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I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) has been prepared at the request of the University of California, Berkeley for Unit 3 Housing at 2400 Durant Avenue (APN 055 187902203) in the City of Berkeley (Figure 1). Unit 3 Housing was designed by architect John Carl Warnecke and Associates in a derivative of the New Formalist style with landscape design by landscape architect Lawrence Halprin. The complex was constructed between 1961 and 1964 as a student dormitory complex.

![Figure 1. Block map with the parcel containing Unit 3 Housing, shown with red outline. Source: City of Berkeley Parcel Conditions and Permit History.]

SUMMARY OF DETERMINATION

Unit 3 Housing has not been previously evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) or the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). The complex does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register. However, the complex appears eligible for listing as a City of Berkeley Landmark because it is an example of a mid-century residence hall complex design that was shaped by social, cultural, political, and economic forces within the UC Berkeley and City of Berkeley housing environment. It retains a high degree of architectural integrity, whereas the overall site designs of Units 1 and 2 have been altered, and is thus the best representation of the design concept originally used for all three Units. Unit 3 Housing is therefore considered an historic resource for the purposes of review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

METHODOLOGY

This report follows a standard outline for Historic Resource Evaluation Reports, and provides a building description, historic context statement, and examination of the current historic status for UC Berkeley Unit 3 Housing. The report also includes an evaluation of the property’s eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources and for local designation as a Berkeley Landmark or Structure of Merit.

Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research collected at various local repositories, including the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, University of California Offices, the San Francisco
Public Library, and Page & Turnbull’s in-house library. Steven Finacom, of UC Berkeley Physical and Environmental Planning, assisted Page & Turnbull in the production of this report by gathering information from the University of California Archives and University of California Offices. He produced a “Summary History of Student Housing at the Berkeley Campus” (Draft, 10 October 2012) based on his research. The majority of general context about UC Berkeley’s student housing in this Historic Resource Evaluation is excerpted from his report.
II. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state, and local historical ratings currently assigned to the building at Unit 3 Housing.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) 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.

Unit 3 Housing is not currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

Unit 3 Housing is not currently listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.

CITY OF BERKELEY LANDMARKS & STRUCTURES OF MERIT

The City of Berkeley maintains a list of properties designated as local Landmarks and Structures of Merit under chapter 3.24 of the Berkeley Municipal Code. Much like the National and California Registers, the Municipal Code provides a number of criteria, which must be met in order for a property to gain Landmark or Structure of Merit designation. Properties may be landmarked if they meet standards of architectural, cultural, educational, or historical significance, or if they are already listed in the National Register. A property may be designated as a Structure of Merit if it does not rise to the level of Landmark status, but has contextual importance and is worthy of preservation as part of a neighborhood, block or street frontage, or group of buildings that includes Landmark properties.

Unit 3 Housing is not designated as a City of Berkeley Landmark or a Structure of Merit.

CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) of “1” to “7” to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register or NR) or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register or CR). Properties with a Status Code of “1” or “2” are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of “3” or “4” appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of “5” have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of “6” are not
eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of “7” means that the resource has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

Unit 3 Housing is not listed in the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) database with any Status Code, which means that the building has not been formally evaluated using California Historical Resource Status Codes.
III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SITE

Unit 3 Housing is located on an approximately 300’ x 425’ rectangular parcel on a through-lot between Durant Street and Channing Way, between Dana Street and Telegraph Avenue (Figure 2). Constructed between 1961 and 1964, Unit 3 Housing is a complex of four nine-story-over-basement Residence Halls that face inward toward a one-story-over-basement Commons Building at the center of the parcel. Ida Sproul Hall is located on the west side, paralleling Dana Street; Norton Hall is located in the northwest corner, paralleling Durant Avenue; Spens-Black Hall is located in the northeast corner, paralleling Durant Avenue; and Priestley Hall is located in the southeast corner, paralleling Channing Way. Aside from Spens-Black Hall, much of the site is raised on a plinth from the street level and is enclosed with concrete walls. Thus, the basement levels of the other three buildings are partially above-ground. A short sloped driveway on Dana Street leads to a loading dock that provides direct access to the basements of Norton and Ida Sproul residence halls and the Common Building.

Figure 2. Aerial view looking north, with parcel outlined in red.

The landscape site plan consists of several courtyards between buildings. The north open space, adjacent to Durant Avenue, features a slightly sloping, sparsely landscaped hill shaded by several pine trees (Figure 3). The space contains a zigzagging ADA-accessible ramp with metal handrails that leads to the basement level of the Commons Building. A short concrete retaining wall divides the hill from a shallow paved courtyard with wood benches. Most of the paving throughout the open areas consists of a grid of concrete aggregate rectangles.

The east courtyard is paved and contains a smooth concrete volleyball court and a rectangular bike enclosure with a concrete and wood frame, vertical wood siding, a metal gate and grilles, and a flat roof (Figures 4 & 5).

Site features on the south side include a concrete sign reading “Unit 3 Residential Complex” adjacent to a long series of concrete steps, and a sunken courtyard at basement level (Figures 6-8). A
geometric-shaped raised border around the courtyard contains sparse landscaping and tall pine trees, and is enclosed by low concrete walls. The courtyard contains picnic tables and a brick barbeque range, and is accessible to the basement level multi-use room in the Commons Building as well as concrete stairs from the ground level walkways above.

Two smaller courtyards at ground level are located southeast of Ida Sproul Hall and between Norton and Ida Sproul Halls (Figures 9 & 10). The ground floor lounge of Ida Sproul Hall opens onto the southeast courtyard, which includes a palm tree that pre-dates the construction of the Unit 3 complex.¹ The lounge of Norton Hall opens onto the northeast courtyard. Both courtyards feature the same grid of concrete aggregate paving, low retaining walls around raised planting beds, metal bicycle racks, and wood benches.

¹ The palm tree shows on the existing condition drawing for the site before demolition. John C. Warnecke and Associates, “Survey, University of California Residence Hall Unit No. 3,” (March 1961).
EXTERIOR

Commons Building
The one-story-over-basement Commons Building features a rectangular plan and a concrete frame structure. The walls are clad with pre-cast concrete aggregate panels and glazed aluminum storefront systems, which consist of plate glass windows and single and paired fully glazed aluminum doors (Figure 11). All four sides feature covered walkways comprised of flat concrete roofs punctured by regularly-spaced recessed square skylights (Figure 12). The roofs are supported by a series of concrete posts. The basement levels are exposed on the north and south sides, and feature the same materials as the ground floor facades (Figures 13 & 14). Concrete stairs lead from the ground floor walkways down to the basement level courtyards. The two stairwells and two light well cutouts on each side are enclosed by metal railings. The concrete roof is flat and features three raised flat sections, which are enclosed by decorative panels (Figure 15). Some mechanical equipment sits atop of the roof, and the square skylights over the covered walkways are visible along the edges. The entire roof is painted red.
High-Rise Residence Halls

The nine-story-over-basement, reinforced concrete high-rises are clad in smooth stucco (Figures 16-18). The rectangular buildings are nine bays long. The ground floors of the long sides are clad with concrete aggregate panels and anodized aluminum storefront systems containing plate glass windows and pairs of fully glazed aluminum doors. A few of the windows in the ground floor lounges have operable awning sashes.

Full-height decorative concrete panels project from the facades that face outward toward the streets (Figure 19). The panels span three bays (beginning the second bay from one end) and feature incised
vertical rectangles and rectangular window perforations of varying lengths and orientations. The sides of the projecting bays contain three stacked aluminum-sash awning windows per floor. These bays contain the circulation core and restrooms. The other six bays on the outward-facing facades are divided by concrete columns flanked by vertical steel supports. Each bay contains a horizontal aluminum-sash sliding window.

The inward-facing facades are also divided by concrete columns flanked by steel supports, and each bay contains windows identical to those on the outer facades (Figures 20 & 21). Primary entrances face the Common Building, and consist of pairs of glazed aluminum doors surrounded by divided aluminum sidelights and transom windows (Figures 22 & 23). The second, fourth, sixth, and eighth floors feature concrete balconies with metal railings that project from the study lounges. Each balcony is accessed via fully glazed aluminum sliding doors.

One end facade of each building is clad in textured concrete that is scored at each floor division, and the other end façade contains an exterior concrete emergency stairwell with metal railings. Decorative concrete walls similar to those on the street façades enclose the outer sides of the stairs (Figures 24 & 25). The buildings are capped by flat roofs with projecting circulation penthouses (Figure 26). The roofs are covered with gravel and are enclosed with low concrete parapets and metal railings. Segmented flat concrete awnings project over each bay of the inward- and outward-facing facades, except at the three projecting bays clad with perforated panels.
Figure 20. Ida Sproul Hall, looking northeast from the roof of Ida Sproul Hall. 
Source: Page & Turnbull, September 2012.

Figure 21. Priestly Hall, looking southeast from the roof of Ida Sproul Hall. 
Source: Page & Turnbull, September 2012.

Figure 22. Entry to Spens-Black Hall, looking northwest. 
Source: Page & Turnbull, September 2012.

Figure 23. Entry to Priestly Hall, looking south. 
Source: Page & Turnbull, September 2012.
INTERIOR

Commons Building
The Commons Building contains a large dining hall with seating areas on the north, east, and west sides of a central kitchen (Figure 27). The dining spaces were completely re-modeled and re-decorated in recent years. The northeast corner of the ground floor contains a convenience store. The basement level contains a computer lab, multi-purpose meeting room, music practice rooms, a small study lounge/library, laundry room, restrooms, and storage for dining services (Figure 28). Most of these spaces have been remodeled, though the multi-purpose room appears little changed from its original appearance.
High-Rise Residence Halls

The residence halls contain a basement level that houses maintenance and storage rooms. The ground floor features an entry lobby with a security booth, vending machines, restrooms, and one two-bedroom unit. Most of the ground floor is occupied by a student lounge that contains a large fireplace at the far end and is furnished with such items as a ping-pong table, sofas, and a piano. The upper eight floors feature double-loaded corridors with double-occupancy rooms throughout and triple-occupancy rooms at the end. A study lounge is located off the center of each hallway on the second, fourth, sixth, and eighth floors. Each floor contains one communal co-ed bathroom. The bathrooms have been remodeled. The floors are accessed via one elevator per building and an internal stairway. The external emergency stairwell is accessed through doors at one end of the hall.
SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD

The neighborhood immediately surrounding UC Berkeley Unit 3 Housing is a mixed use area comprised of multi-family residences and apartment buildings, university dormitories and other adjunct university facilities, several church complexes, social and community services, parking garages, and public parks. Commercial thoroughfares exist on Bancroft Way to the north and Telegraph Avenue to the east. The UC Berkeley campus is located on the north side of Bancroft Way, one block from the Unit 3 Housing complex. Beverly Cleary Hall, another UC Berkeley housing facility, is located south of the subject property across Channing Way. The immediate neighborhood contains a variety of architectural styles for buildings that were constructed over a period of a century or more. The oldest extant buildings, generally houses, were constructed in the late nineteenth century, while the area also contains very recent construction.

The surrounding neighborhood contains numerous qualified historic resources. The map below (Figure 34) identifies the locations of properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, found eligible for listing in the National Register through historic evaluation, and properties listed by
the City of Berkeley as either Landmarks or Structures of Merit. Table 1 correlates numbers on the map to the properties’ pertinent information.

![Figure 34. Map of surrounding historic resources, subject property outlined in black.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Built Date/ Date of Significance</th>
<th>Historic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berkeley Women’s Club</td>
<td>2315 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>National Register, City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Anna Head School (Miss Head’s Preparatory School for Girls)</td>
<td>2538 Channing Way</td>
<td>1892; 1911-1927</td>
<td>National Register, City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Mark’s Episcopal Church</td>
<td>2301 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Eligible for National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gray Gables, Canterbury Foundation</td>
<td>2346 Bancroft Way</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Eligible for National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>2362 Bancroft Way</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Eligible for National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>James A. Squire House</td>
<td>2400 Dana Street</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Eligible for National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maria Marsh House</td>
<td>2308 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>McCready-Greer House</td>
<td>2318 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>Ca. 1896-1901</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cambridge Apartments</td>
<td>2500 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fred Turner Building</td>
<td>2546 Bancroft Way</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Brasfield (Stratford Hotel)</td>
<td>2520 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Description</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 now Beau Sky Hotel</td>
<td>2521 Channing Way</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 John Woolley House</td>
<td>2509 Haste Street</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 People’s Bicentennial Mural</td>
<td>2500 Haste Street</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 People’s Park</td>
<td>2556 Haste Street</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Landmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Haste Street Annex of McKinley School</td>
<td>2407 Dana Street</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Structure of Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 The Robcliff Apartment House</td>
<td>2515 Channing Way</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Structure of Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ellen Blood House (Tompkins House)</td>
<td>2526 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Structure of Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 The Albra</td>
<td>2530-2534 Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Structure of Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

UC BERKELEY HOUSING

Early UC Housing (1870s to mid-1920s)
In the early years of the University of California, the institution provided instruction but the students were entirely on their own for "off-campus" activities such as food and lodging. The university attempted a brief experiment in the 1870s with the construction of eight wood "cottages" on the campus for lease to some students, but after this, the UC did not undertake other projects to create or operate student housing for more than half a century. Even at the end of that period, campus run housing came about because of the external influence of private gifts, not University investment or policy.

From the 1870s to the 1920s, in the absence of University-run housing, students pursued a variety of living options. Some students organized themselves into private residential or dining clubs and rented or bought quarters. Others founded fraternities and sororities and affiliated with national organizations. During the first several decades of the Berkeley campus, many students were Berkeley residents who lived at home. Some students commuted from San Francisco and Oakland, the major population centers of the Bay Area. A system of private rooming and boarding houses developed locally, and many Berkeley households also rented extra rooms to students. In the early decades of the University, there were few apartment accommodations, although some private residential hotels were built and served the campus market.

At the time, there was ambivalence about whether dormitories were a good idea, and people voiced concerns about potential moral dangers of students living together unchecked by faculty control. Campus-run student housing was not named as a primary campus need in official university reports of the era. In contrast, at Bay Area private colleges including Stanford and Mills College, on-campus, college-run, residence halls were an early feature of the campus landscape.

Early Residence Halls (1929 to 1945)
A private gift created the first University-owned and operated student housing of the 20th century. Mary McNear Bowles, widow of University Regent Phillip Bowles, offered funds to build a residence hall in his memory. This became Bowles Hall, sited at the base of Charter Hill behind the campus, and opened in 1929. It accommodated 204 male students. The next addition to the housing supply with direct UC affiliation was International House, also the result of a private gift in the late 1920s. Opening for fall semester 1930, it provided housing for 530 students. The building was not only the largest college residence hall in California at the time, but also the first to provide co-educational living. Stern Hall, the third residence hall built to serve the campus, was the result of a private gift and opened in 1942. Thus, by the early days of World War II, the Berkeley campus had three UC-run or closely affiliated residence halls. Each was a self-contained unit, providing living, dining, and common/program areas within one building. All were designed on the principle of having single students share quarters and activities. These facilities accommodated only a fraction of the total student population—several hundred residents, total, out of more than 15,000 students at the end of the 1941-42 academic year.

---

3 Steven Finacom, UC Berkeley Physical and Environmental Planning, “Summary History of Student Housing at the Berkeley Campus,” Draft (10 October 2012). Research conducted specifically for this HRE report.
4 Steven Finacom.
World War II and Early Post War Experiences (1944-1950)

World War II had considerable temporary and long term impacts on the Berkeley campus. The number of male students declined, and women became a majority of the student population for the first time. Many fraternities temporarily closed for the duration of the war and were rented as boarding house accommodations to women students. Student enrollment temporarily dropped from more than 17,000 in 1940-41 to just over 11,000 in 1944-45. At the same time, private off-campus accommodations became scarce for students because of the development of war industries, including shipyards, munitions manufacturing, and food processing in the East Bay that drew workers from around the country.

As the war came to an end, the Federal “G.I. Bill” also had a big impact on the University of California and other institutions of higher education. In addition to supporting many male students returning to college, the G.I. Bill allowed others to pursue a college education. The enrollment of male students swelled rapidly in the post-war years, and for the first time in UC history, a large number of students came to school married and with young families, creating demand and need for a different type of housing.

In 1944, the Regents adopted a general goal to provide housing for 25 percent of UC Berkeley and UCLA students and housing for 50 percent of the smaller UC campuses. That year, the University commissioned a “Dormitory Site Study” by architect William C. Hays to advise on possibilities for providing post-war student housing at Berkeley. Opportunities were constrained by the lack of University-owned sites. The University only owned three substantial off-campus properties close to campus in that era, one of which was a seven acre parcel at the top of Dwight Way, the private Fernwald estate gifted to the University by William Smyth.

The University administration took a step toward creating an expanded UC-run residence hall housing system at the end of the war with construction of the Fernwald residence halls in 1946 on the old Smyth property. The construction of the new housing was also, for the first time, completely funded by the University rather than private gifts. The University created a Dormitory Construction Fund to finance the project and adopted the principle of using housing income from student rents to amortize housing debt. The Fernwald Halls provided quarters for 476 women students in eight buildings.

To further meet the emergency housing need in the post-war period, the University also leased former war housing—both apartments and dormitories—in Richmond, and acquired 124 of the apartments the Federal government had built on UC Berkeley’s Gill Tract land in Albany. These were used for married students, primarily returning veterans, and became the first installment of what would become a permanent campus housing supply for student families, a need that had been largely non-existent and not contemplated, before the War.

---

7 Environmental Design Archives, College of Environmental Design, Berkeley. William C. Hays Collection, 1894-1962, University of California, Administrative Files, UC Berkeley Campus Planning, Section B, “Housing”.
8 Verne Stadtman, editor, *Centennial Record of the University of California* (University Printing Department, 1967) 104.
9 Steven Finacom.
Enrollment rocketed from 11,000 in 1944-45 to more than 18,000 the following academic year and shot up again to 25,325 in 1946-47. Campus facilities, most of them constructed in the 1910s and 1920s for a population of 10,000 or less, were strained and housing was at a premium. In 1948, the California Alumni Association (CAA) took the lead in studying student needs beyond the classroom. Some 2,000 students were interviewed and the CAA produced a report, titled “Students at Berkeley,” summarizing findings and recommendations. A core conclusion of the study was that the University should commit itself to a program of building and operating extensive non-academic facilities for students. These would include a new Student Union complex, parking lots, recreation and sports fields and courts, and large new residence halls. To accommodate these needs, which required considerable amounts of land, the study suggested that the University embark on a land acquisition program of nearly 20 square blocks of off-campus land, particularly south of the campus. This property would be cleared of existing buildings—although most existing churches and the business spine along Telegraph Avenue would remain—and the resulting area redeveloped with a vast network of new facilities.

The “Students at Berkeley” report was not officially adopted or implemented, but within a number of years, it had considerable influence on the physical development of the campus and the residence hall program. When Clark Kerr became the first Chancellor of the Berkeley campus in 1952, he recalled the report and sought to work towards implementing its recommendations, a process that accelerated with Kerr’s appointment as UC President in 1958.

While campus-specific influences such as the “Students at Berkeley” report were important to the evolution of the residence halls, the Unit residence hall projects at Berkeley were also part of a broad program of constructing new single student housing throughout the UC system, not just at Berkeley. In the same era that Units 1 and 2 were being planned at Berkeley, UC was planning two new units at UC Davis, three residence halls at UCLA, three at UC Riverside, and two residence halls at UC Santa Cruz. In 1946, the University made plans to appropriate six million dollars in State money for residence halls at several campuses. These funds were allocated in 1950.

Modern Residence Halls (1950 to 1960)
By the 1950s, the University of California as a whole was coming to see the need for both an expanded dormitory system and the concurrent need to find some source of major, permanent funding to support the expense of constructing new housing.

At the same time, the Federal Government began a major effort to support student housing construction around the country in the form of the College Housing Loan Program. This provided a life-line of financing for UC that coincided with the demand. Created in 1950, the program provided more than 3,100 loans by 1970 to American colleges, universities, and teaching hospitals to build housing, at a total loan investment of $3.6 billion.

---

12 Steven Finacom.
13 University Archives, President’s Office records, CU-5 Ser. 8 133:2.
14 Nedderson to Corley, University Archives, President’s Office records, CU-5 Ser. 8 133:2.
The program had major implications for the development and expansion of the University of California’s residence hall system. On the one hand, it provided a new means to finance large amounts of student housing construction without committing UC funds from the State of California or from private donors. From the standpoint of the Regents and UC administrators, this finally meant the campuses could significantly add housing without subtracting from the resources available for other programs. On the other hand, it indirectly created a necessity for an expanded residence hall system because the Federal aid was helping universities all over the country to build housing; if UC didn’t build, it would be at an increasing disadvantage with its peer institutions, which could lure new students and their parents with brand new, convenient, affordable, campus-managed housing. These factors, combined, worked to eliminate the last internal resistance to providing campus operated housing and dining, and led to a vast planned new program for residence halls at the Berkeley campus and elsewhere in the UC system.

Net revenue from federally financed residence halls, after operating expenses, would go into a central fund to pay down the bonds. The Regents directed that after making required payments on the bonds and other loans, funds remaining in the Net Revenue Account could be used by the Regents to expand the system. This approach bound the campus housing system to two key financial principles: it would be self-sustaining from rents and other revenues, and surplus funds could be used to build more housing which would, in turn, generate additional surplus to be used for more housing. As long as this system worked, the campus housing system would be able to both operate and grow, without either being an annual financial burden on the University budget or, conversely, paying any “profits” into the University’s general funds for non-housing purposes. The system was built on a key premise: new housing could be added only so long as there was sufficient income from the housing system overall to sustain both operating costs and debt service. That meant that the residence halls, while serving an academic purpose—helping to socialize and support students in their studies—would be functionally required to operate like a business. If not enough students used the services of the business (that is, signed contracts to live in the halls), the financial system would be at risk. This was a key factor in evaluating Berkeley student housing expansion after Unit 3.

The 1948 “Students at Berkeley” report model was revised and refined into the first Long Range Development Plan of the Berkeley campus, adopted in 1956. Although it addressed the full spectrum of campus needs, from landscape planning to libraries and research laboratories, a major component was off campus land acquisition and development. The “Students at Berkeley” model to buy and raze nearly 20 square blocks in the City of Berkeley was revised to a somewhat more geographically modest plan to acquire approximately 40 acres (about 10 square blocks) within one to four blocks of the campus edge, most of it on the Southside. Within the existing city street grid, six to eight of those blocks would be set aside for residence hall “units.” The bulk of the land acquisition would be for housing, parking, recreation, and other non-academic programs.

The extent of the UC’s contemplated land acquisition aroused some community and official City protest. Residents and property owners in the affected areas were concerned about losing their homes or income properties. The City Council and staff were concerned about the loss of tax revenues because land bought or leased by the University goes off the property tax rolls. The University administration and city officials interacted for some years, and an understanding was eventually reached: the University would concentrate its land acquisition and new housing development in the eight square blocks east of Telegraph, west of College, and north of Dwight, while pursuing considerably more limited land acquisitions west of Telegraph. The area west of

---

16 Personal Communication, Steven Finacom, Capital Projects, UC Berkeley.
17 Ibid.
Telegraph would be targeted by the City for privately built new, denser housing that would remain on the tax rolls.\footnote{Ibid.}

The Long Range Development Plan envisioned residence hall modules of about 200 students per residence. The limited land available demanded “high-rise” construction. Construction and operational efficiencies necessitated a standardized architectural model with most students living in double rooms of the same size and configuration, grouped into stacked residential floors of the same general size and configuration.

Standards for residence halls were codified in a 1947 booklet produced by University staff entitled “Some General Specifications for Items Required for Adequate Residence Halls.”\footnote{“Some General Specifications for Items Required for Adequate Residence Halls.” University Archives, CU-5, Ser.8 133:3.} The 1950 revision began with these “General Assumptions”:

> It is assumed that we want to provide more than mere shelter and food at a price for the students. We want to create such an atmosphere of respect and pride in their surroundings as well foster stable standards of conduct and produce harmonious group life. We want to give opportunities for self-development, for profitable use of leisure time, for organized social and cultural programs. Residence Halls should contribute to the education of the student in the broadest sense of the word.\footnote{Ibid.}

The specifications when went on to detail plans for:

> “…a Residence Hall housing 800 women students, to be constructed in such a manner that there will be four separate units, each housing 200 students. Each of these units will be termed a Residence Hall unit and will contain complete lounge, recreation, office, and dining room facilities for the 200 residents. There will be one central kitchen for all four units. [...] Generally speaking, it is agreed that all of the requirements for an adequate Residence Hall for women are the same for men.”\footnote{Ibid.}

The specifications were very detailed. They stated that for every group of 200 residents, 98 double bedrooms, measuring 160 square feet per room exclusive of closet space, and four rooms for staff would be constructed. Each room would have two of every bed, pillow, mattress, study table, study chair, easy chair, study lamp, and metal wastebasket, and eight sheets provided.\footnote{Ibid.} Each building would additionally be provided with a basement recreation room, and laundry, ironing, and sewing rooms. The central dining area would have one common kitchen plus “[four] dining rooms to accommodate 200 each, arranged so two can be thrown together for dancing.”\footnote{“Date rooms,” a library, game room, music or radio room, and a main lounge were also to be provided.}

**High-rise Residence Hall Complexes: Units 1 and 2**
With some minor exceptions, the above plan is essentially what was implemented within the next decade for Units 1, 2, and 3. This included the arrangement of four 200-resident halls with double bedrooms, each with its own in-house professional and student staff; a central dining commons with one kitchen but four dining rooms that could be combined into two large spaces; and common rooms for each unit.
Units 1 and 2 were constructed by UC Berkeley between 1959 and 1960. Originally, six residence hall complexes were planned that could accommodate a total of 4,800 students, but only three complexes were ultimately constructed. They were financed by federal loans, university housing revenues, a state grant, and a private donation.25

In 1956, UC Berkeley held a University of California Residence Hall Competition for the design of new residence hall complexes. Five architectural firms from the Bay Area and two from Southern California were invited to participate in the competition, the first conducted for UC Berkeley since the international competition for the Hearst Plan in 1897. The competitors included John Funk and Kitchen & Hunt; Pereira & Luckman; Welton Becket & Associates; Gardner Dailey; Vernan DeMar, Joseph Esherick, and Ernest Kump; Weihe, Frick, and Kruse; and Warnecke & Warnecke.26 The architects were asked to design a complex of four self-contained buildings to house 800 students on a block of College Avenue between Durant Avenue and Channing Way. Centralized facilities were also required as part of the design, and were required to include a recreation room, administrative and support functions, a kitchen, and four dining rooms arranged in two pairs.27

The winning firm consisted of architects Carl I. Warnecke and his son, John Carl Warnecke. Warnecke & Warnecke sought to attain three goals: “a sense of enclosed free space within the building group, a plan that would not hamper the future campus development, and a sense of variety and spatial movement while still achieving the required identical units.” Their design reflected the influence of Walter Gropius and other Modern architects in the use of high-rise buildings to conserve open space (Figure 35).28 Landscape architect Lawrence Halprin designed the landscape, and Dinwiddie Construction Company functioned as general contractors. The one proposed complex turned into two, and eventually three, nearly identical commissions.

---

26 “Competition Award for Design of Student Residence Hall Group, University of California, Berkeley,” Architect & Engineer (September 1956).
27 Ibid, 302.
28 Ibid.
Unit 1 is addressed 2650 Durant Avenue and is located on a block bounded by Durant Avenue to the north, College Avenue to the east, Channing Way to the south, and Bowditch Street to the west. It was constructed between 1958 and 1959. Unit 2 is addressed 2650 Haste Street and is located on a block bounded by Haste Street to the north, College Avenue to the east, Dwight Way to the south, and Bowditch Street to the west. It was constructed between 1958 and 1960. Both complexes originally consisted of four nine-story buildings at the corners of the site that surrounded a common ground level dining area with basement-level mail room, recreation room, and offices. Each residence hall building was named after alumni or faculty and was originally planned for single-sex occupancy. Each floor had approximately 15 rooms that are 13’9” x 13’2” in dimension, plus a single large bathroom with lockers, sinks, toilet stalls, and shower stalls. Each room on the floor was a double, except for the rooms at the buildings’ corners, which were triples. Even numbered floors had laundry rooms and odd numbered floors had lounges.

The residence halls were connected to the central building by covered-trellis walkways and separated by landscaped courtyards. Pagoda-style parabolic roofs were used to distinguish the dining rooms, whose relationship to the courtyards was intended to emphasize an indoor-outdoor fluidity (Figure 36). This feature, along with the Asian influence of the roof forms and the use of trellises, were used to “retain the character of the Bay Area tradition of architecture, which had its origin in the City of Berkeley, and of which there are still outstanding examples in the work of Bernard Maybeck.” For these reasons and as works of master designers Warnecke and Halprin, the dining halls of Units 1 and 2 were designated City of Berkeley landmarks in 2000.

Over the years, various alterations were made to the residence hall complexes, including becoming co-ed. At Units 1 and 2, most courtyard-facing rooms are double-occupancy and outward-facing rooms are generally triples. Restrooms were renovated to provide more privacy between toilet stalls. Some buildings modified rooms on the first floor for potential disabled persons. Concrete bases and cross bracing were installed on the exteriors of the high rise buildings after the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. Major alterations to the original designs have also taken place, including demolishing the individual dining commons for Units 1 and 2. The buildings were replaced by a larger dining hall.
located on the block separating the two Units, and the center courtyards were converted to landscaped outdoor space. In addition, both Units 1 and 2 have seen infill between the original four high rises by additional residence halls which opened in 2005.29

PROJECT SITE HISTORY & ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OF UNIT 3

Development of the Subject Site Prior to Construction of Unit 3 Housing

The subject property was originally part of the College Homestead Association Tract, bounded by College and Shattuck avenues and Bancroft and Dwight ways. Telegraph Avenue bisects the tract. The plan for the College Homestead Association Tract was recorded on 15 May 1866. At the time, the area consisted primarily of fields and farms. The tract was intended to create a campus community of mixed uses and generate income from the sale of lots for the College of California, the predecessor to the University of California.

When the College chose to move from its original home in Oakland to a new Berkeley site, the trustees decided to finance the expansion by selling land in the vicinity of the prospective site. To this end, they formed the College Homestead Association and purchased 160 acres of land north of Oakland, in what is now Berkeley. The streets in the area were laid out in a grid pattern.30

The lots sold poorly, and the College of California could not survive without capital from their sales. The College subsequently collaborated with the State of California’s Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College to establish a public university, the University of California. In 1869, the former College of California transferred its property and interests to the University of California. Meanwhile, all of the unsold College Homestead and Berkeley Property Tracts in Berkeley were sold to the public.31

According to Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps, four single family residences facing Channing Way were constructed on the subject site prior to 1894. They were Queen Anne in style and featured rounded corner bay windows or turrets and angled bay windows. All were two-and-a-half stories in height, and three also contained basements. Three of the four were clad with wood shingles (Figures 37 & 38). The remainder of the block was not yet divided into individual parcels, though several other residences were constructed between 1896 and 1903.

29 “Housing at the University of California, Berkeley, Website accessed 19 September 2012 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Housing_at_the_University_of_California_Berkeley
By 1911, the subject property was divided into nine and a half parcels (Figure 39). The four earlier residences were joined by another two facing Channing Way. Three single-family residences and five residential flats buildings containing two flats each had been constructed facing Durant Avenue and Dana Street. Six single-family residences on the block stood east of the subject property. The adjacent block to the south is representative of the surrounding neighborhood in general, displaying the construction of numerous single-family residences, a flats building, and a church and school.
The neighborhood blocks appear to have been almost completely built out by 1929 (Figure 40). A few residences adjacent to Telegraph Avenue were demolished by the 1920s and commercial buildings were constructed in their place. Other properties had added auto garages at the rear, and several of the large single-family houses had been converted to “rooms” or “room & board.” A house at the corner of Dana Street and Channing Way was converted into a fraternity house. A large parcel facing Durant Avenue that was undeveloped in 1911 saw the construction of a 39-unit apartment building.

By 1950, the fraternity house on the southwest corner of the block had been demolished. It was one of the original buildings on the block. The rest of the block saw little new development since 1929, though the large houses continued to evolve into “rooms” and “boarding,” as well as a private school and doctors’ offices. In 1952 and 1953, several houses on the block, including 2419 Channing Way, 2425 Channing Way, and 2431 Channing Way were bought by the City of Berkeley and demolished to make way for a surface parking lot adjacent to the commercial area of Telegraph Avenue. Known as the Sather Gate parking lot, it was Berkeley’s first publicly owned lot. The project was financed by contributions from local merchants, property owners in the area, and parking meter revenues. The lot opened in September 1953 (Figure 41).32

32 Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association files for the subject block, including newspaper clippings and other ephemera.
Unit 3 Housing, Constructed

Completion of the first two residence hall units, along with existing student housing, increased the number of students housed in university residence halls to about 12.5 percent of the enrollment. With the housing shortage still critical, Unit 3 was pushed forward. Financing for the construction of Unit 3 included a state grant and a $550,000 gift bequeathed by Sally McKee Spens-Black, daughter of Regent Samuel Bell McKee (1868-1883), and for whom one of the high rise buildings was named.

Although another architectural firm had been appointed, the need to accelerate the housing program and take advantage of federal financing caused the Regents to recommend re-use of the Warnecke & Warnecke plans for Unit 3. They appointed John Carl Warnecke and Associates, the Warnecke’s successor firm, as architect. It appears that John Carl Warnecke and Associates modified Halprin’s design for the Unit 3 site themselves. The general contractor was Perini Brothers. The design was very similar to Units 1 and 2. It consisted of four high-rise residence halls: Ida Sproul Hall, Norton Hall, Priestley Hall, and Spens-Black Hall. Ida Sproul and Spens-Black Halls were women only, and Norton and Priestley Halls were men only. Though Unit 3’s landscape design is based on Lawrence Halprin’s design for Units 1 and 2, his name does not appear on any Unit 3 design or construction drawings.

However, the reused plans were modified to take advantage of suggestions from the residents of Units 1 and 2 and make other cost-related design changes. For example, small windows set in perforated concrete screens were used in the bathroom areas instead of the decorative screens used in the older units. To reduce the glare and heat build-up experienced in the earlier high-rises, the window openings were reduced and concrete-finish spandrels were used instead of colored.

Figure 41. Site prior to construction showing “Paved Parking Lot, City of Berkeley” covering the center and southwest corner of the block, March 1961.

Source: John Carl Warnecke and Associates, Architects, University of California Residence Hall Unit No. 3, Sheet No. A1A.

33 Harvey Helfand, 301-302.
metal spandrels. In the central building, the pagoda roof of the dining commons at Units 1 and 2 was replaced with a flat roof with ornamental copper facing (Figure 43).^{35}

---

Figure 42. Exterior elevations and floor plan for Building C (Spens-Black), 1 August 1961. Source: John Carl Warnecke and Associates, Architects, University of California Residence Hall Unit No. 3, Sheet No. A47.

Figure 43. Exterior elevations and floor plan for Building C (Spens-Black), 1 August 1961. Source: John Carl Warnecke and Associates, Architects, University of California Residence Hall Unit No. 3, Central Building, Sheet No. A25.

The University of California purchased the City’s Sather Gate parking lot property from the City in 1962, as well as several properties on the block that were still occupied by older residences. The City acquired property east of the Unit 3 site behind commercial buildings on Telegraph Avenue as a relocated site for the parking lot. A multi-level parking structure called the Sather Gate Garage (now

---

the Telegraph/Channing Garage) operated by the City was subsequently built there. The pinwheel configuration of the residence halls, apparent in the layout of Units I and II, was apparently modified at Unit III so the windows of Spens-Black Hall would not abut the future garage façade.\footnote{Steven Finacom, Written communication responding to HRE draft report, October 2012.}

Construction delays meant that only three buildings could be occupied at the beginning of the fall 1963 semester. Student residents moved into Priestley, Spens-Black, and Idea Sproul Hall on September 9, 1963. At that time, the dining common was not completed and landscaping was not yet finished. Residence halls rooms in Units 1 and 2 were converted to triples in preparation for the later opening of Norton Hall on September 22, 1963. The commons building and landscaping were complete by 1964.\footnote{Steven Finacom.}

**Construction Chronology**

The following provides a timeline of the construction history of Unit 3 Housing, including all known alterations.

1986-1988: Alterations by Gordon H. Chong & Associates included a Common Building kitchen remodel with new equipment; alterations to conduit runs and circuits throughout the buildings; installation of bollards at approach ramps and stairs on the site; alterations to the mechanical rooms in the residence halls; upgrades to the sprinkler systems; alterations to second floor residence hall rooms for ADA accessibility; removal of glazing in the residence hall restrooms and replacement with ventilation louvers; replacement of fireplace facing and mantles with slate and plaster in the residence hall lounges; and exterior painting, including the present ground floor striping pattern.\footnote{Gordon H. Chong & Associates, Drawings dated 22 February 1988.}

October 1989: O’Kelly & Schoenlank produced drawings to upgrade the HVAC.\footnote{O’Kelly & Schoenlank, Drawings dated 4 October 1989.}

March 1993: Razzano Associates produced drawings to construct a ramp at the south entry on the south and west sides of the sunken courtyard.\footnote{Razzano Associates, Drawings dated 5 March 1993.}


February 2000: Gordon H. Chong & Associates produced drawings to remodel the storage and maintenance spaces in the basements of the residence halls, as well as a remodel of the Common Building basement spaces.

October 2004: Mesher|Shing Architects produced drawings for a full dining facility remodel.\footnote{Mesher|Shing, Drawings dated 26 October 2004.}


Fall 2006-Spring 2007: Café 3, the central dining facility, underwent major renovations by Mesher|Shing Architects and Kava Massih Architects.

---

\footnote{Steven Finacom.}
\footnote{O’Kelly & Schoenlank.}
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\footnote{Vintage Fire Protection, Inc.}
August 2007: Reif Shaffer produced drawings to upgrade the Common Building mechanical room.44

Architectural Style: New Formalism (1960-Present)

The high rise buildings at Unit 3 appear to possess many of the qualities of a modern architectural style called New Formalism, though in a simplified manner. According to Alan Higgins in “Architectural Movements of the Recent Past,”

“Oh, sometimes called Neo-Palladianism [or Neo-Formalism], New Formalism emerged in the 1960s as a rejection of the limits of Modernism. The style reflects a taste for classicism and is a mid-century effort to update past styles with new technologies and design elements. New Formalist buildings utilize Classical elements such as building proportion and scaling, colonnades, and entablatures. In addition, New Formalist buildings make use of modern innovations in concrete design through the inclusion of umbrella shells and folded plates in the design. Exterior materials are made to look expensive, as if marble or cast stone. New Formalist design principles were popularized by Minoru Yamasaki and Edward Durrell Stone. This style is typically found on […] banks, and public buildings such as government centers, libraries, museums, or school buildings. New Formalist buildings are based upon a carefully organized sense of space and an emphasis is placed on the structure of the building. Buildings are often set on a raised base. Public buildings may utilize cast stone, brick, or marble or may mimic these materials. Surfaces are always smooth and an arched motif is commonly found within the colonnade or columnar supports. Public buildings are typically built on a grand scale to emphasize the monumental nature of the design. Patterned grills or screens are likely to appear in small-to-mid-size buildings.”45

In addition, roofs are designed as large, heavy slabs and have elements that project out from the building. Large, thick columns are often employed. There is an emphasis on the plasticity of concrete.

The style was used primarily for high profile cultural, institutional and civic buildings, including the Los Angeles Music Center and the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, the Ambassador Auditorium in Pasadena, the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York City, and the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C. In California, the style was applied mainly to museums, auditoriums, and college campuses by different architectural firms.46

Identifying features include:

- Lines and Geometric shapes dominate facades
- Typically have symmetrical facades
- Surfaces are always smooth
- Interest in relationship parts to whole
- Buildings usually set on a podium
- Often defined at top by heavy, flat projecting slab

44 Reif Shaffer Architects, Drawings dated August 2007.
- Repetition of arch motif is common
- Column supports common along all facades
- Patterned screens or grilles may appear as decorative features
- Formal landscape: use of pools, fountains, sculpture within a central plaza.

The high-rise residence hall buildings do not feature arch motifs and their facades are not symmetrical. However, they do emphasize geometric shapes, especially in the grid of windows and the use of a patterned concrete screen. Aside from the screens, the concrete surfaces are smooth. The buildings are set on a podium that provides space for an underground loading. The roofs are flat and terminate in flat projecting concrete slabs over each column of windows. Lastly, verticality is emphasized by way of projecting structural columns that divide each bay.

Figure 44. UC Berkeley campus, looking southwest toward Unit 3 Housing, 1978. Campus buildings in the left and center foreground are prime examples of the New Formalism style, and the high rise residence halls use a similar vocabulary. Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Berkeley_-_California_-_Campus_-_Student_Union_-_1978.jpg

John Carl Warnecke, Warnecke and Associates, Architect
John Carl Warnecke (1919 – 2010) was born in Oakland, California. The son of a prominent architect, Warnecke received his bachelor's degree from Stanford University in 1941, and the following year received his master's degree in architecture from Harvard University. Among his professors at Harvard was the noted architect, Walter Gropius.

After graduation, Warnecke worked as an inspector for the public housing authority in Richmond, California, as well as a draftsman for his father's architectural firm. In 1950, Warnecke established his own architectural practice. Among his notable early projects was the Mira Vista Elementary School in El Cerrito, CA (1951), which earned him national recognition. He received an Honor Award from the American Institute of Architects in 1953. Warnecke also received

Dennis McLellan, “John Carl Warnecke Dies at 91; Designer of JFK Grave Site,” Los Angeles Times, April 24, 2010.
widespread critical praise for the design of a new U.S. embassy in Thailand in 1956. Though never constructed, the embassy design was highly regarded for incorporating traditional Thai architectural elements.48

In 1958, Warnecke reorganized his practice under the name John Carl Warnecke & Associates, and that same year was named as an Associate of the National Academy of Design. More commissions followed, including the design of the new corporate offices for the Ampex Corporation (1959) in Redwood City, CA, Campbell Hall at U.C. Berkeley (1959), and the Mabel McDowell Elementary School (1960) in Columbus, Indiana.

In his practice, Warnecke “adhered to the Modernist values of emphasizing function and structure, but searched for an architecture that respected historic buildings and the natural setting.”49 In 1959, Warnecke’s firm was commissioned by the California Department of Parks and Recreation to create a Twenty Year Master Plan for the facilities at Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove. In conjunction, Warnecke also designed several new buildings for Asilomar. These new buildings were honored the following year with a Merit Award from the American Institute of Architects.50

In many respects, Warnecke’s greatest notoriety came through his association with the Kennedy family, which began in 1962 when Jacqueline Kennedy persuaded Warnecke to submit plans for new federal office buildings at Lafayette Square in Washington, D.C. Unlike previous designs for the site, Warnecke’s plans integrated several historic buildings lining the square with the new buildings. His completed design is frequently cited as an important example of contextual design, as the new office buildings “responded deferentially to the residential structures lining Jackson and Madison Places.”51 Warnecke was also accused of “facadism,” because several of the houses were not restorations, but new construction behind original facades. Scholars have held that Warnecke’s approach was strongly influenced by the regional modernism developed by San Francisco Bay Area architects such as William Wurster, who as early as the 1940s had advocated for the preservation of Lafayette Square.52 Warnecke opened an office in Washington, D.C., and in 1963 President Kennedy appointed Warnecke to the United States Commission of Fine Arts. That same year, he was made a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects. Warnecke also worked briefly with President Kennedy on designs for a presidential library, but these were put on hold after the President’s assassination. Warnecke was subsequently commissioned to design the President’s grave marker at Arlington Cemetery, which was officially dedicated in 1967.

During this period, Warnecke worked on a number of prominent commissions, including the Master Plan and several buildings for the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, MD (1965), as well as the Hawaii State Capitol (1965), designed in association with the Hawaiian firm Belt, Lemmon & Lo. Warnecke also designed several buildings for the University of California, Berkeley campus, including Mccone Hall (1961), Birge Hall (1964), and the Moffit Undergraduate Library (1970).

52 Ibid.
In 1967, Warnecke opened an office in New York City, where he employed noted architects Gene Kohn and Bill Pederson. Other branches were opened in Boston, Los Angeles and Honolulu. By 1977, Warnecke and Associates was regarded as the largest architectural firm in the United States. During this period, some of the firm’s more notable commissions included the U.S. embassy in Moscow (1975), the Hart Senate Office Building (1975), and the South Terminal for Logan Airport in Boston (1977). This stage of Warnecke’s career is also sometimes associated with Brutalist architectural designs, including the Lauinger Library at Georgetown University (1970), and the AT&T Long Lines Building in New York City (1974).

In the 1980s, Warnecke’s commissions slowed dramatically and he closed nearly all of his branch offices. Few notable works ensued, although Warnecke continued to receive recognition. In 2001, the Mabel McDowell Elementary School in Columbus, Indiana (designed by Warnecke in 1960), was designated a National Historic Landmark. Though less than fifty years old at the time, the building was considered exceptionally important “as an early example of Modern architecture in Columbus, and as an important example of the contextual work of John Carl Warnecke, a leading architect of the twentieth century.”

During the last two decades of his life, Warnecke spent much of his time at his ranch in Healdsburg, California, where he grew grapes for Sonoma wineries. He also worked on establishing an international retreat and think tank, known as the Warnecke Institute of Design, Art and Architecture, at the ranch. Warnecke passed away at the age of 91 in May 2010.

Warnecke’s school-related projects include, but are not limited to:

- Cragmont Elementary School – Berkeley, California (1946)
- White Oaks Elementary School – San Carlos, California (1947)
- Burbank Junior High School – Berkeley, California (1950-55)
- Portola Junior High School – El Cerrito, California (1951)
- Mira Vista Elementary School – Richmond, California (1951-52)
- East Contra Costa Junior College (now Diablo Valley College) – Pleasanton, California (1952)
- Campbell Hall, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1959)
- Book Store #2, Stanford University – Stanford, California (1959-60)
- Unit 1 Housing, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1959-60)
- Unit 2 Housing, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1959-60)
- Mabel McDowell Elementary School – Columbus, Indiana (1960) (Figure 45)
- United States Postal Service Post Office, Stanford University – Stanford, California (1960)
- McConie Hall, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1961)
- Unit 3 Housing, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1961-64)
- University of California, Santa Cruz Master Plan – Stanford, California (1963)
- College of San Mateo – San Mateo, California (1963) (Figure 46-47)
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54 National Park Service, National Historic Landmark nomination for the Mabel McDowell Elementary School,
- Nathan Cummings Art Building, Stanford University – Stanford, California (1963-64)
- Henry J. Meyer Undergraduate Library, Stanford University – Stanford, California (1964-66)
- Birge Hall, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1964)
- United States Naval Academy – Annapolis, Maryland (1965)
- McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz – Santa Cruz, California (1965-66) (Figure 48)
- Sonoma State University – Rohnert Park, California (1966)
- Roscoe Maples Pavilion, Stanford University – Stanford, California (1969)
- City College of New York Master Plan – New York, New York (1969-70) [Project Never Realized]
- Moffit Undergraduate Library, University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, California (1970) (Figure 49)
- Lauinger Library, Georgetown University – Washington D.C. (1970) (Figure 50)
- Gottwald Science Center, University of Richmond – Richmond, Virginia (1976-77)

Figure 45. Mabel McDowell Elementary School – Columbus, Indiana (1960). Source: Wikimedia, courtesy Greg Hume.

Figure 46. College of San Mateo, San Mateo, California (1963). Source: Heather David, all rights reserved.

Figure 47. College of San Mateo, San Mateo, California (1963). Source: Heather David, all rights reserved.

Figure 48. McHenry Library, UC Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California (1965-66). Source: Heather David, all rights reserved.
Warnecke’s portfolio of school projects is clearly extensive, though it appears that Units 1, 2, and 3 are the only residence hall projects that he completed. The designs vary depending on the preeminent style of the era in which they were constructed, for example, the New Formalist style in the early 1960s and Brutalism by 1970. Compared to other projects within Warnecke’s portfolio, the Unit 3 buildings do not stand out as particularly innovative. They are relatively simple in design and construction compared to the perforated screens and pagoda-like roof of the Unit 1 and 2 residence halls and common building, and also when compared to contemporaneous projects such as the College of San Mateo. The design of Unit 3 was not published in architectural journals like Units 1 and 2 were, and thus, it does not appear that the architectural design was considered distinguished by the design community at that time.

RESIDENCE HALL CONSTRUCTION FOLLOWING UNITS 1, 2, AND 3

The Units, when built, drew not only local attention and comment, but national attention. For example, they were the subject of a photo essay in *Life Magazine* in 1960 that outlined such novelties as male and female students communicating across the wide courtyards after closing hours by flashing code on their desk lamps.57 On the eve of planning and construction of Unit 3, however, students were still scattered through a very wide variety of accommodation types and the Greek system still housed a significant percentage of the student population.58

When Unit 3 opened, there were waiting lists for the residence halls and the assumption was that the campus would continue to build. However, the completion of Unit 3 also coincided with a rise in student dissatisfaction with residence hall conditions. Based on newspaper articles of the time, the concerns were that the residence halls were managed with what students regarded as an archaic and restrictive social system that involved house mothers and rules controlling many details of student lives.59 Dormitory rooms were inspected to see if students had made their beds. Allowable types of clothing, particularly for dining, were stipulated. Female students were subject to detailed “lock-out” and faced penalties (including restriction to one’s room for a period of time) if they did not return by

---

58 University Archives, CU-5, Ser.8, 133:4
a certain hour each night. Several meals each week were “served,” meaning that all residents had to enter the dining commons at an exact time, take their places, be served food at their seats by waiters, and eat and leave only when allowed by the head resident. Contact between male and female students was very limited, particularly within the women’s halls.

The University seems to have regarded these rules as a way to manage student behavior, ensure students were properly socialized, and meet the expectations of parents that the University was creating a wholesome “home like” environment in the halls. Many students, however, chafed at the restrictions for social, cultural, and practical reasons. The goal of creating a “home like” atmosphere proved difficult in a situation with 30 residents per floor, 200 per building, and one house mother. Lastly, the sheer size and small spaces of the residence halls seemed to occasion repeated complaints. Students noted that the halls were noisy and crowded, and it was hard to find quiet to study.

These issues led to repeated student complaints in 1963 and 1964. The complaints seeped up to the Regent level where University administrators explained that they felt caught between the desires of students for more freedom, and the expectations of parents and State legislators that the University closely manage student life.

The dissatisfaction had an impact, as students chose other places to live or moved out. Newspaper articles reported 124 vacancies in women’s residence halls in early February 1964. This was of crucial importance because the housing system’s financial stability was based on a high student occupancy rate. If vacancies occurred, it imperiled the internal system of financing and also endangered the prospect of building additional housing.

“The dormitory system may have to be changed…” the Daily Californian reported February 11, 1964. Even though the Regents anticipated 25 percent of undergraduates at Berkeley would ultimately be housed in campus housing, “There is no rule that all the dormitories have to be completed if the students do not want to move into them. [University administrator] Wilson said funds have only been appropriated for one additional residence hall unit. The new unit, to be completed in 1970, has not been designed yet, although it is expected to resemble the existing Units 1, 2 and 3. Even this does not have to be completed, Wilson said.”

The campus recognized changing factors in student attitudes and market conditions when it conducted a student housing market study, authorized in summer 1964, in partial response to residence hall vacancies and “to advise the administration and Regents on the kinds of residential units and the building types that should be constructed in the future.” It noted, “Students overwhelmingly listed ‘quiet for study’ as the factor most important to them in their overall housing satisfaction. Yet half of the student respondents who lived in University residence halls in 1963-64 rated ‘quiet for study’ as ‘fair’ or ‘poor’.”

An analysis by a University ad hoc committee on residence halls essentially acknowledged that the system of building cookie-cutter, double-bedroom, residence hall units should be re-thought; more diversity of housing types should be provided, particularly for single students; consideration should be given to housing that could be altered in the future as demand or markets changed; and rules

60 Daily Californian, February 17, 1964.
62 Regents minutes.
63 “Housing Problem Continues: Not All Women’s Dorms Full,” Daily Californian (February 11, 1964)
64 Ibid.
65 University Archives, President’s Office records, CU-5, Sec.8. 135:7, 600:10, Folder #1, Page IV-14, item b.1.
governing the life of students within the campus run student housing should be liberalized and minimized.\textsuperscript{66}

Regents and campus administrators became preoccupied with managing the immediate Free Speech political crisis as opposed to long-term planning. In this environment, residence hall construction and implementation of the 1962 Long Range Development Plan housing elements came to a halt. Instead of successively consolidating additional blocks for construction and commencing new projects, the campus retained portions of blocks and either moved temporary administrative or service operations to them, or rented out existing buildings as a prelude to demolishing them. For example, the site of Unit 4 (today's People's Park) was left as a block of about 25 single family homes and multi-unit properties where the campus simply rented out the buildings as they were purchased. The site of a fifth proposed unit, two blocks south of Unit 3 (the current Rochdale Village site), was not fully acquired.\textsuperscript{67}

These developments meant that the construction and opening of Unit 3 marked the end of a two decade era—mid-1940s to mid-1960s—of proposing, planning, and constructing high-rise, high-density, standardized residence halls at the Berkeley campus. Only a single “high rise” hall on the double-bedroom, double-loaded corridor, model was constructed after Unit 3; this was Manville Hall, a specialized dormitory for the Law School (since converted to office uses and renamed Simon Hall).

At the same time in 1965 that there were over 3,000 students in the residence halls and International House, the Greek system housed about 2,600 students and the boarding houses somewhere between 500 and 600.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, with Unit 3, the number of beds in the residence halls for the first time about equaled the beds in the Greek system and the traditional boarding houses, combined. University run group living was now a large and permanent counterpart to private living groups.\textsuperscript{69}

During the second half of the 1960s and through the 1970s, the campus undertook no major student housing construction or land acquisition for housing, with the exception of Manville Hall. The campus also relaxed housing management. Residence hall food service became entirely cafeteria style, and most of the residence hall rules of the 1950s-60s, such as dress codes, “lock-outs” and sign-out/sign-in systems, room checks to see if beds had been made, and restrictions on visits by members of the opposite sex, were eliminated, as was the original system of resident “house mothers,” who were replaced entirely with student “resident assistants.” The campus also converted all but two (Deutsch and Cheney) of the twelve high-rise halls to either alternating men’s and women’s floors, or full co-ed floors. Most of these changes can be assumed to be a response to changing student demand and market conditions.

In response to a housing crisis in the fall of 1979, the campus initiated two new policies for the residence halls. First, a system of “temporary” conversions of some double bedrooms to triples to provide more capacity was instituted. Second, students could no longer return to the residence hall system for another year simply by renewing their contracts.\textsuperscript{70} Instead, a portion of the residence hall beds were reserved for new/incoming students, who were regarded as the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in the housing market, and returning residents had to compete in a lottery system for the remaining spaces. Over time, this transitioned the residence halls from places where students could live for several years to accommodations generally for freshmen. A related consequence of this policy was an increased emphasis on support service programming within the residence halls.

\textsuperscript{66} University Archives, President’s office files, Cu-5, Ser. 9, 135:17
\textsuperscript{67} Steven Finacom.
\textsuperscript{68} Stadtman, Centennial Record, 104.
\textsuperscript{69} Steven Finacom.
\textsuperscript{70} Personal Communication, Steven Finacom, Capital Projects, UC Berkeley.
The Foothill and Clark Kerr projects were largely residence hall in type, but marked a different approach from the high-rise units. Instead of carbon-copy and standardized buildings on standardized rectangular sites, the new housing was inserted into existing buildings or designed for a complex hill site where each building had a different configuration. Suites became a preferred design style in these buildings, rather than double loaded, double-bedroom residence halls with one bathroom per floor.

In the 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century, there was an emphasis on constructing more flexible student apartments, rather than conventional residence hall spaces. Five single student apartment buildings were constructed—the new Manville, Channing-Bowditch, Ida Jackson Graduate House, Slottman Hall, and Towle Hall. Two infill residence halls were also built, in Units 1 and 2. In the private sector, the 1990s also saw a degree of renewed interest in the Greek system, although it remains a small percentage of the total student housing supply. Private sector developers also began to construct new, mid-rise, infill apartment buildings geared towards the student market in Downtown Berkeley.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
V. EVALUATION

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, resources over fifty years of age are eligible for listing in the National Register if they meet any one of the four criteria of significance and if they sufficiently retain historic integrity. However, resources under fifty years of age can be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance,” or if they are contributors to a potential historic district. National Register criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. There are four basic criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National Register. These criteria are:

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

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

Criterion C (Design/Construction): Properties 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): Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource can be considered significant on a national, state, or local level to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

In order for a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found significant under one or more of the following criteria:

- Criterion 1 (Events): Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

- Criterion 2 (Persons): Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- **Criterion 3 (Architecture):** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.

- **Criterion 4 (Information Potential):** Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

- Resources eligible for the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register of Historical Resources. \(^{72}\)

**Criterion A/1 (Event)**

Unit 3 Housing at 2400 Durant Avenue does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 for an association with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of local, state, or national history. The subject property was constructed during a large building campaign of high-rise residence hall complexes at UC Berkeley and throughout the University of California system during the early 1960s. At UC Berkeley, it was part of a campaign to provide University-owned off-campus housing that could house 25-percent of the student population. Together, the Units illustrate an approach to student housing that reflects higher education planning of the period. However, Unit 3 does not individually represent this context. It is associated as much with these patterns of local and regional history as Units 1 and 2 and residence halls constructed at other UC campuses during this period.

Unfavorable opinions toward large residence halls regarding the strict rules and relatively crowded conditions resulted in a decreased population of students living in the residence halls during the mid-1960s, and this consequently affected the financial viability of supporting the units and constructing additional ones. For financial, political, and social reasons, none of the planned additional units were built after Unit 3. Unit 3 did not, however, cause an end to the high-rise building program in and of itself. Indeed, the complex opened as these changes in attitude were already taking place.

In sum, Unit 3 does not make a significant contribution to social, political, and economic trends that were occurring in student housing during the 1960s such that it would be individually eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register. Because it represents the same context as Units 1 and 2, it may have been considered a contributing resource to a small historic district that included those units; however, Units 1 and 2 have lost a great deal of historic integrity and a district is no longer viable.

**Criterion B/2 (Person)**

Unit 3 Housing does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register under Criterion 2 (Person). The scope of this study did not allow any research to identify significant persons from history amongst Unit 3’s residents. Preliminary research has failed to suggest that any individual persons figured prominently enough in Unit 3 Housing’s development to qualify the building for listing under this criterion.

**Criterion C/3 (Design/Construction)**

Unit 3 Housing does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C or the California Register under Criterion 3. The design of Unit 3 follows the tenets set

---

forth by the University in the 1950 Dormitory Study. These guidelines represent the popular ideals of the era, including the concept of providing high-rise living in order to retain open space on confined lots; the general format of one Common Building surrounded by residence halls; and the prescribed social, academic, and living spaces within each building.

John Carl Warnecke and Associates modeled Unit 3’s design after Warnecke’s earlier designs of Units 1 and 2, which earned design accolades when they were constructed. Though Unit 3 resembled the first two Units and included the indoor-outdoor connection of spaces so highly regarded in the Unit 1 and 2 designs, the details of Unit 3’s design are much simplified compared to the earlier projects’ creative use of concrete screens and pagoda-like Common Building roof. Thus, it does not stand out in association with Warnecke as one of his most distinguishable works. It also does not appear to be significant for its use of New Formalist style vocabulary. The site plan and building designs follow the ideals of residence hall living at UC Berkeley and other college campuses in California during the late 1950s and early 1960s, but it does not rise to a level of individual significance for this reason that would make it eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register.

**Criterion D/4 (Information Potential)**

The analysis of Unit 3 Housing for eligibility under Criterion 4 (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report. The “potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area” typically relates to archeological resources, rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the building itself is the principal source of important construction-related information. Based on historic research, this criterion is not applicable to Unit 3 Housing.

**INTEGRITY**

In order to qualify for listing in the California Register, a property must possess significance under one of the aforementioned criteria and have historic integrity. The process of determining integrity is similar for both the California Register and the National Register. The same seven variables or aspects that define integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association—are used to evaluate a resource’s eligibility for listing in the California Register and the National Register. According to the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, these seven characteristics are defined as follows:

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

Unit 3 Housing retains integrity of location and setting. It is situated on its original lot, and the surrounding Southside neighborhood remains characterized by residential, commercial, and off-campus University uses. The property has undergone few known exterior alterations since its construction in 1961-64 and retains integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. It remains in use as a UC Berkeley residence hall and dining commons complex with associated social, academic, and living spaces, and therefore retains integrity of feeling and association. Overall the property retains a high degree of architectural integrity.

CITY OF BERKELEY LANDMARKS

The City of Berkeley maintains a local register of historic resources that is managed by the City of Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission.73 The purpose of this commission is to “…recognize, preserve, and prevent the unnecessary destruction or impairment of structures, sites, and areas of special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value.” Potential resources may be designated as landmarks or historic districts under at least one of the following criteria, which are as follows:

1. Architectural merit:
   a. Property that is the first, last, only, or most significant architectural property of its type in the region;
   b. Properties that are prototypes of or outstanding examples of periods, styles, architectural movements or construction, or examples of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of an architect, designer or master builder; or
   c. Architectural examples worth preserving for the exceptional values they add as part of the neighborhood fabric.

2. Cultural value: Structures, sites and areas associated with the movement or evolution of religious, cultural, governmental, social and economic developments of the City;

3. Educational value: Structures worth preserving for their usefulness as an educational force;

4. Historic value: Preservation and enhancement of structures, sites and areas that embody and express the history of Berkeley/Alameda County/California/United States. History may be social, cultural, economic, political, religious or military;

5. Any property which is listed on the National Register described in Section 470A of Title 16 of the United States Code.

---

73 City of Berkeley Municipal Code, Title 3 Boards, Commissions and Committees, Chapter 3.24 Landmarks Preservation Commission.
BERKELEY LANDMARK EVALUATION

Unit 3 appears individually eligible for listing as a Berkeley Landmark.

1. Architectural Merit
Unit 3 Housing was the last architectural property of its type constructed by the University of California in Berkeley. It represents a specific period, style, and overarching design movement for high-rise student residence halls in the Southside neighborhood during the early 1960s. Its site plan and building designs reflect mid-century ideals of residence hall living at UC Berkeley. Though it was designed in a simplified vocabulary compared to Units 1 and 2, it is today the best surviving residence hall work by John Carl Warnecke and Associates in the City of Berkeley. Thus, because it is the only remaining complex of the three Units to retain integrity to its original site design, it appears locally significant under this criterion.

2. Cultural Value
Based on the historic context, Unit 3 Housing does not appear to individually represent religious, cultural, governmental, social or economic developments in the City of Berkeley.

3. Educational Value
Unit 3 Housing does not appear to clearly represent a historic context that would provide educational value to the public.

4. Historic Value
Unit 3 Housing expresses an important period in the history of Berkeley’s Southside neighborhood. Its historical importance lies within its architectural/design merit, as described in Criterion 1. In addition, the construction of Units 1, 2, and 3 on previously residential blocks affected the physical environment of the Southside neighborhood, which is locally significant. The development of Unit 3 replaced several private residences for students and non-students on smaller land parcels, thus representing the consolidation of land for University use and contributing to a permanent change in the Southside’s character. Lastly, Unit 3 represents a specific historical period within the City of Berkeley that was characterized by UC Berkeley’s desire to house more students during a time of baby boomer student population growth.

5. National Register Listing
Unit 3 Housing is not listed in the National Register described in Section 470A of Title 16 of the United States Code, and is therefore not eligible for Berkeley Landmark status under this criterion.

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

For a property to be eligible for designation, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must typically be evident. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials. The character-defining features of Unit 3 Housing include:

- Site plan organization consisting of low center building surrounded by four high-rise buildings at the edges of the parcel;
- Landscape design, including open space at north side of the Common Building; large sunken courtyard to the south of the Common Building; smaller courtyards at the edges of the parcel, adjacent to residence hall “living rooms;” and a variety of mature trees, including a palm tree east of Ida Sproul Hall that pre-dates the construction of the Unit 3 complex;
- Rectangular one-story massing of the Common Building and rectangular high-rise massing of the residence halls;
- Vertical emphasis of the high-rise buildings via full-height pilasters and punched window openings;
- Features of mid-century architectural design and construction, including:
  - Reinforced concrete construction and flat roofs on all buildings;
  - Full-height decorative concrete wall panels on the street-facing facades and ends of emergency stairwells;
  - Flat concrete awnings at the rooflines of the residence halls;
  - Recessed square skylights on the roofs of the covered walkways around the Common Building.
VI. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

In order for the Unit 3 Housing complex to retain integrity through the construction process, we recommend that the character-defining features described above be retained or altered in a way that is compatible with the historic character of the property. In addition to the following recommendations, all new work should comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Site Plan

- Maintain existing site plan organization and spatial relationships between the four high-rise residence halls and the center Common Building. Because the organization of the site is primary to the property’s significance, large new construction between these buildings is not recommended.

- Removal of the existing bicycle storage building at the east end of the site is acceptable, and construction of small one-story accessory buildings would not impact the overall character of the site.

Landscape Design

- Maintain the general organization and built features of the courtyards, such as retaining walls and planters.

- Exposed aggregate walkways with smooth concrete borders should be retained or replaced to match. New walkways or paving may be introduced if they respect the spatial relationships between courtyards and buildings.

- Replacement of existing guardrails or new guardrails should match the character of the existing railings.

- Site furnishings, such as benches, picnic tables, bike racks, and light standards, may be replaced or relocated.

- Retain all healthy mature trees, with special attention to the palm tree east of Ida Sproul Hall. Other plantings may be replaced. We recommend that a professional arborist examine the health of mature trees as part of consideration for removal.

- We recommend referring to John Carl Warnecke’s Planting Plan (revised 28 October 1963) as a guide to hardscape design, planting location and plant type.

Massing

- We recommend that any alterations or additions do not impact the overall low-rise character of the Common Building. A partial or full one-story addition may be acceptable.

- Alterations should not alter the tall rectangular form of the high-rise residence halls.

Architectural Features and Character: Common Building

- We recommend retaining the flat roof on the Common Building, as well as the overhanging roofs above the covered perimeter walkways. Recessed square skylights on the roofs of the covered walkways around the Common Building should be retained or replaced in kind.

- Storefronts and doors may be modified within the existing glazed sections of the facades. In other words, solid walls should remain solid, glass walls should remain glass, but window
systems may be modified to accommodate fully glazed doors, if needed. All new metal doors and storefront systems should match the original in profile, character, and color.

- The interior of the building does not contribute to the building's significance and is not considered a character-defining feature. Therefore, the existing organization may be modified as needed.

**Architectural Features and Character: Residence Halls**

- Maintain the vertical emphasis of the high-rise buildings by retaining their full-height pilasters and punched window openings.

- Existing windows may be replaced with new sliding windows to match the character and color of the original. Window material may be changed if needed.

- We recommend retaining the flat roofs and flat concrete awnings on all residence hall buildings, as well as the full-height decorative concrete wall panels on the street-facing facades and ends of emergency stairwells of the residence halls. In-set windows within the decorative concrete wall panels may be replaced in kind.

- The storefront systems at main entrances do not appear original and may be modified or replaced with new metal storefront systems. Anodized aluminum storefront systems at ground-floor lounges should be retained or replaced in kind.

- The balconies and balcony guardrails on the interior-facing facades should also be retained or rebuilt to match the original profiles. Likewise, the stairwell landings and railings at the end facades should be retained or rebuilt to match existing.

- The interior of the buildings do not contribute to the complex’s significance and are not considered character-defining features. Therefore, the existing organization may be modified as needed.

- All new structural work should be concealed within the buildings and not exposed on the exterior.
VII. CONCLUSION

Constructed from 1961 to 1964 as a residence hall complex to house 800 UC Berkeley students, Unit 3 Housing does not appear to rise to a level of significance that would make it eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register. However, it does appear significant at the local level and eligible for listing as a Berkeley Landmark as an example of a mid-century residence hall complex design that was associated with social, cultural, political, and economic forces within the UC Berkeley and City of Berkeley housing environment. It retains a high degree of architectural integrity, whereas the overall site designs of Units 1 and 2 have been altered, and is thus the best representation of the design concept originally used for all three Units. Unit 3 Housing would therefore be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.
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