

BERKELEY ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE ASSOCIATION

THE BAHHA NEWSLETTER

FALL 2007-
WINTER 2008
NO. 127

"GREEN" NUMBER

Retaining and Restoring
What We Already Have

Historic Preservation has
always been **GREEN**



THE BAH NEWSLETTER

No. 127

FALL 2007-WINTER 2008



ENNOR'S "ORIGINAL"

C O N T E N T S

ENNOR'S "ALTERED"

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---------|
| Call for Nominations _____ | page 2 | Retaining & Restoring (<i>cover story</i>) _____ | page 6 |
| Richard Moe is Coming to Town! _____ | page 3 | Membership News _____ | page 11 |
| President's Message _____ | page 4 | Calendar of Events _____ | page 12 |



COVER: Ennor's Building (James W. Plachek, Architect, 1922), 2128 Center Street, "in progress." Photo by Daniella Thompson, February 2008. See story, page 6. ABOVE: Ennor's soon after it was built. Plachek Collection, BAH Archives. Ennor's in 1979, after several so-called "improvements." Betty Marvin photo.

CALL FOR PRESERVATION AWARDS NOMINATIONS

AWARDS
PRESENTATION
TO BE HELD
THURSDAY,
MAY 29



Koerber Building, College & Ashby, awarded last year.
Before: Anthony Bruce. After: Daniella Thompson.

BAHA invites the nomination of outstanding projects that have renewed the life of historic properties and neighborhoods in the city of Berkeley. Entries will be judged according to such criteria as aesthetic quality, historical significance, and contribution to the fabric of the city. Each nomination should include the project's address, the dates of the preservation work, the names and telephone numbers of the nominator, owner, architect or landscape architect, contractor, and engineer, as well as historical information regarding the site and a description of the project that explains the reason for its nomination. All projects must be located within Berkeley and have been completed between April 2007 and March 2008. Please include photographs, ideally showing "before and after."

Please submit nominations by April 1, 2008. Documents should be sent to BAH, P.O. Box 1137, Berkeley, California 94701, or, by e-mail, to baha@berkeleyheritage.com, or brought to the office at 2318 Durant Avenue. Winners will be awarded certificates at the BAH Annual Meeting, to be held on May 29.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Carrie Olson,
President
Jane Edginton,
Program Vice-President
Austene Hall,
Preservation Vice-President
Jerry Sulliger,
Corporate Secretary
Stephanie Manning,
Treasurer

Laurie Bright
Susan Cerny
Susan Chase
Richard Ehrenberger
Steve Finacom
James Grandison
Tim Hansen
Michael Kelly
John McBride
Richard Pettler
Sally Sachs
Arlene Silk
Janice Thomas
Daniella Thompson
Anne Wagley

STAFF

Anthony Bruce
Lesley Emmington Jones

The **BAHA Newsletter** is published quarterly by the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association and is sent to all members of the Association. Entire contents of this issue © 2008 by the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, P.O. Box 1137, Berkeley, California 94701. tel: 510-841-2242; e-mail: baha@berkeleyheritage.com; website: www.berkeleyheritage.com.

Produced February 2008. Next Newsletter, the Annual House Tour Number, due to be mailed in April...

THE SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE:

President Richard Moe is Coming to Town



BERKELEY is categorically a “green” town as its citizens voted for Measure G in the last election and the elected officials are crafting policies accordingly:

“...the People of the City of Berkeley have a goal of 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050...” (Measure G).

While the issue of “sustainability” is of concern to everyone, in every town and in all quarters — one of the serious, open challenges of our time — preservation planning does not yet seem to be a high consideration in our own hometown mix.

Thus, BAHA is excited to announce that Richard Moe, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, is coming to Berkeley to deliver a significant address “Sustainable Stewardship: Historic Preservation’s Essential Role in Fighting Climate Change.” This will be Mr. Moe’s only public visit in the Bay Area, a gathering on March 27 in Maybeck’s great auditorium at the 1st Church of Christ, Scientist.

Mr. Moe’s message is for everyone, not just preservationists. As a preview, we are reprinting here his “President’s Note” from the May-June National Trust for Historic Preservation magazine, *Preservation*:

“In the early days of our movement, preservation efforts were motivated largely by the *cultural* values associated with the homes of the Founding Fathers and other iconic landmarks that functioned as shrines where visitors could refresh their patriotism and become better citizens. Later, the emphasis shifted to *economics*, highlighting preservation’s value as a tool for reinvestment in and revitalization of older neighborhoods. More recently, we’ve highlighted preservation’s social benefits by showing how it makes for more livable communities.

“Each of these represents an important phase in the continuing maturation of the American preservation movement. Now we must take the next step. At a time of increasing concern about such issues as climate change and the depletion of natural resources, we must work hard to strengthen and publicize the connections between preservation and sustainable development.

“For most of us, this is a no-brainer. Many of our especially ardent supporters joined our ranks from the environmental movement because they realized that preservation is, as has often been said, “the ultimate recycling.” Nor is it a new issue for the National Trust:

Longtime members will recall that our 1980 Preservation Week poster featured a gas can in the shape of an old building — a reminder that reusing an existing building, instead of demolishing it and replacing it with a new one, is one good way to conserve energy.

“But while many of us already understand that preservation must be an integral part of any effort to encourage environmental responsibility and sustainable development, this message hasn’t been effectively conveyed to our colleagues in other fields or to the general public. Most recent efforts by the green community, for instance, place heavy emphasis on new technology rather than on tried-and-true preservation practices whose value has already been demonstrated in thousands of communities. Our job is to show everyone that preservation is good for the environment. Our message, in words that I wish I’d thought of first, is that the greenest building is one that already exists.

“Work on this initiative is already underway. The Trust is part of a coalition (with the American Institute of Architects, the Association for Preservation Technology International, and the National Park Service) that will develop strategies for making preservation a fully viable option in green building practices. We’ll also launch a research effort to quantify such concepts as the “embodied energy” in existing structures and the environmental impact of adding more demolition and construction debris to already-crowded landfills...”

Do LOOK for your announcement in the mail, tell your friends, and JOIN us on March 27th!!



PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

To: BAHA Members From: Carrie Olson, President

The “green” theme of the Newsletter can only scratch the surface of a big subject. BAHA is excited and proud to be sponsoring Richard Moe’s visit this month to the Bay Area to address the topic—we hope most of you can come! Below you will find the text of a letter BAHA sent on February 1st to the Planning Coordinator of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) regarding the proposed Helios Research Facility project. It is a comment letter on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). If the project is built in Strawberry Canyon, along with the proposed Computational Research and Theory Facility, we will all suffer the loss of a valuable historic landscape and one of our most significant green assets. The letter begins here, with two quotes...

...[Piedmont Way is] extended eastwardly to the mouth of the valley [Strawberry Canyon] or gorge in the mountains, which is a part of the property of the College. This lane is extended up the gorge, first, however, crossing to the other side. Thence it is intended to follow up the course of the brook, as close upon its banks as is practicable, until the point is reached at which the branch enters from the left. There the lane should fork, being carried up the branch to the left with such curves as will be necessary to reach the small table land. From this it would return on the left bank of the southerly branch of the stream to the main stem, crossing near the fork by a bridge. There should be a convenient stopping-place for carriages upon the table-land from which a walk should be formed to the highest point of the knoll around which the lane passes. At this point there is a very interesting view through the gorge and out upon the Bay, and it would be a suitable place for a small summer-house or pavilion. The lane within the gorge would have to be formed by excavation on the hillside and a thick plantation should be carefully established on the upper slope so as to confine attention to the damp ravine below and the opposite bank, which to a considerable height is abundantly covered with native foliage of a very beautiful character. As the road follows a stream of water from the open landscape of the bay region into the midst of the mountains, it offers a great change of scenery within a short distance, and will constitute a unique and most valuable appendage to the general local attractions of the neighborhood.”

— Frederick Law Olmsted, 1865

...It [University property] is in area 200 acres, is watered by numerous springs in the hills, and the collection and disposal of this will furnish hereafter abundant study and practice to the engineering student. With the spring water and surface water saved, the grounds [Campus site] could be thoroughly irrigated throughout the year, and made to blossom as the rose... Beyond, toward the Monte Diablo Range, the ground rises into hills, the highest of which is 884 feet above the base of the south college. The average height of the tract is 400 feet above tide-water. The hilly portion could be well utilized for forestry. The University is supplied with water from a reservoir of 38,000 gallons capacity, situated at the foot of Strawberry Cañon, and at an elevation of 205 feet above the basement of the south college. It will carry water entirely over any building contemplated. Other springs of large resources will be reclaimed and brought in from time to time. Strawberry Creek is for a large portion of the year a beautifully clear stream; during the winter it discharges an enormous quantity of water, and runs between the steep banks ten to fifteen feet in depth, and with a span from thirty to one hundred feet. Along it are found many shady, quiet nooks, gracious to the scholar, philosopher, and naturalist. The soil of the lower portion of the site is a deep, rich adobe, capable of being wrought into a soil of great productiveness; on the plateau it is a lighter kind. On the hills there is a thin soil of decomposed shale rock, etc. It would be difficult to find within so small an area as the University site a spot with so many varieties and capabilities in the way of soils, irrigation, and exposure.”

— Frank Soulé, Jr., 1875

Dear Jeff Philliber:

The Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA), an organization dedicated “to educate the community to encourage and secure the preservation of those structures, sites, and areas which have special architectural, historic, or aesthetic value contributing to the enrichment of the Berkeley environment and to the understanding of its heritage,” and representing over 1200 members, urges the Regents of the University of California (University) to re-consider placement of the Helios project in Strawberry Canyon. The University’s own beginnings in the 1860s were predicated upon the discovery that Strawberry Canyon had a bounty of water so wonderful and a landscape so grand that the grassy plains below provided the ideal site for an institution of higher learning for the State of California. Yet, the DEIR for the Helios project fails to adequately acknowledge Strawberry Canyon as a unique cultural landscape, opposite the Golden Gate, revealing significant historical events (“it is not clear that it has characteristics that would warrant nomination...” DEIR 4.4-1). The DEIR, likewise, fails to elucidate the potential impacts that the Helios project would have upon the integrity of the Canyon and its historic environment, nor does the DEIR put forth project alternatives truly feasible off the LBNL hill site.

To begin, it should be noted that the DEIR excludes relevant information concerning the common boundary between Strawberry Canyon’s “urban forest” of today and the University of California Campus with its surrounding residential neighborhoods.

In 1865, when Frederick Law Olmsted laid out his vision for the first Campus plan and for the Berkeley Property neighborhood he foresaw a natural divide between the “civilized” Campus buildings and homes, built upon the sloping contours of a new townscape, and the beautiful terrain of the Canyon’s steep ravine. Indeed, over the last 100 years an urban interface has developed distinguished by some of the finest examples of the San Francisco Bay Tradition architecture. Most immediately, Bowles Hall, the University of California Memorial Stadium, and the Panoramic Hill Historic District, each, listed on the National Register of Historic Places and contributing significantly to this shared sense of place, are enhanced by and enhance the powerful presence of the Canyon’s landscape. In accordance with the obligation to recognize impacts that might adversely affect environmental resources, please address the following:

- The DEIR for the Helios project lacks a definition and adequate analysis of the interface between Strawberry Canyon and the adjacent significant historic resources (specifically Bowles Hall, Stadium, and Panoramic Hill), inclusive of the Central Campus “Classical Core” and the Landscape Master Plan, and;
- In light of the context of the adjacent historic environment and the Campus cultural landscape when/who/ what gives the Molecular Foundry building (approved without the benefit of an EIR) and/or the “Redwood cluster” merit to be the standard for design guidelines for the Helios project? Please give an adequate explanation, even if based upon 2006 LBNL LRDP, and;
- Does not the cumulative size, massing, materials and design of the proposed Helios project coupled with the Molecular Foundry building promise to dominate and, thus, have significant, unmitigating effects upon the distinct adjacent historic Campus/urban environment below (the view analysis is not adequate)? Please adequately analyze.

The Helios DEIR also excludes relevant discussion concerning the shared interface between Strawberry Canyon and the East Bay Regional Park District, founded in 1934. The Park District, the largest urban park in the United States, expanding across the eastern ridges of Coast Range, protects and preserves a wealth of natural resources for the benefit of future generations. In 1930, the University sponsored the “Report on Proposed Park Reservations for East Bay Cities” (Olmsted Brothers, Landscape Architects, and Ansel Hall, National Park Service), under the direction of Professor Samuel C. May, Bureau of Public Administration, advocating the establishment of these vast parklands. Strawberry Canyon, then, was largely viewed as a contiguous natural landscape, save the 19th and early 20th century introduction of the eucalyptus trees, the newly located Botanical Garden, and the Stephen Mather Grove. The “Olmsted-Hall Report” reflected the long held vision of Oakland/Berkeley planners (see Werner Hagemann, *Report on a City Plan for the Municipalities of Oakland and Berkeley*, 1915) that canyons and creeks were to be properly planned as parkway areas “extending out into the hills” with a seamless boundary. Strawberry Canyon remains a significant historic landscape serving as the single visible “urban forest” corridor or gateway—opposite the Golden Gate—connecting the watershed territories of the nine East Bay counties and the urban density of the East Bay.

Growing concern for the environmental health of Strawberry Canyon began as a result of WWII activity and continued development for research, educational, recreational, and parking facilities. The incremental loss of integrity to the historic landscape, including compromise of the watershed, has not gone unnoticed by the University prior to this date. The University took action in 1968 to designate Ecological Study Areas (ESA) toward “...the guiding principle in the development of Strawberry Canyon and the Hill Campus should be...maximum use consistent with conservation of native values.” It would appear to be an obligation that the LBNL environmental review for the Helios project include those internal University reports that have discussed development in the Canyon. These reports/studies do not concur with the statement in the Helios DEIR “...The proposed project is consistent with this changing and ongoing pattern of development in the area” (4.4-2). For instance, see the 1976 report by Garrett Eckbo & Associates for the University’s Office of Architects & Engineers, “Strawberry Canyon, A Land Use and Vegetative Management Study.” To quote the conclusion of the Eckbo Study:

...The larger question, which is central in these recommendations, is that whoever uses the Canyon area, for whatever purposes and in whatever part of it; and whoever looks at or into the Canyon from outside, or passes through or over it; are all experiencing it as a total landscape structure or complex, a total people/nature artifact. Its impact on all of these experiences, visually and through the other senses, is one of its primary functions. Therefore we have viewed the Canyon as a potential work of landscape art, including and transcending all of its multiple technical, functional and cultural aspects. We believe that the comprehensive view will enhance relations between all of these component aspects, and improve each one. Institutional uses cannot expand much beyond their current areas...

(continued on page 10)

RETAINING AND RESTORING

What We Already Have

A RECENT ARTICLE entitled “Mayor Speaks at Boalt Hall on Plans for Downtown Berkeley” could set the stage for an awakening in City Hall. Mayor Bates is quoted in the article with an observation and question that is rather timely:

“The biggest concern is that the plan [UC-Berkeley Downtown Plan] is not reality-based...Once you buy the property and tear down the building, which most of the time you have to do, the costs are so high. We need to reflect on that—what we planned, can we do?”—*The Daily Californian*, Feb. 20, 2008

“Can we do?” With the passage of Measure G, committing us to set goals to reduce greenhouse gases, this is, indeed, an opportune time to reflect, change course, and recognize that retaining and restoring *is* reality-based, proven to stimulate reinvestment, create revitalization, and offer “green” solutions.

Acknowledgement in City Hall that the current policies for development may no longer “pencil out” would be significant. The trend has been to promote the “smart growth” formula that goes: buy, tear down, maximize bulk and density for new condos, and utilizing new (inferior) materials. But now, not only has the demolition scenario become questionable financially, it raises global warming questions. With each demolition we waste materials and products that have already been produced—embodied energy—and then we are forced to start over consuming new resources.

Berkeley’s Measure G may seem revolutionary, but, in fact, it is preceded by Governor Schwarzenegger’s Executive Order (2005) and the Global Warming Solutions Act (2006, SB32), both designed to slash California’s greenhouse gas pollution by 80% or more, by 2050, to avoid disastrous climate change. Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa of Los Angeles has proposed to meet this challenge by mandating that all new development projects in Los Angeles be reviewed using the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to “expressly require global warming analysis.” Demolition and land fill would be impacts that would require analysis.

If we follow Mayor Bates’ musings to reflect upon the potential for economic failure and folly when an irreplaceable building resource is demolished, such reflection should come easily. Berkeley is loved for being one of those special older California cities that *still* has a sense of place, enhanced by a spectacular natural setting. Its well-designed buildings are everywhere, in every neighborhood, making Berkeley livable, attractive for thriving businesses, and a regional draw for visitors. Reflection should not be painful for developers either. Time and again, throughout the Bay Area, rehabilitation, restoration, adaptive reuse, and/or additions to older buildings have proven to bring new vitality to a streetscape, a neighborhood, and an area.

So, wouldn’t it be beneficial if City Hall (including Planning Commission, Zoning Adjustments Board, and Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC)), together with the citizenry, adopted preservation planning as an essential tool to both stimulate healthy investment opportunities and meet the goals of Measure G toward achieving a sustainable environment?

In the meantime, demolition permits continue to be issued in Berkeley for buildings that have attractive architectural features, cultural history, and usable and reusable materials, all contributing to the city’s assets. Painful though it may be, here is a partial list of demolitions, proposed and/or ready to proceed:

• **Brennan’s** (John P. Brennan, builder, 1959), 700 University Avenue.

Demolition application approved for a 171-unit infill project. Brennan’s can best be described as a Vernacular Corner Bar—a large workingman’s bar/restaurant of the type once easily found in the industrial sections of every American city, but rarely seen today. Designed to be non-descript on the exterior, the interior features a central bar brought from a 19th century bar/restaurant in San Francisco’s Mission district. Although a local and regional cultural resource, the LPC denied landmark designation due to its plain exterior. Upon demolition, the restaurant is to move

into the Southern Pacific Station (State Architect's Office, 1913).

Because of the economic downturn, there is some question as to whether the project will proceed as proposed. An alternative would be to incorporate Brennan's into a mixed-use project (with 2nd floor), including restoration of the City Landmark SP Station for a proper Berkeley Amtrak station.



The Joe Donham Willys Showroom, set in the center of an open lot, was designed to catch the eye of passing motorists with a three-sided circular showroom faced with slanting windows and crowned by an upswept roof.

Daniella Thompson photo, 2006.

• **Joe Donham Willys Showroom** (William Henry Wisheropp, Jr., designer, 1952), 2747 San Pablo Avenue.

Demolition application approved to make way for a 39-unit condominium infill project. The Willys Showroom is an outstanding example of Mid-Century Modern Roadside Architecture, affectionately known as Googie. This style is recognized by its bold, upswept rooflines and large expanses of glass. In the mid-1960s, the building was adapted by Oakland Oaks basketball star Jim Hadnot for use as a liquor store. Currently it is a medical cannabis dispensary. The LPC denied landmark designation, although comparable examples of roadside architecture have been placed on the National Register of Historic Places. Recently a Googie-style Denny's in Seattle was landmarked, supported by the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, in spite of intentions to develop condos on that property.

Again, the current economic climate may mean the Willys building will not be demolished. A reassessment of the property could save the building and its Googie architecture.

• **San Pablo Florist and Nursery** (E. Neil Clintsman, Jr., builder, 1947), 1800 San Pablo Avenue.

Demolished, December 2007, to construct another 51-unit condominium infill project on San Pablo's "transit corridor" (termed so, to qualify for "smart growth" entitlements). This corner shop was one of Berkeley's most distinctive examples of Streamline Moderne. It was built after World War II by the Nabetas Family upon their release from Internment Camp. The Nabetas were part of the early Japanese-American flower-growing community in the East Bay. In the 1990s, the property was converted into an auto repair business, a regional draw along San Pablo. The LPC failed to initiate it. Before demolition, the San Pablo Florist and Nursery was acclaimed in California's Japantown Survey for its association with significant members of the Japanese American community.

With the faltering economy and unstable financing (City Council deferred fee payments) the project may be in question. An alternative to demolition could have been to in-fill the open nursery area and retain the distinctive and historic shop building as an anchor.



The San Pablo Florist and Nursery displayed stylized horizontal lines and other fashionable features of the Streamline Moderne, emphasized by a seamless curving corner, a flat overhang faced with aluminum bands, slanting display windows, and an entrance delineated by a glass block surround. It utilized the surrounding property for the nursery grounds. Daniella Thompson, 2006.



This one-story Queen Anne Cottage above a half-story raised basement is typical of a working man's house, placed on a small "urban" rectangular lot, that was once prolific in Victorian Era neighborhoods in the East Bay. It has a projecting front bay, high cut-away recessed porch, and no single roof line under oversized gables. 1964 image, Donogh File, BAHA Archives.

• **Ellen Blood-Perry Tompkins House** (R. Gray Frise, architect, 1891), 2526 Durant Avenue.

Demolition application approved, for an oversized 5-story, 40-plus-unit housing infill project to be conditional on house moving agreement. The Blood House is one of the few residential survivors of the 19th Century College Homestead Tract south of the University. Built as a grand Queen Anne with an adjacent garden lot, it was altered by Duncan McDuffie's senior financial partner to contribute to a high-fashion urban Southside streetscape in the early part of the 20th Century. Recognizing the place the house plays in the historic fabric of the Southside, the LPC designated it a Structure of Merit and denied a demolition permit. After almost 8 years of public discussion, the Council approved the demolition permit in February. The building is underused, neglected, and the garden site has been converted to a parking lot.

BAHA participated in trying to influence a preservation alternative by working with Mark Gillam, AIA, to design a project retaining and altering the Blood House to co-exist with new infill units placed on the former garden site. The Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) accepted the alternative, but, with passage of time, new ZAB members and Planning Staff buried the alternative. The City Council did not set a public hearing for Appeals filed by BAHA, the ASUC, and individuals.

• **May S. McDonald House** ([S. S. Quakenbush, designer?] c. 1897), 3100 Shattuck Avenue.

Demolition application pending for replacement multi-unit housing. This modest Queen Anne Cottage on a small corner lot on Shattuck at Prince Street was built on the streetcar "red line." The trolley stop at Ashby had stimulated the construction of a cluster of homes and businesses, hence, in 1892, annexation of the district to the city of Berkeley. The McDonald House contributes to the Ashby Station Streetcar Suburb, encircled by Ashby-Martin Luther King, Jr. Way-Woolsey-Shattuck, identified by the State Office of Historic Preservation as being eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Expressed concern for the McDonald House, as significant in a historic neighborhood, has stalled the demolition application. It has been suggested that the McDonald house be raised, as was successfully done to the Victorian next door, to provide an additional story, to not only preserve the owner's multi-housing investment, but to also preserve an irreplaceable historic asset for the city.



The Blood House on its streetscape in the 1950s. R. Gray Frise is noted for designing other grand Queen Anne Victorians in the early 1890s in Oakland. While the characteristic high gable roofs still define the house, the exterior was altered by second owners, Perry and Xora Tompkins, to reflect the Revival styles of the 1920s. Donogh File, BAHA Archives.

• **Berkeley High School Gymnasium** (William C. Hays, 1922; Walter H. Ratcliff, Jr., 1929; Thomas Franklin Chace, 1936) 1920 Allston Way.

Demolition application approved by Berkeley Unified School District (BUSD) for unclear plans, including to construct new classrooms and/or a new city pool complex, possibly somewhere else, if supported by a Bond measure in the next election. The Gym, contributing to one of the first high school campus plans developed in this country and an early example of a sophisticated physical education facility with 2 pools, 3 gyms, locker rooms, classrooms, practice rooms, and playing fields, was designed, redesigned and added to, and retrofitted by three of Berkeley's greats in architecture. It is a designated Landmark and, along with the BHS Campus, has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places.



Designed by architects schooled in the Beaux Arts tradition, the Gym was detailed with handsome architectural features and sited on Milvia Street to contribute to a civic streetscape, as well as to enhance the neighborhood scale, and, then, to open out to an expanse of playing field, as shown in this view from the 1930s. BAHA Archives.

The Gym has needed restoration for years. In 2002 the citizens of Berkeley voted for Bond monies to restore one of its pools— Warm Water Pool—a task not yet undertaken. Because of legal efforts of Friends Protecting Berkeley Resources, BUSD is required to hold an architectural charrette to review alternatives to demolition. The charrette is scheduled to occur in March. Retaining and restoring the Gym would meet the goals of Measure G!



In this rendering provided by the developer, one can see how the classic details of the original Ennor's Building—such as the parapet wall with cornice—will be restored. With its planned expanse of glass, the building will once again be a lively and exciting presence on Center Street. See other pictures of the Ennor's Building on page 2 and on the cover of this Newsletter. Rendering courtesy Patrick Kennedy.

• **Ennor's** (James W. Plachek, architect, 1922)
2128 Center St.

Retaining and restoring under construction to re-establish a downtown restaurant with the addition of an open bar to stimulate night life. Ennor's began as one of the city's distinguished restaurants, then served as a branch location for Breuner's furniture store, and more recently as Act I & II. Designed by one of Berkeley's most prolific early 20th Century architects, the building reflected the classic downtown architectural style of the time, providing then, as now, commercial space for trade and foot traffic along a busy and attractive streetscape. Several years ago the 2100 block of Center Street was enhanced with trees and street furniture through a joint University-City planning effort. Ennor's is a designated Landmark, by request of the owner.

The conversion of the Ennor's building into a restaurant, once again, would appear to be a good reinvestment in a handsome, usable resource that is centrally placed in a popular downtown location. Other food and restaurant businesses thrive on the same block. By seeking landmark status, the developer, will be able to gain a considerable reduction on property tax by utilizing the Mills Act.

(continued from page 5)

The Eckbo Study is not the only report meriting public discussion in the EIR process if a fair argument is to be made regarding the location of the Helios project on an LBNL hill site. In accordance with the obligation to recognize impacts that might adversely impact Strawberry Canyon, please address the following:

- The Eckbo Study discusses the health of the Canyon, based on thorough consultation, recommending that institutional uses not expand substantially. The massive size, infrastructure, footprint, and cumulative impacts of the Helios project, and the completed “Redwood cluster,” would suggest a far greater impact than any use the Eckbo Report contemplated. An adequate analysis is needed of the comparative conclusions of the DEIR and the Eckbo Study made 30 years ago of potential detrimental effect upon the Canyon, and;
- Note the “UC Berkeley Hill Campus Working Paper, A Study in Support of the 2020 Long Range Development Plan,” December 2002, Co-Chaired by Beth Burnside, Vice Chancellor for Research, and Tom Lollini, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Physical and Environmental Planning, does not appear to advocate institutional expansion in the location of the proposed Helios project. Again, please give adequate analysis, and;
- The value and purpose of the ESA designation needs to be presented in the Helios DEIR vis.a.vis Helios potential impacts. The standing recommendations for ESA expansion, management, and preservation are ignored and disregarded by the LBNL environmental review, including that the location of the Helios project would have significant, unmitigating effects. Again, please give adequate analysis.

Since first learning of LBNL’s intent to expand further on the LBNL hill site, BAHA has dedicated its own research and membership activities toward gaining a greater understanding of the Strawberry Canyon landscape. Please find BAHA materials included here reflecting these endeavors. Also, please find included here copies of BAHA’s letters of concern and comment regarding the LBNL expansion plans.

BAHA supports the timely motion made by the Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), a California Certified Local Government entitlement under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, when they made comment on the 2006 LBNL Long Range Development Plans DEIR:

It is the considered assessment of the LPC that 1) the Strawberry Canyon Area is a potential Cultural Landscape and that it merits documentation as such; 2) because the Strawberry Canyon Area may be eligible for designation as a Cultural Landscape, the Draft Environmental Impact Report is inadequate as it does not acknowledge the adverse impacts that the proposed development(s) might cause to significantly change the natural setting and particular features of this irreplaceable resource; 3) Significant alteration of the Strawberry Canyon Area may not be mitigable, and, therefore, alternatives, including alternative sites for the proposed development(s), need to be identified and analyzed in the EIR.

It would seem that the LBNL environmental review for the Helios project is not sufficient until a cultural landscape report is prepared.

The obligation to undertake a cultural landscape report for Strawberry Canyon could begin with an adequate understanding of the regional and local history, which is only superficially and minimally outlined in the Helios DEIR (see 4.4-2). Furthermore, while the current ongoing work of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to complete “...a series of reports to identify, survey, and evaluate 245 buildings and structures at the LBNL site for potential eligibility for listing in the National Register” (4.4-3) is important documentation for potential nomination of LBNL buildings, such work does not address the comprehensive geographic area. Strawberry Canyon is a natural landscape with important traditional values. Its unique landscape heritage can not be segmented. Certainly the Landscape Heritage Plan for the Central Campus “Classical Core” could be used as a guide, observing nearly parallel framework of historical events: a Picturesque era, 1865-1898, a *Beaux-Arts* Era, 1899-1940, and a Modern Era, 1940-1970.

BAHA appreciates the ongoing environmental review process for proposed LBNL development projects, inspiring BAHA to learn about and to understand that Strawberry Canyon is a significant and distinct landscape that does reveal a historic, natural, and cultural relationship to our collective quality of life and sense of place. However, BAHA understands that the failure of the Helios DEIR to include relevant background material and cultural resource information both thwarts a public understanding of the project impacts and may cause the Regents to preclude informed decision making.

Sincerely,

Carrie Olson, President

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS . . .

BAHA welcomes the following people who have joined BAHA since the last Newsletter went out. Tell your friends about BAHA and encourage them to join, too!

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Marisa Atamian | Barbara Nerness |
| Susie Bailey | Barbara Nilmeier |
| Ann M. Branston | Dee Plunkett |
| Donna Castro & Winston Chou | Tom Roland |
| Robert Collier | John Shively |
| Gabriel Gomes | Tracey Taylor |
| Melville K. | Contributing |
| Hayes-Martin | Dr. & Mrs. M. H. Humphreys |
| Alan Jencks | Margaret & Contee Seely |
| Shelly Kleinschrodt | |

...AND MEMBERS RENEWED!

Susan Acquistapace, David Allswang, Laura L. Anderson, Lorri Arazi;
David Baker, Horst Bansner, Steve Booth, Fadhillah Bradley, Kay Bristol, Dorothy Duff Brown & Alvin K. Ludwig, Thomas Bruce, Catherine Burns;
Anne Campbell, Eugenie Candau, Caleb B. Case, Cheryl Cherpitel, Frances Chiappetta, Robert Judson Clark, Betty & Murray Cohen;
Janet Dahlstein, Steve Douglas, Ellen Drori, Ken Duffy, Katherine Dunlap;
Ted Edlin, Leslie Easterday, Milton Edelin, Pat & Michael Edwards, Sylvia Egan, Dan Eisenstein, S. Entwistle, Liz Exter & Steve Klucharich;
Grace Fawcett, Beni & Mike Fein, Laine Feingold, Susan Duhan Felix, John Ferrari, Al Ferreira, Karen Fiene, Elizabeth Fisher, Alyce T. Foley, Angelica Forti-Lewis, Nancy H. Francis, Rocky Francis, Constance Fraser, Jen Fraser, Ann May & Rodney Freeland, Robin Mark Freeman, Ruth Friedman;
Barbara Imbrie, Sandra & George Innes, Judy Isaksen;

Melanie O'Hara, Barbara Oliver, Linda Oliver, Mr. & Mrs. R. M. Oliver, Greta Olsen, Susan Opsvig, Lorraine Omsundson;

Kathy Pacheco, Gregory Page, Jan Papps, Stephanie Pardee, Shirley L. Parr, Betty R. Parsons, Gary Earl Parsons, Loren W. Partridge, Mary Jane & Robert Pauley, Karen Paull, Joann Pavlinec, Donna E. Peers, Aida M. Peterson, Gary Peterson, Kirk Peterson, Kenneth I. Pettitt, Roberta A. Phillips, Betty Pillsbury, Kimberly & Zachary Pine, Zetta-Lynne Poli, Linda O. Polsby, Janis Porter, Yope Posthumus, Jonathan Pritikin, Mark Prouty;

Linda & Bruce Race, Gianna Ranuzzi, Kate Ratcliff & Sue Bradshaw, Claudia Reel, Suzanne Renne, Diane Resek, Walter E. Rex, Michael Rice, Shelley Rideout, Rhonda Righter, James Risley, Barbara Robben, Jane & Bob Robbins, Lynn Roberts, Laurel Robinson, Helen E. Rogers, Phila Rogers, Catherine Ronneberg, Margit & Richard Roos-Collins, Linda Rose, A.&R. Rosenfeld, Rosie Rosenthal, Daniel Ruark, Gail Rubman, Patricia D. Russell, Marguerite Ryce;

Sandra & Jerome Sackman, Nan Sandusky, Elizabeth Sauer & Fitz Simmons, Marjorie & Ken Sauer, Jack Sawyer, Jim Schee, Judith Schelly, Susie Schevill & Robert Sinai, Eloise H. Schmidt, Renata Polt Schmitt, Peter Schorer, Therese Schroeder, Anne-Catrin Schultz, Susan Schwartz, Steve Sekiguchi, Shari Ser, Carol & Ira Serkes, Susan Carter Shafsky, Brenda Shank, J. Sharp & D. Thompson, Patrick Sheaffer, Suki Shepard, Sandra Sher, Lindsey Shere, Robert Shimshak, Elizabeth Shugart, Pamela Sihvola, Candy & Tom Simonen, Ann Singer, Joan & Ron Sipherd, Barbara & Sam Skelly, Ann Reid Slaby, Sherrick A. Slattery, Dan I. Slobin, Betsy Smith, Carl & Grace Smith, Daniel Smith, Debbie Smith, Gibbs Smith, Roger Smith & Gene Erickson, David Snippen, Franz Snyder, Jane Sokolow, Ernest Sotelo, Winsor Soule, Patricia Spear, Sherril Spellman, Paul N. Spencer, Carrie Sprague, Susan & Bruce Stangeland, John W. Stansfield, Christine Stark, Harry Stark, George Starr & Julia Bader, Kris Steensma, Clara Stern, William Stern, Sallie Stockton, Ladonna Stoppel, David Strachan, Karlyn Strand, George Strauss, Liz Strauss, Allen Stross, Susan Subtle, Kathleen E. Sullivan;

Marianne Tanner, Tarpoff & Talbert Ltd., Ann & Dickran Tashjian, Judi & Stan Taubman, Alice R. Taylor, Anna Taylor, Christine Taylor, Edie Darknell Taylor, Marion Taylor, David Teece, Joyce & Don Temby, Kathy & Paul Terrell, Dena Thaler, Judith Thomas, Marci Thomas, Ellen E. Thomsen, Judy & Pate Thomson, Conness Thomson & Dave Norman, William Thur, Megan Thurmond-Smith, Garth Tissol, Lisa Titus, Pat Todhunter, Frances Townes, David Trachtenberg, Robin Boyce Trubitt;

Josephine Vamis, Claire Van Brunt, Jane Van Camp, Inga Vanek, John Vilett, Lenore Vogt, Paul Vojta;

Jerry Wachtel, Gus Wagele, Sara M. Wages, Grace M. Wahlberg, Marlys Walburger, Aleta Wallace & Peter Nussbaum, Jason Wallace, Rebecca Waring, Suzanne L. Weakley, Carolyn Weinberger, Diana Wellum, Mary Anne & Baird Whaley, Paul Widdess, Gloria Will, Roderic Williams, Sally & George Williams, Thomas Williams, Alan B. Wilson, Majia Wilson, Richard E. Winnie, Alba Witkin, Brenda L. Wong, Robin Wright, Katinka & Fred Wyle;

Alison Zarembo & Dan Marvin, Bill Zerke.

CONTRIBUTING, Joan & Ron Brown, Warren Byrne, Harvey Clark, Libby & Don Erickson, Bruce A. Fodiman, Art Goldberg, Lessel Hans-Mansour, Steve Hyland, Jason Kaldis Architect, Kathie & Jack Longinotti, Colleen Neff, John & Mary Lee Noonan, James Novosel, John Shepherd & Katharine Gale, Carl & Joan Strand, Molly Sullivan & Philip Monrad, Paul Templeton, Ann K. U. Tussing, Wooden Window

SUSTAINING, Jenny Emerson, Lynn & Jeff Horowitz

IN MEMORIAM

Elizabeth Anne McCreary Blair
Helen Break
James Cara
Andrew Imbrie
Ted Kowalski
Howard Whisler



Richard Moe, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation. Courtesy of the National Trust office.



Interior of First Church of Christ, Scientist, which will be the location of the Sustainability Evening on March 27th.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

MAR 27 — BAHA SUSTAINABILITY EVENING

Richard Moe, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, will be the keynote speaker at an evening program on “Sustainability,” with remarks by San Francisco *Chronicle* columnist Jon Carroll. First Church of Christ, Scientist, 2619 Dwight Way. *See page 8.*

APR 4 — BAHA FRIDAY OUTING

African American Museum & Library of Oakland, housed in a former Carnegie library (Bliss & Faville, 1900). \$15. Reservations required. 510-841-2242. Lunch optional.

MAY 4 — BAHA HOUSE TOUR

“BENVENUE & HILLEGASS.” Architectural discoveries in Berkeley’s famed “brown-shingle” neighborhood. 12 houses open between 1 and 5. Watch for announcement in the mail. To volunteer, 510-841-2242.

MAY 29 — BAHA ANNUAL MEETING & PRESERVATION AWARDS

Watch for announcement in the mail in early May.

JUN 6 — BAHA FRIDAY OUTING

Blake Gardens in Kensington. The lavish grounds are used as a teaching facility for the University’s Department of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning. \$15. Reservations required. 510-841-2242. Lunch optional.

JUL 11 — BAHA FRIDAY OUTING

Tao House in Danville. The former home of Eugene and Carlotta O’Neil. \$15. Reservations required. 510-841-2242. Lunch optional.

Don’t forget to check BAHA’s website often for updates on events and preservation issues! berkeleyheritage.com



Richard Moe, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation. Courtesy of the National Trust office.



First Church of Christ, Scientist, Berkeley, California. Rendering by Bernard Mayoek. Courtesy of First Church of Christ, Scientist.