

STANFORD UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY ARCHITECT / CAMPUS PLANNING AND DESIGN

Contents

Attachments:

1.	CASBS Evaluation – 2018 GUP application	pg 1-2				
2.	CASBS Evaluation – January 2021	pg 3-76				
3.	TPS Preservation Brief #14 – New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings:					
	Preservation Concerns.	pg 77-92				
Additi	Additional Information:					
1.	Stanford University - Design Philosophy for Architectural Compatibility - April	1				
	2020	pg 93-105				
2.	Architectural Team Qualifications – Olson Kundig Architects	pg 106-114				

CASBS Evaluation – 2018 GUP application

State of C	ilifornia The Resources Agency
DEPART	ENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
0011	
PRIM	RYRECORD

P P

SOC ATTACHMENT

PRIMARY RECORD	Trinomial
	NRHP Status Code 3CS
Other Listings	
Review Code	Reviewer
Date	
Page_1_ of _8 *Resource Name or #: (Assigned	I by recorder) Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
P1. Other Identifier: Stanford University Building 12-200) (main building), 12-210 (studios 1-6), 12-220 (studios 7-12), 12-230
(studios 13-16), 12-240 (studios 17-20), 12-250 (studios 2	1-25), 12-270 (studios 30-37), 12-280 (studios 38-54)
*P2. Location: 🗆 Not for Publication Unrestr	ricted
* a. County<u>Santa Clara</u>a a	nd (P2c, P2e, and P2b or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
*h USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto Date	

HRI#

Primary #

- Address 75 Alta Road City Stanford Zip 94305 C.
- UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone 1, mE/ d. <u>572560</u> 4141728 mN

Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., asappropriate) e.

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries) The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (also known as CASBS) is a complex of thirteen buildings built in different phases: four were part of the Alta Vista farm, seven were built in 1954, one in 1955, and between 1969-79. All the 1950s buildings are one or two-story wood-framed buildings with low-pitched composition shingle roof and deep eaves. The exterior walls are clad in wood siding interjected by large areas of glass that connect the outdoors with the indoors. The complex is unobtrusively set on the foothills with a larger administrative building at the entrance and a series of smaller rectangular studio buildings distributed around the site forming interior courtyards.

The administrative main building has a cross-shaped floorplan, and programmatically houses all the common spaces. The studio buildings surround it on three sides and house individual study spaces. The seven studio buildings are simple repetitive structures that share a common cross section but differ in length and orientation. Placement is determined by the site conditions to maximize views and maintain privacy. Each studio building comprises of two sides: the side facing the common areas is opaque with solid doors directly accessible from a covered colonnade. In contrast, the opposite side of the building is completely transparent with large metal sliding doors, directly leading to a terrace or a wood deck.

The eighth studio building incorporated on the complex is an older building (1899). It is a two-story structure, which was part of the Alta Vista Farm (12-260, Studios 26-29, commonly known as the Dairy); it has been surveyed separately. Additionally, the accessory structures: two pre-1908 sheds (12-290 duplicate and storage building) and the 1910 caretaker's cottage (12-295) have been surveyed separately as agricultural buildings. Finally, a (early 70s) small restroom building is located to the west of the sheds.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)_ HP15 Educational Building

*P4.	Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.)
P5b.	. Description of Photo: (view, date, accession #) Top: View of main building from west, 2014 Bottom: View of building 12-230, 2014
P6.	Date Constructed/Age and Source: Historic D Prehistoric D 1954, 1955 addition, ca 1970 addition



*P7. Owner and Address: Board of Trustees, 3160 Porter Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94034

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address) Elena Angoloti, Sapna Marfatia, LBRE, 3160 Porter Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94034

*P9. Date Recorded: 1/23/2017 minor date change 6/17/20

*P10.Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") 2017 Stanford University Historic Resources Survey

*Attachments:
NONE
Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record
Archaeological Record District Record
Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record
Rock Art Record Artifact Record O Photograph Record
O Other (List): *Required information

DPR 523A (1/95)

Primary# HRI#

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

Page 2 of 8 *Resource Name or #(Assigned by recorder) Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

B1.Historic Name:	Ford Foundation Research Center, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences	
B2. Common Name:	CASBS	
B3. Original Use:	Academic AC-T/R	
B4. Present Use:	Academic AC-T/R	

*B5. Architectural Style: Second Bay Tradition

***B6.** Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

The site was originally part of an estate known as Alta Vista with multiple farm structures, some of which remain and are detached accessory structures. The main house along with other ancillary farm structures were demolished in 1954 to make way for the Ford Foundation Research Center, renamed CASBS. In 1955 the center was enlarged with a new building by the same architects. It received an AIA First Honor Award in 1956 for its design. In the early 70s a new restroom building was built to the southwest. Accessibility remodels were made in 1999.

*B7. Moved? No 🛛 Yes 🗆 Unknown Date:	Original Location:
1999 Accessibility Adaptations	Cody Anderson Wasney Architects
1969-76 New restroom building	Unknown
1955 Addition (south building, #12-280)	Wurster, Bernard and Emmons Architects
1954 Construction	Wurster, Bernard and Emmons Architects
Date Scope	<u>Architect</u>

***B8. Related Features:** Part of the center but built outside the period of significance Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences-Studios 26-29, 12-260

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences-storage and duplicate, 12-290

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences-detached restroom

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences-Caretaker's house, 12-295

B9a. Architect: Wurster, Bernard & Emmons Architects (1954, 1955), Cody Anderson Wasney Architects (1999)

b. Builder: Unknown

*B10.	Significance:	nificance: Theme Regional Modernism		Area San Fra		
Period	of Significance	1950- 1974	Property Type	Academic AC-T/R	Applicable Criteria	3

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address The buildings built in 1954 of the property were evaluated in the context of collegiate architecture of the San Francisco Bay Area and found eligible for listing on the California Register. These buildings display the distinctive characteristics of Second Bay Tradition style to a similar extent as listed properties at other colleges and universities in the region. The property therefore embodies Second Bay Tradition collegiate architecture in the region in the period 1950— 1974 and thus meets Criterion 3 of the California Register. The property was also evaluated under Criteria 1 and 2 and no significant associations were identified thus the property does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register under Criteria 1 or 2.

The character-defining features of the property are:

- Low pitched roof
- Wood frame construction
- · Wood cladding
- Overhanging eaves
- · Exposed soffit and rafters

- Horizontal massing
- Large expanses of glass forming window walls
- Plain and simple with a rustic appearance
- Woodsy texture
- · Linked to landscape through pergola and covered

The 1955 addition, constructed during the period of significance, was evaluated and found to be compatible and a characterdefining feature of the property. The early detached accessory structures, built before the period of significance, have a utilitarian character and were evaluated and found to be compatible but not character-defining feature of the property. The early 70s restroom building, built after the period of significance, has a

utilitarian character and was evaluated and found to be neither compatible nor a character - defining feature of the property.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) _____ ***B12. References:**

2017 Stanford University Historic Resources Survey

Remarks: *B14. Evaluator Elena Angoloti, Sapna Marfatia

*Date of Evaluation: 1/23/2017

(This space reserved for official comments.)

(Sketch Map with north arrow requi	red.)
Sta ROAN	FER
some an	
12-200 to 12-295	
CENTER FOR	share Should be
	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
ADVANCED STUDY	and the second
THE BEHAVIORAL	N King N
SCIENCES	A states and a state of the states of the st
	N II
St. some	The second second second
	1
	10
	2
*Requir	ed information

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	Primary # HRI #
PRIMARY RECORD	Trinomial
	NRHP Status Code
Other Listings Review Code	Reviewer Date
Page 1 of 74 *Resource Name or #: <u>Center fo</u>	or Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
P1. Other Identifier: CASBS	
*P2. Location: 🗆 Not for Publication 🛛 🔳 Unrest	ricted
*a. County Santa Clara and	
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto Date 1997	T ; R ; □ of □ of Sec ; B.M.
Address 71 72 74 75 77 70 91 92 95 97 00	A lts \mathbf{D}_{sad} — City — Cts of and — \mathbf{Z}_{sad} — \mathbf{A}_{sad}

d. UTM: Zone <u>10S</u>, <u>572572</u> mE/ <u>414151</u> mN

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (also known as CASBS) is located in the Stanford foothills about 500 feet south of Junipero Serra Boulevard. It is placed at the peak of a hill within an oak grove overlooking Lagunita reservoir and the Stanford campus. (continued on pg 4)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>

DEa		P5b. Description of Photo:
Fod.		Aerial view, October 2020
San Star		*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source ■ Historic □ Prehistoric
	Main Campus	□ Both
		<u>Before 1908 - 1965</u>
		*P7. Owner and Address:
		Board of Trustees, Stanford University
	在主义的国人口思想的方法。在父父	LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall
		Redwood City, CA 94063
"se?		*P8. Recorded by:
		N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway,
		L. Jones, S. Marfatia
See market and	Junipero Serra pu	*P9. Date Recorded: January 2021
	a Bivd.	*P10. Survey Type: <u>Intensive</u>
A Del a		*P11. Report Citation:
		District Record: Center for Advanced
1911 - 3 -	Existing CASBS Complex	Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford
Mar Par		University. January 2021.

*Attachments: NONE Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Other (List):

SOC ATTACHMENT



DPR 523J (Rev. 1/1995)(Word 9/2013)

* Required information 4 01/2021

Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page 3 of <u>74</u>

*NRHP Status Code: 3CD

*Resource Name or #: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences **D1.** Historic Name: Same

D2. Common Name: CASBS

*D3. Detailed Description

Eight one-story wood-clad buildings in a rustic hilltop setting overlooking the Stanford campus, built to house a retreat for academic scholars. The complex was designed in Second Bay Tradition style in 1954 and 1955 by one of the most prominent design teams of this period: Wurster Bernardi and Emmons with landscape architect Thomas Church and has experienced excellent maintenance and very little in the way of alterations since its construction. All eight of the Wurster Bernardi and Emmons buildings, and their connecting landscape elements, are contributors to the district. Four pre-existing farm buildings and an ancillary restroom/shower building are present within the district boundary but are non-contributing as they do not contribute to the significance of the district. Each of the buildings within the district boundary are described in detail in Primary Record forms below.

*D4. **Boundary Description**

An approximately 10-acre rectangular site extending from the southern edge of Junipero Serra Boulevard south to just below the crest of a hill. The district is bounded on the west side by an independent research building, the Institute for Research in Social Science at 30 Alta Rd, and to the south by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, constructed in 2001 at 51 Vista Lane. The eastern edge is a fence line with the Stanford "Dish" foothills area.

*D5. **Boundary Justification**

The property was developed as a lease to the Ford Foundation from Stanford University; the boundary is the area described by this lease and contains all the properties developed for this purpose. The boundary is concurrent with a single parcel, APN 142-12-002.

D6.	Significance: Theme M	id-Century	Modern and	the Post-War Colle	giate Campus
	Area: San Francisco Bay	Area			
	Period of Significance:	1954-55		Applicable C	Criteria: 3

See Continuation Sheets, beginning page .

*D7. References

Original construction documents: Stanford University Maps and Records. Historic Context and Survey, Stanford University Campus. (Stanford University: Heritage Services and University Architect/Campus Planning Design Office, 2017). See also notes, Continuation Sheet, Page .

*D8. **Evaluator:** L. Jones, S. Marfatia **Date:** January 2021

Affiliation and Address: Stanford University, 477 Oak Road, Stanford, CA 94305

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 4 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update

D3a. Description



CASBS Location. Source: Nearmap edited by Author

The CASBS complex contains thirteen structures:

- Four farm buildings constructed between 1908 and 1951: two sheds (90 Alta Rd), a cottage (74 Alta Rd), and the dairy building (85 Alta Rd).
- In 1954, seven buildings were built: the large cruciform main building located in the center (75 Alta Rd), and six rectangular studio buildings surrounding the main building: Studios 1-6 (71 Alta Rd), Studios 7-12 (73 Alta Rd), Studios 13-16 (79 Alta Rd), Studios 17-20 (83 Alta Rd), Studios 21-25 (81 Alta Rd), Studios 30-37 (87 Alta Rd).
- In 1955, an additional linear studio building was added to the complex: Studios 38-54 (77 Alta Rd).

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

• Finally, in 1965, the last building, a small shower and restroom facility was also added (90 Alta Rd).



Site map numbered for entire document. Source: Nearmap edited by Author

D6. Significance

Historic and Architectural Context (boundary included)

The Alta Vista Estate

A survey map (1908) presents a detailed view of the Alta Vista Estate, a residence and small farm established by Charles Lathrop in 1899 on land leased from his sister, Jane Lathrop Stanford. Charles Gardner Lathrop, the university business manager, built the main house in 1900. Charles Hodges, the university's resident architect, designed a large Victorian house sited on the crest of a hill.¹ The *San Francisco Chronicle* noted that the house "will command a magnificent view of the Santa Clara valley."² Located in the vicinity of the house was a peacock aviary and tennis court.

The Lathrop farm produced fruit and raised livestock: dairy cattle, poultry, and pigs. The large

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

greenhouse south of the main house was possibly where the Lathrop staff started trees that were later transferred to the orchard. Alongside the greenhouse were buildings that sustained the daily operations of the house and grounds, such as a dairy barn/creamery, a laundry building, and two milking sheds.³

The areas of Alta Vista located furthest from the main house contained outbuildings and fenced pens that allowed the Lathrops and their employees to raise livestock. Pig pens, pig sheds, and a "manure pit" were located at the south edge of the property. The western periphery contained facilities for poultry, including a fenced chicken yard, a duck pond, and a turkey run.⁴ Additional outbuildings served the everyday maintenance and labor needs of a farm, including tool sheds and a "bunkhouse"—most likely quarters for hired labor. Near the entry gate to the property on County Road stood a "lodge" this building is currently known as the "gatehouse" but appears to have served as a secondary residence on Alta Vista.⁵ Plans for the auxiliary buildings have not been found and the designer's identity is unknown.

The Lathrop family occupied the property from 1901 until Charles Lathrop's widow died in 1951. The property lease terminated with her death. Initially, since the property use was undetermined, the structures were used for storage by the university. The university considered several alternative uses for the estate and main house including academic use, inn, international house, rest home, and lease for residential use.⁶ Since the property is located too far from the main campus to be a viable site for classroom or student residence purposes, a portion of the original estate was leased in 1954 to the Ford Foundation for the construction of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. (The lease was terminated and the Center was formally incorporated under Stanford's administration in 2008.)

While the main house and many ancillary farm structures were demolished in 1954, a few buildings from the original estate remained on site and were incorporated into the new design and marked in purple in the map on page 9. The "lodge" chicken house lies outside the CASBS boundary and therefore will not be discussed further. Two sheds (90 Alta Rd) were relocated slightly south of their original location within the CASBS boundary and used by CASBS for storage.⁷⁸ The cottage (74 Alta Rd) and the dairy building (85 Alta Rd), were retained in their original locations.⁹ The dairy was converted to researcher studies.



Map of Alta Vista, Charles G. Lathrop's residence and grounds, 1908. Source: Stanford University Archives.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page
 8
 of
 74
 *Resource Name or #
 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by:
 Stanford University professional staff
 *Date
 January 2021
 Continuation
 Update



Lathrop residence, GP5901 c.1954.



Lathrop residence, GP5902 c.1954.



CASBS lease line. Source: Stanford University Maps & Records.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page

 ______* Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by:

 Stanford University professional staff
 *Date

 Update



CASBS (red) 1954 Phase 1 Overlay on Lathrop Residence & Grounds, 1908. Structures from Lathrop Estate within CASBS Lease Line (sheds, dairy, cottage, barn) marked in purple. Source: Stanford University Archives, edited by Author

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

The Ford Foundation gave a \$3.5 million grant to form a center for the study of the human behavior. Several sites were evaluated in the Bay Area close to university campuses. The locations considered included Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Berkeley, Oakland, and Stanford.¹⁰ Stanford University's 11-acre site located on a hilltop above the surrounding terrain with a view of Lake Lagunita and the Stanford Campus was finally selected. Most existing buildings, including the main house, of the Lathrop residence and farm were demolished to accommodate the new center. Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons, the local architectural firm selected to design the facility, retained some agricultural buildings to provide a rural setting. A remodel of buildings was contemplated; but William Wurster claimed that a group of one-story buildings would be much better suited for the program and could be completed within a reasonable time schedule at the Stanford site.¹¹ The center, called "Scholar's Paradise" by Newsweek was built within budget and ready for occupation within four months.¹² The area of the lease is the boundary of the potential district.

The initial development of the CASBS complex comprised of one-story wood-framed buildings with a low-pitched gable roofs and deep eaves and included a large central cruciform main building, and

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 10
 of 74
 *Resource Name or #
 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by:
 Stanford University professional staff
 *Date
 January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □
 Update

six linear studio buildings. The exterior walls were clad in wood siding interjected by large areas of glass that connect the outdoors with the indoors. The complex was unobtrusively set within an existing grove of trees with a larger administrative building at the entrance and a series of smaller rectangular studio buildings distributed around the site forming interior courtyards.

The **main administrative building** has a cross-shaped floor plan, and programmatically houses all the common spaces. The **studio buildings** surround it on three sides and housed individual study spaces. The studio buildings are simple repetitive structures that share a common cross section but differed in length and orientation. Placement was determined by the site conditions to maximize views and maintain privacy. Each studio building comprises two sides: the side facing the common areas was designed to be opaque with solid doors directly accessible from a covered colonnade. By contrast, the opposite side of the building is completely transparent with large metal sliding doors, directly leading to a terrace or a wood deck, creating a feeling of sitting outside.

The dual building typology was in response to the program: the studies served as a quiet respite for researchers to think while the central spaces served as collaborative and meeting areas to share the knowledge. Center Fellows can be alone in their individual studies or come together in the seminar rooms, and in indoor and outdoor spaces. The variety of spaces provided for exchange of knowledge while respecting the spaces required for quiet contemplation.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 11 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □ Update



Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons. Source: Stanford University Archives¹³.

The **main building** was located on the top of the hill, in the area where the land was relatively level. The entrance to the complex was located directly off the south-west parking lot. The main building was designed cross-shape and divided by circulation into smaller wings that shared a common roof. The north wing housed a library and a seminar room. The east wing comprised of a meeting and lounge room. The west wing was located by the main entrance and housed the administration suite and the restroom facilities. It was directly connected to the south wing which comprised the main social dining space and supporting kitchen facility. The building had a low-pitched composition roof with deep eaves and covered circulation walkways. The main building had a unique Wurster detail, the glue-laminated beams of the roof structure were exposed ending in rafter tails that tapered from the ridge line towards the edge of the eave.

Large, glazed areas were located at selected locations, connecting to the outdoors. These large openings allowed for views and made the spaces seem larger. In the Main Building the openings comprised steel sliding doors with a band of hopper windows located directly above. The study buildings are slightly shorter and have steel sliding doors spanning from floor to ceiling. Skylights are located in the open colonnade of the administrative area. The ventilation grills and service doors were purposefully concealed.

The study/studio buildings surround the Main Building on three sides. The buildings are simple repetitive

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 12 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update

structures designed specifically for scholarly concentration. All studio building share a common cross section but differ in length and orientation. Building location was determined by site conditions to maximize views of nature while maintaining privacy. Each building comprises of two sides: the side facing the common areas is opaque with solid doors directly off the covered circulation colonnade, by contrast, the opposite side is completely glazed with large metal sliding doors, directly leading onto a terrace or a wood deck. Consequently, some studios had extraordinary views of the Stanford University campus while others faced oak groves on the foothills beyond. The interior division of each studio was sized identically, 12 by 14 feet.

The WBE designed buildings blended seamlessly and naturally into the existing site context and the existing agricultural buildings that were retained from the Lathrop Estate. In order to achieve a natural look, the new buildings had the following design features:

- 1. The buildings were all composed of low simple profiles with natural materials, the exterior walls were made of wide wood siding, arranged vertically.
- 2. The structures were distributed across the site and adapted easily to the undulating topography.
- 3. The buildings were located considering the views beyond while maintaining the existing mature vegetation.
- 4. The project consciously blurred the edges between the new development and the natural environment of the foothills beyond.

The CASBS layout took advantage of the improvements made by Lathrop to level the hillside site and largely occupied the footprint of the main Lathrop house. The design integrated some existing buildings in place (the dairy and cottage). However, Wurster's design called for the relocation of two shed structures to the edge of a new parking lot and for storage.¹⁴

Paths and stairs connect the studios and the Main Building, creating quiet spaces formed by low stone walls (sometimes curved). The landscape comprises of outdoor gathering rooms and circulation spaces created in response to the topography, program, views and exiting mature trees on site. A series of stairs and ramping pathways connects all outdoor rooms to the main building and studios. Four main outdoor spaces were designed surrounding the Main Building. The southern two were more public, as they were part of the entry sequence, whereas the two northern ones located centrally were more private and responded directly to the program housed in the buildings adjacent to the space. The landscape of the foothills is also gracefully incorporated revealing oaks on a steep hill with natural grasses blurring the boundary between the developed and the natural. It received an AIA First Honor Award in 1956 for its design.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

Page 13	of	74 *Resource Name or # Ce	enter for Advanced	Study in the Behav	ioral Sciences	
*Recorded b	y: _	Stanford University professional	staff *Date	January 2021	Continuation	Update

Construction History

Date	Description		
Pre-1908, pre-1951	Alta Vista Farm Structures, unknown architect		
April 23, 1954	Demolition of the Lathrop residence and several		
	farm structures. Construction of CASBS complex		
	by Wurster Bernardi & Emmons		
April 18, 1955	Addition (Wurster Bernardi & Emmons)		
January 1, 1965	Addition Shower Facility unknown architect		
December 11, 1970	CASBS automatic sprinkler plan		
June 21, 1999	Accessibility upgrades & maintenance Cody		
	Anderson & Wasney		
June 2, 2009	Duct replacement		
February 14, 2012	Emergency tower, blue phone duplicate		
February 3, 2014	CASBS renovations upgrade PG&E transformer		
	and switchgear		
September 2, 2015	CASBS building HVAC upgrade		
September 1, 2016	CASBS new fire alarm system replacement		

Scholarship, Moral Leadership and Public Service Context

CASBS is an auxiliary of Stanford University, hosting research fellows from major universities with the same standards for assessing academic success. Stanford University is consistently ranked among the top 5 universities in the world for excellence in research, technological innovation and the arts.¹⁵ The university has employed more than 6,000 faculty members since its founding 125 years ago; nearly all of these scholars might be considered "significant" persons in their fields. Indeed, this is a basic requirement for promotion to the rank of Professor at Stanford: "In general, the evidence must show that the person being proposed for promotion is among the very best individuals in the field and not merely the best of a particular experience cohort in the field. The evaluation should address whether the candidate's performance is the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, or changes the way the field is viewed, or broadens our understanding of the field, or opens up new methods or new areas of investigation, and thereby has (or is likely to have) the fundamental impact on the field that is expected from the very best scholars in the field" (Faculty Handbook).

At the rank of Full Professor every Stanford faculty member – and every CASBS fellow -- has received awards and other recognition for their work. A survey of a handful of current full professors yielded single individuals with more than 60 awards. Stanford University grants degrees in more than 70 fields. Assessing the importance of the thousands of individual faculty members or scholars who may have worked in a building at Stanford based upon scholarship contributions alone would not lead to differentiation; all faculty

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 14 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update

would qualify. Similarly, it is not feasible to differentiate among Stanford's faculty on the basis of general categories of scholastic awards; again, all would qualify. A similar problem presents itself at CASBS, where over 2800 successful scholars have spent 9-12 months as fellows. To objectively and feasibly identify the most significant persons and events at Stanford from the perspective of research and scholarship, the most important honors are used. In the case of a research center where fellows were only present for short durations, a link between a specific award and their time at CASBS will be necessary to establish a direct association. Therefore, the threshold for significance for assessing contributions in scholarship is winners of Nobel Prizes, and Pulitzer Prizes. These are prizes awarded by juries following rigorous nomination guidelines and are universally recognized as representing excellence. These prizes span a wide range of disciplines represented in the university. A further check should be performed to certify that the work for which the prize was awarded has not been challenged since the award was given, and that no other significant controversies have emerged to question the significance of the events or persons identified in the award, or to cause concerns regarding the individual's moral leadership.

Public Service is more difficult to assess as the major award, the Presidential Medal of Freedom awarded for ""an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavors," is given by a single individual following idiosyncratic criteria.¹⁶ Thus, this award is considered, but not necessarily dispositive in assessing whether an individual is significant at Stanford. In the context of an educational institution, moral leadership is also an important factor in considering the significance of individuals who have received this award. Because of the short tenure of fellows at CASBS, this threshold was applied to the Center's directors who served for multiple years.

Architectural Context: Collegiate Architecture in the San Francisco Bay Area¹⁷

Stanford University is one of more than seventy institutions of higher education in the San Francisco Bay Area region and shares a common mission, and common property types, with its sister institutions. The nine-county San Francisco Bay Area was selected as a geographic context because 1) it is a geographic unit recognized by local, state and federal agencies, 2) it has a social cohesion created by patterns of residence, recreation and employment that tie the region's communities to each other, and 3) it is a manageable sample for comparative purposes. This regional perspective captures the range of institutional types: state colleges and universities, community colleges, private sectarian institutions, for-profit professional schools, and private colleges and universities of varying scales. Fine architecture, influenced by common trends, and in many instances, common architects, can be found in all types of colleges and universities. Architecturally there may be subtle differences in plan but generally colleges and universities share a common list of property types and popular styles. The scholarly literature on architecture in higher education commonly uses "collegiate" to refer to various styles and we adopt that convention here.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 15 of _74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: _Stanford University professional staff _____*Date ______anuary 2021 ■Continuation □ Update

The San Francisco Bay Area had easy access to lumber and stone, a mild climate, and a dynamic, diverse and egalitarian population in the mid nineteenth century as it entered the United States in 1850 as the 31st state. The earliest colleges in the region were founded in the 1850s and focused on training teachers for public schools as the population swelled after the Gold Rush.¹⁸ The San Francisco Bay Area continued to grow and higher education grew as well: today there are over 70 colleges and universities in the region.¹⁹ The colleges and universities of the Bay Area often adopted national and international architectural styles – there are buildings at Bay Area campuses that would not be out of place in Paris or Pittsburgh. However, regionalism also flourished and produced great campus buildings and distinctive California styles. Stanford's iconic Main Quadrangle with its synthesis of California Mission and Richardsonian Romanesque, Bernard Maybeck and Julia Morgan's California Arts and Crafts buildings at UC Berkeley and Mills College, and the rustic modernism of Second Bay Tradition exemplify this regionalism in collegiate architecture.

Mid-Century Modern and the Post-War Collegiate Campus (1951-1975)

California suffered a brief period of economic instability at the end of World War II, as war material factories closed, and veterans returned to one of the highest unemployment rates in the nation.²⁰ The state government invested heavily in expanding access to public colleges and universities to reduce unemployment numbers and to take advantage of the G.I. Bill. Stanford University's enrollment also tripled between 1945 and 1950.²¹ By 1950 the state's economy was growing again and the Cold War (1947-1991) created a flow of federal spending directed at higher education, particularly in science and engineering.

Most California colleges and universities expanded rapidly during this period to meet the rising demand of California's growing population. Some of the smaller private colleges were insulated from this trend; for example, religious institutions had no access to state or federal funding for expansion. Other institutions lacked sufficient land area for major expansion on their existing sites. But nearly all the public colleges and universities grew rapidly during this period, as did Stanford University.

Collegiate architecture during the postwar period took a turn towards Modernism as a new generation of architects entered the profession. On many campuses this style was simply added without much attention to a collection of pre-existing buildings of various periods and styles. On other campuses, including Stanford and UC Berkeley, students and alumni protested the addition of starkly modern buildings to their picturesque historic sites. Newly founded colleges and universities were often designed as master planned campuses, and many displays higher quality Modern architecture than older institutions.

Like the Beaux-Arts and Spanish Eclectic styles, Modern architecture includes a number of different substyles. These are variously labelled by different critics, but for our purposes three major styles dominate collegiate architecture during this period. First, the raw concrete, deeply recessed openings, and massive

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 16 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □ Update

cubist forms of Brutalism had a following in the San Francisco Bay Area. Wurster Hall at UC Berkeley is a well-known example of this type. Second, Mid-Century Modern architecture, used flat or shed roof forms with projecting eaves, large windows (often floor-to-ceiling), direct expression of structural systems, and horizontal massing.²² Pacific Union College and the College of San Mateo feature fine examples of Mid-Century Modern architecture. Third, a variant of Modernism known as California Regionalism adapted the functionality of Modernism to the California climate and culture. Sloping roofs--rather than flat roofs--wide overhanging eaves and spaces blurring the boundary between indoors and outdoors are three characteristics of this style. Foothill College and the College of San Mateo both have award-winning examples of California Regionalism on their campuses.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences was designed by Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons in 1954 and enlarged by the same firm a year later. The architecture style is the Second Bay Tradition, prevalent in the San Francisco Bay Area between the 1930s to the 1960s.

The Second Bay Tradition was a subtype of the Modern style descendant of a regional vernacular architecture that originated in the San Francisco Bay Area; a style based on a rustic naturebased philosophy with "the sleek lines and machine aesthetic associated with European Modernism."²³ Second Bay Tradition Modernist architects referenced the site and climate, sourced local redwood, borrowed imagery from historic context, and incorporated these local contextual elements with the Modern movement and the International Style to create a unique architectural expression. The complex has many of the characteristics of the style: wood cladding (redwood in this instance), large expanses of glass, overhanging eaves and flat or low-pitched roofs with an emphasis on access to and the use of outdoor spaces.

One of the most emblematic representations of the Second Bay Area Tradition Style is the Schuckl Canning Co, Sunnyvale 1942²⁴ this project designed by William Wurster was continuously illustrated and written as the ideal example of the second Bay Area Tradition. However, an example of the style and more similar to CASBS in its program and scale is the US Merchant Marine Cadet School of 1942 in Coyote Point by Gardiner Dailey. At Coyote Point the structures were sited within a grove of eucalyptus trees, the buildings and connecting links responded naturally to the contours of the site²⁵, the school shared many similarities to CASBS.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 17 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update



William Wurster, Schuckl Canning Co, 1942.



Creator: Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons, Schuckl and Co, 1942. Source: ARTstor - Wayne Andrews

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 18 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □ Update



Gardner Dailey, US Merchant Marine School, 1942.

Designers Wurster Bernardi and Emmons and Thomas Church

William W. Wurster's (1895 – 1973) early architecture (1925-1931) displayed a considerable range of styles: revivals such as the Mediterranean Hagar House (1927), French Regency Smith House (1927), and Spanish Colonial Kellam House (1928) as well as the inception of the naturalistic designs which ultimately became a hallmark of Wurster's practice. Two key works that emerged during his early career were his Gregory Farmhouse in Santa Cruz (1928) widely considered the prototype for the post-war suburban ranch house, and projects in Pasatiempo (Church House and Studio 1931, Butler House 1935) that were designed with Thomas Church specifically for "extreme openness … [that] epitomized his early balancing of planned footholds of civilized landscape and features of the existing landscape."²⁶ Author Marc Treib notes that even his, "earliest work offered simplicity and restraint in form, a direct expression of materials, a careful regard for the climate, and economy of construction."²⁷

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 19 of _74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: _Stanford University professional staff _____ *Date _____ anuary 2021 ■Continuation □ Update



WBE, UCSC Cowell College 1965.

Wurster's shift towards regionalism, modernism, and regional modernism evolved overtime and drew from the specific cultural landscape of the Bay Area. He was not the only architect on the area drawn by the Second Bay Area Tradition style, but he was one of its pioneers.²⁸ His association with Second Bay Tradition is considered influential, "Modernity, for Wurster. Was itself an evolving enterprise ... 'I like to think of the word as meaning 'of today' – which means it will be different tomorrow--a constant term applying to changing modes and mediums.'"²⁹ Some critics argue that the Bay Area Tradition architecture is not a style, but a shared approach of the Bay Area architects to puzzle out the design. It drew upon European modernism and rural California vernacular buildings and created a softer modernism (also called Picturesque Modernism) that was appropriate for California.³⁰

Most of the architects designing in the Bay Area Tradition style worked closely with landscape architects due to the close relationship between the indoor/outdoor spaces typical of the style. Wurster forged a successful career long association with master landscape architect Thomas Church.³¹ They worked on projects both residential and institutional starting in the 1930s.³² The collaboration between Church and Wurster was very strong and symbiotic. Their designs provided models for the regional architecture of California with natural low maintenance and livable gardens, this is in contrast with the current International Style that proposed either ultra-formal or naturalistic landscapes.³³ They both avoided theory and formalism and created gardens and architecture that sought simplicity in the fulfillment of function. They complemented each other. Church understood architecture, and that the space around the house is "made to produce living space, play space and workspace."³⁴ Similarly, Wurster understood landscape, and his designs made the transition from the inside to the outside feel seamless and natural.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 20
 of 74
 *Resource Name or #
 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by:
 Stanford University professional staff
 *Date
 January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □
 Update

The siting of a house designed by Wurster resulted from a discussion between architect and landscape architect that evaluated orientation, topography, vegetation, views, and connections to utilities. He described both disciplines as "being separated only as to materials and technique, not as a basic approach."³⁵ Their collaboration ranged from the large planning scale of Federal Public Agency Projects to the small scale of the design of the brick patterns. In 1932 Church inaugurated his office in San Francisco on a floor below Wurster's firm; their practices were interdependent for many decades. Eventually, Church achieved great prominence and their ties loosened but their later collaborations showed the same mutual respect and understanding as their earlier ones.³⁶

In the years following the depression era, while peers were struggling for work Wurster successfully continued to design with modest budgets, a characteristic quality sharpened during the middle phase of this architectural maturity (1933-1938). During this period, his architectural designs: sought simplicity in the fulfillment of function, resourcefully utilized locally available materials, responded appropriately to the site and human factors, and emphasized indoor-outdoor relationships. Author Marc Treib notes "By the mid-1930s—Wurster's career was firmly established, His residential designs had been lauded, published, and premiated [*sic.*], and he was acknowledged as one of the leading architects on the West Coast."³⁷

Wurster became very successful and extremely influential through his built and published works, exhibitions, and as the dean of architecture at UC Berkeley he extended his influence on the next generation of architects. In 1944, he partnered with Theodore Bernardi, Donn Emmons joined a year later, and the firm was renamed Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons. Although Wurster is most known for his small-scale residential architecture, he also planned and designed larger projects. The most successful of which are: Woodlake Apartments (San Mateo 1964), Golden Gateway Housing (San Francisco 1965), Ghirardelli Square (San Francisco 1967), and Cowell College (UC Santa Cruz 1965).³⁸ By the time CASBS was designed, in 1954, the firm of Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons was one of the leading architectural entities in the nation, winning numerous design awards for both residential and institutional architecture. CASBS received an AIA First Honor Award in 1956 for its design.

Criterion 1: 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.

National and regional newspaper archives were consulted; no events taking place at the Center other than a small fire and a handful of lectures, were noted. The Center is a private place for quiet reflection, writing, and scholarly conversations. The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 21 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update

The Center has a record of its visiting fellows going back to 1955. This list of over 2800 names was compared to lists of winners of the Nobel and Pulitzer prizes, and then further refined to identify persons who are no longer living. These were all highly successful people, with long, enduring associations to other institutions. The threshold for a significant association with CASBS is the strength of relationship between their award-winning project and their time at CASBS. The list was queried to identify those who were visiting fellows at CASBS prior to winning their award, and thus may have done something associated with the award-winning effort while in residence at the Center. Fourteen names were identified for further research.³⁹

Biographies, obituaries and oral histories were reviewed for these fourteen individuals for mentions of their work while at the Center, and then whether this work may have contributed to their award-winning projects. While their year at the Center was mentioned in some of the biographies, in only one case was a direct connection identified linking the prize-winning work to that time (Erik Erikson). The one-year (in some cases scholars visited twice) association between these notable persons and the Center is transitory and tenuous by comparison to other places in these persons' lives: all of these scholars served for many years as leaders of academic departments and other research institutes.

The CASBS website suggests that Erik Erikson (1902-1994) worked on his 1970 Pulitzer-prize winning nonfiction book *Gandhi's Truth* while a fellow at the Center in 1964-65.⁴⁰ Erikson was a psychoanalyst and faculty member associated with Harvard University from 1960 until his death in 1994. Erikson's biographer detailed narrative of the research and writing of *Gandhi's Truth* acknowledges that Erikson began writing the book in 1964. However, the book was not completed until 1967 due to a lengthy period (in 1966 and 1967) in which Erikson struggled with evidence that Gandhi may have mistreated family members.⁴¹ The consideration of Gandhi's family relationships led to major changes in the book after the time spent at CASBS. The book was completed at Erikson's homes in Cambridge, Stockbridge and Cotuit (Massachusetts) during breaks from teaching at Harvard in 1967.⁴² There is a stronger association between the Gandhi's Truth book and these sites in Massachusetts than with the CASBS location.

The Center has had ten directors. Five are still living. None of the directors, all highly successful scholars, earned a major prize for their research.⁴³ The most prominent former director, O. Meredith Wilson (director from 1966-75) was president of the University of Oregon (1954-60) and president of the University of Minnesota (1960-66) before joining CASBS and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank in San Francisco after his term at CASBS. Wilson has been honored with a library in his name at the University of Oregon. Biographical sources identify Wilson as a "noted administrator," who served on many boards and committees and steered a number of organizations.⁴⁴ While Wilson was a successful and respected figure in higher education, his public career has been recognized at other sites and his administration of a private

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 22 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation □
 Update

research institute does not appear closely associated with his career in public service. No CASBS director was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.*

CASBS has many of the characteristics that Wurster developed in residential projects during his career,⁴⁵ its character defining features are:

- 1. Dual and programmatic response of the building. Wurster created a new building typology that responded to a specific program and included the spaces directly outside the building as part of the program. This was an innovative concept at the time to use the exterior spaces as living spaces. CASBS exhibits a duality of spaces that reveal themselves as one approaches the more private spaces from the more public:
 - (1) The large public spaces around the main building are designed for the CASBS scholars to gather and communicate.
 - (2) The study buildings provide smaller private spaces. The individual studios that lead to balconies and decks are designed for the scholars to reflect.
- 2. Landscape and architecture relationship (Wurster and Church in collaboration)
 - (1) Integration of the building with the site through the vegetation, topography, and views.
 - (i) Muting the structures decoratively: keeping their proportions low, bending and stepping them to respect the contours of the land resulted in a great intimacy with the landscape.
 - (ii) most of surrounding vegetation was retained, the edges of the project were blurred and borrowed the vistas from neighboring environments.
 - (2) Indoor-outdoor relationship: the indoor spaces have floor to roof openings that connect to the exterior, both physically with large sliding doors and visually with the use of transparent glass.
 - (3) outdoor rooms serve as gathering and contemplative spaces programmatically.
- 3. Outdoor circulation. The building takes full advantage of the California climate and brings most the circulation outdoors to fully take advantage of the weather, materials and environment.
- 4. Materiality appropriate to surroundings

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 23 of _74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: _Stanford University professional staff _____ *Date _____ January 2021 ■Continuation □ Update

- (1) Single story, simple volumes adapted to the land contours
- (2) Low-pitched shingle roofs and wide eaves
- (3) Exterior redwood siding
- (4) Interior wood paneling and exposed post and beams
- (5) Fenestration formed by large panels of glass and steel sliding doors that connected to the exterior.
- (6) extension of spaces that borrowed outdoor views, adding spaciousness to otherwise basic interior spaces that allowed the outdoor to flow indoors.

CASBS exemplifies the Second Bay Area Tradition style pioneered by William Wurster. The redwood siding, inside and out, the small scale and wide eaves, masterly adaptation to the landscape, views, large expanses of glass, outside circulation and outdoor living areas all are characteristic elements of the style and represents Wurster's contribution to the style.

The relative simplicity of the CASBS design is also a hallmark characteristic of the Second Bay Tradition and particularly of Wurster's well-noted preference for unpretentious and inexpensive materials. The greatest feature of the design is the integration of the landscape and the interdependency of the indooroutdoor worlds, which effectively allowed the outside spaces to be used for social interaction and fulfil the programs mission. This smooth integration found between the architecture and the landscape architecture reflect the maturity of Wurster and Church's collaboration.

When CASBS was designed, Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons was one of the leading architectural firms in the nation. CASBS was publicly acclaimed and was awarded the American Institute of Architects First Honor in 1956.

Furthermore, the leading designer, William Wurster, was awarded the Gold Medal from the American Institute of Architects in 1969, its most prestigious award, for his "significant body of work of lasting influence on the theory and practice of architecture." CASBS is one of William Wurster's most successful non-residential designs.⁴⁶ The property does appear to meet Criterion 3 as it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction: Mid-Century Modern collegiate architecture of the Second Bay Tradition style. It further meets Criterion 3 as a significant example of the design work of master architect William Wurster and landscape architect Thomas Church.

The 1954 buildings were designed to function as an interdependent set of facilities, thus they are eligible as a district and not individually eligible (if all but one were removed it would not be significant). The 1955 addition (Studios 38-54), constructed during the period of significance, was evaluated and found to be compatible and a character- defining feature of the property. The early detached accessory structures, built before the period of significance, have a utilitarian character and were evaluated and found to be compatible but not character-defining features of the property. The 1965 restroom building, built after the period of significance, has a utilitarian character and was evaluated and found to be neither compatible nor a character-

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 24
 of 74
 *Resource Name or #
 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by:
 Stanford University professional staff
 *Date
 January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □
 Update

defining feature of the property.

Criterion 4: Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

This criterion is normally applied to archaeological deposits. There may be archaeological deposits associated with the Alta Vista Estate within the district boundary; these sites have not been located or assessed. The CASBS buildings do not display unusual or rare construction techniques that might prove of interest to future researchers. The CASBS District does not appear eligible under Criterion 4.

Integrity

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility, in this case Criterion 3, as a significant example of Second Bay Tradition collegiate architecture and the work of master designers Wurster Bernardi and Emmons (WBE) and Thomas Church. The period of significance is the overlap between the post-World War 2 period defined by the architectural context theme and this property: 1954-1975.

The contributing buildings (constructed in 1954 and 1955) within the CASBS district retain integrity in terms of **location, design and setting**. The CASBS District/Complex retains its original 1954 setting within the foothills with abundant open space surrounding the buildings. Some minor design and material changes have occurred over time (refer to the construction history) but overall, the integrity of **materials and craftsmanship** has been retained. The exterior siding, wood structure, and fenestration all remain from the original design. There have been some material changes since 1975: the paving under the colonnade from asphalt to brick, replacement of railings at study-building decks, roofing updates and landscape modifications in 1999. The vegetation has matured since 1975, but overall the landscape surrounding the district remains untouched, with views unblocked, and the quietude intact.

The **feeling and association** within the CASBS district are intact. The Center continues to be programmatically used in the same manner as it was originally envisioned under the same name. The buildings within the district show wear over time, but overall time seems to have stopped at CASBS.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 25 of _74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: _Stanford University professional staff _____ *Date _____ January 2021 ■Continuation □ Update

⁵ Mary Montella and Roxanne Nilan, "200 Junipero Serra Boulevard (The County Road)": Lathrop Lodge," in *Historic Houses VII: South San Juan Neighborhood and Stock Farm, Stanford University* (Stanford Historical Society 2016), 41-49.

⁶ Stanford University, Vice President for Business Affairs, Records (SC0677). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Box 36, Lathrop folder

⁷ Ibid. Letter from the Business Office to the Ford Foundation, dated December 3, 1954.

⁸ Ibid. Letter from Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons to Lantzco, dated March 26, 1954.

⁹ Institutional Box No. 05086 – Center for Advanced Research in the Behavioral Sciences, CASBS 75 Alta Road, (1) 1954-1959. Letter from the Business Office to Marsh & McLennan Insurance dated April 6, 1954.

¹⁰ San Francisco Chronicle, April 1, 1954.

¹¹ Arts & Architecture (February 1955): 13.

¹² "Scholar's Paradise." *Newsweek* 44, no. 19 (Nov 08, 1954): 102. ProQuest, <u>https://www-proquest-com.stanford.idm.oclc.org/docview/1843950782?accountid=14026</u>.

¹³ Stanford University, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Photographs (PC0079). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

¹⁴ Letter from Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons to Lantzco dated March 26, 1954.

¹⁵ https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2019/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/25/sort_by/rank/sort_order/asc/cols/stats

¹⁶ https://www.whitehouse.gov/medaloffreedom/

¹⁷ *Historic Context and Survey, Stanford University Campus.* (Stanford University: Heritage Services and University Architect/Campus Planning Design Office, 2017).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 89-92.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 77.

²⁰ John Douglass, *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan* (Stanford University Press, 2000), 195.

²¹ *Ibid*.

²² San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 (City and County of San Francisco, 2010), 128; Growth, Efficiency and Modernism: GSA Buildings of the 1950s, 60s and 70s. (General Services Administration, 2003), 14. Also called "Post-and-Beam" style in some surveys including San Diego Modernism Historic Context Statement (City of San Diego, 2007), 67-8; and San Jose Modernism Historic Context Statement (PAST Consultants for Preservation Action Council of San Jose, 2009), 81.

²³ *Ibid.*, 104.

²⁴ Marc Treib (ed.), *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 172.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 172.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

²⁷ Ibid., 87.

²⁸ Wurster is recognized as one of the pioneers of the Second Bay Area Tradition, along with Mary Brown, *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design, 1935-1970: Historic Context Statement* (San Francisco: Planning Department, 2010), 103.

¹ Mary Montella and Roxanne Nilan, "Alta Vista: The house on the hill," in *Historic Houses VII: South San Juan Neighborhood and Stock Farm, Stanford University* (Stanford Historical Society, 2016), 51.

²"CHARLES G. LATHROP'S NEW HOME AT STANFORD." San Francisco Chronicle (Sep 02, 1899), 2.

³ Lathrop Barn Draft Historic Resource Evaluation Report. Page & Turnbull, April 16, 2014. On file at Heritage Services, Stanford University.

⁴*Ibid*. See also DPR Form for Turkey Incubator Shed, demolished 2001. On file at Heritage Services, Stanford University.

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

 Page 26 of 74 *Resource Name or # Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

 *Recorded by: Stanford University professional staff
 *Date January 2021
 ■ Continuation
 □ Update

³⁰ David Weingarten, *Bay Area Style: Houses of the San Francisco Bay Area Region* (Rizzoli International Publications Inc, 2004),12-13.

³¹ Thomas Church grew up in San Francisco and earned his degrees from UC-Berkeley and Harvard (1922). He taught at UC-Berkeley before going into practice for himself in 1932. Church was one of the most influential American landscape architect from the 1940s until his death in 1973, using spatial ideas drawn from modern architecture and insisting that people's desires should determine their use of the landscape, simultaneously embracing horticulture, a place for family activities and the view. Best known for writing "Gardens Are For People", a book that espoused indoor/outdoor living and is still widely popular today.
³² Marc Treib (ed.), *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 105.

³³ *Ibid.*, 118.

³⁴ Church, "Transition: 1937-1948," in Landscape Design, 14-15.

³⁵ Marc Treib (ed.), *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 114.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 130, 131.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 96.

³⁹ Kenneth Arrow, Ronald Coase, Lawrence Cremin, Gerard Debreu, Erik Erikson, Milton Friedman, Leonid Hurwicz, Tjalling Koopmans, Wassily Leontief, Douglass North, Theodore Schultz, George Stigler, William Vickrey and Oliver Williamson.

⁴⁰ <u>https://casbs.stanford.edu/about/explore-tyler-collection</u>

⁴¹ Friedman, Lawrence J. *Identity's Architect: A biography of Erik H. Erikson*. (Harvard University Press, 1999), 371.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ <u>https://casbs.stanford.edu/about/leadership-history</u>

⁴⁴ "Historical Note". O. Meredith Wilson papers, 1929-1989. University of Oregon Libraries, Special Collections and University Archives. <u>http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv80390</u>

⁴⁵ Alan R. Michelson. *Towards a Regional Synthesis: the Suburban and Country Residences of William Wilson Wurster, 1922-1964.* Ph.D. Thesis. (Stanford University, 1993), 309-313.

⁴⁶ Marc Treib (ed.), *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 89.

²⁹ Marc Treib (ed.), *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 31.

SOC ATTACHMENT

State of California & The Reso DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND	urces Agency RECREATION	Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 3	3CD	
	Other Review Code	Reviewer	Date	Listings
Page <u>27</u> of <u>74</u>	*Resource Name or #:	CASBS Studios 1-6		
*P2. Location: Not for	Publication Unres	er 12-210		
*a. County <u>Santa Cla</u> *b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo A c. Address <u>71 Alta Ro</u> d. UTM: Zone 10S, 5725'	ra and <u>lto Date 1997</u> pad City 72 mE/ 414151 mN	7 T ; R ; Stanford	Of □ of Sec; Zip94305	B.M.

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

Studio Building 12-210 has a rectangular plan and contains total of 7 rooms (three on each end of the rectangular plan and a middle room which is divided to two smaller rooms which have redwood doors to the mechanical and service rooms.

South elevation which opens to the colonnade, is comprised of six redwood doors to the offices and two narrower doors to the service rooms. The colonnade has white square columns and white eave. North elevation which is called view elevation by the architect has a porch that could be accessed from each single room by a black metal and glass sliding door. On the left side of each redwood entrance door to a room, there is a sign that holds the researcher's name and last name. East and west elevations are very simple; they both are made of redwood siding painted brown on the exterior side and you can see the pitched white profile of the roof on both elevations. (continued on pg 29)



*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List):



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>28</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Studios 1-6

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale: <u>1:1000</u> *Date of map: 1997 USGS





Studios 1-6 (Alta Rd)



South elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

South elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



Study building elevations. Source: WBE 1954.

On the east elevation, there is an colonnaded area on the left with wide white eave and white square columns that hold the eave. There is a square window on the right side of the elevation. There is a metal gutter on this elevation that is painted brown to match the color of redwood sidings. The west elevation of Studios 1-6 has the colonnaded area on the right, and a porch on the left. The porch is sitting on the hill with brown square columns. The parapet has a brown railing with still infill.



East elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



West elevation of Studios 1-6. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

SOC ATTACHMENT

State of California & The Reso DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AN	ources Agency D RECREATION	Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code:	3CD	
	Other Review Code	Reviewer	Date	Listings
Page 31 of 74 P1. Other Identifier: Stanfor *P2. Location: Not fo	*Resource Name or #: ord University Building Num r Publication	CASBS Studios 7-12 ber 12-220		
 *a. County <u>Santa Cl</u> *b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo c. Address <u>73 Alta R</u> d. UTM: Zone 10S, 5723 	ara and Alto Date 199 .oad City 572 mE/ 414151 mN	97 T ; R; Stanford	□ of □ of Sec; Zip94305	B.M.
e. Other Locational Data	: (none)			

*P3a. Description:

Studios 7-12 has a rectangular plan and contains total of seven rooms (three on each end of the rectangular plan and a middle room which is divided to two smaller rooms which have redwood doors to the mechanical and service rooms. On the west elevation you will see three red doors on each end of the elevation that open to the offices, and two narrower doors in the middle that open to the mechanical and storage rooms. This elevation has the colonnaded area with white square columns and white eave. East elevation which is called view elevation by the architect has the porch that provided access to outside from each study room with floor to ceiling sliding doors. There is one metal gutter on this elevation that is painted brown to match the color of the siding. (continued on pg 33)

***P3b.** Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>



*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Other (List):

State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>32</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS Studios 7-12</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale: 1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS





Studios 7-12 (73 Alta Rd)



West elevation of Studios 7-12. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

East elevation of Studios 7-12. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

Although this building has the same plan and profile as Studios 1-6, due to the topography it looks different from outside. The north and south elevations are very simple: the south elevation has one square window on the left side; and north elevation has one square window on the right side. The profile of the low-pitched roof on north and south elevations is apparent; the roof is painted white to match the eave and create contrast with brown sidings.



North elevation of Studios 7-12. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



South elevation of Studios 7-12. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.
State of California & The Resou DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND	rces Agency RECREATION	Primary # HRI #				
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Statu	ıs Code: 6Z			
	Other Listings Review Code	Reviewer			Date	
Page <u>34</u> of ₇₄ * P1. Other Identifier: <u>Stanford</u>	Resource Name or # : I University Building Nur	CASBS Caretal	ker Cottage			
*P2. Location: Dot for l *a. County Santa Clar	Publication	estricted	D .	⊐ of	□ of €oo	D M
c. Address <u>74 Alta Ros</u>	ad City	Stanford	n;_	Zip	_ 0 1 Sec ; 94305	,D.IVI.

*P3a. Description:

The cottage is located south of Alta Road just before approaching the parking lot. It houses the center's caretaker. It is set apart from the CASBS 1954's buildings. The building is located within the footprint area of the Lathrop auto shed. But very little is known about this structure, it does not appear on the 1908 survey listed as a cottage. The house is very small and dominated by large trees and thus not easily distinguishable in available historic aerial photographs of this region. (continued on pg 36)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP2 Single Family Property, HP3 Ancillary Building</u>
 *P4.Resources Present: ■Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other (Isolates, etc.)



*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List):



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>35</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS Caretaker Cottage</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale: 1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS



	SOC ATTACHMENT
State of California - The Resources Agency	Primary#
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	HRI#
	Trinomial
CONTINUATION SHEET	
Page <u>36</u> of 74 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by	recorder) CASBS Caretaker Cottage
*Recorded by: <u>Stanford University Professional Staff</u> *Date	January 2021 Continuation Update

Cottage (74 Alta Rd)

The cottage is a simple one-story square (25'x25') structure clad in horizontal wood lap-siding and topped with a gable-ended roof finished in composition shingles. A small porch edged with a pair of diagonal cross-brace wood railings protrudes beyond the front north façade to pronounce the main entry door. A pair of openings are located directly adjacent to the main door on either side. The east and west elevations are similar, and each have a pair of openings symmetrically located. Since the grade drops, compared to the east elevation the west elevation is taller with a lattice apron to conceal the raised piers. All openings in the main structure are fitted with simple two-overtwo double hang wood windows finished with a trim and sill.

The cottage has a modest rear-addition attached to the south elevation. The addition has a single opening in the south elevation fitted with a wood double-hang one-over-one sash window. The east elevation of the addition has a single door and is setback from the east elevation of the main building. The west elevation of the addition has a sliding aluminum door opening directly onto a small deck with metal railing. The aluminum door and metal railing are modern replacement materials.



Cottage north façade with entry porch. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.



East elevation with addition. Source: UA/CPD March 2015. DPR 523L (9/2013

West elevation with lattice apron and south addition and deck. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD	Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 3C		
Other			Listings
Review Code	Reviewer	Date	
Page 37 of _74 *Resource Name or #: P1. Other Identifier: Stanford University Building Numb	CASBS Main Building er 12-200		
*P2. Location: Not for Publication Unres	tricted		
*a. County <u>Santa Clara</u> and			
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto Date 1997	/T;R;	_ □ of □ of Sec;	B.M.
c. Address 75 Alta Road City	Stanford	Zip <u>94305</u>	
d. UTM:Zone <u>10S, 572572</u> mE/ <u>414151</u> mN			

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

The Main Building is comprised of two intersecting rectangular sections that come together and form a cruciform roof. Each arm of the cruciform ends in a gable end with two-thirds composed of an enclosed structure and one-third composed of an open circulation walkway.

The West elevation of the building forms the main entrance to the complex. A glass door allows entry into the complex and provides a glimpse of the courtyards, the rest of the complex, and the lake beyond. The approach to the main door consists of a colonnade with square columns and white eaves. The building has a white low-pitched roof with gable ends that contrasts with brown walls and blue sky. (continued on pg 39)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>

*P4.Resources Present: Building 🛛 Structure 🗆 Object 🗆 Site 🗆 District BElement of District 👘 Other (Isolates, etc.)



P5b. Description of Photo:
South view, Nov 2020
*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:
Historic 🛛 Prehistoric
□ Both
1954
*P7. Owner and Address:
Board of Trustees, Stanford University
LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall
Redwood City, CA 94063
*P8. Recorded by:
N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway,
L. Jones, S. Marfatia
*P9. Date Recorded: January 2021
*P10. Survey Type: <u>Intensive</u>
*P11. Report Citation:
District Record: Center for Advanced
Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford
University. January 2021.

 *Attachments: □NONE
 ■Location Map □Continuation Sheet
 □Building, Structure, and Object Record

 ■Archaeological Record
 □District Record
 □Linear Feature Record
 □Milling Station Record
 □Rock Art Record

 □Artifact Record
 □Photograph Record
 □ Other (List):
 □
 □



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>38</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS Main Building</u>

*Map Name USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale:

1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS





Main Building (75 Alta Rd)



1954 Site plan, Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons Architects.

View to the west elevation of Main Building Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

The elevation is clad in redwood sidings painted brown on the exterior. The roof ridgeline is interrupted with two skylights, and one chimney. Overall, the west elevation is composed of a glass and metal exterior wall with white pitched room and skylights interspersed with wood siding. The overall fenestration rhythm consists of five black metal and glass sliding doors (three on the left and two on the right), each door has hopper windows directly above the sliding panes for ventilation. The south section of the west elevation has one square window and a narrow door, this is the service side of the building.



East elevation. Source: WBE 1954.



1954 Section Building A, Sliding Doors details. Source: WBE 1954.

South Elevation of the Main Building is a simple elevation comprised of two square windows. This elevation just like the other faces has redwood siding that is painted brown and arranged vertically.





North elevation of Main Building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



South elevation of Main Building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

South elevation of Main Building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

The south elevation is comprised of five black metal sliding glass doors that open directly into the patio outside: a red metal door, and one narrow glass door. This elevation is made up of redwood siding that is painted in brown color and has an colonnaded area with white square columns and white wide eaves. The fenestrations are all bronze glass. If you step back, you will see the white pitched roof a chimney.

East elevation of the Main Building contains five black metal sliding doors, one solid wood door, one redwood and glass door and one window.



East elevation of Main Building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

The north elevation is comprised of six black metal sliding doors, Three on each end; one wing glass door, two square windows; and redwood and glass door.

The Main Building defines four distinct courtyards each located within the quadrant created with the adjacent studio buildings. These courtyards are directly accessed via large sliding glass doors, exterior walkways, and other paths in the landscape and enhance the indoor-outdoor relationships that characterize the property. The northwest and northeast are better defined, whereas the southwest and southeast courtyards are open-ended and remain undefined by the parking lot. Each courtyard has a function. The northwest serves as a quite contemplative garden whereas the northeast dining terrace located directly contiguous to the main building dining hall that serves as the social heart of the CASBS complex. To accommodate the grade changes across the site both north courtyards have raised terraces at the center edged with typical Thomas Church stone walls. By contrast, the south terraces are leveled, the southwest courtyard is open and welcoming as part of the arrival and approach. The southeast courtyard does not have any main building circulation walkways along the perimeter and is therefore unused except for occasional service.





View of the entrance from the parking lot. Source: University Archives (PC0079) Baer, Morley, Photographer 1954.

State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

Page 44 of 74 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Main Building

*Recorded by: <u>Stanford University Professional Staff</u> *Date <u>January 2021</u>

Continuation Update



View of the entrance and southwest courtyard. Source: University Archives (PC0079) Baer, Morley, Photographer



View of the southwest courtyard from the west. Source: UA/CPD 2014.



View of the entrance and southwest courtyard. Source: University Archives (PC0079) Baer, Morley, Photographer



View of the southwest courtyard and entrance. Source: UA/CPD 2014.



View of the northwest courtyard. Source: University Archives (PC0079) Baer, Morley, Photographer 1954.



Northeast courtyard dining terrace from south. Source: UA/CPD 2015.



Northeast courtyard dining terrace from the colonnade of Main Building. Source: UA/CPD 2014.



View of planters in front of Studios 21-25 from south. Source: UA/CPD 2015.



Main Building east elevation. Source: UA/CPD 2014.

State of California & The Resourc DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND R	es Agency ECREATION	Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 3		
	Other Review Code	Reviewer	Date	Listings
Page _46 of _74 * P1. Other Identifier:	Resource Name or # : Jniversity Building Numbe	CASBS Studios 38-54 er 12-280		
*P2. Location: \Box Not for Pu	blication 🛛 🗧 Unrest	tricted		
 *a. County <u>Santa Clara</u> *b. USGS 7.5' Quad <u>Palo Alto</u> c. Address <u>77 Alta Road</u> d. UTM. Zong 105, 572572 	and Date 1997 City	T; R; Stanford	Of Of Sec; Zip94305	B.M.

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

Shortly after the opening the center was enlarged by the same team of architects. They added one long building at the northeast end of the site. This building follows the same section and wood deck but is longer than its predecessors (17 units) and bents slightly at the middle following the terrain.

West façade which is where you can enter the study rooms has seventeen red doors, each goes to a study room. There is a white board on the left side of each door that holds the researcher's name. This elevation opens to the colonnaded area, white square columns carry the roof and white eave. If you step back you from the building to see the whole façade, you can see seventeen square skylights that bring light to each individual study room. (continued on pg 48)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>

*P4.Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Element	of District 🛛 Other (Isolates, etc.)
P5a.	P5b. Description of Photo:
7700 4001 20	West view, Nov 2020
	*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ■ Historic □ Prehistoric
	□ Both
	1955
	*P7. Owner and Address:
	Board of Trustees, Stanford University
	LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall
	Redwood City, CA 94063
	*P8. Recorded by:
	N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway,
a second s	L. Jones, S. Marfatia
	*P9. Date Recorded: January 2021
	*P10. Survey Type: Intensive
	*P11. Report Citation:
	District Record: Center for Advanced
	Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford
	University. January 2021.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Record Record Other (List):



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page 47 of 74

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS Studios 38-54</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale:

1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS



	SOC ATTACHMENT
State of California - The Resources Agency	Primary#
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	HRI#
	Trinomial
CONTINUATION SHEET	
Page 48 of 74 *Resource Name or # (Assigned	ed by recorder) CASBS Studios 38-54
*Recorded by: Stanford University Professional Staff *D	Pate January 2021 Continuation Update

Studios 38-54 (77 Alta Rd)



Phase 2 addition. Source: WBE 1955.

The east elevation has the porch fronting seventeen ceiling to roof metal and glass sliding doors that connect each study room to the porch. The porch has brown square columns that are sitting on round concrete footings. The parapet has brown railing with still infill. Every other two columns are connected with a metal bracing, there are total of six metal bracings. You can see the back of the retaining wall on this elevation which is covered by redwood siding.

On the south elevation you can see the continuation of parapet and deck, and although there is no door on this elevation, there is one square window on the right side. You can see the white profile of pitched roof.

The north elevation is very simple, like the rest of the elevation is covered with redwood siding that is painted brown on the exterior and has one square window on the left side.



West elevation of Studios 38-54. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



Colonnade walkway side view of Studios 38-54. UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Primary# HRI # Trinomial

CONTINUATION SHEET

Page 49 of 74 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Studios 38-54

*Recorded by: <u>Stanford University Professional Staff</u> *Date January 2021

Continuation Update



East elevation of Studios 38-54. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



Deck side view of Studios 38-54. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



South elevation of Studios 38-54. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 38-54. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California & The Resource DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RE	es Agency CREATION	Primary # HRI #				
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial	Trinomial			
		NRHP Statu	us Code: 30	D		
	Other					Listings
	Review Code	Reviewer	r		Date	-
Page <u>50</u> of <u>74</u> P1. Other Identifier: Stanford U	* Resource Name or # Iniversity Building Nur	: <u>CASBS Studio</u> nber 12-230	os 13-16			
*P2. Location: 🗆 Not for Pu	olication 🔳 Uni	restricted				
*a. County Santa Clara	and					
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto	Date 19	997 T ;	, R; _	□ of	□ of Sec	; <u> </u>
c. Address 79 Alta Road	City	Stanford		Zip	94305	
d. UTM: Zone <u>10S</u> , <u>572572</u> r	nE/ <u>414151</u> mN					
e. Other Locational Data: (nor	ne)					

*P3a. Description:

Studios 13-16 has a total of five rooms, two on each end and the middle room is divided into two rooms to be used as storage and mechanical rooms.

The west elevation of Studios 13-16 has a total of six doors, two doors on each end take you to the study rooms and two narrower doors lead to storage and mechanical rooms. This elevation is called entrance elevation which has the colonnaded area in front of it. White square columns carry the white eave. There is a white board on the left side of each study room entrance door that carries the researchers name on it. You can see the four skylights on the ceiling of this elevation that bring natural light to each individual room. (continued on pg 52)

***P3b. Resource Attributes:** HP15 Educational Building



*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List):

State of California
Natural Resources Agency Primary # **DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION** HRI# LOCATION MAP Trinomial Page <u>51</u> of <u>74</u> *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Studios 13-16 ***Map Name:** USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 ***Scale:** *Date of map: 1997 USGS 1:1000 4 RS 147 BM C BN 140 ta BI 5



		SOC ATTACHMENT
State of California - The Resources Agency	Primary#	
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	HRI #	
	Trinomial	
CONTINUATION SHEET		
Page <u>52</u> of <u>74</u> *Resource Name or # (Assigned	by recorder) CASBS Stud	o 13-16
*Recorded by: <u>Stanford University Professional Staff</u> *Da	ite January 2021	Continuation Update

Studios 13-16 (79 Alta Rd)

The east elevation has the porch which is sitting on the hill with brown wood columns. Each office has a floor to ceiling sliding door that opens to the porch. The porch itself has a parapet that has a brown railing and steel infill.



East elevation of Studios 13-16. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

West elevation of Studios 13-16. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

North and South elevations are very simple, in both you can see the profile of the piched roof; north elevation has a square window on the right corner and south elevation has a square window on the left corner.



North elevation of Studios 13-16. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

South elevation of Studios 13-16. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California & The Resources Ager DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREAT	icy ION	Primary # HRI #				
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 3CD				
Other Review	v Code	Reviewer		Date	Listings	
Page 53 of 74 *Resou P1. Other Identifier: Stanford University	rce Name or #: ty Building Number	CASBS Studios 21-25 12-250	5			
*P2. Location: Not for Publication 	n 🔳 Unrestr	icted				
 *a. County Santa Clara *b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto c. Address <u>81 Alta Road</u> d. UTM: Zone 10S, 572572 mE/ 41 	and Date1997 City 4151 mN	T; R Stanford	; □ of Zip	_ □ of Sec; 94305	B.M.	

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

This building is rectangular on plan and has total of six rooms, two rooms on the east corner and three rooms on the west corner are study rooms, the room in the middle is divided to three smaller rooms that are being used as mechanical and storage rooms.

The South elevation from which one enters the study rooms has five doors that take you to the study rooms and two narrower doors that take you to the the machanical/ storage rooms. Each door has a board on the right side of the door that hold the current researcher's name. From the North elevation, five metal glass sliding doors open to the porch that gives beautiful views from each individual study room. The east and west elevations of this building are very simple, you can see the profile of the pitched white roof from these two elevations. The east elevation has a square window on the right side and west elevation has a square window on the left side. (continued on pg 55)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: HP15 Educational Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District ■Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.) *P4.Resources Present: Building P5a. P5b. Description of Photo: South view, Nov 2020 *P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: Historic Prehistoric Both 1954 *P7. Owner and Address: Board of Trustees, Stanford University LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall Redwood City, CA 94063 *P8. Recorded by: N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway, L. Jones, S. Marfatia ***P9. Date Recorded:** January 2021 *P10. Survey Type: Intensive *P11. Report Citation: District Record: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford University. January 2021.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List):



State of California
Natural Resources Agency Primary # **DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION** HRI# LOCATION MAP Trinomial Page <u>54</u> of <u>74</u> *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Studios 21-25 ***Map Name:** USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 ***Scale:** *Date of map: 1997 USGS 1:1000 4 0 9 147 BM 0 BI 14Pedestrian Overpass 0 ta B Lagunita 0 æ 00 b 200. 9945 O,

OSE



Studios 21-25 (81 Alta Rd)



East elevation of Studios 21-25. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



West elevation of Studios 21-25. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 21-25. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



South elevation of Studios 21-25. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California & The Resources A DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECRI	gency EATION	Primary # HRI #				
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 3CD				
Oth Rev	ner view Code	Reviewer		Date	Listings	
Page 56 of 74 *Re P1. Other Identifier: Stanford University	source Name or #: (ersity Building Numbe	CASBS Studios 17-2 er 12-240	0			
*P2. Location: Not for Publica	ation 🔳 Unrest	ricted				
*a.CountySanta Clara*b.USGS 7.5'QuadPaloAltoc.Address83Alta Roadd.UTM:Zone10S, 572572mB	and Date1997 City _/ <u>414151</u> _mN	T ; R Stanford	_; □ of Zip	_ □ of Sec ; 94305	B.M.	

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

The south elevation has two doors at each end which open to study rooms and there are two narrower doors that open to the middle room which is divided to three smaller rooms which are being used as mechanical and storage rooms. The elevation carries the colonnaded area that has white square columns and white eave.

The north elevation of building 12-240 has four black metal, floor to ceiling sliding doors. The sliding doors open to a porch that has a white trellis. The elevation is being held by white square columns that have round concrete footing.

The east and west elevations are very simple, you can see the profile of the pitched white roof from these two elevations. The east elevation has a square window on the left side and west elevation has a square window on the right side. (continued on pg 58)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>
 *P4.Resources Present: ■Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District ■ Element of District □ Other (Isolates, etc.)



- PSD. Description of Photo:
North view, Nov 2020
*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:
Historic DPrehistoric
□ Both
1954
*P7. Owner and Address:
Board of Trustees, Stanford University
LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall
Redwood City, CA 94063
*P8. Recorded by:
N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway,
L. Jones, S. Marfatia
*P9. Date Recorded: January 2021
*P10. Survey Type: Intensive
*P11. Report Citation:
District Record: Center for Advanced
Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford
University. January 2021.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Record Record Other (List):







Studios 17-20 (83 Alta Rd)



North elevation of Studios 17-20. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 17-20. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



West elevation of Studios 17-20. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



East elevation of Studios 17-20. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION		Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Co	de: 6Z	
Oti	ner			Listings
Re	view Code	Reviewer	D	ate
Page 59 of 74 *Res P1. Other Identifier: Stanford Univ	source Name or #: ersity Building Numb	CASBS Studios 26 er 12-260, Dairy	-29	
*P2. Location: Not for Public	ation 🔳 Unres	tricted		
*a. County <u>Santa Clara</u>		, – –	_ / _ /	
* b. USGS 7.5 [•] Quad Palo Alto	Date	/I; K	_; □ of □ of	
c. Address <u>85 Alta Koad</u>	City	Stanford	Zip <u>94</u>	303

Other Locational Data: (none) e.

*P3a. Description:

The dairy building is a two-story structure was part of the Alta Vista Farm that was integrated into the CASBS design by the architects Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons in 1954. It served as the study building J that housed 4 study rooms, a toilet room and storage space in the upper floor and service spaces in the lower. Minor changes were done to the building, only a new path and stairs were introduced at that time.

The structure (70' x 20') was carved into a steep hill making the south façade appear only one-story tall whereas the north façade is two stories tall. Both stories are connected to the ground at different levels. The roof is gabled with a low pitch and is composed of asphalt shingles. (continued on pg 61)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: HP15 Educational Building, HP33 Farm/Ranch

P5a. P5b. Description of Photo: North view, March 2015 *P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ■ Historic □ Prehistoric Both Pre-1908 *P7. Owner and Address: Board of Trustees, Stanford University LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall Redwood City, CA 94063 *P8. Recorded by: N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway, L. Jones, S. Marfatia *P9. Date Recorded: January 2021 *P10. Survey Type: Intensive *P11. Report Citation: District Record: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford University. January 2021.

*Attachments: DNONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Record Record □Archaeological Record □Artifact Record □Photograph Record □ Other (List):



□ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.) *P4.Resources Present: Building





*Recorded by: <u>Stanford University Professional Staff</u> *Date January 2021

Continuation Update

Studios 26-29 (Dairy Building, 85 Alta Rd)



Studios 26-29 south-east entry. Source: UA/CPD October 2014.



Studios 26-29 south-west entry. Source: UA/CPD April 2012.





Studios 26-29 west elevation. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.

Studios 26-29 east elevation. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.



Studios 26-29 north elevation. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.

The exterior walls of the top story are clad in dark painted wood shingles whereas the lower story is made of exposed grey concrete cinderblocks. The south façade has two gabled porches with slightly curved ends. The windows on this façade are double-hung with a one-over-one sash and white trim. By contrast, the top story of the other three elevations have the double hung windows paired. The lower story has three doors that open to a narrow concrete path with an oak tree and great views to the campus.

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION		Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code:	3CD	
	Other			Listings
	Review Code	Reviewer	Date	
Page 63 of 74 P1. Other Identifier: Stanford U	*Resource Name or #: University Building Numb	CASBS Studios 30-37 per 12-270		
*P2. Location: Not for Pu	blication Unres	stricted		
*a. County <u>Santa Clara</u> *b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto	and Date 1997	7 T ; R ;	□ of □ of Sec ;	B.M.
		a 0 1		
c. Address 87 Alta Road	City	Stanford	Zip <u>94305</u>	

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

This building is rectangular on plan and has a total of six rooms, three rooms on the east corner and three rooms on the west corner are study rooms, the room in the middle is divided into three smaller rooms that are being used as mechanical and storage rooms.

The south elevation, has six doors that take you to the study rooms and two narrower doors that take you to the mechanical/storage rooms. Each door has a board on the right side of the door that holds the current researcher's name.

The north elevation has six metal glass sliding doors that open to the porch that gives beautiful views to each individual study room. The east and west elevations on this building are very simple, you can see the profile of the pitched white roof from these two elevations. The east elevation has a square window on the left side and west elevation has a square window on the right side. (continued on pg 65)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: <u>HP15 Educational Building</u>



*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Record Record Art Record Other (List):



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>64</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS Studios 30-37</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale: <u>1:1000</u>

*Date of map: 1997 USGS





Studios 30-37 (87 Alta Rd)



West elevation of Studios 30-37. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



South elevation of Studios 30-37. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



North elevation of Studios 30-37. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.



East elevation of Studios 30-37. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION		Primary # HRI #			
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Co	de: 6Z		
Oth	ier				Listings
Rev	view Code	Reviewer		Date	
Page <u>66</u> of <u>74</u> *Re	source Name or #:	CASBS North Sh	ed		
P1. Other Identifier: Stanford Unive	ersity Building Numbe	er 12-290			
*P2. Location: Not for Publica	ntion 🔳 Unrest	tricted			
*a. County Santa Clara	and				
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto	Date 1997	T; R	; 🛛 of	□ of Sec ;	B.M.
c. Address 90 Alta Road	City	Stanford	Zip	94305	
d LITM Zong 108 572572 mE/	414151 mN				
u. UTWI. ZUITE $103, 372372$ ITE/	<u>+1+131 IIIIN</u>				

*P3a. Description:

The North Shed (12-290A) is clad in board-and-batten and has a rectangular addition with a flat roof attached to the rear-west facade. The building is symmetrical with a single opening centered on each side of the north and south façade. The rear-west facade has two openings symmetrically located on either side of the addition. All four openings have a three-over-three paned wood and glass sash windows. These windows are inoperable and have no visible hardware but could have been hopper or awning windows in the past. (continued on pg 68)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: HP4 Ancillary Building *P4.Resources Present: Building 🛛 Structure 🗆 Object 🗆 Site 🗆 District 🗆 Element of District 👘 Other (Isolates, etc.) P5a. P5b. Description of Photo: Northwest view, Oct 2014 *P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ■ Historic □ Prehistoric Both Unknown (pre-1955) *P7. Owner and Address: Board of Trustees, Stanford University LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall Redwood City, CA 94063 *P8. Recorded by: N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway, L. Jones, S. Marfatia ***P9. Date Recorded:** January 2021 *P10. Survey Type: Intensive *P11. Report Citation: District Record: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford University. January 2021.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Other (List):



State of California D Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION LOCATION MAP Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page <u>67</u> of <u>74</u>

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS North Shed</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale:

Scale: 1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS



State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	Primary# HRI # Trinomial	SOC ATTACHMENT
CONTINUATION SHEET Property Name: Page Of		
Page 68 of 74 *Resource Name or # (Assigne *Recorded by: Stanford University Professional Staff *	ed by recorder) CASBS Nort Date January 2021	h Shed

North Shed (90 Alta Rd)

One of two accessory structures flanking the parking lot at CASBS. These two structures are vernacular in design and of unknown construction date (they do not appear on the circa 1908 Lathrop Estate survey but do appear as "existing" buildings in 1954). Similar in design, both display a front gabled roof with small cupola vent, ornamental bracketing at the eaves and roofline, and four narrow pebbled glass windows on the front elevation. The current entry doors are each located at the front right edge of the building. (Both buildings appear to have had much larger doors on the front elevation that were later filled with plywood panels and narrow pebbled glass windows.)

The North Shed is clad in board-and-batten siding and displays three-over-three paned wood sash windows. These windows are inoperable, painted shut, and have no visible hardware but may have been hopper or awning windows. One window is centered on each side, and two windows appear on the rear elevation.





Rear elevation of North Shed with small addition and window. Source: LUEP June 2020.

Rear elevation of North Shed. Source: LUEP June 2020.

The side elevations of the North Shed are not accessible due to shrubbery, materials and equipment leaning against and blocking the walls. There is a flat roof of corrugated plastic braced between the North and South Sheds.

State of California & The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION		Primary # HRI #			
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Cod	e: 6Z		
Other					Listings
Revie	w Code	Reviewer		Date	
Page ₆₉ of <u>74</u> *Reso P1. Other Identifier: <u>Stanford Univers</u>	ource Name or #: ity Building Numbe	CASBS South She r 12-291	d		
*P2. Location: Not for Publication:	on 🔳 Unrest	ricted			
*a. County <u>Santa Clara</u>	and				
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Palo Alto	Date 1997	T; R	; □ of	□ of Sec ;	B.M.
c. Address 90 Alta Road	City	Stanford	Zip	94305	
d. UTM: Zone <u>10S</u> , <u>572572</u> mE/	<u>414151</u> mN				
e Other Locational Data: (none)					

*P3a. Description:

The South Shed (12-290B) is clad in corrugated metal on all four sides. The rear-west façade has two openings that have been boarded with plywood. The south facade displays a single opening than has been boarded with plywood. The building is directly adjacent to the CASBS volleyball court and signs celebrating volleyball victories in the recent past are displayed on the plywood. The building is in a state of disrepair with a cracked slab and the exterior siding that has been removed and replaced. The building is currently used as a storage shed. (continued on pg 70)

*P3b. Resource Attributes:	HP4 Ancillary Building
*P3b. Resource Attributes: *P4.Resources Present: I Building	HP4 Ancillary Building Structure Object Site District Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.) P5b. Description of Photo: West view, Oct 2014 *P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: Historic Prehistoric Both Unknown (pre-1955) *P7. Owner and Address: Board of Trustees, Stanford University LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall Redwood City, CA 94063 *P8. Recorded by: N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway, L. Jones, S. Marfatia *P9. Date Recorded: January 2021 *P10. Survey Type: Intensive *P11. Repart Citation: District Record: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford
	University. January 2021

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Record Art Record Artifact Record Other (List):
State of California
Natural Resources Agency **DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION** LOCATION MAP

Primary # HRI# Trinomial

Page _70 _ of _74 ____

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) <u>CASBS South Shed</u>

*Map Name: USGS Palo Alto Quadrangle 7.5 *Scale: 1:1000

*Date of map: 1997 USGS



State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	Primary# HRI # Trinomial	SOC ATTACHMENT		
CONTINUATION SHEET				
Property Name:				
Page of				
Page <u>71</u> of <u>74</u> *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS South Shed				
*Recorded by: Stanford University Professional Staff	*Date January 2021	Continuation Update		

South Shed (90 Alta Rd)

One of two accessory structures flanking the parking lot at CASBS. These two structures are vernacular in design and of unknown construction date (they do not appear on the circa 1908 Lathrop Estate survey but do appear as "existing" buildings in 1954). Similar in design, both display a front gabled roof with small cupola vent, ornamental bracketing at the eaves and roofline, and four narrow pebbled glass windows on the front elevation. The current entry doors are each located at the front right edge of the building. (Both buildings appear to have had much larger doors on the front elevation that were later filled with plywood panels and narrow pebbled glass windows.)



South Shed with corrugated metal siding. Source: UA/CPD March 2015.

There is a flat roof of corrugated plastic braced between the North and South Sheds.



Rear-west elevation of South Shed. Source: LUEP March 2020.



South elevation of South Shed. Source: LUEP March 2020.

SOC ATTACHMENT

State of California & The Resourd DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND F	ces Agency RECREATION	Primary # HRI #		
PRIMARY RECORD		Trinomial NRHP Status Code: 6	Z	
	Other Review Code	Reviewer	Date	Listings
Page 72 of 74 P1. Other Identifier: Stanford	*Resource Name or #: University Building Number	CASBS Showers r 12-291		
*P2. Location: Not for Particular Santa Clara	ublication Unrestr and	ricted		
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad <u>Palo Alta</u> c. Address <u>90 Alta Road</u> d. UTM: Zone <u>10S</u> , <u>57257</u>	Date 1997 1 City 2 mE/	T; R; Stanford	_ □ of □ of Sec; Zip _94305	<u> </u>

e. Other Locational Data: (none)

*P3a. Description:

In 1965, a small restroom building was constructed west of the sheds, built to serve the volleyball court. The restroom has a flat tar and gravel roof, exposed wood rafters, and clerestory windows. The restroom building does not appear on the 1954 construction plan and no construction documents have been located for this structure. (continued on pg 74)

P3b. Resource Attributes: HP4 Ancillary Building		
*P4.Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Elem	nent of District 🛛 Other (Isolates, etc.)	
P5a.	P5b. Description of Photo:	
	East view	
	*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ■ Historic □ Prehistoric	
Construction of the second sec	Both	
	1965	
	*P7. Owner and Address:	
	Board of Trustees, Stanford University	
	LBRE 415 Broadway, Academy Hall	
	Redwood City, CA 94063	
	*P8. Recorded by:	
	N. Baradaranfallahkhair, L. Conway,	
	L. Jones, S. Marfatia	
	*P9. Date Recorded: January 2021	
	*P10. Survey Type:	
	Intensive	
	*P11. Report Citation:	
	District Record: Center for Advanced	
	Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Stanford	
	University. January 2021.	

*Attachments: DONE ILocation Map Continuation Sheet Duilding, Structure, and Object Record □Archaeological Record □District Record □Linear Feature Record □Milling Station Record □Rock Art Record □Artifact Record □Photograph Record Other (List):



	SOC ATTACHMENT			
State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION	Primary# HRI # Trinomial			
CONTINUATION SHEET				
Page <u>74</u> of <u>74</u> *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) CASBS Showers				
*Recorded by: Stanford University Professional Staff *Date	January 2021 Continuation Update			

Shower/Restroom Building (90 Alta Rd)

The east elevation of the Shower/Restroom building is comprised of two horizontal sections; lower/ wider red masonry section that has three narrow white doors; and upper/ narrower section that has a continuous row of clerestory windows at each corner and a solid white infill opaque section. The infill is the same size as a clerestory window and holds the building number. A continuous horizontal trim piece separates the clearstory from the masonry section.

The west elevation is as simple as the east elevation; it is divided to two horizontal sections as the east elevation. The lower/ wider section is very simple and comprised of only red masonry units. The upper/ narrower section has two clerestory windows at each corner and a solid white section the same size as the clerestory window in the center.

The north and south elevations are identical; like the east elevation, a continuous horizontal trim divides the elevation into an upper and lower section. The lower section is wider and is made of red masonry units; the upper level is narrower and is divided to two clerestory openings, but the openings are filled with solid white wood pieces.



Shower/Restroom building east façade. Source: UACPD November 2020.



North elevation of Shower/Restroom building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020. DPR 523L (9/2013



South elevation of Shower/Restroom building. Source: UA/CPD November 2020.

C ATTACHMENT

TPS Preservation Brief #14 – New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns.

14 PRESERVATION BRIEFS

New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns

Anne E. Grimmer and Kay D. Weeks



National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior Technical Preservation Services

A new exterior addition to a historic building should be considered in a rehabilitation project only after determining that requirements for the new or adaptive use cannot be successfully met by altering nonsignificant interior spaces. If the new use cannot be accommodated in this way, then an exterior addition may be an acceptable alternative. Rehabilitation as a treatment "is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and *additions* while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values."

The topic of new additions, including rooftop additions, to historic buildings comes up frequently, especially as it



Figure 1. The addition to the right with its connecting hyphen is compatible with the Collegiate Gothic-style library. The addition is set back from the front of the library and uses the same materials and a simplified design that references, but does not copy, the historic building. Photo: David Wakely Photography.



relates to rehabilitation projects. It is often discussed and it is the subject of concern, consternation, considerable disagreement and confusion. Can, in certain instances, a historic building be enlarged for a new use without destroying its historic character? And, just what is significant about each particular historic building that should be preserved? Finally, what kind of new construction is appropriate to the historic building?

The vast amount of literature on the subject of additions to historic buildings reflects widespread interest as well as divergence of opinion. New additions have been discussed by historians within a social and political framework; by architects and architectural historians in terms of construction technology and style; and

> by urban planners as successful or unsuccessful contextual design. However, within the historic preservation and rehabilitation programs of the National Park Service, the focus on new additions is to ensure that they preserve the character of historic buildings.

Most historic districts or neighborhoods are listed in the National Register of Historic Places for their significance within a particular time frame. This period of significance of historic districts as well as individually-listed properties may sometimes lead to a misunderstanding that inclusion in the National Register may prohibit any physical change outside of a certain historical period-particularly in the form of exterior additions. National Register listing does not mean that a building or district is frozen in time and that no change can be made without compromising the historical significance. It does mean, however, that a new addition to a historic building should preserve its historic character. 77



Figure 2. The new section on the right is appropriately scaled and reflects the design of the historic Art Deco-style hotel. The apparent separation created by the recessed connector also enables the addition to be viewed as an individual building.

Guidance on New Additions

To meet Standard 1 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which states that "a property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment," it must be determined whether a historic building can accommodate a new addition. Before expanding the building's footprint, consideration should first be given to incorporating changes-such as code upgrades or spatial needs for a new use-within secondary areas of the historic building. However, this is not always possible and, after such an evaluation, the conclusion may be that an addition is required, particularly if it is needed to avoid modifications to character-defining interior spaces. An addition should be designed to be compatible with the historic character of the building and, thus, meet the Standards for Rehabilitation. Standards 9 and 10 apply specifically to new additions:

(9) "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

(10) "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

The subject of new add **ROGAT TACHAR NT** cause a new addition to a historic building has the potential to change its historic character as well as to damage and destroy significant historic materials and features. A new addition also has the potential to confuse the public and to make it difficult or impossible to differentiate the old from the new or to recognize what part of the historic building is genuinely historic.

The intent of this Preservation Brief is to provide guidance to owners, architects and developers on how to design a compatible new addition, including a rooftop addition, to a historic building. A new addition to a historic building should preserve the building's *historic character*. To accomplish this and meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, a new addition should:

- Preserve significant historic materials, features and form;
- · Be compatible; and
- Be differentiated from the historic building.

Every historic building is different and each rehabilitation project is unique. Therefore, the guidance offered here is not specific, but general, so that it can be applied to a wide variety of building types and situations. To assist in interpreting this guidance, illustrations of a variety of new additions are provided. Good examples, as well as some that do not meet the Standards, are included to further help explain and clarify what is a compatible new addition that preserves the character of the historic building.



Figure 3. The red and buff-colored parking addition with a rooftop playground is compatible with the early-20th century school as well as with the neighborhood in which it also serves as infill in the urban setting.



Preserve Significant Historic Materials, Features and Form

Attaching a new exterior addition usually involves some degree of material loss to an external wall of a historic building, but it should be minimized. Damaging or destroying significant materials and craftsmanship should be avoided, as much as possible.

Generally speaking, preservation of historic buildings inherently implies minimal change to primary or "public" elevations and, of course, interior features as well. Exterior features that distinguish one historic building or a row of buildings and which can be seen from a public right of way, such as a street or sidewalk, are most likely to be the most significant. These can include many different elements, such as: window patterns, window hoods or shutters; porticoes, entrances and doorways; roof shapes, cornices and decorative moldings; or commercial storefronts with their special detailing, signs and glazing patterns. Beyond a single building, entire blocks of urban or residential structures are often closely related architecturally by their materials, detailing, form and alignment. Because significant materials and features should be preserved, not damaged or hidden, the first place to consider placing a new addition is in a location where the least amount of historic material and character-defining features will be lost. In most cases, this will be on a secondary side or rear elevation.

One way to reduce overall material loss when constructing a new addition is simply to keep the addition smaller in proportion to the size of the historic

building. Limiting the size and number of openings between old and new by utilizing existing doors or enlarging windows also helps to minimize loss. An often successful way to accomplish this is to link the addition to the historic building by means of a hyphen or connector. A connector provides a physical link while visually separating the old and new, and the connecting passageway penetrates and removes only a small portion of the historic wall. A new addition that will abut the historic building along an entire elevation or wrap around a side and rear elevation, will likely integrate the historic and the new interiors, and thus result in a high degree of loss of form and exterior walls, as well as significant alteration of interior spaces and features, and will not meet the Standards.





Figure 4. This glass and brick structure is a harmonious addition set back and connected to the rear of the Colonial Revival-style brick house. Cunningham/Quill Architects. Photos: © Maxwell MacKenzie.

Compatible but Differentiated Design

In accordance with the Standards, a new addition must preserve the building's historic character and, in order to do that, it must be differentiated, but compatible, with the historic building. A new addition must retain the essential form and integrity of the historic property. Keeping the addition smaller, limiting the removal of historic materials by linking the addition with a hyphen, and locating the new addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side elevation of a historic building are techniques discussed previously that can help to accomplish this.

Rather than differentiating between old and new, it might seem more in keeping with the historic character

simply to repeat the historic form, material, features and detailing in a new addition. However, when the new work is highly replicative and indistinguishable from the old in appearance, it may no longer be possible to identify the "real" historic building. Conversely, the treatment of the addition should not be so different that it becomes the primary focus. The difference may be subtle, but it must be clear. A new addition to a historic building should protect those visual qualities that make the building eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The National Park Service policy concerning new additions to historic buildings, which was adopted in 1967, is not unique. It is an outgrowth and continuation of a general philosophical approach to change first expressed by John Ruskin in England in the 1850s, formalized by William Morris in the founding of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in 1877, expanded by the Society in 1924 and, finally, reiterated in the 1964 Venice Charter-a document that continues to be followed by the national committees of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The 1967 Administrative Policies for Historical Areas of the National Park System direct that "...a modern addition should be readily distinguishable from the older work; however, the new work should be harmonious with the old in scale, proportion, materials, and color. Such additions should be as inconspicuous as possible from the public SOCW TAS CHARANT volution from these Policies specifically for National Park Service-owned historic structures, the 1977 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which may be applied to all historic buildings listed in, or eligible for listing in the National Register, also state that "the new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

Preserve Historic Character

The goal, of course, is a new addition that preserves the building's historic character. The historic character of each building may be different, but the methodology of establishing it remains the same. Knowing the uses and functions a building has served over time will assist in making what is essentially a physical evaluation. But, while written and pictorial documentation can provide a framework for establishing the building's history, to a large extent the historic character is embodied in the physical aspects of the historic building itself—shape, materials, features, craftsmanship, window arrangements, colors, setting and interiors. Thus, it is important to identify the historic character before making decisions about the extent—or limitations—of change that can be made.



Figure 5. This addition (a) is constructed of matching brick and attached by a recessed connector (b) to the 1914 apartment building (c). The design is compatible and the addition is smaller and subordinate to the historic building (d).





Figure 6. A new addition (left) is connected to the garage which separates it from the main block of the c. 1910 former florist shop (right). The addition is traditional in style, yet sufficiently restrained in design to distinguish it from the historic building.

A new addition should always be subordinate to the historic building; it should not compete in size, scale or design with the historic building. An addition that bears no relationship to the proportions and massing of the historic building-in other words, one that overpowers the historic form and changes the scalewill usually compromise the historic character as well. The appropriate size for a new addition varies from building to building; it could never be stated in a square or cubic footage ratio, but the historic building's existing proportions, site and setting can help set some general parameters for enlargement. Although even a small addition that is poorly designed can have an adverse impact, to some extent, there is a predictable relationship between the size of the historic resource and what is an appropriate size for a compatible new addition.

property should not be covered with large paved areas for parking which would drastically change the character of the site.

Despite the fact that in most cases it is recommended that the new addition be attached to a secondary elevation, sometimes this is not possible. There simply may not be a secondary elevation—some important freestanding buildings have significant materials and features on all sides. A structure or group of structures together with its setting (for example, a college campus) may be of such significance that any new addition would not only damage materials, but alter the buildings' relationship to each other and the setting. An addition attached to a highly-visible elevation of a historic building can radically alter the historic form or obscure features such as a decorative cornice or window ornamentation. Similarly, an addition that fills

Generally, constructing the new addition on a secondary side or rear elevation—in addition to material preservation—will also preserve the historic character. Not only will the addition be less visible, but because a secondary elevation is usually simpler and less distinctive, the addition will have less of a physical and visual impact on the historic building. Such placement will help to preserve the building's historic form and relationship to its site and setting.

Historic landscape features, including distinctive grade variations, also need to be respected. Any new landscape features, including plants and trees, should be kept at a scale and density that will not interfere with understanding of the historic resource itself. A traditionally landscaped



Figure 7. A vacant side lot was the only place a new stair tower could be built when this 1903 theater was rehabilitated as a performing arts center. Constructed with matching materials, the stair tower is set back with a recessed connector and, despite its prominent location, it is clearly subordinate and differentiated from the historic theater. **81**



Figure 8. The rehabilitation of this large, early-20th century warehouse (left) into affordable artists' lofts included the addition of a compatible glass and brick elevator/stair tower at the back (right).



Figure 9. A simple, brick stair tower replaced two non-historic additions at the rear of this 1879 school building when it was rehabilitated as a women's and children's shelter. The addition is set back and it is not visible from the front of the school.



Figure 10. The small size and the use of matching materials ensures that the new addition on the left is compatible with the historic Romanesque Revival-style building.

in a planned void on a highly-visible elevation (such as a U-shaped plan or a feature such as a porch) will also alter the historic form and, as a result, change the historic character. Under these circumstances, an addition would have too much of a negative impact on the historic building and it would not meet the Standards. Such situations may best be handled by constructing a separate building in a location where it will not adversely affect the historic structure and its setting.

In other instances, particularly in urban areas, there may be no other place but adjacent to the primary façade to locate an addition needed for the new use. It may be possible to design a lateral addition attached on the side that is compatible with the historic building, even though it is a highly-visible new element. Certain types of historic structures, such as government buildings, metropolitan museums, churches or libraries, may be so massive in size that a relatively largescale addition may not compromise the historic character, provided, of course, the addition is smaller than the historic building. Occasionally, the visible size of an addition can be reduced by placing some of the spaces or support systems in a part of the structure that is underground. Large new additions may sometimes be successful if they read as a separate volume, rather than as an extension of the historic structure, although the scale, massing and proportions of the addition still need to be compatible with the historic building. However, similar expansion of smaller buildings would be dramatically out of scale. In summary, where any new addition is proposed, correctly assessing the relationship between actual size and relative scale will be a key to preserving the character of the historic building.

SOC ATTACHMENT



Figure 11. The addition to this early-20th century Gothic Revival-style church provides space for offices, a great hall for gatherings and an accessible entrance (left). The stucco finish, metal roof, narrow gables and the Gothic-arched entrance complement the architecture of the historic church. Placing the addition in back where the ground slopes away ensures that it is subordinate and minimizes its impact on the church (below).

Design Guidance for Compatible New Additions to Historic Buildings

There is no formula or prescription for designing a new addition that meets the Standards. A new addition to a historic building that meets the Standards can be any architectural style — traditional, contemporary or a simplified version of the historic building. However, there must be a balance between differentiation and compatibility in order to maintain the historic character and the identity of the building being enlarged. New additions that too closely resemble the historic building or are in extreme contrast to it fall short of this balance. *Inherent in all of the guidance is the concept that an addition needs to be subordinate to the historic building*.

A new addition must preserve significant historic materials, features and form, and it must be compatible but differentiated from the historic building. To achieve this, it is necessary to carefully consider the placement or location of the new addition, and its size, scale and massing when planning a new addition. To preserve a property's historic character, a new addition must be visually distinguishable from the historic building. This does not mean that the addition and the historic building should be glaringly different in terms of design, materials and other visual qualities. Instead, the new addition should take its design cues from, but not copy, the historic building.



A variety of design techniques can be effective ways to differentiate the new construction from the old, while respecting the architectural qualities and vocabulary of the historic building, including the following:

- Incorporate a simple, recessed, small-scale hyphen to physically separate the old and the new volumes or set the addition back from the wall plane(s) of the historic building.
- Avoid designs that unify the two volumes into a single architectural whole. The new addition may include simplified architectural features that reflect, but do not duplicate, similar features on the historic building. This approach will not impair the existing building's historic character as long as the new structure is subordinate in size and clearly differentiated and distinguishable so that the identity of the historic structure is not lost in a new and larger composition. The historic building must be clearly identifiable and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition.



Figure 12. This 1954 synagogue (left) is accessed through a monumental entrance to the right. The new education wing (far right) added to it features the same vertical elements and color and, even though it is quite large, its smaller scale and height ensure that it is secondary to the historic resource.



Figure 13. A glass and metal structure was constructed in the courtyard as a restaurant when this 1839 building was converted to a hotel. Although such an addition might not be appropriate in a more public location, it is compatible here in the courtyard of this historic building.



Figure 14. This glass addition was erected at the back of an 1895 former brewery during rehabilitation to provide another entrance. The addition is compatible with the plain character of this secondary elevation.

- Use building materials in the same color range or value as those of the historic building. The materials need not be the same as those on the historic building, but they should be harmonious; they should not be so different that they stand out or distract from the historic building. (Even clear glass can be as prominent as a less transparent material. Generally, glass may be most appropriate for small-scale additions, such as an entrance on a secondary elevation or a connector between an addition and the historic building.)
- Base the size, rhythm and alignment of the new addition's window and door openings on those of the historic building.
- Respect the architectural expression of the historic building type. For example, an addition to an institutional building should maintain the architectural character associated with this building type rather than using details and elements typical of residential or other building types.

These techniques are merely examples of ways to differentiate a new addition from the historic building while ensuring that the addition is compatible with it. Other ways of differentiating a new addition from the historic building may be used as long as they maintain the primacy of the historic building. Working within these basic principles still allows for a broad range of architectural expression that can range from stylistic similarity to contemporary distinction. The recommended design approach for an addition is one that neither copies the historic building exactly nor stands in stark contrast to it. Revising an Incompatible Design for a New Addition to Meet the Standards

















Figure 15. The rehabilitation of a c. 1930 high school auditorium for a clinic and offices proposed two additions: a one-story entrance and reception area on this elevation (a); and a four-story elevator and stair tower on another side (b). The gabled entrance (c) first proposed was not compatible with the flat-roofed auditorium and the design of the proposed stair tower (d) was also incompatible and overwhelmed the historic building. The designs were revised (e-f) resulting in new additions that meet the Standards (g-h).

Incompatible New Additions to Historic Buildings

New Addition TRANSPORT OF CONTRACTOR OF CON Her III 199 Martin Contraction and Allower States and Allower and Allower States and Allower and Allower Allower and Allower a bandle of TRACK LAPTER. E-Statio Criste ACTING & LOAD THINK IN ADD П H --Ħ H STATE OF STREET PERSONAL NEW EAST ELEVATION: PROPOSED Street South Street of

Figure 16. The proposal to add three row houses to the rear ell of this early-19th century residential property doubles its size and does not meet the Standards..

SOC ATTACHMENT



Figure 17. The small addition on the left is starkly different and it is not compatible with the eclectic, late-19th century house.





Figure 18. The expansion of a one- and one-half story historic bungalow (left) with a large two-story rear addition (right) has greatly altered and obscured its distinctive shape and form.



Figure 19. The upper two floors of this early-20th century office building were part of the original design, but were not built. During rehabilitation, the two stories were finally constructed. This treatment does not meet the Standards because the addition has given the building an appearance it never had historically.



Figure 20. The height, as well as the design, of these two-story rooftop additions overwhelms the two-story and the one-story, low-rise historic buildings.



New Additions in Densely-Built Environments

In built-up urban areas, locating a new addition on a less visible side or rear elevation may not be possible simply because there is no available space. In this instance, there may be alternative ways to help preserve the historic character. One approach when connecting a new addition to a historic building on a primary elevation is to use a hyphen to separate them. A subtle variation in material, detailing and color may also provide the degree of differentiation necessary to avoid changing the essential proportions and character of the historic building.

A densely-built neighborhood such as a downtown commercial core offers a particular opportunity to design an addition that will have a minimal impact on the historic building. Often the site for such an addition is a vacant lot where another building formerly stood. Treating the addition as a separate or infill building may be the best approach when designing an addition that will have the least impact on the historic building and the district. In these instances there may be no need for a direct visual link to the historic building. Height and setback from the street should generally be consistent with those of the historic building and other surrounding buildings in the district. Thus, in most urban commercial areas the addition should not be set back from the facade of the historic building. A tight urban setting may sometimes even accommodate a larger addition if the primary elevation is designed to give the appearance of being several buildings by breaking up the facade into elements that are consistent with the scale of the historic building and adjacent buildings.

New Addition





Figure 21. Both wings of this historic L-shaped building (top), which fronts on two city streets, adjoined vacant lots. A two-story addition was constructed on one lot (above, left) and a six-story addition was built on the other (above, right). Like the historic building, which has two different facades, the compatible new additions are also different and appear to be separate structures rather than part of the historic building.



Figure 22. The proposed new addition is compatible with the historic buildings that remain on the block. Its design with multiple storefronts helps break up the mass.

SOC ATTACHMENT



Rooftop Additions

The guidance provided on designing a compatible new addition to a historic building applies equally to new rooftop additions. A rooftop addition should preserve the character of a historic building by preserving historic materials, features and form; and it should be compatible but differentiated from the historic building.

However, there are several other design principles that apply specifically to rooftop additions. Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height to minimize its visibility and its impact on the proportion and profile of the historic building. A rooftop addition should almost always be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is free-standing or highly visible.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to minimize the impact of adding an entire new floor to relatively low buildings, such as small-scale residential or commercial structures, even if the new addition is set back from the plane of the façade. Constructing another floor on top of a small, one, two or three-story building is seldom appropriate for buildings of this size as it would measurably alter the building's proportions and profile, and negatively impact its historic character. On the other hand, a rooftop addition on an eight-story building, for example, in a historic district consisting primarily of tall buildings might not affect the historic character because the new construction may blend in with the surrounding buildings and be only minimally visible within the district. A rooftop addition in a densely-built urban area is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.

A number of methods may be used to help evaluate the effect of a proposed rooftop addition on a historic building and district, including pedestrian sight lines, threedimensional schematics and computer-generated design. However, drawings generally do not provide a true "picture" of the appearance and visibility of a proposed rooftop addition. For this reason, it is often necessary to construct a rough, temporary, full-size or skeletal mock up of a portion of the proposed addition, which can then be photographed and evaluated from critical vantage points on surrounding streets.







Figure 23. Colored flags marking the location of a proposed penthouse addition (a) were placed on the roof to help evaluate the impact and visibility of an addition planned for this historic furniture store (b). Based on this evaluation, the addition was constructed as proposed. It is minimally visible and compatible with the 1912 structure (c). The tall parapet wall conceals the addition from the street below (d).

SOC ATTACHMENT



Figure 24. How to Evaluate a Proposed Rooftop Addition. A sight-line study (above) only factors in views from directly across the street, which can be very restrictive and does not illustrate the full effect of an addition from other public rights of way. A mock up (above, right) or a mock up enhanced by a computer-generated rendering (below, right) is essential to evaluate the impact of a proposed rooftop addition on the historic building.





Figure 25. It was possible to add a compatible, three-story, penthouse addition to the roof of this five-story, historic bank building because the addition is set far back, it is surrounded by taller buildings and a deep parapet conceals almost all of the addition from below.

Figure 26. A rooftop addition would have negatively impacted the character of the primary facade (right) of this mid-19th century, four-story structure and the low-rise historic district. However, a third floor was successfully added on the two-story rear portion (below) of the same building with little impact to the building or the district because it blends in with the height of the adjacent building.







Figure 27. Although the new brick stair/elevator tower (left) is not visible from the front (right), it is on a prominent side elevation of this 1890 stone bank. The compatible addition is set back and does not compete with the historic building. Photos: Chadd Gossmann, Aurora Photography, LLC.

Designing a New Exterior Addition to a Historic Building

This guidance should be applied to help in designing a compatible new addition that that will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

- A new addition should be simple and unobtrusive in design, and should be distinguished from the historic building—a recessed connector can help to differentiate the new from the old.
- A new addition should not be highly visible from the public right of way; a rear or other secondary elevation is usually the best location for a new addition.
- The construction materials and the color of the new addition should be harmonious with the historic building materials.
- The new addition should be smaller than the historic building—it should be subordinate in both size and design to the historic building.

The same guidance should be applied when designing a compatible **rooftop** addition, plus the following:

- A rooftop addition is generally not appropriate for a one, two or three-story building—and often is not appropriate for taller buildings.
- A rooftop addition should be minimally visible.
- Generally, a rooftop addition must be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is freestanding or highly visible.
- Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height.
- Generally, a rooftop addition is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.





Figure 28. A small addition (left) was constructed when this 1880s train station was converted for office use. The paired doors with transoms and arched windows on the compatible addition reflect, but do not replicate, the historic building (right).





SOC ATTACHMENT

Figure 29. This simple glass and brick entrance (left) added to a secondary elevation of a 1920s school building (right) is compatible with the original structure.

Summary

Because a new exterior addition to a historic building can damage or destroy significant materials and can change the building's character, an addition should be considered only after it has been determined that the new use cannot be met by altering non-significant, or secondary, interior spaces. If the new use cannot be met in this way, then an attached addition may be an acceptable alternative if carefully planned and designed. A new addition to a historic building should be constructed in a manner that preserves significant materials, features and form, and preserves the building's historic character. Finally, an addition should be differentiated from the historic building so that the new work is compatible with—and does not detract from—the historic building, and cannot itself be confused as historic.

Additional Reading

Byard, Paul Spencer. The Architecture of New Additions: Design and Regulation. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998.

Day, Steven, AIA. "Modernism Meets History: New Additions to Historic Structures." *Preservation Seattle* [Historic Seattle's online monthly preservation magazine.] May 2003. www.historicseattle.org/preservationseattle/publicpolicy/ defaultmay2.htm.

Incentives! A Guide to the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program for Income-Producing Properties. "Avoiding Incompatible Treatments: New Additions & Rooftop Additions." Technical Preservation Services Branch, National Park Service. Online at <u>www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/</u>.

Interpreting the Standards Bulletins (ITS). Technical Preservation Services Branch, National Park Service. Online at www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/.

New Additions to Historic Buildings. Technical Preservation Services Branch, National Park Service. Online at <u>www.nps.</u> <u>gov/history/hps/tps/</u>.

O'Connell, Kim A. "Making Connections." Traditional Building. March/April 2004. (Vol. 17, No. 2), pp. 12-15.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Preservation Assistance Division, rev. 1990.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. (Authors: W. Brown Morton, III, Gary L. Hume, Kay D. Weeks, and H. Ward Jandl. Project Directors: Anne E. Grimmer and Kay D. Weeks.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Preservation Assistance Division, 1992. Online at <u>www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/</u>.

Semes, Steven W. "Differentiated and Compatible: The Secretary's Standards revisited." *Traditional Building*. February 2009. (Vol. 22, No. 1), pp. 20-23.

Semes, Steven W. *The Future of the Past: A Conservation Ethic for Architecture, Urbanism, and Historic Preservation.* (In association with The Institute of Classical Architecture and Classical America.) New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2009.



Figure 30. The small addition on the right of this late-19th century commercial structure is clearly secondary and compatible in size, materials and design with the historic building. **91**



Figure 31. An elevator/stair tower was added at the back of this Richardsonian Romanesque-style theater when it was rehabilitated. Rough-cut stone and simple cut-out openings ensure that the addition is compatible and subordinate to the historic building. Photo: Chuck Liddy, AIA.

Acknowledgements

Anne E. Grimmer, Senior Architectural Historian, Technical Preservation Services Branch, National Park Service, revised *Preservation Brief 14*, written by Kay D. Weeks and first published in 1986. The revised Brief features all new illustrations and contains expanded and updated design guidance on the subject of new additions that has been developed by the Technical Preservation Services Branch since the original publication of the Brief. Several individuals generously contributed their time and expertise to review the revision of this *Preservation Brief*, including: Sharon C. Park, FAIA, Chief, Architectural History and Historic Preservation, Smithsonian Institution; Elizabeth Tune and Karen Brandt, Department of Historic Resources, Commonwealth of Virginia; and Phillip Wisley and David Ferro, Division of Historical Resources, Florida Department of State. The Technical Preservation Services professional staff, in particular Michael J. Auer, Jo Ellen Hensley, Gary Sachau and Rebecca Shiffer, also provided important guidance in the development of this publication. All illustrations are from National Park Service files unless otherwise credited. Front cover image: Detail of new addition shown in Figure 4. Photo: © Maxwell MacKenzie.

This publication has been prepared pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop and make available information concerning historic properties. The Technical Preservation Services Branch, National Park Service, prepares standards, guidelines and other educational materials on responsible historic preservation treatments for a broad public audience. Additional information about the programs of Technical Preservation Services is available on the website at <u>www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps</u>. Comments about this publication should be addressed to: Charles E. Fisher, Technical Preservation Publications Program Manager, Technical Preservation Services-2255, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240. This publication is not copyrighted and can be reproduced without penalty. Normal procedures for credit to the author and the National Park Service are appreciated.

ISBN: 978-0-16-085869-7 U.S. Government Printing Office Stock Number: 024-005-01280-0

Stanford University - Design Philosophy for Architectural Compatibility

Stanford University is a place for learning, discovery, innovation, expression, and discourse. Since the opening of the university in 1891, Stanford's physical campus has played a vital role to support and enhance the university's mission and vision. Although the university's endeavors and physical campus have continued to evolve, many of the principles that have shaped the campus planning and design have remained consistent.

Stanford Campus Character

The original architecture and campus master plan have shaped the character of Stanford's built environment. Programming, planning, and architecture first and foremost support the university's academic and research mission, with a secondary goal of enriching the sense of place for the Stanford community.



Components of Stanford's general planning and architecture principles that advance the campus identity include:

• **Campus framework plan and vision**: Stanford generally sites buildings in a manner that is informed by the precepts of the original Frederick Law Olmsted Campus Plan that including a strong axial entry sequence, a framework of north/south and east/west

malls and roads, and an east/west series of quadrangles that provide order and create dynamic exterior spaces. Residential neighborhoods, as well as areas that house unique programs such as the recreation and athletics, are often organized in a less formal manner.

- Scale & massing: A general planning principle is to develop the campus in a compact manner with buildings designed at a sensitive human scale. Buildings are planned with a special attention to how the bases of the buildings address the ground plane, the roof and lid profiles meet the sky, and program spaces engage the landscape.
- **Exterior material consistency**: While Stanford encourages a range of architectural styles on campus , a consistent exterior palette of materials in warm earth-tone colors contributes to a sense of campus continuity.
- Sense of place: In new buildings and redevelopment of existing buildings, Stanford focuses on creating connections between the interior and exterior environments as well as creating hubs that relate to the programs. Standards for signs, waste and recycling containers, site furniture, lighting, and landscape details strengthen the overall consistency of the campus. Campus connective elements and standards are periodically updated to address new program needs (e.g. recycling receptacles, LED light fixtures, etc.).

Architectural Compatibility

The main Stanford campus sits predominantly in unincorporated Santa Clara County and the county guidelines (Guideline for Architecture and Site Approval, Chapter 1-Design, Section A-Architecture, Compatibility with Neighbors) are consistent with the way Stanford thinks about architectural compatibility; properly siting buildings, establishing appropriate massing, and using quality exterior materials in earth tone color palettes, serves Stanford well to ground the planning and architecture on its campus.

Many memories of the iconic Stanford campus are rooted in the architecture of the Main Quad which continues to anchor and represent the heart of the university. The Main Quad features sandstone buildings connected by arcades, hipped clay tile roofs, and an ordered rhythm of deep punched window openings. From the origins of the Main Quad, the main campus has developed to support emerging trends in academics, research, and residential life. A wide range of architectural styles and motifs has been approved by Stanford leadership as well as the County, yielding buildings that are architecturally harmonious, but also reflect a variety of individual approaches that support academics, accelerate research efforts, and sustain residential life. A key aspect of maintaining architectural integrity is to design and construct buildings of our time; architecture that complements the existing context, but also provides an inspirational nod to the future.



STANFORD CAMPUS COMPATIBLITY

The **Knight Management Center**, which houses the Graduate School of Business, is a recent example of an assemblage of buildings that is grounded in the campus planning and design principles. Hipped clay tile roofs, buff colored precast cladding, ordered rhythms of rectangular openings and fenestration, and a network of arcades connect the multiple programs housed within. A distinctive pavilion and associated trellis anchor a vibrant courtyard that generates a memorable sense of place along Jane Stanford Way.



Knight Management Center (2011)

In addition to considering compatibility from a neighborhood architectural perspective, Stanford also focuses upon and respects the context and setting of its significant historic resources. The university's practices in determining whether new construction is compatible with adjacent historic buildings is guided by the **Secretary of Interior Standards**, which outlines the means to be compatible with historic properties. Since the standards recommend differentiation of the new construction from the existing historic resources, Stanford is careful to protect the integrity of its adjacent historic architecture by practicing restraint when using stylistic motifs like ornamentation, arches, decorative columns, etc. to avoid architectural mimicry which can devalue the historic resource.

Key Guidelines - Secretary of Interiors Standards

Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would not be impaired.



Peterson Lab Renovation/Addition (2009)

Early Example of Compatibility with a Historic Building: Encina Hall and Encina Commons

An illustration of one of the earliest examples of architectural compatibility on the Stanford campus is the addition of Encina Commons (1922) to Encina Hall (1891). Encina Hall, the original men's residence hall complemented the architecture of the Main Quad with its Richardsonian vocabulary that included arched windows and arcades, rusticated sandstone, and prominent hipped clay tile roofs. The residence hall was set on a plinth with a grand set of granite stairs leading to the primary entry. Encina Commons was constructed as the dining hub and its design complemented but was deferential to the architecture of Encina Hall. While a single arched portal in the entry tower designated the Commons entry, the arcades were not articulated by arched openings, but by simple, regularly spaced rectangular openings composed of piers supported by buttresses. In lieu of the signature rusticated sandstone, Encina Commons was clad in smooth stucco and its gable roofs were low pitched clay tile.



Encina Commons (1922)



Encina Hall (1891)

More Recent Examples of Compatibility with Historic Buildings

The following Stanford projects, constructed within the last 15 years following review and approval by Santa Clara County, further illustrate this respect for history. Many of these projects have been lauded by experts in the design and preservation industry for their sensitive design solutions. These exemplary projects demonstrate that there is not a single approach or set of rules that is or should be applied to all new construction. Rather, the Secretary of Interior Standards provide leeway to allow the university to elect how to achieve compatible design through siting, massing, and other features, while also ensuring differentiation so as not to replicate the motifs of the historic structure.

Meier Hall and Norcliffe Hall at Lagunita Court

The first example is set within the neighborhood of Lagunita Court (1934), a residential dorm complex that is a historic resource. Two residence hall additions (216 new undergraduate beds) were completed in 2016.

Lagunita Court, the original residence hall, has a simple but elegant series of 3-story stucco wings with double hung windows, hipped clay tile roofs and well-proportioned courtyards. An arched portal highlights the primary entry and arched windows differentiate the dining commons.





Lagunita Court (1934)

Meier Hall, and its sibling, **Norcliffe Hall** were designed to complement the scale, materiality, and architectural simplicity of the original Lagunita Court. The building massing, the clay tile roofs, and double-hung windows reflect the historical design. It was intentional that each of the primary entries for Meier Hall and Norcliffe Hall was not an arched expression to ensure that these buildings would not compete with and diminish the original Lagunita Court.



Meier Hall (2016)

Roble Hall and Windhover Contemplative Center

Directly adjacent to Lagunita Court is Roble Hall, and the Windhover Contemplative Center. Roble Hall is a Spanish eclectic style residence hall with a classical entry portico, arched articulated first floor openings with decorative pilaster panels, and earth tone stucco. The Windhover Contemplative Center was approved by the County in 2014. The program for contemplation is unique, and the architecture of Windhover is intentionally differentiated from the residential area by its deferential scale and more contemporary design. For compatibility, the architecture draws from the materiality of the surrounding buildings; the color, texture, and pattern of the rammed earth walls reflect the ornamental detailing on Roble Hall, and the warm wood cladding complements the more natural materials the area.



Roble Hall (1918)



Windhover Contemplative Center (2014)

Leland Stanford Junior Museum, Cantor Center Addition, Anderson Collection and McMurtry Art Building

The buildings surrounding the original Leland Stanford Junior Museum illustrate how, in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, three new designs are compatible with a historic building, but differentiated from the original historic building. The museum vicinity is anchored by a portion of the original Leland Stanford Junior Museum (1891), and Stanford has constructed a contemporary Cantor Center Addition (1999), the Anderson Collection (2014), and the McMurtry Art Building (2015).





Leland Stanford Junior Museum (1891)

The original **Leland Stanford Jr. Museum** was one of Jane Stanford "noble" buildings designed in the neoclassical style, which was notably different from, but compatible with the architecture of the Main Quad. The building consists of a domed central block with an iconic portico, stepped back wings, and projecting pedimented end blocks. The building envelope is concrete and treated as 'artificial stone', with mosaic panels that accentuate the exterior.

In the following image, the original museum pavilion is on the right, and the contemporary **Cantor Center Addition** is to the left. The Cantor Center Addition is differentiated so that the original historic resource can be distinctive. Its metal and glass exterior provides a greater connection between the interior and exterior commons spaces than the original museum, while its textured buff-colored stucco and bronze fenestration system harmonizes with the original museum facades.



Cantor Center (Addition 1999)

Fifteen years after completing the Cantor Center Addition, Stanford constructed two new arts buildings on sites that are adjacent to the Leland Stanford Junior Museum. The **McMurtry Building** and the **Anderson Collection** both reflect the contemporary nature of the program they house and complement the original museum in different ways. The **Anderson Collection** anchors and defines the north edge of the original museum's formal courtyard, and the Anderson Collection's scale, height, and massing reflects the original massing of the museum wings. The articulated pattern of the buff-colored glass fiber reinforced concrete panels complements, but does not match, the original scored concrete on the museum seen on the right. While the original museum pavilion has a much more solid mass, the Anderson Collection's first floor is much more transparent to invite you in and highlight the view of art from the exterior.



Anderson Collection (2014)

The **McMurtry Building**, designed to energetically reflect the art program housed within, builds on the forms and contemporary character of the 1999 Cantor Center addition to the original museum. While McMurtry is one of the most sculptural architectural expressions on Stanford's campus, it is intentionally sited to define the edge of the Cantor Center lawn and Rodin Sculpture Garden. Its scale and composition of mass and voids, its connection to the landscape, its material palette complement its existing neighbor. One of the wings which houses art history program is designed to extend the Cantor Center stucco addition, while the other wing, which houses the visual arts, is clad in a pre-patinated zinc panel which relates to the commonly used terra cotta clay tile on campus.



McMurtry Building (2015)

Looking to the future

A noble objective of a great university is to prepare students to make meaningful contributions to society as engaged citizens and leaders in a complex world, as well as nurture a culture of collaboration that drives innovative discoveries vital to our world, our health and our intellectual life. University campuses across the country balance the responsibility to steward their historic resources, with the aspiration to design buildings that represent the current times and support new cutting-edge programs. Stanford will continue to respect and enhance the campus context to maintain a compatible and harmonious campus that also sensitively accommodates its evolution.

Stanford University April 2020

Firm Information

About

Olson Kundig is a full-service design firm providing integrated architecture, urban design, interior design and exhibit design services for diverse clients across the world. The firm's work is grounded in the belief that buildings can act as bridges between culture, nature and people, and that inspiring surroundings can positively affect every aspect of our daily lives.

Rooted in the Pacific Northwest, the firm's work— museums, cultural and civic centers, mixed-use buildings, residences, commercial and hospitality projects—extends worldwide. With a staff of over 140, Olson Kundig brings the capacity of a large firm with the intensity of a small practice.

Industry and Peer Recognition

In 2009, the American Institute of Architects recognized our firm with its National Architecture Firm Award, citing our hands-on project involvement, creation of inspiring buildings and places, deep commitment to share knowledge with students, interns, clients and community, and collaboration with artists and craftspeople.

Our owners have been honored with some of the nation's highest design awards, including the 2014 AD 100, National Design Awards in Architecture Design from the Smithsonian Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum, an Academy Award in Architecture from the American Academy of Arts and Letters and an induction into *Interior Design* magazine's Hall of Fame.

The firm's accolades also include American Architecture Awards from the Chicago Athenaeum and national and regional design awards from the American Institute of Architects and the International Interior Design Association. For two years in a row, the firm was named one of the Top Ten Most Innovative Companies in Architecture by *Fast Company*.

Sustainable Design

Developing sustainable and lasting architecture is a hallmark of our practice. Our architectural staff are experienced with BIM/Revit, LEED[®] certified design, the Living Building Challenge and Passive House standards. Our expertise is supported by an in-house team of quality control, graphics and technical specialists, as well as a team focused on research and development initiatives that support the firm's work.

Location and Practice

Founded in 1966 by Jim Olson, Olson Kundig has been in practice for nearly 50 years. Led by partners Jim Olson, Tom Kundig, Kirsten R. Murray, Alan Maskin, and Kevin Kudo-King our office is located in the historic Pioneer Square neighborhood of downtown Seattle. In 2014, we opened a small work space in New York City to serve our East Coast and international clients more efficiently.



L. MARK

Olson Kundig installed the 157-foot by 37-foot tapestry made of pressed tin and mirrors on New York City's High Line EL ANATSUI'S BROKEN BRIDGE II / NEW YORK, NEW YORK

1

R.R.R.R.R.
Firm Culture

Weekly Speaker Series

Every week starts with an all-office meeting and our visiting speaker series—a program inspired by the power of cross-fertilization and intended to stimulate collaboration and interdisciplinary thinking. Individuals who excel in areas outside of architecture come and share with us what they do. Over the years, we have had presentations by local and internationally recognized artists, craftspeople, urban agriculture advocates, performers, mathematicians and scientists.

Thursday Night Crits

Every Thursday at 4:30pm since the firm began its existence, we get together for an all-office crit. The intent of these discussions is to make every project in our office the best it can be—to put the collective genius of the office to work. Over food and drink, a project is presented and discussed. The free flow of ideas consistently makes our projects better, and opens up lively discussions about design and how we see the world. This forum is also a great way to connect with each other on a regular basis, and to celebrate individual and collective achievements.

Community Involvement

Our commitment to community extends to a wide range of activities. We have an employer match program that helps support non-profit organizations, and we donate hundreds of hours every year in service. Each of the principals is active in our community through service on boards and through the donation of expertise. In 2003, we contributed design as well as to the construction of a ten-house development for Habitat for Humanity, and for the past several years have led the category for architecture and engineering firms in fundraising for Food Lifeline.

r + D

Olson Kundig defines research and development as "little r-big D," meaning that our research efforts are focused on developing ideas into built projects. Realizing that compelling ideas often emerge from both within and outside the framework of our practice, we regularly include craftspeople, contractors and subconsultants in our design discussions.

We believe that architects are obligated to solve more than functional or aesthetic needs—we believe that architecture must satisfy a sense of delight and address the changing paradigm and impact of the building industry on our natural resources.

With that in mind, we look to identify and foster compelling ideas into actionable concepts. As a firm, we are committed to challenging preconceived limits and questioning the possibilities of architecture.

Our recent research efforts have allowed us to incorporate pre-manufactured, digitally designed building components into construction; develop a massive and highly efficient window system; and design a Passive House in an extreme northern climate that not only meets but also exceeds the standard.



















[storefront] Olson Kundig



Launched in 2011, [storefront] Olson Kundig was an experimental work place for the firm's community collaborations, pro-bono design work, philanthropic and volunteer work, and for design research and the development of design ideas.

Olson Kundig began [storefront] based on a collective desire to create places to engaged the surrounding community—not only permanent structures, but temporary spaces, and experiences. With 20 installations ranging from an experimental performance ensemble and an urban mushroom farm to non-profit organizations focused on ending homelessness, [storefront] was Olson Kundig's means of engaging civic-minded partners to spark new life in one of Seattle's oldest communities.

Each installation called for close collaboration between the firm and its community partners to design a space that is functional while retaining a sense of inspiration and innovation. For example, the record store installation functioned as a cultural commons where vinyl records acted as a trading post for relationship-building dialogue.

The design needed to support the concept while also supporting the affiliated events that took various forms (listening parties, salon discussions, dance classes, etc.). The record store installation included modular and kinetic furnishings, including record storage bins, work tables, listening stations, a DJ station, display panels and a stage.











Kinetic Architecture



Architecture provides the threshold between the world around us and the world within. The ability to easily move large-scale building elements reminds us of our connection to nature, while creating delightfully playful spaces in which to live our lives. We bring decades of experience designing kinetic architecture—spaces that move, change, and physically respond to those who live and work inside them.

Featured projects include:

1. Chicken Point Mechanical Interactive: This gizmo was designed so that a young child could move several tons of steel and glass simply by turning the mechanism on the wall, breaking down the lines which ordinarily demarcate "inside" and "outside."

2. Delta Shelter: This 1,000 square-foot weekend cabin is essentially a steel-clad box on stilts that can be completely shuttered when the owner is away. Raised above the ground to minimize potential flood damage and to take in 360-degree views of the surrounding forest and mountains, the cabin was conceived as a low-tech, virtually indestructible weekend house.

3. Hot Rod House Installations: A family of installations includes a system of interconnected pulleys that allow viewers to move a large video screen from room to room.

4. Shadowboxx Kinetic Residence: Moveable doors, shutters, walls and roofs constantly shift the threshold between inside and outside. At the push of a button, the bathhouse roof can open like a cigar box lid; it is engineered with a 5,500-pound steel counterweight, two steel pivot hinges, and two pairs of counter-rotating lifting arms. Combined with sliding and pivoting steel and glass doors, the space can completely open to the elements.

5. Hydro-Engineering Skylight: This art machine is also a R&D-investigation into using city water pressure as an energy source to move building parts. The 14' x 25' counterweighted skylight that it powers weighs 6 tons; two 6' pistons raise the skylight using only city water pressure. The skylight is controlled by "puzzle" levers that require the user to close one valve before opening the other one, thus allowing visitors to interact with and alter the air temperature and daylighting with easy turns of the levers.







Recent Awards



AIA Seattle Honor Awards, Honor Award, Shinsegae International, 2015

AIA Washington Civic Design Awards, Merit Award, Tacoma Art Museum Haub Gallery, 2015

AIA National Housing Award, Studhorse, 2015

Architectural Digest's AD100, Olson Kundig Architects, 2014

AIA National Housing Award, Sol Duc Cabin, 2014

AIA National Honor Award, Architecture, The Pierre, 2014

Architectural Digest AD100 List, Olson Kundig Architects, 2013

AIA Seattle Honor Awards - Merit Award, [storefront], 2013

SEGD Global Design Awards - Merit Award, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Visitor Center, 2013

Communication Arts Interactive Design Environmental Award, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Visitor Center, 2013

AAM Awards - Excellence in Exhibition Label Writing, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Visitor Center, 2013

AIA National Honor Awards - Architecture, Art Stable, 2013

AIA National Honor Awards - Interior Architecture, Charles Smith Wines Tasting Room & Global Headquarters, 2013

Interior Design Magazine Hall of Fame, Tom Kundig, 2012

European Centre and Chicago Athenaeum, International Architecture Award, Art Stable, 2012

Chicago Athenaeum, American Architecture Award, The Pierre, 2012

Chicago Athenaeum, American Architecture Award, Studio Sitges, 2012

AIA National Housing Award, The Pierre, 2012

IIDA Interior Design Awards, Best of Competition, The Pierre, 2012

Residential Architect Design Award, Architectural Detail Merit Award, Shadowboxx, 2012

Residential Architect Design Award, Architectural Detail Merit Award, Studio Sitges, 2012

AIA Northwest and Pacific Region Honor Award, Art Stable, 2011

AIA National Housing Award, Art Stable, 2011

AIA National Housing Award, 1111 E. Pike, 2011

Residential Architect Design Award, Project of the Year, Art Stable, 2011

Residential Architect Design Award, Grand Award, Slaughterhouse Beach House, 2011

Residential Architect Design Award, Merit Award, Glass Farmhouse, 2011

World Architecture News, House of the Year, The Pierre, 2010

AIA National Honor Award, Outpost, 2010

Fast Company, Top 10 Most Innovative Companies in Architecture, Olson Kundig Architects, 2010

Residential Architect Design Award, Merit Award, Montecito Residence, 2010

Residential Architect Design Award, Merit Award, Salt Spring Island Cabin, 2010

AIA Architecture Firm Award, Olson Sundberg Kundig Allen Architects, 2009

AIA National Housing Committee Award, Montecito Residence, 2009

AIA National Housing Committee Award, Outpost, 2009

Chicago Athenaeum, American Architecture Award, Outpost, 2009

Chicago Athenaeum, American Architecture Award, The Rolling Huts, 2009

Chicago Athenaeum, American Architecture Award, Lightcatcher at the Whatcom Museum, 2010

Fast Company, Top 10 Most Innovative Companies in Architecture, Olson Kundig Architects, 2010