stair runs along the north side of the Main Corridor. At the top of the stairs are the landing and the door to Room 101. There is another short flight of stairs that extends south from the landing up to the Corridor on the second floor. The staircase balustrade consists of a series of panels cut with a scroll saw into an elaborate decorative pattern.

Condition: Good
Overall, the Main Corridor and Main Stair appear to be in good condition. The front door appears to be original to the house and is in fair condition, due to water infiltration. Wood deterioration is also visible on the threshold, but does not continue into the Main Corridor. The elements of the staircase, walls, and floor are original and appear to be in good condition, although the paneling should be stripped of paint to reveal its original finish. Paint analysis should also be undertaken to determine the original interior color scheme.

Rear Corridor

Description:
The Rear Corridor is L-shaped. It has contemporary linoleum flooring, fluorescent light fixtures, and is painted white. The east-west section of the Rear Corridor is a continuation of the Main Corridor beyond the partition wall. This portion of the Rear Corridor widens into a wedge shape. At the southeast corner of this wedge is an egress door leading to the rear of the house and the ADA-accessible ramp. A January 1950 floor plan suggests that the Rear Corridor previously angled to the north instead of to the south, making the rear door only accessible from Room 10.
The north-south section of the Rear Corridor is narrower than the east-west section (Figure 23). The north-south section is partially finished with three-foot-high wainscoting on the east wall. To the north of the entrance to Room 8, the east wall appears to be finished with painted gypsum board. At the northern end of the corridor is the door to Room 4C, a closet. The door to the closet is original but the doorframe is not, suggesting that this door was reused from another location. The January 1950 floor plans indicate that the Rear Corridor originally extended through the present location of Room 4C and beyond to connect to the Back Stair. The doorframe at the entrance to Room 8 is finished with typical wood details. At the center of the western wall is the door to Room 4, which is framed with a simple board trim.

**Condition:** Good

The Rear Corridor appears to be in good condition.

### Room 1: Office

**Description:**
Room 1 is located on the north side of the Main Corridor. The room appears still to have many of its original character-defining features, including its original plan, and elements such as the bay window on the west wall, coved plaster ceiling, and plaster moldings on the ceiling (Figure 24).

Both of the doors to this room are four-panel wood doors with chamfered rails and stiles. The southwest door retains its decorative bronze doorknob, which is one of the few remaining in the house. The high level of finish in Room 1 suggests that it was the most formal room in the house and was likely the main parlor.

The east wall contains a sealed fireplace hood, although the fireplace has been removed (Figure 25). University plans indicate that there was once a door at the approximate location of the fireplace hood, but no evidence remains of it now. If this door actually existed, it is unlikely to have been original to the house.

Room 1 is carpeted. A non-functioning air conditioner unit is set into the north wall. Surface conduits connect the ceiling-mounted florescent lighting and the wall-mounted electrical switches.

**Condition:** Good

Overall, Room 1 is in good condition.

### Room 4: Office

**Description:**
The ceiling of Room 4 is relatively low compared to the rest of the house. The room has a simple 4-foot-high chair rail that runs along the walls (Figure 26). Above this rail, the walls are painted white, as is the ceiling. Below the rail, the room is painted dark yellow. On the south wall of Room 4 is a sealed frame (Figure 27). There is no obvious function for this frame, as it would open into the interior of the house and does not display the same details as the original window casings. It is shown as a window on a January 1950 floor plan of 2241 College Avenue and may once have served as a pass-through to Room 10.

**Condition:** Good

Room 4 and its elements appear to be in good condition.
Room 4C: Closet

Description:
Room 4C is at the north end of the Rear Corridor. It appears that this closet is a later addition to the house; as mentioned above, January 1950 floor plans suggest the Rear Corridor extended through the present location of Room 4C. This is corroborated by a section of rustic channel siding on the exterior of Room 4C that shows obvious evidence of patching. The door to Room 4C appears to be original, but the frame around it is simpler than those seen in the rest of the house, suggesting that the door was reused from another location. The interior of Room 4C was inaccessible at the time of the survey.

Condition: Unknown
The condition of Room 4C is unknown, but the exterior door is in good condition.

Room 5: Vestibule

Description:
Room 5 is a small square room with doors in its east wall leading to Room 6, and in the north wall leading to the Back Stair. The room has linoleum flooring and gypsum board walls. This section of the house was likely the kitchen wing.

Condition: Good
Room 5 is in good condition.

Room 6: Toilet Room

Description:
Room 6 is a toilet room that has been completely remodeled in compliance with the American Disabilities Act (Figure 28). This room was used as a toilet room as early as January 1950, according to University floor plans. The floor is linoleum, and there is a simple baseboard running around the perimeter of the floor. The window on the north wall has unadorned casings, and is partially obstructed by the Rear Stair, suggesting that the stair was a later addition; although the roof framing of this stair seems to indicate that it was originally part of the house (Figure 29). The ceiling of Room 6, like those in Rooms 4, 5, and 8, is relatively low, at approximately 8½ feet. There is exposed plumbing running through the room, fluorescent lighting, and surface conduit for the electrical connections.

Condition: Good
Room 6 and its elements appear to be in good condition.
Rooms 7 & 7A: Office and Closet

**Description:**
Rooms 7 and 7A form a long narrow room with relatively low ceilings. Room 7 is at the north end, and contains a sink and a non-historic window with obscure glass (Figure 30). Room 7A is a small toilet room at the south end (Figure 31). Like in Room 6, the floors are linoleum and there is a simple baseboard. The walls are gypsum board, and there is exposed plumbing at the north end of Room 7.

Rooms 7 and 7A were additions to the original house, added either at the same time as the rear addition (circa 1903-1911) or later. Room 7A is a small, shed-roofed structure built against the east wall of Room 8, and Room 7 was likely created by enclosing the space between the main house and the rear addition. January 1950 floor plans show Room 7A labeled as a lavatory. Both the doors into Room 7 and 7A are multi-panel wooden constructions, which appear to be original to the house, but might have been reused from other locations.

**Condition:** Fair
Rooms 7 and 7A are in fair condition. There is evidence of water damage, especially on the west wall of Room 7.

Rooms 8 & 8A: Office and Closet

**Description:**
Room 8 is in the section of the house that was likely originally the kitchen wing. The southeast corner of Room 8 is fenestrated with operable 2/3 wood casement windows; there are two windows on the east wall, and three on the south wall (Figures 32 & 33). The windows have the typical casings seen elsewhere in the interior. A closet (Room 8A) sits in the southwest corner of the room (Figure 34). The doors to the closet, and to the Rear Corridor, also display typical detailing seen in the house. The room features a picture rail running along the perimeter about 6 inches below the ceiling.

**Condition:** Fair
Rooms 8 and 8A are in fair condition. Overall, this room is suffering from the effects of moisture infiltration. The room is not well ventilated and was quite hot and humid when it was surveyed. Signs of water-caused deterioration were apparent in the failing paint and plaster, particularly noticeable in the southwest corner of the room (Figure 34). The floor of Room 8 is a concrete slab that is covered with carpet. The sources of the water intrusion appear to be both from rising damp through the concrete slab and from leaking from the ceiling, particularly in the southwest corner of the room. The rising damp problem is the result of poor drainage and grading outside this room. The source of the leak over Room 8A appears to be the result of improper drainage and the meeting of two roof slopes. Attempts have been made to correct the roof slope problem by stapling Kraft paper over the roof and siding, but this has only exacerbated the problem.

Room 9: Office

**Description:**
Room 9 forms the first floor of the rear addition of 2241 College (Figure 35). Its original use is unknown. Room 9 is accessed by a small foyer on the southwest corner of the room; the foyer leads to both Rooms 7 and 9 (Figure 36). A second, non-historic door is in the east wall (Figure 37). Room 9 sits on a concrete slab that is covered with a layer of carpet. There is a row of three, non-historic, single-light awning windows with plain casings on the south wall. There is also a simple wood baseboard, but otherwise the walls are unornamented plaster.

**Condition:** Poor
Room 9 is in poor condition. Like Room 8, Room 9 is also suffering from the effects of water intrusion. In the southeast corner, near the doorway, there is fungus growing in the carpet (Figure 38).

Room 10: Office
Description:
Room 10 has an irregular shape, resulting from the widening of the Rear Corridor. The north wall—which is not original and is constructed of gypsum board—angles inward as it runs from west to east, truncating the otherwise square room. January 1950 plans show this wall angling outward. Originally, Room 10 likely extended further to the north, and the north wall was only inserted to create a back corridor.

Room 10 has the same high ceilings as Rooms 1, 11, and 12, and retains the typical wood casings around the doors and windows (Figure 39). In addition, there is a chair rail that runs around the perimeter of the room 4 feet from the floor. The wall above the rail is painted white and the wall below the rail is painted yellow. At the west side of the room, there is a typical four-panel door that connects to the closet, Room 11A (Figure 40). The door to the Rear Corridor is a non-historic door with no door surround. There are exposed pipes in the southeast corner of the room and surface conduit for the electrical systems. The room is lit by a suspended fluorescent light.

Condition: Good
Room 10 is in good condition.

Rooms 11 & 11A: Office and Closet
Description:
Rooms 11 and 12 were once a single room, likely a large parlor (Figure 41). The inserted partition wall intersects with the south wall and partially covers the window frame on the south wall. On the east side of Room 11 is Room 11A: this room appears to be original because the trim along the wall dividing Room 11 from 11A is original—including the door, door surround, and baseboard—and because it contains the back of a fireplace, which would not have sat in the middle of the parlor. Since Room 11A does not extend to the exterior wall of the house, a small alcove is created in the southeast corner of Room 11.

Room 11 has a carpeted floor. A fan has been installed on the high ceiling. On the north wall, a Dutch door leads to the Main Corridor (Figure 42). The frame of this door is simple and does not have the ornamental Stick/Eastlake details seen in the rest of the house, suggesting that it is a later alteration; the original door to the parlor is probably now in Room 12. On the east wall of Room 11, there is an enclosed fireplace with a wood mantel, detailed with a flame motif, and a patterned tile hearth (Figures 43 & 44). A hinged shelf has been added to the mantel.

Room 11A is currently a small kitchen. The ceiling and walls are plaster and the floor is wood. Original four-panel doors open into Rooms 10 and 11. On the north wall are built-in shelves. The original use of this room is unknown, but it could possibly have served as a small storage space for wood for the fireplace.

Condition: Good
Rooms 11 and 11A are in good condition.
Room 12: Office

Description:
As described above, it appears that Rooms 11 and 12 were once a single large room. Four double-hung windows fill the bay at the west end of Room 12 (Figures 45 & 46). There is a door on the north wall that opens into the Main Corridor. The window and doorframes display typical wood Stick/Eastlake casings. The ceilings and walls are plaster, but the ceiling is not coved as it is in Room 1, suggesting that Room 11/12 was the second most importance public space in the house. The room has exposed pipes in its southwest corner.

Condition: Good
Room 12 is in good condition.

Second Floor

Second Floor Corridor

Description:
The Second Floor Corridor follows the L-shaped Main Staircase and provides access to four rooms and one closet: Rooms 105, 107, 108, 109, and 106. The Corridor has plaster walls, a 12-inch baseboard, and a ceiling that reflects the shape of the gambrel roof. The most prominent feature of the Corridor is the curved railing and baluster panels of the staircase. This is a continuation of the decorative woodwork visible in the Main Corridor. The original wood surfaces of the baluster panels have been painted brown and red. The curved handrail is stained dark brown (Figure 47).

Condition: Good
Overall, the wooden elements and the plaster of the Second Floor Corridor appear to be in good condition.

Room 101: Rear Corridor

Description:
Room 101 is a long corridor that runs east-to-west from the Main Stair to a ten-light glazed door that opens onto the exterior second-floor deck (Figure 48). It appears that Rooms 101 and 103 were originally one room; the room appears divided in a January 1950 floor plan, and the partition wall was likely inserted in the 1940s when the building came into University use. The partition wall, which forms the north wall of Room 101, is wood-framed with “celetex” panels and contains three fixed windows with obscure “pebbled” glass, possibly added to provide additional natural light to Room 103. Fenestration in Room 101 consists of two double-hung windows on the south wall.

Condition: Good
Room 101 is in good condition. However, at the time of the survey, there were yellow jacket bees living in a hive inside the frame of the westernmost window on the southern wall, making it difficult to fully examine the room.

Rooms 102 & 102A: Office

Description:
Room 102 has a square plan, high ceilings, and wood Stick/Eastlake trim on the baseboards, window, and doorframes typical of the finish in most of the house (Figure 49). There are two single-pane wood casement windows on the north wall. The walls, ceiling, and wood trim are painted a uniform white. There is surface conduit to the electrical outlets and a ceiling-mounted fluorescent light. The base trim on the south wall of Room 102 does not match the trim on the
other three walls; this evidence, coupled with the fact that the wall overlaps the door casings in Room 101, suggests that the south wall of Room 102 is a later alteration. The wall was most likely added by the University in the 1940s when the building was converted to office use; it appears in the January 1950 floor plans.

Room 102A is a closet on the north wall of Room 102 (Figure 50). The door is of typical 4-panel construction with incised stiles and panels.

Condition: Good
Rooms 102 and 102A are in good condition.

Room 103: Office

Description:
Room 103 is square in plan and has plaster walls (Figure 51). The room has plain wood baseboards and plain door and window trim, indicating that this room originally housed a function of lower prestige, and possibly was used a servant’s bedroom. The ceilings are relatively low at approximately 8 feet. The south wall was evidently added in the 1940s after the University purchased the house. The wall is wood-framed with celotex panels and three fixed windows glazed with pebbled glass (Figure 52). As mentioned above, all of the interior finishes are very simple with the exception of the door on the north wall. It is a six-panel door, much like the typical four-panel doors seen throughout the house. Although the door features typical Stick/Eastlake detailing, it is significantly larger, indicating that it was once an exterior door (Figure 53). Room 103 also has a small window on the north wall that looks out onto the Back Stair (Figure 54). Both the larger door and the presence of a window indicate that the Back Stair was not originally enclosed, but as discussed earlier, the roof framing seems to suggest that it has always been enclosed.

Condition: Good
Room 103 is in good condition.

Room 104: Office

Description:
Room 104 is located in the rear addition, and the interior of the room was likely finished when the addition was constructed between 1903 and 1911. The space retains the majority of its original features and finishes. Unlike the rest of the house, the board and batten paneled walls and ceiling of Room 104 are stained rather than painted (Figure 55). The ceiling has a gambrel profile, despite the fact that the rear addition has a gable roof. The room also has built-in bookcases on the west wall and a bookshelf that runs along the perimeter of the room. The flooring consists of 3-inch-wide hardwood boards. The room is lit with suspended fluorescent light fixtures. Surface conduit has been added to supply power to the electrical outlets. Room 104 has a non-historic, solid core wood door leading to the exterior deck, and a historic five-panel wood door leading to the Back Stair (Figure 56). There are two replacement 1/1 windows on the south wall, flanking the exterior door, and one window on the north wall (Figure 57).

Condition: Good
Room 104 is in good condition. The wooden walls and built-in features show some signs of age and use but appear sound.
Room 104A: Kitchen/Storage  

Description:  
Room 104A is a narrow room located between Room 104 and the Back Stair. Room 104A is separated from the Back Stair by a plastic accordion partition. On the south wall, there is a single-panel wood door with a glass insert that opens onto the exterior deck (Figure 58). The walls and ceiling are clad in board and batten paneling similar to that in Room 104, except the paneling in Room 104A is painted white. There is an industrial sink on the west wall, and built-in shelves on the east and west walls. The floors of Room 104A are the same 3-inch boards seen in Room 104.

Condition: Good  
Overall, Room 104A is in good condition.

Rooms 105 & 105A: Office and Closet  

Description:  
Rooms 105 and 105A occupy the southeast corner of the main house (Figure 59). Room 105 has plaster walls and typical Stick/Eastlake trim, including the baseboards and window and door casings. The floor of Room 105 is carpeted, and there is exposed surface conduit and overhead fluorescent light fixtures. There are two types of windows in this room: a large double-hung window on the east wall, and a pair of smaller double-hung windows on the south wall (Figure 60). Also on the south wall is the door to the closet, Room 105A (Figure 61). Both doors in this room are typical original four-panel wood Stick/Eastlake doors seen elsewhere in the interior.

Condition: Good  
Rooms 105 and 105A are in good condition.

Room 106: Closet  

Description:  
Room 106 is a small closet off the Second Floor Corridor. The door to Room 106 was locked, so the closet was unavailable for survey.

Condition: Unknown  
The condition of Room 106 is unknown.

Room 107: Toilet Room  

Description:  
Room 107 is a toilet room with plaster walls and a sloping plaster ceiling (Figure 62). The floor is covered in linoleum. The room was used as a bathroom as early as January 1950, according to floor plans. An enclosed toilet stall sits in the southeast corner of the room. There are two sinks in the room: a sink on the west wall with a built-in mirrored cabinet above it; and a janitor’s sink on the east wall (Figure 63). The window and door casings display typical detailing observed elsewhere in the interior.

Condition: Good  
Room 107 is in good condition.

Rooms 108 & 108A: Office  

Description:  
Room 108 features a square plan with wood floors and plaster walls (Figure 64). The floors appear to be original, but recently have been painted brown. The ceiling of Room 108 is flat, except for the southernmost 4 feet, which follows the roofline (Figure 65). There are two pairs of windows in Room 108: one pair on the south wall, and the other pair on the west wall. The
windows are double-hung wood windows. The north wall features the door to Room 108A. Room 108A was formerly a closet but currently houses computer and telephone equipment.

Room 108A has a sloped plaster ceiling, wood floors and built-in bookshelves (Figure 66). There is an air conditioning unit mounted in the window on the west wall.

Condition: Good
Rooms 108 and 108A are in good condition.

Rooms 109 & 109A: Office and Closet

Description:
Room 109 features a square plan (Figure 67). The ceiling of Room 109 is steeply sloping on the west wall, following the roofline (Figure 68). The walls and ceiling are plaster, and the floor is carpeted. The room displays typical Stick/Eastlake detailing on the baseboards, and window and door casings. There are two double-hung windows in the room with typical detailing, one on the west wall, and the other on the north wall (Figure 69).

The closet, Room 109A, is located in the northeast corner of the room (Figure 70). It has typical Stick/Eastlake casings, but the door is a contemporary hollow-core door. The closet has built-in shelves. Adjacent to Room 109A to the south is an enclosed chimney that served the fireplace in Room 1, directly below, before the fireplace was removed.

Condition: Good
Rooms 109 and 109A are in good condition.

Back Stair

Description:
The Back Stair connects Room 5 on the first floor to Room 104A on the second floor. The staircase consists of wood treads and risers and a non-historic railing (Figure 71). At the bottom of the staircase on the west wall is a single-panel wood door with a brass knob (Figure 72). A single, six-light wood casement window is located on the north wall at the bottom of the stair. The south wall of the staircase is clad in the beveled shiplap siding seen on the exterior of the house. The north wall features exposed stud framing with the backside of the exterior sheathing visible. The exterior sheathing is suffering from extensive water damage. Given these conditions, the Back Stair appears to be a later addition to the house; however, the roof framing suggests that it was integral to the original construction.

Condition: Poor
The north wall of the Back Stair is suffering from paint failure and wood rot due to water infiltration. It is in poor condition (Figure 73).
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 2241 College Avenue and the broader Southeast Campus area. When evaluating the significance and condition of a resource, a scale is often used to rate the 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.184

- **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.

184 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.  

LANDSCAPE

The following discussion evaluates the areas of significance for the landscape around 2241 College Avenue. Ratings for the historical value and condition of each tree can be found in the 2005 Tree Inventory (X. Appendix).

Hardscape Character-Defining Elements

The majority of the hardscape around 2241 College Avenue is non-contributing, with the exception of Thomas Church’s designed pedestrian pathway on the former location of College Avenue.

Thomas Church’s designed pedestrian pathway

Significance: Significant

The pathway exhibits the implementation of the 1962 Thomas Church Landscape Plan for the 1962 LRDP for a pedestrian spine to replace this section of College Avenue, thereby eliminating vehicular traffic (Map 20).

Landscape Character Defining Elements

Trees at western side

Significance: Significant

Church’s 1964 plan for Calvin Laboratory shows several existing specimen trees that were to be retained (Map 21). The plan shows the trees extending down the slope toward 2241 College Avenue. It is apparent that they were mature specimens at the time, and considerable effort was taken to preserve these trees during construction. These trees are significant as they likely date from the early 1900s when this area was a residential neighborhood. The following extant trees are noted on the Church plans:

---

185 University of California, Berkeley, 2020 Long Range Development Plan, 4.3.
186 Please see the “Calvin Laboratory Historic Structure Report” (Page & Turnbull and PGA design, 2006) for a more detailed discussion of Thomas Church and his plans for the southeast campus, including his design for the landscape around Calvin Laboratory.
Deodar Cedar (Cedrus deodar), Tree No. 566
American Elm (Ulmus Americana), Tree No. 334
Large Leaf European Linden (Tilia platyphellos), Tree No. 570
Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), including Tree Nos. 503, 505, and 506

Other trees including a Bronze Loquat (Eriobotrya deflexa) and several other Coast Live Oak trees were also marked for retention, but they are no longer extant.

Specimen Trees: Historical and Natural Area
Due to their condition, only Coast Live Oak, Tree No. 503, and the Deodar Cedar, Tree No. 566, are considered specimen trees. They form part of the Southeast Campus woodlands area meeting the criteria for a Natural Area. Historically, the trees likely date to the garden plantings of 2241 College Avenue based on the size of tree as well as being shown as an existing tree on Thomas Church’s 1964 Bio-Organic Lab construction documents (Map 21).

Redwoods at western side
Significance: Significant
The grove of five Coast Redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens), Tree Nos. 559, 560, 561, 562, and 563, likely dates to the garden plantings of 2241 College Avenue based on the size of the tree as well as being shown as existing trees on Thomas Church’s 1964 Bio-Organic Lab construction documents (Map 21). The two trees less than 36-inches diameter at breast height (dbh), Tree Nos. 560 and 562, are likely part of the Thomas Church Redwood plantings planned for the College Avenue pedestrian pathway. The three trees greater than 36-inch dbh, Tree Nos. 559, 561, and 563, likely date to the garden plantings of 2241 College Avenue.

Specimen Trees: Historical and Natural Area
The trees likely date to the Thomas Church Redwood plantings and form part of the Southeast Campus woodlands area meeting the criteria for Natural Area.

California Buckeye (Aescules californica), Tree No. 558
Significance: Significant
The California Buckeye likely dates to the garden plantings of 2241 College Avenue based on the size of tree.

Specimen Trees: Historical and Educational
Historically, this tree likely dates to the garden plantings of 2241 College Avenue. Educationally, the California Buckeye is regularly used by Campus instructors as an example of the species.

Common Pear (Pyrus communis), Tree No. 489
Significance: Significant
At one time, this Common Pear tree likely provided fruit for the residents of 2241 College Avenue, as was typical for houses of this period. Thomas Church’s 1964 Bio-Organic Lab construction documents show that a Loquat tree also existed at this location, reinforcing the notion of food sources growing at the rear of the house.
BUILDING EXTERIOR

The building’s exterior has remained largely intact and is reflective of the original massing, configuration, and appearance.

Significance: Very Significant

Character-Defining Features:
- Building massing
- Various cladding materials: rustic channel, flush siding with “stickwork” detailing, shingle patterns
- Building’s roofline and roof profile inclusive of dormers and chimneys
- Balustrades, railing, chamfered posts, and brackets on main porch on west façade
- Wood-sash windows
- Wood doors
- Wood molding and trim
- Brass hardware

BUILDING INTERIOR

Basement

Crawlspace

Significance: Non-Contributing

Character-Defining Features: None

First Floor

Main Corridor and Stair

Significance: Very Significant

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Ceiling beams
- Board and batten/beadboard paneling
- Wood trim, including cornice
- Staircase, including wood treads and risers
- Wood banister, pattern-cut wood baluster panels, and newel caps
- Doors and door surrounds
- Original bronze hardware

Rear Corridor

Significance: Contributing

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Wainscot
- Door and door surrounds
Room 1: Office
  Significance: Very Significant
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Decorative plaster ceiling
  • Wood baseboard and trim
  • Doors and door surrounds
  • Windows and window surrounds
  • Original bronze hardware
  • Fireplace hood in ceiling

Room 4: Office
  Significance: Significant
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Plaster ceiling
  • Wood baseboard
  • Wood chair rails
  • Doors and door surrounds
  • Windows and window surrounds

Room 4C: Closet
  Significance: Not Surveyed
  Character-Defining Features: N/A

Room 5: Vestibule
  Significance: Non-Contributing
  Character-Defining Features: None

Room 6: Toilet Room
  Significance: Contributing
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Wood baseboard
  • Window surround

Rooms 7 & 7A: Office and Closet
  Significance: Contributing
  Character-Defining Features:
  • Plaster walls
  • Plaster ceilings
  • Wood baseboard
  • Doors
Rooms 8 & 8A: Office and Closet

Significance: Significant

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Wood picture rail
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Room 9: Office

Significance: Contributing

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard

Room 10: Office

Significance: Significant

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Wood chair rail
- Door and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Rooms 11 & 11A: Office and Closet

Significance: Very Significant

Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboard
- Wood chair rail
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds
- Wood mantel
- Tile hearth
- Wood flooring
- Built-in shelves
Room 12: Office

*Significance:* Very Significant

*Character-Defining Features:*
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceilings
- Wood baseboards
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Second Floor

Second Floor Corridor

*Significance:* Very Significant

*Character-Defining Features:*
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceilings
- Wood baseboards
- Staircase, including wood treads and risers
- Wood banister, pattern-cut wood baluster panels, and newel caps
- Doors and door surrounds
- Hardwood floors

Room 101: Rear Corridor

*Significance:* Contributing

*Character-Defining Features:*
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Rooms 102 & 102A: Office and Closet

*Significance:* Significant

*Character-Defining Features:*
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Doors and door surrounds
- Window surrounds
Room 103: Office
Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Room 104: Office
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Board and batten paneling on walls and ceiling
- Built-in shelves and bookcases
- Wood flooring
- Door and door surround

Room 104A: Kitchen/Storage
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Board and batten paneling
- Wood baseboards
- Door and door surround

Rooms 105 & 105A: Office and Closet
Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds
- Brass hardware

Room 106: Closet
Significance: Not Surveyed
Character-Defining Features: N/A
Room 107: Toilet Room

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Built-in mirror/cabinet
- Wood baseboards
- Door and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds

Rooms 108 & 108A: Office and Closet

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Wood flooring
- Doors and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds
- Wood built-in shelves and bookcase

Rooms 109 & 109A: Office and Closet

Significance: Significant
Character-Defining Features:
- Plaster walls
- Plaster ceiling
- Wood baseboards
- Door and door surrounds
- Windows and window surrounds
- Brass hardware

Back Stair

Significance: Contributing
Character-Defining Features:
- Shiplap siding
- Stair treads and risers
- Door and door surround
- Window and window surround
- Brass hardware
SIGNIFICANCE DIAGRAMS FOR BUILDING INTERIOR

The following diagrams assign levels of significance to the interior of 2241 College Avenue using the categories defined at the beginning of this section. The diagrams are based on floor plans provided by the University. The floor plans on file generally date to the 1981 Campus Space Plan and do not necessarily reflect the layout of the building in 2005. Page & Turnbull made minor changes to the floor plans to more accurately represent the layout of 2241 College 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.
IV. Areas of Significance
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V. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

2241 College Avenue has been 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 2241 College Avenue has been found individually eligible for the National Register. The property was found eligible in a 1978 survey.

2241 College Avenue is also listed as a City of Berkeley Landmark, together with its former rental cottage at 2243 College Avenue. The Addendum to the Landmark application reads in part:

The importance of the Warren Cheney Houses for an appreciation of the work of Frederick Law Olmsted must be stressed. The Berkeley Property Tract was Olmsted’s first commission for a neighborhood, and these houses are the last surviving Victorian remnants of that plan. This portion of Audubon Street was totally in keeping with his grand plans for the College of California.

When the definitive work is written on this early conceptual phase of Olmsted’s career…it will be important that these 19th Century buildings still exist, to suggest the epoch from which sprang his ideas on suburban development, and to illustrate the former transition between the college campus and surrounding residential areas.

These houses are the last surviving intact Victorians in the area, and are significant also for their part in Frederick Law Olmsted’s first neighborhood plan.

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

187 Anthony Bruce conducted the 1978 survey of 2241 College. Bruce is the current Executive Director of the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA). The survey form indicated that there was a threat to the site from a “new school of business admin.” This is not unusual; surveys are often spurred by a perceived threat to a building. Anthony Buffington Bruce, “State Historic Resources Inventory: Cheney, (Warren) House, 2241 College Avenue, Berkeley, California,” 27 June 1978.

188 The author notes in the Forward to the Addendum: “Although submitted as an addendum, this document should be read as the unifying core of the application, superceding the various exhibits and documents submitted with the original application, which may be considered to be references.” Judy Margulis, “Addendum to Application for City of Berkeley Landmark Status for the Warren Cheney Houses (2241 and 2243 College),” 4 September 1990. On file at the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association.
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.

---


190 California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 11.5
• **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.

**EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**Historic Context**

The first step in determining the significance of a property is identifying its historic context. The historic context provides the framework for evaluating the significance of a resource. 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 the Cheney House is the first period of residential development south of the University campus (1860s-1900), starting with the purchase of land by the College of California in the 1860s, and ending with the population and building boom in Berkeley that began just prior to the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. During this period, private development followed the patterns established by land subdivisions made by the College of California in the 1860s, creating a secluded enclave for intellectuals, artists, and other upper-middle-class residents. The first residents of the Cheney House—Warren and May Cheney—were part of the vanguard that established the newly formed Town of Berkeley, and individually played important roles within this historic context.

**Significance of 2241 College Avenue**

**Criterion A (Event)**

2241 College Avenue appears to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion A (Event). The development of the Berkeley Property Tract played a substantial role in the history of Berkeley and the University. 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). Although the subdivision and sale of lots in the neighborhood failed to financially support the College of California, the Berkeley Property Tract eventually developed during the 1870s and 1880s as the neighborhood that Olmsted envisioned: a district of single-family homes on relatively large, landscaped lots, with upper-middle-class residents that would have—in theory—a wholesome and beneficial effect on the University students. The neighborhood’s success energized the development of the University, and helped drive the early twentieth-century building boom in Berkeley by attracting residents to this desirable area.
From the 1890s through the mid-twentieth century, the large lots in the Berkeley Property Tract were further subdivided, and most of the single-family, nineteenth-century homes dating to the earliest development period were demolished, moved, or substantially altered for use as University buildings, student housing, or fraternity or sorority houses. Today, only eleven nineteenth-century homes appear to remain in the Berkeley Property Tract.  

Since 2241 College Avenue is no longer in a residential neighborhood, it has lost some ability to convey its significance under Criterion A. However, 2241 College Avenue appears to be a rare example of a property type. The building is the oldest structure in the Berkeley Property Tract on its original location; the second-oldest survivor in the Tract; and one of the only nineteenth-century residential buildings in the neighborhood to remain largely unaltered. In the case of a rare example of a property type, the National Park Service states:

The property must have the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic character of information. The rarity and poor condition, however, of other extant examples of the type may justify accepting a greater degree of alteration of fewer features, provided that enough of the property survives for it to be a significant resource.

Although other nineteenth-century buildings in the Berkeley Property Tract may retain a higher degree of integrity of setting and association than 2241 College, because they are still located on city streets, almost all of these structures have lost at least some integrity of their remaining character-defining features due to extensive alterations. As the National Park Service states:

It is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity. The essential physical features are those that define both why a property is significant…and when it was significant. They are the features without which a property can no longer be identified as, for instance, a late 19th century dairy barn or an early 20th century commercial district.

---

191 As mentioned previously, there are approximately ten other nineteenth-century houses remaining in the Berkeley Property Tract: 2431 College Avenue (1897, altered 1913); the McFarland Houses at 2708 and 2710 Haste Street (circa 1895); 2721 Channing Way (1890, altered); the Ford-Hall House at 2425 Hillside Avenue (circa 1890, altered); the Smyth House at 2451 Hillside Avenue (possibly circa 1870s, altered 1911); the Perkins-Hayne House at 2421 Piedmont Avenue (1886, altered); the Sarah M. Goodrich House at 2498 Piedmont Avenue (1893); the George H. Maxwell House at 2405 Prospect Street (1883, moved from 2401 Piedmont Avenue and altered); and the John F. Sims House at 2422 Prospect Street (1892, moved from Warring Street and altered). Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, Frederick Law Olmsted’s Berkeley Legacy—Piedmont Way and the Berkeley Property Tract (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, [1995]), n.p.


193 Ibid., 46.
Although it is difficult to see that 2241 College was originally located in a residential neighborhood, due to the extensive alterations in the surrounding area, the building is still highly recognizable as a house constructed in the late nineteenth centuries in the Eastlake/San Francisco Stick style. Buildings in the Berkeley Property Tract that have been altered to an extent where they no longer appear to date from the late nineteenth century, or no longer appear to be residential buildings, are not able to convey their historic identity, regardless if they are still located in a residential neighborhood. 2241 College and its rental cottage at 2243 College retain the most important characteristics of integrity to convey their historic identity. Therefore, 2241 College Avenue retains a sufficient degree of integrity as a rare type to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion A.

**Criterion B (Person)**

2241 College Avenue appears to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion B (Person), for its association with Warren and May Cheney. As detailed above, both Warren and May Cheney were influential members of Berkeley and University society. Both Warren and May Cheney graduated from the University and decided to live in the neighboring area as a young couple. They spent the majority of their productive adult lives living at 2241 College. Warren Cheney is notable for his role in real estate development in Berkeley, including the development of the recently designated Panoramic Hill National Register District. May Cheney is notable for her establishment of a teacher placement system at the University—the second of its kind in the United States—and for her work promoting the University by appointing teachers throughout the state.

**Criterion C (Design/Construction)**

2241 College Avenue appears to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C (Design/Construction) as an excellent example of the Eastlake/San Francisco Stick style. The building displays the distinctive characteristics of this style: irregular, asymmetrical massing; varied cladding materials including rustic channel siding, stickwork, and different types of shingles; and exuberant Eastlake interiors, including the main staircase balustrade, chamfered door and window frames, and Arts and Crafts decorative hardware. In addition, 2241 College is significant as a type and for its period of construction, because it represents the kind of large, single-family homes developed at the end of the nineteenth century in the Berkeley Property Tract for upper-middle-class residents. As one of the only unaltered, Eastlake/San Francisco Stick style buildings remaining in the Berkeley Property Tract, 2241 College is both an excellent example of its type and a rare example within its historic context.
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 2241 College Avenue for eligibility under National Register Criterion D (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report.

2241 College Avenue Integrity

2241 College Avenue retains a moderate to high degree of integrity, and therefore, retains a sufficient degree of integrity to be listed on the National Register.

2241 College retains its original massing, proportions, and overall footprint. Although the interior plan of the building has been somewhat altered for University use, the structure is still highly recognizable as a single-family dwelling. It retains its original circulation system, and much of the original floor plan. The main alteration to the floor plan has been the insertion of partition walls, rather than the demolition of original walls, making the alterations largely reversible. The exterior of the building retains its original fenestration pattern, cladding, and ornamentation; original window sash; and, likely, the original front door. The interior of the building retains its original, decorative door and window surrounds; wood sash; wood doors; some decorative brass knobs and hinges; plaster walls and ceilings; wood trim—including baseboards, board and batten paneling, wainscoting, and shelving; an original fireplace mantel; and the elaborately finished main staircase and balustrade. Therefore, 2241 College retains a moderately high degree of integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

2241 College is on its original site, and retains a high degree of integrity of location. When originally constructed, the Cheney House was in a secluded residential neighborhood that was part of the Berkeley Property Tract subdivision. During the twentieth century, the University began to expand into the neighboring residential neighborhoods and eventually acquired all of the homes on the 2200 block of College Avenue, including the Cheney property at 2241-2243 College. Subsequent development on the University campus resulted in the loss of all of the buildings in the 2200 block with the exception of 2241, 2243, and 2251 College Avenue. College Avenue north of Bancroft Way was eventually closed as a city street, and this section of the road is now a pedestrian and bicycle path. As a result, 2241 College has lost a great deal of integrity of setting and association; the building is no longer on a city street nor in a residential neighborhood. However, the building does retain some integrity of setting and association since the rental cottage at 2243 College—which has stood next to 2241 College on the same location for over 100 years—is still extant, as is the former fraternity house.
at 2251 College to the south and the row of houses on Piedmont Avenue to the rear of 2241 College. The setting of 2241 College is also defined by residual landscaping dating from the residential period, including the grove of trees at the front, west side of the building. In addition, although College Avenue is no longer a vehicular street, the pedestrian and bike path largely follows the original street, giving some indication of the relationship of 2241 College to the former street.
Image 1: The two Palmer Houses above Piedmont Avenue, on the California Memorial Stadium site, ca. 1882. Note apparent divided median on Piedmont Avenue at bottom of the photograph. (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 14Q:4)
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

(Clintom 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, UCARC PC 06:074)
Image 6. The Clinton Day House at the corner of Piedmont and Bancroft Ways, looking northwest, ca. 1890 (Clinton Day Collection, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association)
Image 7. View from Panoramic Hill with buildings on Piedmont Avenue in the foreground, 1890s. The house with a tower in the lower lefthand corner is one of the Palmer Houses. (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 03:265)
Image 8. View from the vicinity of present-day LeConte 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)
Image 9. View of Berkeley looking west towards San Francisco Bay, ca. 1903 (University of California, Berkeley)
Image 1. 2200 Block of Piedmont Avenue looking north, ca. 1910
(Postcard, image obtained from University of California, Berkeley)
Image 12. Aerial view of campus looking east, ca. 1920. College Avenue is running through the center of the photograph; the 2200 block of College and Piedmont Avenues is at the right (Bancroft Library, UARC PC 03:067)
Image 13. 1928 aerial of Piedmont Avenue and California Memorial Stadium
(University of California, Berkeley, Earth Sciences & Map Library)
Image 14. View of Piedmont Avenue and Piedmont Place looking west likely from California Memorial Stadium, late 1920s. The Haas School of Business is currently at the site of the large fraternity house (2220 Piedmont Avenue) in the center of the photograph; the future site of Calvin Laboratory is to the left behind 2222 Piedmont Avenue (photograph from undated newspaper article courtesy of the Denny Family).
Image 15: Aerial view of campus looking east, ca. 1931. College Avenue is running parallel to the Stadium; the 2200 block is approximately in the center of the photograph (Bancroft Library, UARC PIC 03:041)
Image 17. Looking north on the 2200 block of College Avenue from Bancroft Way during the “Big C Sirkus” parade, 29 February 1940. 2241, 2243, and 2251 College Avenue are to the right of the road, obscured by trees; to the left are the University tennis courts (courtesy of Robert Singleton)
Image 20. 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 21. 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 LeConte 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. West façade

Figure 2. West façade

Figure 3. West façade

Figure 4. South façade

Figure 5. South façade

Figure 6. South façade
Figure 7. South façade

Figure 8. South façade

Figure 9. South façade, rear addition

Figure 10. East façade

Figure 11. East façade, rear addition

Figure 12. North façade, rear addition
Figure 13. North façade

Figure 14. North façade

Figure 15. North façade

Figure 16. Typical interior doors

Figure 17. Detail of brass knob

Figure 18. Detail of brass hinge
Figure 19. Possible original finish on woodwork

Figure 20. Crawlspace

Figure 21. Main Corridor and Stair

Figure 22. Main Corridor and Stair

Figure 23. Rear Corridor

Figure 24. Room 1
Figure 25. Room 1

Figure 26. Room 4

Figure 27. Room 4

Figure 28. Room 6

Figure 29. Room 6

Figure 30. Room 7
Figure 37. Room 9

Figure 38. Room 9

Figure 39. Room 10

Figure 40. Room 10, looking toward 11A

Figure 41. Room 11

Figure 42. Room 11
Figure 43. Room 11, fireplace mantel

Figure 44. Room 11, tile hearth

Figure 45. Room 12

Figure 46. Room 12

Figure 47. Second floor corridor

Figure 48. Room 101
Figure 55. Room 104

Figure 56. Room 104

Figure 57. Room 104

Figure 58. Room 104A

Figure 59. Room 105

Figure 60. Room 105
Figure 61. Room 105A

Figure 62. Room 107

Figure 63. Room 107

Figure 64. Room 108

Figure 65. Room 108

Figure 66. Room 108A
Figure 73. Back stair
LANDSCAPE PHOTOGRAPHS

Figure 74. West façade

Figure 75. West façade

Figure 76. West façade

Figure 77. West façade

Figure 78. South façade

Figure 79. North façade taken from Calvin Lab Arcade
Figure 80. West façade with view to California Buckeye tree

Figure 81. North façade, taken from Calvin Lab Arcade

Figure 82. East façade

Figure 83. East façade and ADA ramp

Figure 84. South façade, common pear tree at ADA ramp

Figure 85. South façade, common pear tree at ADA ramp
Figure 86. East façade between Buildings 2241 and 2243 College Avenue

Figure 87. East façade between Buildings 2241 and 2243 College Avenue

Figure 88. West façade between Buildings 2241 and 2243 College Avenue
VIII. Maps

Map 1. 1866 map of the College Homestead (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
Map 2. Map of the Berkeley Property marked with the College of California Seal (in the lower right corner) with the date of 1865 (Alameda County Public Works)
Map 3. Frederick Law Olmsted's 1866 plan for the Berkeley Neighborhood (Bancroft Library)

"Study plan outlining the Berkeley Neighborhood including the Chateau of the University of California."

(1866)
VIII-4

Map 4. 1868 W.F. Boardman map of the Berkeley Property (Berkeley Department of Public Works)
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. 1930 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. Landscape plan for Calvin Laboratory: irrigation, drainage, & details, 1964 (University of California, Berkeley)
Map 22: 1988 Roma Study of existing conditions of the southeast part of campus (University of California, Berkeley)
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X. APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY

circa 1885  Warren Cheney builds the house as his family home.

1894-95  In a city directory, Warren Cheney is listed as having his business office at 2120 Shattuck and residence at “Audubon near Bancroft.” May L. Cheney is listed as operating “Educational Bureau, S.F.,” and residing at “College Avenue near Bancroft.” This presumably reflects the era when the street name was evolving from the original Audubon to College; this is also the period when May Cheney was operating a job placement bureau on her own and not yet employed by the University of California in a similar capacity.

circa 1885-1910s  Warren and May L. Cheney and their four sons occupy the house at 2241 College. Sheldon Cheney later notes that his parents provided the three sons who survived into adulthood with free housing at home through their college years, and all attended Cal; Sheldon graduated in 1908.

1903  Husted’s city directory lists Warren and May Cheney living at 2241 College along with sons Charles H., John A., Marshall C, and Sheldon W., all identified as students.

circa 1903-1906  Charles Cheney, with the help of his brothers, converts a stable on the 2241 College property to an automobile garage.

1906  Sheldon Cheney’s reminiscences of the San Francisco Earthquake and Fire include a description of being awakened by the earthquake along with his brothers while sleeping at 2241 College in the back of the house; his story notes that there were two water tanks in the back of the house that could have fallen on them.

Warren and May Cheney are listed in Husted’s directory as living at 2241 College along with “Harvey C. Cheney, M.C. Cheney, Sheldon W. Cheney.” “Harvey C.” does not appear in any other records, but given the last name, he was presumably related to the family. Warren’s business address is given as “Warren Cheney and Co (W. Cheney, P. Monroe, J.A. Martenstein) real estate and insurance, agents London and Lancashire Fire Ins. Co, First National Bank Building, 2082 Center, Berkeley.”

1913-15  Sheldon Cheney lives for about a year (1913) on the East Coast but returns to Berkeley where he writes his first book, Open Air Theatres, apparently while residing at least part of the time at 2241 College.

1915  Sheldon Cheney’s Art Lovers Guide to the Exposition is published by “The Sign of the Berkeley Oak,” with a mailing address of 2241 College Avenue.

1921  Warren Cheney dies.

1925  Polk’s directory shows May Cheney still in residence, presumably since construction of the house.
1930-37 Polk’s directory shows May Cheney living at 2241 College with her son Marshall, and Marshall’s wife, Penelope. During much of this period, Marshall is also listed as a practicing physician at various nearby addresses on Bancroft Way or Telegraph Avenue. Marshall and Penelope appear in the Polk directories as residents at 2241 College through 1939; May is present as a resident through 1937, but absent from the directory in 1939 and 1940.

1932 Frank Lloyd Wright visits Berkeley to give a lecture and visits 2241 College where his friend Sheldon Cheney is then living; Wright comments on the view towards the campus from the front porch of the house.

1938-39 Marshall Cheney is listed in a University directory as living at 2241 College in this academic year, and working as an “Associate Physician for Men, Student Health Service.” May Cheney is also listed as living at 2241 College and serving as “Chairman, Club House Loan Fund Committee.” The term “clubhouse” presumably refers to the private women’s rooming and boarding houses of the era.

1939 The house is sold to the University by May L. Cheney on December 14, according to University property acquisition records.

1940 The Pacific Bell telephone book for this year lists May L. and Marshall Cheney, M.D., living at 2241 College. Marshall’s office is given as 2560 Bancroft Way.

1941 In 1941, both Marshall and May are listed in Polk’s directory as living at 116 Tunnel Road, and a check of the 1949 directory shows Marshall still at that address in 1949. The implication is that around 1939, the time of the sale of 2241 College to the University, May, her son, and her daughter-in-law moved to a new permanent residence on Tunnel Road, where her son and his family continued to live after May’s death in 1942.

1942 May Cheney dies.

1950 2241 College is identified on a University plan as belonging to the “Institute of Child Welfare,” along with 2243 College and 2939 Bancroft (since demolished). A set of hand-drawn floor plans, source unknown, identifies the main (ground) floor rooms as “office,” “office service,” and four “Fac” (presumably “Faculty”). Few of the rooms on the second floor are labeled, but the smallest one, Room 102, is labeled “Fac.” Room 103 is labeled “4 TA’s” (likely teaching assistants), and Room 104A is labeled “Conference.”

1957 The Institute of Human Development moves to the newly built Harold Jones Child Study Center on Atherton Street.

1962 Photographs show a University sign on the exterior of the house referring to it as occupied by the “Center for Human Learning.” The Campus Directory for this year lists “Center for Human Learning” at this address.

1963-64 Campus directory for this year lists “Institute of Human Learning” at this address.

1964-65 Campus Directory lists “Human Learning,” Leo Postman, Director, at this address.
1966-67 “Institute of Human Learning, Director, Leo Postman” listed at this address.

1967 Campus directory lists “Institute of Human Development” located at 1203 Tolman Hall. This indicates a relocation from 2241 College. The Centennial Record lists 2241 College as “Occupied by Institute of Human Learning.”

1968 English as a Second Language program moves into the building. Three second-floor rooms at the front of the building are left unoccupied for fire safety reasons.

Fall 1968 The FDX (campus facilities database) lists “Eng for Stud. Lang Lit” as the sole occupant of the building; it is assumed this is a variant title for English as a Second Language.

Fall 1969-Fall 1978 FDX lists English as a Second Language as occupant. In the 1971 FDX, rooms are assigned mainly as “academic offices;” one room is “office service” and another is “conference” space. The 1978 FDX lists six apparently unassigned rooms (105, 105A, 108, 108B, 109, 109A) as “Alteration-General Admin.”

1979 The 1981 Berkeley Campus Space Plan states some work was done on the building in 1979: “A fire alarm system for the building was installed... At the same time major electric renovation work was done inside. This consisted of installation of new wiring, additional outlets and new lighting fixtures. Much of the interior was painted with a fire retardant paint.”

Fall 1979-Fall 1980 Subject A is listed as a building occupant, and six rooms (105, 105A, 108, 108A, 109, 109A) are listed as “Gen. Admin.,” apparently vacant and unassigned.

1980 A portion of the Department of Near Eastern Studies (NES) moves into the second floor of the building. The front rooms on the second floor are modified for occupancy. Bathrooms are “improved” in this period.

1981 The 1981 Berkeley Campus Space Plan reports: “2241 College was once occupied by the Institute of Human Learning. English as a Second Language (ESL) moved in around Fall, 1968 and occupied the building exclusively until a segment of the Department of Near Eastern Studies (NES), focusing on the ancient Near East, moved into the upper floor during 1980... This move is intended to be temporary until additional space for humanities programs becomes available as a result of space reassignments in other campus buildings.”

The report notes that “the lower floor has been used exclusively by ESL... on the north is a reception area used for pre-enrollment and secretarial work, with a library and office service room directly east. The reception room is planned for reassignment to NES. To the south of the corridor are three offices used by ESL instructors and the program coordinator. Another office and a toilet are at the rear. At the far eastern end of the building is a room used as an office that can only be entered from the outside. Its floor is below grade and it has suffered from moisture and mildew problems in the past. The second floor is now used entirely by Near Eastern Studies except for a meeting room at the rear temporarily shared by both occupants... This floor includes four rooms used as faculty and graduate offices, plus
a seminar-study room, a toilet and a very minimal ‘kitchen.’” The report also makes reference to the easternmost room on the top floor being used as a “shared meeting room,” consistent with the 1950 floor plan.

“The NES program is crowded and does not have enough office space, particularly for students, or adequate space for research work with slides and other materials. Because of space limitations NES cannot bring all the staff it would like into the building, resulting in further fragmentation of the Department…NES considers the location and consequent isolation undesirable and temporary until more space is available in Dwinelle or at another permanent location. It does, however, have the advantage of closeness to the Lowie Museum of Anthropology and to archaeologists occupying the former residences on Piedmont Avenue.”

**Fall 1982-Fall 1984**

Subject A is listed as occupying 12 rooms in the building, while three (102, 102A, 103) are assigned to Business Administration: two for “Grad(uate student) office(s),” and one for “office service.” The remainder of the building (Rooms 105, 105A, 108, 108A, 109, 109A) is listed as assigned to “Comput(ing Aff)airs.” However, the FDX data is at odds with the Berkeley Campus Space Plan statement that Near Eastern Studies moved into the building in 1980.

**1985**

Several repairs are undertaken to replace decking, roof trim, and gutters.

**Fall 1985**

Subject A and “Computer Fac.” are listed as occupying the building, along with three rooms assigned to the Chancellor’s Office.

**Fall 1986**

Subject A is listed as occupying twelve rooms in the building, while nine rooms are given the designation of “Admin Info.”

**Fall 1988**

Subject A is listed as occupying twelve rooms in the building with “IS and T – ITP” occupying seven room. This latter abbreviation apparently means “Information Systems and Technology, Instructional Technology Project.”

**1990**

The building is designated a City of Berkeley Landmark.

**1990**

A program with the acronym of “SANSE” occupies at least part of the building. (SANSE probably stands for “Subject A for Non-Native Speakers of English.”) Two rooms on the main floor are repainted.

**1990**

The Women’s Studies Department moves into the building from Campbell Hall. This occurs shortly after Women’s Studies became a formal Department. Some repairs are undertaken.

**Fall 1991**

The FDX database lists “Alteration – General Administration” along with IS and T – ITP in the building. This is at odds with other sources that state that Women’s Studies moved in during 1990.

**Fall 1993**

“Alteration – General Administration” remains listed for the building, along with IS and T – ITP.

**Fall 1994**

Women’s Studies and IS and T – ITP are listed as building occupants.
Fall 1995  Women’s Studies is listed as a building occupant and assigned 12 rooms, with five of them designated as “academic offices.” Nine rooms remain assigned to IS and T – ITP.

2005  Occupants include the College of Letters & Sciences/College Relations and Development Office, and the Tanner Lectures program.
2005 TREE INVENTORY

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

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNU</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLE</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 includes Quercus agrifolia that are 30” or greater diameter at breast height (dbh).

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

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

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

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

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (Excellent)</td>
<td>The element is near original condition, i.e. The tree is a specimen quality tree in excellent form and health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (Good)</td>
<td>The element is mostly intact, i.e. The tree is in good form and health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Fair)</td>
<td>The element is showing signs of wear or deterioration, i.e. The tree is in moderate health and form is poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Poor)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

- Aesthetics
- Historical
- Educational
- Strawberry Creek
- Natural Area

Tree Caliper

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
<th>Health Rating</th>
<th>Tree Caliper</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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 styaciflua</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>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</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>NLE</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>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-353</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 3&quot;</td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(5) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(5) 3&quot;</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 oxycanthra</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</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>359</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-364</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Eriobotrya deflexa</td>
<td>Bronze Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366-369</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373-375</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Eucalyptus ficifolia</td>
<td>Red Flowering Gum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377-379</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Eucalyptus robusta</td>
<td>Swamp Mahogany</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>English Holly</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387-389</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Torulosa'</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Torulosa'</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Torulosa'</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Torulosa'</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Torulosa'</td>
<td>Hollywood Juniper</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395-397</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>Glossy Privet</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Liquidambar styaciflua</td>
<td>Sweet Gum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(3) 12&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-404</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Magnolia campbellii</td>
<td>Campbell Magnolia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406-409</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(2) 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412-414</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(5) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Common Olive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(3) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 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>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>418-19</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>421-23</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>425-29</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434-38</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 tenufolium</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(3) 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Pittosporum tenufolium</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 tenufolium</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Crataegus laevigata</td>
<td>English Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Victorian Box</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457-58</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 tenufolium</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(4) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463-66</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Pittosporum tenufolium</td>
<td>No common name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2) 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468-70</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>475-76</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>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481-482</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana</td>
<td>Ornamental Pear</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>no trunk, sprouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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; trunk hollow in center</td>
<td></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>6&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; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>16&quot; Specimen</td>
<td></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; Leaning</td>
<td></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; Specimen</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; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12&quot; Specimen</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; Specimen</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; Specimen</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; Leaning</td>
<td></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>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Quercus rubur</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36&quot; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6&quot; Specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>8&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>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6&quot;</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>12&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>24&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 platyphloos</td>
<td>Largeleaf Linden</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571-575</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>Fern Pine</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>Fern Pine</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596-598</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Acacia decurrens</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>severely leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>(2) 15&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>Coast Redwood</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610-619</td>
<td>NNU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2005 TREE INVENTORY

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

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