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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto (City) to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja Master Plan and Conditional Use Permit (proposed project). The proposed project would allow for an increase in student enrollment and expand the existing campus by demolishing existing buildings, constructing a new building and a new below-grade parking structure, and increasing the amount of open space.

This initial submittal for the cultural resources study includes a records search of the proposed project site plus a 1-mile radius, Native American coordination, a pedestrian survey of the project site for cultural resources, archival and building development research for buildings located within the project site, and evaluation of buildings for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and City register eligibility. When complete, the cultural resources study report will also include an assessment of impacts to historical resources in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and management and mitigation recommendations.

For this initial submittal, all buildings and structures within the proposed project site that were constructed at least 45 years ago were photographed, researched, and evaluated in consideration of CRHR and City designation criteria and integrity requirements. Consideration of potential impacts to historical resources under CEQA will be presented in the complete cultural resources study report.

As a result of the significance evaluation, including consideration of CRHR and City evaluation criteria and integrity requirements, the Castilleja School campus was found not eligible for designation as a historic district due to the fact that most of the campus has been significantly altered from its original appearance. Further, all of the 1960s buildings and the two residential properties were found not eligible at the individual level due to a lack of important historical associations and compromised integrity. However, the Administration/Chapel building appears to remain eligible for listing on City’s local register as a Category 3 (Contributing Building).

As a result of these findings, the Administration/Chapel building is considered an historical resource under CEQA. As such, the proposed project has the potential to adversely impact historical resources. However, these impacts can be mitigated below a level of significance (see Section 7.2.1).

No archaeological resources were identified within the project site or immediate vicinity as a result of the CHRIS records search or Native American coordination. However, it is always possible that intact archaeological deposits are present at subsurface levels. Therefore, standard protection measures for archaeological resources and human remains are provided.
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INTRODUCTION

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto (City) to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja Master Plan and Conditional Use Permit (proposed project). The cultural resources study will include the following components: (1) a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search covering the proposed project site plus a 1-mile radius at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), (2) a review of the California Native American Heritage Commission’s (NAHC’s) Sacred Lands File, (3) outreach with local Native American tribes/groups identified by the NAHC to collect any information they may have concerning cultural resources, (4) a pedestrian survey of the project site for cultural resources, (5) archival and building development research for buildings located within the project site, (6) the evaluation of buildings for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and City of Palo Alto register eligibility, and (7) consideration of impacts on historical resources in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This initial submittal of the cultural resources study report was prepared by Dudek architectural historians Samantha Murray, MA, Sarah Corder, MFA, and Kara Dotter, MSHP, who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for architectural history, and Dudek archaeologists Adam Giacinto, MA, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), and William Burns, MSc, RPA.

1.1 Project Location

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School, located at 1310 Bryant Street in the City of Palo Alto, San Clara County, California. The project site is bounded by Bryant Street to the northeast, Kingsley Avenue to the northwest, Kellogg Avenue to the southeast, and Emerson Street to the southwest (Figures 1-3).

1.2 Project Description

Castilleja School is an all-girls private school in Palo Alto that has been educating 6th- to 12th-grade girls since 1907 and has been located at the current site since 1910. The school’s facilities include administrative buildings, a chapel theater, classrooms, a gymnasium, a pool, an aboveground parking area, a playing area, and a track. Castilleja has submitted applications to the City for preliminary review of a tentative map and amendment of the school’s Conditional Use Permit to allow for increased enrollment. To accommodate the increased enrollment, Castilleja proposes to demolish several of the existing buildings within the campus and construct a new underground parking structure, a new swimming pool, and a new classroom building.
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Figure 2

Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Initial Study

Vicinity Map

Project Site

SOURCE: ESRI 2015
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1.3 Regulatory Setting

This section includes a discussion of the applicable state laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards governing cultural resources, which must be adhered to before and during construction of the proposed project.

1.3.1 State

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Public Resources Code, Section 5020 et seq.)

In California, the term “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

(1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.

(2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

(3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 CCR 4852(d)(2)).
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The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

California Environmental Quality Act

As described further, the following CEQA statutes (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource”; it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of a historical resource.
- PRC Section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC Sections 21083.2(b) and 21083.2(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures. Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

More specifically, under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause “a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(b)). If a site is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is an “historical resource” and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)).
A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(1); PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project does any of the following:

1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or

2. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

3. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(2)).

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any “historical resources,” then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource’s historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC Sections 21083.2(a)–(c)).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (PRC Section 21083.2(g)).

Impacts on nonunique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC Section 21083.2(a); 14 CCR 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a nonunique archaeological resource qualifies as a tribal cultural resource (PRC Sections 21074(c) and 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described below, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5(b)). PRC Section 5097.98 also outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact NAHC within 24 hours (Section 7050.5(c)). NAHC will notify the “most likely descendant.” With the permission of the landowner, the most likely descendant may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the most likely descendant by NAHC. The most likely descendant may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

1.3.2 Local

City of Palo Alto Municipal Code – Historic Preservation (Chapter 16.49)

In adopting Section 16.49.010 (“Purpose”) of the City Municipal Code, the City found that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and use of structures, districts, and neighborhoods of historical and architectural significance located within the City are of cultural and aesthetic benefit to the community. The City further found that respecting the City’s heritage would support the City’s economic, cultural, and aesthetic standing. According to Section 16.49.010, the purposes of the City’s Historic Preservation chapter are to:

(a) Designate, preserve, protect, enhance and perpetuate those historic structures, districts and neighborhoods which contribute to the cultural and aesthetic heritage of Palo Alto;
(b) Foster civic pride in the beauty and accomplishments of the past;
(c) Stabilize and improve the economic value of certain historic structures, districts and neighborhoods;
(d) Develop and maintain appropriate settings for such structures;
(e) Enrich the educational and cultural dimensions of human life by serving aesthetic as well as material needs and fostering knowledge of the living heritage of the past;
(f) Enhance the visual and aesthetic character, diversity and interest of the city;
(g) Establish special requirements so as to assure the preservation and the satisfactory maintenance of significant historic structures within the downtown area.

**Historic Resource Designation Criteria**

In accordance with Section 16.49.404(b) of the City Municipal Code, the following criteria, along with the definitions of historic categories and districts in Section 16.49.020, shall be used as criteria for designating additional historic structures/sites or districts to the historic inventory:

1. The structure or site is identified with the lives of historic people or with important events in the city, state or nation;
2. The structure or site is particularly representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the city, state or nation;
3. The structure or site is an example of a type of building which was once common, but is now rare;
4. The structure or site is connected with a business or use which was once common, but is now rare;
5. The architect or building was important;
6. The structure or site contains elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship.

**City of Palo Alto Historic Inventory**

The City's Historic Inventory lists noteworthy examples of the work of important individual designers and architectural eras and traditions, as well as structures whose background is associated with important events in the history of the city, state, or nation. The Inventory is organized under the following four categories:

- **Category 1:** An “Exceptional Building” of pre-eminent national or state importance. These buildings are meritorious works of the best architects, outstanding examples of a
specific architectural style, or illustrate stylistic development of architecture in the United States. These buildings have had either no exterior modifications or such minor ones that the overall appearance of the building is in its original character.

- **Category 2:** A “Major Building” of regional importance. These buildings are meritorious works of the best architects, outstanding examples of an architectural style, or illustrate stylistic development of architecture in the state or region. A major building may have some exterior modifications, but the original character is retained.

- **Category 3 or 4:** A “Contributing Building” which is a good local example of an architectural style and relates to the character of a neighborhood grouping in scale, materials, proportion or other factors. A contributing building may have had extensive or permanent changes made to the original design, such as inappropriate additions, extensive removal of architectural details, or wooden facades resurfaced in asbestos or stucco.
2 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

2.1 CHRIS Records Search

Dudek requested a CHRIS records search from the NWIC, which houses cultural resources records for Santa Clara County. Dudek received the results on February 20, 2017. The search included any previously recorded cultural resources and investigations within a 1-mile radius of the project site. The CHRIS search also included a review of the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, the Office of Historic Preservation Historic Properties Directory, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and other ethnographic resources. A letter from the NWIC summarizing the results of the records search, maps of previously recorded resources and previously conducted studies, and a bibliography of prior cultural resources studies is provided in Confidential Appendix A of this report.

2.1.1 Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies

The NWIC records indicate that 43 cultural resources investigations have been conducted within 1 mile of the project site. Of these, three studies have overlapped a portion of the project site (S-033061, S-041536, and S-029573). A summary of these studies is provided in the following paragraphs. Table 1 presents a record of all previously conducted studies identified as a result of the records search.

Table 1
Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within 1 Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-004511</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey, 04-SCL-82, Proposed Lane Widening at Quarry Road and Route 82, P.M. 26.2 04220-402291</td>
<td>Cindy Desgrandchamp</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008647</td>
<td>Reconnaissance of the grounds surrounding the Palo Alto Southern Pacific Depot, Red Cross, and Veterans buildings (letter report).</td>
<td>William Roop</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-009487</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Proposed Site of the Stanford University Psychiatric Center for the Archaeological Element for the Quarry Road General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Robert Cartier</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within 1 Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-020523</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment, Pacific Bell Mobile Services Facility SF-533-07, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Barry A. Price</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-020550</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment, Pacific Bell Mobile Services Facility SF-614-03, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Barry A. Price</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-021146</td>
<td>Findings of Effect (No Effect), Palo Alto Transit Center Improvements, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Basin Research Associates Inc.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022157</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property at 955 Alma Street in the City of Palo Alto, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Robert Cartier</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022183</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property at 200 Hamilton Avenue in the City of Palo Alto, California</td>
<td>Robert Cartier</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022359</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring at 168 University Avenue, Palo Alto, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Hannah Ballard</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022649</td>
<td>Archaeological Testing Program for the Property at 200 Hamilton Avenue in the City of Palo Alto, California</td>
<td>Robert Cartier</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-023900</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Investigation for Stanford University Athletics Department Lighting Plan, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Barbra Siskin</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-025174</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Report for San Bruno to Mountain View Intermodal Level 3 Fiber Optics Project in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California</td>
<td>John Holson, Cordelia Sutch, and Stephanie Pau</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026045</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Survey and Inventory Report for the Metromedia Fiberoptic Cable Project, San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Basin Networks</td>
<td>Richard Carrico, Theodore Cooley, and William Eckhardt</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026088</td>
<td>Architectural/Historical Analysis for Cingular Site No. BA-350-01: &quot;First Baptist Church&quot; (Palo Alto): Negative Results (letter report)</td>
<td>Carolyn Losee</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-029573</td>
<td>Final Report, Archaeological Survey and Record Search for the Six Fluor Global Fiber Optic Segments, Mountain View, Palo Alto, and San Mateo County, California</td>
<td>Jonathan Goodrich</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1
Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within 1 Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-029657</td>
<td>FTA021021A; Caltrain Electrification Program, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties (Concurrence Correspondence)</td>
<td>Knox Mellon</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031911</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring for the Palo Alto Water Facilities Project, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (ESA #201490; PL# 1772-01) (letter report)</td>
<td>Elena Reese</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-032169</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment Report, Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center Project (PAITC), Santa Clara County, California</td>
<td>Leigh A. Martin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033061</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Final Report of Monitoring and Findings for the Qwest Network Construction Project, State of California</td>
<td>Nancy Sikes, Cindy Arrington, Bryon Bass, Chris Corey, Kevin Hunt, Steve O'Neil, Catherine Pruett, Tony Sawyer, Michael Tuma, Leslie Wagner, and Alex Wesson</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td><strong>Within</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033475</td>
<td>Verizon Cellular Communications Tower Site--Palo Alto Retail, 219 University Avenue, Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>Jason D. Jones</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWIC Report No.</td>
<td>Title of Study</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Proximity to Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035835</td>
<td>Finding of Effect (No Adverse Effect), Proposed Modifications to the Palo Alto Southern Pacific Railroad Depot in Palo Alto, California, FTA070326A</td>
<td>HNTB Corp</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035932</td>
<td>Records Search Results for AT&amp;T Mobility Audit Site CNU0770/13313/1-A, 488 University Avenue, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California 94301 (letter report)</td>
<td>Carolyn Losee</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037859</td>
<td>New Tower (&quot;NT&quot;) Submission Packet, FCC Form 620, Channing Avenue &amp; Middlefield Road, CN3548.</td>
<td>Dana E. Supernowicz</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039469</td>
<td>Historical Resources Compliance Report for the San Mateo County SMART Corridors Project, Segment III, Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Palo Alto, San Mateo County &amp; Santa Clara County, California; EA #4A9201; EFIS #0400001169, Caltrans District 4; SR 82 PM SM 0/4.8, SCL 24.1/26.4; SR 84 PM 24.6/28.7; US 101 PM 0.7/5.5; SR 109 PM 1.10/1.87; SR 114 PM 5.0/5.93</td>
<td>Neal Kaptain</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039469</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the San Mateo County SMART Corridors Project, Segment III, Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Palo Alto, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County, California; EA #4A9201; EFIS #0400001169, Caltrans District 4; SR 82 PM SM 0/4.8, SCL 24.1/26.4; SR 84 PM 24.6/28.7; US 101 PM 0.7/5.5; SR 109 PM 1.10/1.87; SR 114 PM 5.0/5.93</td>
<td>Neal Kaptain</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039469</td>
<td>Post-Review Discovery and Monitoring Plan for the San Mateo County SMART Corridors Project, Segment III, Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Palo Alto, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County, California; EA #4A9201; EFIS #0400001169, Caltrans District 4; SR 82 PM SM 0/4.8, SCL 24.1/26.4; SR 84 PM 24.6/28.7; US 101 PM 0.7/5.5; SR 109 PM 1.10/1.87; SR 114 PM 5.0/5.93</td>
<td>Neal Kaptain</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039643</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC, Candidate SF15104A (Channing House), 850 Webster Street, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Jessica Tudor and Kathleen A. Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039704</td>
<td>Direct APE Historic Architectural Assessment for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SF15104A (Channing House), 850 Webster Street, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner and Kathleen A. Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 1

Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies within 1 Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-039718</td>
<td>Direct APE Historic Architectural Assessment for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SF04614A (Stanford Inn), 531 Stanford Avenue, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner and Kathleen A. Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039735</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SF04614A (Stanford Inn), 531 Stanford Avenue, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Jessica Tudor and Kathleen A. Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-040641</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SFO4340A (BA340 101 Alma Building), 101 Alma Street, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California (letter report)</td>
<td>Cher L. Peterson and Kathleen A. Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-041600</td>
<td>Collocation (“CO”) Submission Packet, AT&amp;T POLY 1 - Outdoor DAS, Utility Poles Along Waverly Street, Lincoln Avenue, Emerson Street, Bryant Street, Park Avenue, Rinconada Avenue, Arrowhead Way, Dennis Way</td>
<td>Dana Supernowicz</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-043661</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment for Prior Disturbance, First Congregational Church of Palo Alto/CN3649, 1985 Louis Road, Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, CA, EBI Project Number: 61110231, TCNS Number: 73072</td>
<td>Michael A. Way</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-044034</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Polygon 1 - Outdoor DAS</td>
<td>Dana E. Supernowicz and Holly D. Moore</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-045231</td>
<td>Extended Phase I Excavation for CA-SCL-596 and C-434 for the Oregon-Pagemill Expressway Project, Palo Alto, California, 04-SCL-0-0-CR</td>
<td>Robert Cartier</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-046284</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring Report for Caltrain Base Stations 6,7,8 and 9, Cities of San Mateo, Redwood City, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California</td>
<td>Michael Konzak</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-047075</td>
<td>2555 Park Boulevard Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-Style Documentation Palo Alto, California (15172)</td>
<td>Ruth Todd and Christina Dikas</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NWIC = Northwest Information Center.
In 2000, Pacific Legacy Inc. conducted a cultural resources survey of six fiber-optic segments, one of which passes through the northeast perimeter of the project area. No new archaeological resources were identified as a result of the survey. Pacific Legacy recommended no further archaeological work in the vicinity of the current project area for the fiber-optic installation.

In 2006, SWCA Environmental Consultants conducted a cultural resources inventory for a wide network of fiber-optic cables, one of which passes through the southwest perimeter of the project area. The study included a records search, a Sacred Lands File search, relocation of existing sites, and a pedestrian survey of the project area. No cultural resources were identified in the current project area as a result of the survey. SWCA Environmental Consultants recommended archaeological and tribal monitoring when ground-disturbing maintenance work was being performed on the fiber-optic cable in the vicinity of the current project area.

In 2000, Dames & Moore completed an inventory of historical built environment resources within Palo Alto for the City’s Planning Division. The inventory included reconnaissance and intensive surveys, identification of new historic resources, updating of known built environment resources, and evaluation of particular properties that appeared eligible for the NRHP. The inventory did not identify any NRHP-eligible resources within the current project area.

According to the NWIC records, there are no previously recorded cultural resources located within the project site. However, there is one known locally designated resource within the project area that was not identified by the NWIC – the Administration/Chapel building on campus. This resource is discussed in greater detail as part of the larger evaluation (Sections 4.2 and 5). The records search did identify 29 resources within the 1-mile search radius. A summary of these resources is listed in Table 2. The next closest resources to the campus are 1215 Emerson Street (a single family residence adjacent to the northwest corner of the project area found eligible for the NRHP as an individual property through survey evaluation); a historic utility pole approximately 100 feet to the south of the project area (P-43-0002809, not eligible for the NRHP) and the Professorville Historic District (P-43-000551, NRHP Listed District), located adjacent to the project area, on the north side of Embarcadero Road.
### Table 2
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Year (Recorded by)</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P-43-000388    | Historic Structure: Hostess House / Palo Alto Veterans Memorial Building | 1971 (Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors)  
1971 (Fern B. Hunt, Palo Alto Historical Association)  
1972 (Dorothy F. Regnery, Palo Alto Historical Association)  
1978 (none), (none))  
1979 (J. Cooper, (none)) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000389    | Historic Structure: John Adams Squire House / Squire House | 1973 (Gay Woolley, (none))  
1978 (none), (none))  
1979 (J. Cooper, (none)) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000397    | Historic Structure: T.B. Downing House        | 1978 (none), (none))  
1979 (Paula Boghosian and John Beach, Historic Environment Consultants)  
1981 (T. McGregor, (none))  
1984 (none), Basin Research Associates Inc.) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000454    | Historic Structure: Pettigrew House           | 1976 (none), Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors  
1978 (none), (none))  
1980 (Birge M. Clark, Palo Alto Historical Association)  
1981 (T. McGregor, Cabrillo College)  
1984 (none), Basin Research Associates Inc.) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000463    | Historic Structure: U S Post Office / Hamilton Branch | 1969 (none), Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors  
1979 (Paula Boghosian, John Beach, Historic Environment Consultants)  
1979 (Paula Boghosian, John Beach, Historic Environment Consultants)  
1979 (Paula Boghosian, John Beach, Historic Environment Consultants)  
1981 (T. McGregor, Cabrillo College) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000551    | Historic District: Professorville Historic District | 1978 (none), (none))  
1979 (Paula Boghosian and John Beach, Historic Environment Consultants)  
1981 (T. McGregor, (none)) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000552    | Historic Structure: Norris Residence          | 1986 (Barbara Bocek, Stanford University, Department of Anthropology) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000593    | Prehistoric: Bryant Street, Habitation debris | 1987 (Barbara Bocek, Stanford University) | Outside                                    |
| P-43-000617    | Prehistoric: Emerson Street, Habitation debris | 1990 (Barbara Bocek, Stanford University) | Outside                                    |
### Table 2
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Year (Recorded by)</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-000627</td>
<td>Prehistoric: South Court, Habitation debris</td>
<td>1990 (John Snyder, Caltrans)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994 (Glory Anne Laffey, Archives and Architecture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999 (J. Berg, S. Mikesell, Far Western)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 (Michael Corbett, Dames &amp; Moore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 (Bunse, McMorris, Rogers, JRP Historical Consulting Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 (Theresa Rogers/Meta Bunse, JRP Historical Consulting Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002 (C. McMorris, A. Blosser, JRP Historical Consulting Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008 (Denise Jurich, Jesse Martinez, PBS&amp;J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (Sunshine Psota, Holman &amp; Associates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-000928</td>
<td>Historic Structure: Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>1975 (Paula Puch)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001137</td>
<td>Historic Structure: 1110 Hamilton Ave</td>
<td>(Katherine Cameron, Palo Alto Historical Society)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001735</td>
<td>Historic Structure: First Congregational Church of Palo Alto</td>
<td>2006 (Jason D. Jones, URS Corporation)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008 (Ward Hill, Basin Research Associates Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002206</td>
<td>Historic Structure: 875 Alma Street</td>
<td>1978 ((none), (none))</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 (Dana E. Supernowicz, Historic Resource Associates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002261</td>
<td>Historic Structure: President Hotel</td>
<td>2010 (Dana E. Supernowicz, Historic Resource Associates)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002457</td>
<td>Historic Structure: St. Albert the Great Church, St. Elizabeth Seton School and St. Thomas Aquinas Catholic Parish</td>
<td>2012 (K.A. Crawford, Crawford Historic Services)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Year (Recorded by)</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002750</td>
<td>Historic Structure: T-Mobile West LLC</td>
<td>2012 (K.A. Crawford, Crawford Historic Services)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF04614A/Stanford Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002808</td>
<td>Historic Structure: T-Mobile/West LLC</td>
<td>2012 (Dana Supernowicz, Historic Resource Associates)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCSF15104A/Channing House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002809</td>
<td>Historic Structure: Palo Alto CPAU Utility Poles</td>
<td>2001 (Michael Corbett, Dames and Moore)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002868</td>
<td>Historic Structure: University Avenue Underpass</td>
<td>1995 (James McFall, Historic Resources Board – City of Palo Alto)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002869</td>
<td>Historic Structure: Southern Pacific Railroad Depot</td>
<td>2000 (Michael Corbett, Dames and Moore)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002871</td>
<td>Historic Structure: Embarcadero Underpass</td>
<td>2013 (Dana E. Supernowicz, Historic Resources Associates)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-003129</td>
<td>Historic Structure: Palo Alto CPAU Utility Poles</td>
<td>2010 (Jesse Martinez, PBS&amp;J)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-003137</td>
<td>Prehistoric/Protohistoric: HST-90P, Habitation debris</td>
<td>1975 (Dorothy F. Regnery, Palo Alto Historical Association)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1978 ((none), (none))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979 (Dorothy F. Regnery, Palo Alto Historical Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979 (J. Cooper, (none))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Historic Structure: 1215 Emerson Street</td>
<td>2000 (Michael Corbett, Dames and Moore)</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Native American Coordination

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources within or near the project site, Dudek contacted the NAHC to request a review of the Sacred Lands File. The NAHC emailed a response on February 6, 2017, which failed to indicate the presence of cultural resources within the search area and provided a contact list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have direct knowledge of cultural resources in or near the project site. Documents related to the NAHC Sacred Lands File search are included in Appendix B.

Dudek prepared and sent letters to each of the six persons and entities on the contact list requesting information about cultural sites and resources in or near the project site. These letters, mailed on February 16, 2017, contained a brief description of the proposed project, a summary of the Sacred Lands File search results, and a reference map. Recipients were asked to reply should
they have any knowledge of cultural resources in the area. No responses have been received to date. If any responses are received, they will be forwarded to the lead agency.

The proposed project is subject to compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (PRC Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to “tribal cultural resources” as part of the CEQA process, and requires the CEQA lead agency to notify any groups (who have requested notification) of the proposed project who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. Because Assembly Bill 52 is a government-to-government process, all records of correspondence related to Assembly Bill 52 notification and any subsequent consultation are on file with the City. The City reports that to-date, it has not received any requests for Assembly Bill 52 notification.

2.3 Geomorphology

The topography of the Bay Area consists of north- to northwest-trending mountain ranges and intervening valleys that are characteristic of the Coast Range geomorphic province. The underlying geology is composed primarily of the Franciscan complex rock bounded on the east by the Hayward Fault and on the west by the San Andreas Fault. The Franciscan rocks are formed by pieces of former oceanic crust that have been accreted to North America by subduction and collision of the North American and Pacific Plates. These rocks are primarily marine sandstone and shale; however, chert and limestone are also found.

The project area is underlain by undifferentiated Quaternary alluvium, generally deposited over the course of the Holocene. The alluvium material consists of interbedded clay, silt, sand, gravel, and coarse debris deposited by streams and weathering of the hills to the west. The Bay Area landscape has been subject to substantial change since the Late Pleistocene. Between 15,000 and 9,000 years ago, sea levels rose approximately 230 feet, resulting in the initial infilling of the Bay (Meyer 2011). Studies indicate that the Bay was 124 feet below its present level 9,500 years ago (USGS 1977). Over time, stream and river channels were diverted by sediments, resulting in the creation of large alluvial floodplains, like the San Pablo Peninsula. The Bay continued to grow in size over the last 4,000 years, allowing the formation of large tidal mudflats and peat marshes, further promoting the deposition of sediment around the Bay. By approximately 3,500 years ago, the Bay was 22 feet below its current level (USGS 1977). Landforms became more stable after approximately 2,800 years ago, after which there was less comparative deposition of alluvial sediments. Radiocarbon dates taken from Palo Alto Marsh and lower Colma Creek suggest that these were formed in the last 2,000 years (Meyer 2011).

The Bay shoreline was subject to alluvial filling as a result of historic agriculture, development, and active landscape modification for commercial and residential use that began largely in the mid-1800s. This resulted in the filling of creeks and marshy areas with alluvial sediments and
imported fill. The urbanization of the Bay Area gained momentum in the post–World War II era, and development encroached substantially on the remaining tidal wetlands. Creeks were partially channelized and piped in some areas to protect continued development against the seasonal flooding that was common throughout these areas. While many archaeological resources may have been partially or completely destroyed by urban development, it is possible that some resources may have been buried and protected by artificial fill deposited in these areas.

The geologic formation representing the subsurface soils in the project area, composed of Holocene-age alluvial deposits, would have some potential to support the presence of intact buried cultural deposits if undisturbed. Prehistoric cultural deposits are most likely to be encountered at depths of less than 2 meters (approximately 7 feet) below the surface in the area, and historic deposits are most likely to occur in the vicinity of historic age use. There is documentation of prehistoric cultural deposits or human burials being encountered in excess of 7 meters (23 feet) below the surface in surrounding areas, however such findings are rare and are characteristic of specific contexts for soil formation that do not appear to apply to the project site. The project area has a reduced relative potential for containing deposits compared to areas along creek channels, most notably in the area of San Francisquito Creek to the north. The Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan map of archaeologically sensitive areas (City of Palo Alto 2007) supports this assessment, and indicates that the project site falls within an area of “Moderate Sensitivity.” A geomorphological study completed just south of the project area for the Caltrain Electrification Project (Clay and Waechter 2009) also found this area to have a moderate potential to support subsurface prehistoric cultural deposits, however did not recommend any further subsurface investigation or cultural monitoring of work in the vicinity. A recommendation of “Moderate Sensitivity” does not indicate the presence of cultural resources in itself, instead this level of sensitivity should be understood to suggest that the Project APE does have some potential to contain intact buried cultural deposits only if subsurface conditions remain largely undisturbed or other site-specific information relating to resources is provided. The potential for unanticipated buried deposits must be adjusted based on local context and the record of known archaeological resources. With regards to context and present subsurface conditions, excavations for basement areas, foundations and utilities beneath the existing buildings have disturbed sediments beyond the 2 meter maximum depth with potential to contain unknown prehistoric cultural deposits. In particular, the current classroom building has a full basement along Kellogg Ave and the campus center building has a partial basement. Records search information does not indicate the presence of archaeological resources with in the APE or surrounding vicinity. No historic-age activity likely to result in the deposition of significant deposits has been documented at or near this location. Based on review of available information, there is a relatively low potential for intact significant subsurface cultural deposits to persist in this area given its disturbed subsurface conditions (beneath an existing multistory building).
2.4 Building Development and Archival Research

2.4.1 Castilleja School

On February 22 and 23, 2017, Dudek met with Dan Chapman, superintendent of buildings and grounds for Castilleja School, and Mandy Brown, finance and operations analyst, to obtain information on the development of the school and its campus. Mr. Chapman provided access to campus building drawings and schematics, as well as access to all campus buildings. Mr. Chapman also lent institutional knowledge for the construction and renovation projects completed during his many years at Castilleja School (Chapman, pers. comm. 2017). Ms. Brown provided extensive information on the history of the school, including materials pertaining to the school’s architectural development (Brown, pers. comm. 2017).

2.4.2 Palo Alto Historical Association

On February 23, 2017, Dudek met with Steve Staiger, historian for the Palo Alto Historical Association. Mr. Staiger provided numerous reference files pertaining to the history of the Castilleja School (Staiger, pers. comm. 2017). The files contained a variety of materials, including photographs, brochures, catalogs, letters, event programs, and newspaper articles.

2.4.3 City of Palo Alto Property Research

The City’s online property records indicate that the property located at 1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031) was constructed in 1979 and the property located at 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031) was constructed in 1912. However, the online property report on the parcel containing the bulk of the campus located at 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034) did not provide information about individual buildings, just the campus as a whole, and there were no dates of construction listed in the report.

2.4.4 Historic Aerial and Topographical Map Review

3 HISTORIC CONTEXT

3.1 City of Palo Alto Historical Overview

Before its official founding, Palo Alto was home to a mix of Indian tribes known as the Costeños. The term “Costeños” was a collective term to refer to native groups living in the coastal areas around Half Moon Bay and Pescadero.

European settlement in the region began as early as 1769 with the arrival of Don Gaspar de Portola and his men establishing camp near the San Francisquito Creek under “El Palo Alto,” the tall tree. The next significant appearance of European development occurred 5 years later with the arrival of Franciscan monks led by Padre Palou. The Franciscans sought a location for their new mission but believed a more dependable water supply was required, and they moved on to Santa Clara from Palo Alto. Once the mission establishment fell through, Don Rafael Soto from San Jose requested permission to establish a rancho in the area. His rancho was named Rancho Rinconada del Arroyo de San Francisquito and spanned 2,229 acres from “El Palo Alto to the bay and from south of the present Stanford Stadium to the current Bayshore Freeway” (Bodovitz 1994).

Following the death of her father Don Rafael Soto, Maria Luisa continued to play a key role in the development of Palo Alto through her marriage to a former British naval lieutenant and the grant of an additional 12,545 acres for the establishment of their rancho named Rancho Cañada de Raymundo, which made up the modern Searsville area. Following her husband’s death, Maria Luisa remarried John Greer, who had previously served as an Irish sea captain (Bodovitz 1994).

Irish development continued in the Palo Alto area when two Irish men purchased 1,700 acres of the Rancho de las Pulgas. The Irishmen constructed two homes on the 1,700-acre plot and erected the Menlo Park gate in 1854. Construction of the gates began to attract wealthy residents from San Francisco to the area, and the larger-scale development of the area began in the 1860s and 1870s. While the San Franciscans established large estates around Menlo Park, the ranchos continued to thrive (Bodovitz 1994).

Palo Alto was established just south of the limits of the old township of Mayfield, in unincorporated Santa Clara County. The township of Mayfield was formed in 1855, in what is now southern Palo Alto. In 1875, French financier Jean Baptiste Paulin Caperon, better known as Peter Coutts, purchased land in Mayfield and four other parcels around three sides of today’s College Terrace, comprising more than a thousand acres extending from present-day Page Mill Road to Serra Street and from El Camino Real to the foothills.

Leland Stanford, President of the Southern Pacific Railroad and one of the “Big Four” of the Central Pacific Railroad, started buying land in 1876 around the area in that would become Palo Alto. Leland Stanford Sr. and his wife founded Stanford University in 1891, naming the university in honor of their son Leland Jr., who died of typhoid fever at age 15 in 1884. During
construction of the university, Stanford partnered with land developer Timothy Hopkins to create a town near the future campus location. Stanford and Hopkins purchased parcels of land around the site of the university from Henry Seale and the Greer family and plotted the land into streets and lots. Hopkins wanted to name the town University Park, but Stanford preferred the traditional Spanish name Palo Alto. University Avenue was slated to be the town’s main thoroughfare. By the early 1890s, the first settlers arrived, buying homes on University, Emerson, and Webster Streets, and Lytton Avenue. Commercial development quickly followed along University Street, Lytton and Hamilton Avenues, and near the town’s train depot. In 1894, Palo Alto was officially incorporated and began the process of developing and operating its own utilities, including water, gas, an electric power plant, and a sewage system and treatment plant.

The first Palo Alto subdivision was College Terrace. In 1887, Alexander Gordon began subdividing his land and developing streets that were named after eastern universities, with the goal of selling his lots to Stanford faculty members. Gordon’s development eventually became part of Mayfield, which was incorporated in 1903 and later annexed to Palo Alto in 1925 (Hatfield and Anderson 2008).

The Professorville Historic District is adjacent to the northwestern side of the project site. The district roughly comprises the area bounded by Ramona, Addison, Embarcadero, and Waverley Streets. The district is significant for its important historical associations and high architectural value. The district represents one of the earliest residential areas in Palo Alto, housing the first generation of professors at the fledgling Stanford University. Many of these professors shaped the foundation and intellectual standards of the University, and the surrounding community. The most significant aspect of the district is certainly its architectural value “due to the consistent character and high quality of the buildings and streetscapes that comprise it. Landscaping qualities contribute strongly to the character and ambience of the area, as do the Colonial Revival and Craftsman shingle covered structures which largely constitute the cultural makeup of the district.” (Boghosian and Beach 1979).

Castilleja Hall (later known as the Nardyne Apartments), located at 1121 Bryant Street, is considered one of the more significant elements of the district. This Colonial Revival/Classic Revival building was constructed c. 1892 and was one of first girl’s preparatory schools in the area. The building was originally located at 319 Kingsley and moved to its present location in the early 1900s, shortly before it was occupied by Castilleja Hall. Classes were held at this location until the school’s permanent location at 1310 Bryant Street was constructed. Although unusual for a residential district, the building’s unique architecture makes it a focal point of the historic district (Boghosian and Beach 1979).

By the early twentieth century, the interurban railroad played an important role in connecting Palo Alto and Mayfield with San Jose. Streetcars began operating in 1910, making the daily commute for students and faculty of Stanford University much more convenient. Apartments and
boarding houses began springing up along the streetcar routes to support students and shop workers. Development in the downtown area centered around the railway station, with the Cardinal Hotel (built in 1924) serving as an example of the early transit-oriented building boom. The Crescent Park and Southgate Subdivisions were also built during this period. As the City’s population continued to grow, more high-end housing, like these subdivisions, began to spring up throughout the City. However, low-end rental housing was also introduced through the construction of more affordable bungalow courts.

While the development boom slowed with the onset of the Great Depression, approximately 800 new buildings were constructed in the City between 1931 and 1941. During this time, buildings were constructed on a much tighter budget, using cheaper building materials and exhibiting less ornamentation. Construction materials were generally in short supply and financing options were limited. During World War II, many single-family homes were subdivided into apartments to meet the demand for housing during this period of limited construction. After the war, new subdivisions boomed and entire neighborhoods sprung up throughout the City. While initially built very cheaply, later subdivisions utilized more modern and innovative designs by developers like Joseph Eichler.

After World War II, Palo Alto went through its largest expansion yet, nearly doubling in size when the City boundary expanded south to Mountain View. New commercial buildings were quickly developed to accommodate the daily needs of the growing City, including the Stanford Shopping Center, which was constructed on land owned by the University. By the 1950s, the City had transformed from a college town to a leader in technology, and there was a drastic increase in research, light industrial, and office space. In 1951, Stanford Research Park was developed, bringing accomplished scientists and entrepreneurs to the region (City of Palo Alto 2014).

3.1.1 School Development in Palo Alto

The development of schools in Palo Alto began in 1893, when men from surrounding communities constructed the first schoolhouse in just 4 days. The school was a simple, two-room wooden structure that supported 80 students and 2 teachers (1 of whom also acted as the school principal). Before having its own school, Palo Alto had relied on its neighboring city of Mayfield for schooling. Children would walk more than 2 miles each day to attend school in Mayfield because parents understood the importance of their children being able to read, write, and learn new skills.

The city outgrew its first school in just 1 year (largely due to the establishment of Stanford University in 1891). In 1894, a new 2-story, 6-room schoolhouse was built on Channing Street to accommodate up to 240 students. However, Palo Alto still lacked a public high school. Anna Zschokke, a local single mother, decided to start a high school with her own money. She began a small private school out of her residence at 526 Forest Avenue that cost $6 per year and provided students with college preparation courses.
College preparation and education was a key component of life in Palo Alto. Schools like Palo Alto High offered courses in classic and modern languages, and the curriculum was supervised by Stanford University in an effort to prepare high school students for entrance into Stanford without examination. An article from the Palo Alto Times from 1894 stated that Palo Alto was a key educational center with education starting for children as young as 3 years old in one of the two kindergartens in the town.

During the early twentieth century, the school district constructed dozens of new schools, including Palo Alto High School in 1918. The City’s first junior high school, David Star Jordan, was constructed in 1937, Ellwood P. Cubberley High School in 1956, and Henry M. Gunn High School in 1964. During the post-war population boom in the 1950s, Palo Alto built, on average, one to three schools each year. As time went on, population growth declined and many schools were forced to close their doors. Palo Alto Unified School District currently serves about 12,000 students (PAHA 2015).

3.1.2 Castilleja School History

Castilleja School is located in a residential neighborhood and has expanded over the years to accommodate increased enrollment at the school. Much of the information presented below about the history of the school is summarized from the book Castilleja: Celebrating a Century (Croll and Pang 2007).

In the late 1800s, the education of women was often considered inferior to college preparatory education for men; however, progressive women’s education pioneers sought to change this perspective and began to establish schools focused on preparing women for higher education. While the West Coast was a little slower to reform education than the East Coast, California quickly caught up with its eastern counterparts in the early twentieth century. Examples of early West Coast educational institutions resulting from this increased need for college preparatory school can be seen with the establishment of schools like the Harvard School for Boys and the Westlake School for Girls, both founded in the first 5 years of the twentieth century. Schools like these paved the way for schools like Castilleja and demonstrate a true shift in educational mindsets in California pertaining to preparing students for college entrance (Croll and Pang 2007; PAHA 1952).

The desire to provide college preparatory classes to women spurred Stanford alumna Mary Ishbel Lockey (1872–1939) to found the Castilleja School in 1907 as an all-girls school. Born and educated in Helena, Montana, Lockey was the daughter of wealthy parents who made their fortune during Montana’s mining boom. Upon graduation from high school, Lockey began training to be a teacher at the Normal School in Helena and then transferred to Stanford. She attended Stanford with her brother Richard and graduated in 1902. Her early teaching jobs included the Miss Harker–Miss Hughes School in Palo Alto and Palo Alto High School. After a few years of teaching at other institutions, Lockey decided to establish her own school and serve as principal. Her family
provided the financial backing she needed to establish Castilleja School and begin her journey as the school’s principal and founder (PAT 1939). Lockey’s decision to start the Castilleja School is also closely tied to her time at Stanford and her relationship with Stanford President Dr. David Starr Jordan. During her time at Stanford, Lockey was mentored by Dr. Jordan, and after graduation he strongly encouraged her to start her own school to prepare women for entry into prestigious schools like Stanford.

Familiar with the Palo Alto area from her time at Stanford, Lockey capitalized on the increased population growth and moderate weather and chose Palo Alto as the location for her school. “Castilleja,” the chosen name for the school, comes from the botanical name for a native flower to Santa Clara County, the Indian paintbrush (SJEN 1919). The original school (Castilleja Hall) was founded in 1907 at 1121 Bryant Street. This building has been determined eligible as a contributor to the NRHP-listed Professorville Historic District. The school was scheduled to open on August 19, 1907 (PAT 1907). In its first year, the school had 14 teachers and 68 students and included kindergarten to 12th grade. While the school had been founded as a girls’ school, Lockey also opened enrollment in the lower grades for male day students. The bulk of the student body was female, and there was a mix of boarding students and day students, including some out-of-state students (Croll and Pang 2007).

Lockey, with Dr. Jordan’s advice, developed a strong college preparatory educational platform based on her core values, known as the 5 Cs: “conscience, character, courtesy, charity, and courage.” These values are still paramount to the school today and form the school’s floral emblem. However, Lockey also understood that not all young women were interested in college, so she established a non-college-bound curriculum to appeal to those students. Lockey’s philosophy for both educational paths was focused on broad patterns of education and not simply on an academic curriculum, which is clearly seen in her 5 Cs philosophy. Typical subjects were history, languages, mathematics, and science intermixed with social customs, cooking, and etiquette training, with focuses on refined speech and proper manners.

While Lockey believed that social and academic subject matter was paramount, she also believed that the students should have the best possible teachers to prepare them for the future. Lockey carefully chose instructors with college degrees, and some instructors completed graduate-level work. The students greatly benefited from the curriculum at Castilleja and Lockey’s direction, and many were reportedly admitted to schools like Stanford without formal examination (Croll and Pang 2007).

Enrollment numbers before the Depression were reported in the Western Journal of Education, with 230 children enrolled in 1921. Enrollment declined during the Great Depression and World War II. Following World War II, the City reported that enrollment for the school was only 235, which was only a 5-student increase from 1921. Following Lockey’s death on March 4, 1939, Castilleja experienced financial issues and lacked appropriate leadership candidates to guide the school.
through its troubled financial times following the Depression and during the war years. After two short-lived principal appointments, Miss Margarita Espinosa was promoted from assistant principal to principal in 1941. Miss Espinosa carried on the legacy of Lockey. Although these years were not marked by growth and development, the school continued to function and enrollment numbers rose in the years following World War II. In 1942–1943, the enrollment numbers for the school were at 91, and by 1947, enrollment was at 235. The much-needed increase in enrollment led to a decision in 1947 to make the school all girls and to no longer take on male students in the lower grades. In 1958, the school made a decision to drop the lower grades from the educational platform and only taught grades 7 to 12, which remained the situation until the early 1990s. In 1999, the City reported that enrollment for the school was at 385 students, with 90 staff members (Croll and Pang 2007; WJE 1921).

Campus Development History

Purpose-Built Campus, 1910

Shortly after the founding in 1907, the school moved to its current location at 1310 Bryant Street in 1910. At that time, Lockey purchased 4.5 acres of land from Alfred Seale, who had two daughters who would eventually graduate from Lockey’s school. The site of the new school offered an unobstructed view of the surrounding meadows, all the way to the foothills. Much of the surrounding area consisted of open space and orchards, with sparse residential development. The westerly-adjacent area now known as the Professorville Historic District had already seen substantial residential development.

With the help of local planner/builder Gustav Laumeister, Lockey developed a site plan and building plan for the campus at Bryant Street. Her plan included four buildings: a dormitory, chapel, science building, and gymnasium. Early drawings from the period show the original campus layout to be very similar to the campus today (Figure 4), with buildings around the outside and a large circular greenspace in the center. The greenspace of the campus was only a starting point for the development of the campus. According to a catalog from 1910 to 1911, Lockey advertised the school as follows:

These plans are especially adapted to the school and the climate, and are most attractive and practical. The buildings are strongly built and braced and have excellent fire protection; the plumbing and the heating plant are of the latest and most approved systems. Though the school lies just beyond the town limits, there is a connection with the Palo Alto sewer… The sleeping porch is one of the most attractive features of the building; it is situated on the third floor … has a southern exposure, a roof, and protection from drafts and driving storms. Here, if desired, girls may sleep out of doors all winter… The spacious living rooms are especially planned for entertaining and for comfort. Small round tables are a feature of the cheery dining
room… Particular attention has been paid to the lighting of all the buildings, and in the Recitation Hall every room has east or south sun (Croll and Pang 2007).

Lockey, and many other early-twentieth century educational advocates, believed in the importance of connecting educational achievement with physical surroundings. This logic is partially what inspired the original landscaping and layout for the campus. “Splendid live oak trees beautify the property, producing a park-like effect, and lawns, fruit trees, and gardens are already in a state of advanced growth and bloom possible only in a climate like that of California.” (Croll and Pang 2007:8). Trees and planting was important to Lockey, and she frequently drew analogies between the growth of trees and the growth of young girls. Upon moving to the campus in 1910, Lockey commented that the campus contained “just twenty-two live oaks and nothing more.” (Croll and Pang 2007:50). From the campus’ earliest days, students and faculty would come together to plant a tree or shrub every Arbor Day, and in 1911, the students planted an entire orchard.

Figure 4     Castilleja School 1910 (Croll and Pang 2007)
Growth and Development of the Campus, 1910–1960

Shortly after the original campus was completed, students and faculty added to the beauty of the campus with annual tree plantings and creation of an orchard. Like other educational institutions, Castilleja School developed somewhat organically to support growing enrollment numbers and educational programs.

In 1921, the Western Journal of Education noted an enrollment of 230 children and described the school as follows:

> Surrounded by luxurious and well-kept gardens, the Castilleja private school in Palo Alto, of which Miss Mary I. Lockey is principal, carries an air of refinement and artistic atmosphere which is most delightful. The school grounds occupies almost five acres. Outdoor study rooms are one of the features of the school. A new music and art studio is under construction and a large swimming pool on the grounds will be completed before the new term, which begins September 19 (WJE 1921).

Other early construction projects for the campus included a science lab, cottage, gymnasium, tennis courts, and a chapel. The 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company Map (Figure 5) confirms these early construction projects mentioned in the 1921 Western Journal of Education (Croll and Pang 2007; Sanborn 1949). Figure 6 provides a map of the campus in the 1934 showing the original campus buildings, nearly all of which have been replaced.

Construction of the Chapel in 1926 was by far the largest construction project undertaken by the school since its move to the Bryant Street campus in 1910. The Chapel was designed by esteemed local architect Birge Clark and had a 500-seat capacity. Since the school had no specific religious affiliation and did not intend to use the Chapel as a church, the Chapel became host to a variety of activities for the school, including vespers, lectures, presentations, commencement, and performances (PAT 1926; PAW 1994).

By 1949, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps reveal that the school campus was comprised of the following buildings:

- **Recitation Hall:** The building appears to be L-shaped in plan and have 1 story largely fronting Bryant Street. According to the map, the building was also used for classrooms.
- **Residence Hall/Dormitory:** The building appears to be 2.5 stories and L-shaped in plan largely fronting Bryant Street.
- **Chapel:** The 1.5-story building is located to the rear of the Recitation Hall and appears to be asymmetrical in plan.
• **Gymnasium:** The 1-story building is located to the rear of the Chapel and is rectangular in plan.

• **Bungalow:** The 1.5-story building is roughly square in plan, fronts Kellogg Street, and is to the rear of the Residence Hall/Dormitory.

• **Central Steam Heating Plant/Laboratories:** The 2-story building is asymmetrical in plan and fronts Kellogg Street.

• **Swimming Pool Complex:** The swimming pool area is part of an interconnected series of buildings and structures that includes an open-plan lattice structure that faces Kellogg Street, a 1-story paint shop with what appears to be an open plan courtyard, a 1-story stage, a 2-story shop, and a 1-story building housing dressing rooms, likely for the swimming pool. The swimming pool is rectangular and there are no measurements.

• **Orchard House:** The 2-story music hall building is rectangular in plan.

• **Lodge:** The 1-story lodge building is rectangular in plan.
Figure 5  1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company Map Showing Castilleja School (Sanborn 1924)
Figure 6  1934 Map of Castilleja School
In addition, aerial photographs from 1948 demonstrate significant growth and development on and around the campus. The surrounding neighborhood is entirely developed with residential housing. In 1956 the grounds remain relatively unchanged, with the exception of two small structures added to the front of the pool complex facing Kellogg Street (NETR Online 2017; Sanborn 1949).

Campus Growth and Expansion, 1960–1980

Following the elimination of the lower grades in 1958, Castilleja School decided that its buildings were outdated and decided to move forward with expansion and upgrades to the entire campus. The original plan was very ambitious and called for the replacement of all campus buildings; however, it was not fully carried out, because the Administration building and Chapel remain. Information provided by Castilleja School provided a good construction timeline for all major projects that would occur on campus between the 1960s and 1980s (Castilleja 2016).

The first project undertaken by the school was the construction of the new residence hall in 1960, which was named the Arrillaga Family Campus Center. Although formally dedicated in 1962, architectural drawings provided by the school provided a construction start date of 1960. The original design of the Campus Center planned for housing 90 students and included recreation style rooms with televisions lounges on each floor (Castilleja 2016; Croll and Pang 2007; PAT 1960; DPAT 1961).

A 1968 aerial photograph of the campus shows some changes to the building footprints on the corner of Kellogg Avenue and Bryant Street, which is consistent with the school’s account of the new building construction and architectural drawings of the multiphase construction of Rhoades Hall (Figure 7), with its start as a dormitory and classroom building in 1965 known as Building C and its completion as Rhoades Hall in 1967. Rhoades Hall spanned the space from the Campus Center to the Administration building and contained 20 classrooms to support the 1967 enrollment of 300 students. The 1960s construction projects revolutionized the look of the campus and remain today (Castilleja 2016; Croll and Pang 2007; PAT 1967; SFEC 1967).

Figure 7 Drawing of the 1960s Construction Projects

In 1977, the Seipp-Wallace Pavilion was constructed and functioned as a gymnasium for the school until it was replaced in 2008 with the current gymnasium/fitness center.

The Ely Fine Arts Center was proposed in the late 1970s and constructed in 1980 (Figure 8). In that same year, the school completed extensive renovations on the 1926 Chapel. The interior alterations converted the Chapel from its original function to an auditorium. The school also added a 28-space parking lot to the site to support the needs of its students and faculty.

Figure 8  Ely Fine Arts Center

Extensive renovations to the campus buildings took place in the 1990s and early 2000s. The 1991–2002 aerial photographs lack good resolution to see changes to the campus clearly; however, information provided by the City and representatives at Castilleja School helped establish a development/alteration timeline.

One of the biggest drivers for change in the 1990s was the closure of the student resident program. The lack of boarding residential students made the dormitory spaces in the Campus Center and Rhoades Hall obsolete. In 1997, renovation of the Campus Center included an
interior reconfiguration to replace living spaces on the second and third floors with classrooms, reconfiguration of the first floor to house a library, and changes to the exterior iron stairwells to meet modern code compliance.

In 1998, renovations began on Rhoades Hall to remove the dormitory spaces from the second floor on the side of the building that faces Kellogg Avenue. The reconfiguration of the space resulted in removing all dormitory rooms and replacing them with classrooms and offices for the students. The removal of the dormitories allowed for a walkway along the campus-facing side of Rhoades Hall, which did not exist prior to these renovations. These renovations made Rhoades Hall the continuous classroom and office space it is today (Chapman 2017; PADM 1996; SJMN 1974).

The 1990s were also important because of the acquisition of 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-033) and its renovation. The renovation of the single-family residence to an alumnae house, now called the Lockey House, took place in the late 1990s and included interior and exterior reconfigurations, as well as extensive window replacements. The building was originally oriented to face Melville Avenue, which was annexed by the school for the construction of a new softball field (SJMN 1992). The adjacent property at 1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031) was also purchased by the school in the 1990s. Property records indicate that the building was constructed in 1979.

The early 2000s also represents a period of extensive change on campus with the renovation of the Chapel and Administration building. The Administration building was lifted off its foundation and moved slightly closer to Bryant Street so that a full basement and foundation could be constructed. The interior renovations to the Administration building were extensive, and there is no evidence remaining of the original interiors. Entrances to the building were also reconfigured, shingles and stucco were replaced, a porch enclosed on the southeast elevation, and all windows were replaced with double-paned wood windows that were designed to match the historic single-paned windows originally installed.

Renovations to the Chapel were also quite extensive and included replacement of the balcony, stage, and extension of the west exterior wall of the building. Another major change to the Chapel was the connection of the Chapel to the Administration building and the removal of its Bryant Street entrance on the east elevation. Presently, the Chapel is accessible from the inside of the Administration building via the east elevation (Chapman 2017).

Since 2002, the school has continued to expand. In 2007, a basement addition to the physical arts building was permitted. One of the most significant construction projects to take place since 2002 was the construction of the Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic Center in 2008.
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Campus Architecture

Craftsman Style (1905-1930)

The Craftsman architecture movement in the United States is one of the most prevalent and widespread movements that appealed to almost all social classes. The Arts and Crafts movement began in the mid–late part of the nineteenth century in England as a reactionary movement against the excessiveness and ostentatious designs of the Victorian era. One of the key contributors to bringing the Craftsman movement to the United States was Gustav Stickley. His work helped fuel the development of the Craftsman movement and spread it across the United States. Upon its arrival in California, the Craftsman movement produced a truly unique California architectural form—the California bungalow. Developed by the work of Greene and Greene in Pasadena, the California Bungalow became one of the most widespread architectural movements in California. In Palo Alto, the Craftsman style was often merged with elements from Shingle and Colonial Revival styles to create a unique hybrid style (Foster 2004; McAlester 2015; PASH 2015).

The Craftsman style is characterized by the following features:

- Overhanging eaves
- Distinct horizontal lines
- Low pitched roof designs
- Wood shingle detailing, porches
- Maximum of 2 stories, mostly 1 story or 1.5 stories
- Paired windows
- Tapered wooden porch supports
- Extensive use of natural materials and finishes
- Brick and/or stone chimneys
- Exposed roof beams

Mid-Century Modern Style (1933-1965)

Following World War II, the United States focused on forward thinking, which sparked architectural movements like the Mid-Century Modern style. Practitioners of the style were focused on the most cutting-edge materials and techniques. Architects throughout California implemented the design aesthetics made famous by early Modernists like Richard Neutra and Frank Lloyd Wright, who created a variety of Modern architectural forms throughout California.
The Mid-Century Modern movement in California was characterized by simplistic and clear uses of materials and structural components, open interior planning, and large expanses of glass. Mid-Century Modern flourished in many cities and in many school construction projects supporting the post-war population booms. The cost-effective nature of the style and the ability to mass-produce Mid-Century Modern building materials like concrete, wood, steel, and glass made it the perfect style for educational buildings.

Characteristics of the Mid-Century Modern style include the following:

- 1 to 2 stories in height
- Post-and-beam construction using wood and/or steel
- Cantilevered canopies and overhangs
- Little to no exterior ornamentation
- Open floor plans
- Buildings sheathed in stucco, wood, brick, or steel frame with glass
- Flat roof designs
- Flush-mounted metal frame and clerestory windows
- Large expanses of windows
- Simple size and massing
- Use of simplistic geometric shapes
- Use of covered walkways with geometric canopies using such forms as butterfly or folded plate
- Exterior staircases, decks, patios, and balconies (Dyson 2015; Gebhard and Winter 2003; McAlester 2015)

Campus Architects and Builders

Architect Roy Heald (Administration Building)

Roy Heald was a known architect in Palo Alto and the surrounding Bay Area. He arrived in Santa Cruz, California, from Iowa by way of a covered wagon. According to his obituary in the 1966 Santa Cruz Sentinel, he was a member of the Santa Cruz pioneer family and first cousin to Herbert Hoover (SCS 1966). One of his notable architectural works outside of the City was the farm buildings and house he designed for Theodore Hoover on Waddell Creek in the Santa Cruz Mountains in 1917. Other notable works include the following:
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- 950 University Avenue – De Forest Residence (1908) – Category 4 building on City’s inventory
- 970 University Avenue – Lee House (1909) – Category 2 building on City’s inventory
- Rancho del Oso Farm House and Barns, Waddell Creek, California, 1917
- 255–265 Lytton Avenue – Tiffany Funeral Home/Gatehouse Restaurant (1926) – Category 4 building on City’s inventory
- 248 Homer Avenue (1925–1928 commercial building) – Category 3 building on City’s inventory

In addition to his principal works listed above, Heald was also responsible for the construction of the Castilleja School Administration building in 1910. Today the building is listed as a Category 3 building on the City’s inventory (PASH 2017; SCS 1966).

**Builder Gustav Laumeister (Administration Building)**

The builder Gustav Laumeister was one of the first building contractors in Palo Alto. During his early training in Alameda, Monterey, and Menlo Park, Gustav gained valuable experience as a builder, and after the 1906 earthquake he was involved in the rebuilding of the Stanford campus. While Laumeister was best known for his residential projects, he was responsible for the construction of some University Park office buildings and the Administration building at Castilleja. His influence in Palo Alto is also notable as one of the founders of the Palo Alto Historical Society (PASH 2002, 2017).

**Architect Birge Clark (Chapel)**

Son of Stanford art professor Arthur Bridgman Clark, Birge Clark was born in Palo Alto, California, in 1894 and was exposed to architecture early in life. Clark graduated from Stanford in 1914 and continued his education at Columbia University in New York City until 1917. His early career was filled with a variety of projects, including residential, commercial, and institutional architecture, and was largely in line with revivalist architecture traditions seen throughout California, including Mission, Colonial, and Tudor Revival styles. Clark is a seminal architect in the development of architectural style in Palo Alto, and his work helped create the visual characteristics of post-1920s Palo Alto.

His principal architectural works include the following:

- Lou Henry and Herbert Hoover House, Stanford, California, 1929
- Charles and Kathleen Norris Residence, Palo Alto, California, 1929
Cultural Resources Study for the Castilleja School Project

- Palo Alto Post Office, Palo Alto, California, 1932
- Palo Alto Community Center, Palo Alto, California, 1934
- Palo Alto Times Newspaper Plant, Palo Alto, California, 1948
- Magna Engineering Building, Menlo Park, California, 1951
- Ray Lyman Wilbur Junior High School, Palo Alto, California, 1953
- Camden High School, San Jose, California, 1957
- Shell Oil Company Accounting Center, Menlo Park, California, 1961
- Palo Alto Savings and Loan Building, Palo Alto, California, 1963
- Architecture Instructor at Stanford University from 1950 to 1972

In addition to Clark’s works above, he was responsible for the design of the Castilleja School Chapel building in 1926 (AIA 1956, 1962, 1970; Boghosian and Beach 1979; Michelson 2015a).

**Architect Paul James Huston (Campus Center and Maintenance Buildings)**

Paul James Huston was born in 1916 in Galesburg, Illinois, and received his education from Stanford University in 1939. Huston held numerous positions before starting his own firm in Palo Alto in 1948, including draftsman for Richard Neutra, assistant Naval architect for the U.S. Navy, and a draftsman for William Hempel of Palo Alto. His principal architectural works include the following:

- Tolley House, Atherton, California, 1950
- William Kelley Residence, Atherton, California, 1952
- Original Lockheed Buildings, Sunnyvale, 1956
- University Club, Palo Alto, California, 1957
- Mountain View Library, Mountain View, California, 1957
- Draper, Gaither, and Anderson Building, Stanford, California, 1959
- North Santa Clara County Courthouse, Palo Alto, California, 1961
- Sheppard Cadillac Dealership, Menlo Park, California 1967

In addition to the listing of his principal works above, Huston designed the Campus Center and maintenance buildings for the Castilleja School in 1960 (AIA 1956, 1962, 1970; Michelson 2015b).
**Architect William Daseking (Ely Arts Center and Rhoades Hall)**

Daseking was born in California in 1914 and was educated at the University of California, Berkeley. Living most of his life in either Modesto or Atherton, California, Daseking studied at the University of California, Berkeley, and began practicing architecture in 1938. He served as a major in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from 1941 to 1946. Following his work with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Daseking became partner in the firm Keller and Daseking in Menlo Park, California, in 1946. He worked on several residential, educational, and commercial projects in the Bay Area during his time with the firm. His principal works include the following:

- Ravenswood School District Manor Schools, East Palo Alto, California, 1952
- Redeemer Lutheran Church, Redwood City, California, circa 1952
- Hall of Flowers, San Mateo, California, 1965

In addition to his principal works listed above, Daseking was responsible for the designs of the Ely Arts Center and Rhoades Hall at Castilleja School (AIA 1956, 1962, 1970;; Michelson 2015c; Palo Alto Online 1996).
4 CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY

4.1 Methods

Dudek architectural historian Sarah Corder, MFA, conducted a pedestrian survey of the Castilleja School campus on February 22, 2017. The project site is entirely developed with an active school campus. Therefore, an archaeological survey was not warranted. All buildings and structures on campus that were constructed over 45 years ago were photographed, researched, and evaluated in consideration of CRHR and City designation criteria and integrity requirements, and in consideration of potential impacts to historical resources under CEQA. The survey entailed walking all portions of the campus and documenting each building with notes and photographs, specifically noting character-defining features, spatial relationships, and any observed alterations. During the survey, Dan Chapman, superintendent of buildings and grounds, and Mandy Brown, finance and operations analyst, provided access to locked facilities on the campus and information concerning past construction and renovation projects on campus.

Dudek documented the fieldwork using field notes, digital photography, close-scale field maps, and aerial photographs. Photographs of the project site were taken with a Canon Power Shot SX160 IS digital camera with 16 megapixels and 16x optical zoom. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the current study are on file at Dudek’s Pasadena, California, office.

4.2 Description of Surveyed Resources

Castilleja School is a collection of adjacent parcels and addresses that include 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034), 1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031), and 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-033).

Table 3 provides a description of all buildings and structures surveyed as part of the cultural resources study, including a photograph of the building, current building name, historic building name (if applicable), year built (if known), a general physical description of the building, and any alterations identified through either building development research or during the cultural resources survey.

A great deal of information regarding recent building renovations was provided by Dan Chapman, who has worked for the Castilleja School in a facilities management role for the last 25 years and has extensive institutional knowledge of campus building projects.
Table 3  
**Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunn Family Administration Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Roy Heald (architect) and Gustav Laumeister (builder)</td>
<td>This building is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City’s Historic Buildings Inventory. The 2-story building is irregular in plan and now oriented to face Embarcadero Road. The building sits on a poured concrete foundation. The ground floor is clad in pebble-dash stucco, and the second story is clad in wood shingles. The roof is sheathed in wood shingles. The building was originally designed in the Craftsman style and features overhanging eaves, wood shingle detailing, paired Craftsman style windows, wooden column supports, and dormers. The building is the only remaining original building to the 1910 founding of the school and was designed by prominent local architect Roy Heald and constructed by Gustav Laumeister.</td>
<td>2000: complete reconfiguration of the interior, reconfiguration of the entrance, replacement of all windows, replacement of shingles, replacement of stucco, removal of building from the foundation for basement addition, original porch was enclosed, roof replaced, trellis/arbor addition, and connection of building to Chapel and Rhoades Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Feature 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The use of greenspace in the original and later designs was important to Lockey and the early students. The circle feature appears on early maps of the campus and has remained a significant element in the overall design of the campus. While much of the campus developed and built up from the original plans, the use of greenspace remains a key component with the circle feature.</td>
<td>The circle feature is largely unchanged with the exception of the grass being replaced by synthetic turf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockey House, 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-033)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>This 2-story, wood frame house that is roughly L in-plan has been significantly altered from its original appearance. The building sits on a poured concrete foundation and is clad in stucco. It features a complex hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles, and exposed rafter tails. The façade of the building is oriented to face the Castilleja School campus to the southeast, which is now the main elevation of the house. The main elevation features a poured concrete stoop that is offset to the west and accessed by brick steps under a triangular pediment. The six-panel wooden entry door is flanked by fixed wood windows, each of which features four panes. The remainder of the façade features a large four-over-one window flanked by two, two-over-one windows. The second floor windows are all three-over-one. There was an addition made to the north elevation of the building for a kitchen expansion.</td>
<td>1990s: Enclosure of the original entry way and addition of porch that is oriented toward campus, interior reconfiguration for use as Alumni house. Dates unknown: garage construction and kitchen addition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hughes Chapel Theater 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Birge Clark</td>
<td>This building is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City's Historic Buildings Inventory. The 2-story Chapel was designed by Birge Clark in 1926. The building was originally designed as a standalone building, but was connected to the Administration building in 2000. Constructed in the Craftsman style, the building retains many visual elements of the style including overhanging eaves, side gabled roof sheathed in wood shingles, wood shingle cladding, and paired Craftsman style windows. However, the building was extensively renovated in 1980 and again in 2000 and has lost much of its exterior and interior integrity and configuration.</td>
<td>1980: Replacement and expansion of the stage area, replacement of the ceiling, and expansion of the building to the west with the addition of the step down style windows. 2000: Removal of the building from its foundation for basement construction, connection to the Administration building, replacement of the balcony and reconfiguration of the entrance from Bryant Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrillaga Family Campus Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1960–1962</td>
<td>Paul Huston</td>
<td>The 3-story building was poured in place concrete construction with a complex roofline that is roughly rectangular in plan. The building is oriented with entry from Kellogg Street to the southeast and the campus circle to the northwest.</td>
<td>1997: interior reconfiguration of second and third floors to replace the original dormitory space, reconfiguration of the first floor for the library, reconfiguration of north elevation for library entrance, additional safety bars installed on outdoor staircase railings, and the addition of elevator. 2010: Building was reroofed with spray foam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhoades Hall/Middle School Classrooms 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1965–1967</td>
<td>William Daseking</td>
<td>The 1967 2-story poured-in-place concrete school building was a phased construction project that is irregular in plan. The building is clad in brick veneer under the first-story windows, then clad in stucco that is accented by vertical concrete slat elements all set under a spray foam roof. The building is oriented with its main entry point facing Bryant Street. The main point of entry is recessed and accessed by a columned flat roof porch leading to an elaborately carved set of double doors slightly offset in a 2-story glass and metal wall panel. Fenestration is regular and all original metal windows are intact. The building also features one of the two sunken gardens on campus, which is located to the west of the building.</td>
<td>1998: second floor reconfigured from dormitory space to classrooms and offices, connection to Administration building and campus center building. 2010: building reroofed with a spray foam roof that is in keeping with the color and look of the original roof material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Paul Huston</td>
<td>The 2-story maintenance building was constructed in 1960. It is irregular in plan with a rear carport under a spray foam gabled roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter tails. Fenestration is irregular and a variety of metal windows is featured on all elevations. The building is clad in concrete block on the first story and vertical wood siding on the second story.</td>
<td>1980: The building was reroofed. Circa 1990: Sliding cage doors were added to the carport section of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The 2-story house is L-shaped in plan, clad in wood shingles with a gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles constructed circa 1980. The house is accessed by Emerson Street by a poured-concrete walkway. The house is surrounded by a wooden fence with a small entry door near the garage that provides access to a sizable yard with mature trees. The house has an irregular fenestration and all windows appear to be either fixed or double-hung vinyl windows. The main façade features a recessed entry point with multiple-pane French style doors.</td>
<td>No significant changes were observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Ely Fine Arts Center</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>William Daseking</td>
<td>The circa 1980 2-story building is rectangular in plan and is oriented to the northeast. The building is clad with concrete block and features a flat roof. The main (east) elevation of the building features a recessed entry point that is offset to the north of the façade. The main elevation also features a wooden pergola that is supported with concrete columns with a poured concrete walkway. The building also features one of the two sunken gardens on campus, which is located to the east of building.</td>
<td>2010: Reroof of building with spray foam Date unknown: Addition of the lockers, reroof of the building, addition of door to building facing Emerson and replacement of rotted wood on the exterior trellis system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool, 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The current swimming pool, the third pool built at the same location, was installed in 2001.</td>
<td>There have been no significant changes to the pool since its installation in 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage Building, 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The small, 1-story, flat-roofed, brick-veneer pool storage building is used for chemical and pool equipment storage.</td>
<td>There are no known alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic Center, 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Kornberg and Associates</td>
<td>The 2-story gymnasium is roughly rectangular in plan with a flat roof and is clad in stucco and wood shingles. The building is accessed by a glass entryway offset to the east</td>
<td>There are no known alterations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION

Extensive archival research, combined with an intensive pedestrian survey of the Castilleja School, indicates that the campus contains one historical resource: the Administration/Chapel building, which is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City’s inventory of historic resources; listed in the Office of Historic Preservation’s Historical Resources Inventory with a status code 5S2 (individual property that is eligible for local listing or designation). While the campus conveys its original plan on the most basic level (i.e., a central circle greenspace feature surrounded by buildings and structures on the periphery), all other buildings/features on campus were found to be ineligible for either individual listing or as a contributing element of a historic district. Only buildings and structures over 45 years old were evaluated for historical significance. Table 4 provides a summary of findings for all buildings/features on campus, and Figure 9, (Castilleja School Eligibility Findings), provides an overview of the significance evaluation findings. A Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 form set (DPR forms) for the Castilleja School can be found in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunn Family Administration Center Building/Elizabeth Hughes Chapel Theater</td>
<td>1910/1926</td>
<td>Locally listed (Category 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle greenspace feature</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrillaga Family Campus Center</td>
<td>1960–1962</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoades Hall</td>
<td>1965–1967</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Building</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Ely Fine Arts Center</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage Building</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic Center</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263 Emerson Street (Lockey House)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235 Emerson Street</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.1 California Register of Historical Resources Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria. Integrity is evaluated with reference to specific criteria.

**CRHR Criterion 1:** *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.*

The Castilleja School is one of the City’s oldest private schools, founded in 1907 and moved to its current location in 1910. Castilleja School was established during a major period of growth in the City as the interurban railroad was connected to larger nearby cities, streetcars began operating, and both housing and commercial developments began to spring up throughout the region. Castilleja School is associated with Palo Alto’s first boom of educational development since college preparation became a particularly important focus in the community after the opening of Stanford University in 1891 (of which Castilleja’s founder, Mary Lockey was an alumni) and the arrival of many new families to the area. Castilleja was an all-girls school specifically designed to prepare women for entry into prestigious universities like Stanford and the school is associated with Palo Alto’s educational development and women’s educational development. The current location at 1310 Bryant Street is the second location of the school. The original school (Castilleja Hall) was founded in 1907 at 1121 Bryant Street. This building has been determined eligible as a contributor to the NRHP-listed Professorville Historic District. The existing campus at 1310 Bryant Street lacks sufficient integrity (as a whole) to convey any important associations, as all but two of the original school buildings have been demolished. Therefore, the school does not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 1 as a historic district. For similar reasons, the locally designated Administration/Chapel building does not meet this criterion, as its setting and historical associations, have been significantly compromised by new developments on the Castilleja School campus.

**CRHR Criterion 2:** *Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*

The Castilleja School is associated with an individual important in Palo Alto’s past. In 1907, Mary Ishbel Lockey (1872–1939) founded her own school at 1121 Bryant Street in Palo Alto. Three years later, the school had outgrown its original home in a small rented house and moved to its present day location down the street at 1310 Bryant Street. Lockey earned the respect and trust of then Stanford University president, David Starr Jordan, who once said that he had “implicit confidence in Miss Lockey,” such that he “would not hesitate to turn over the management of Stanford [to her], were it necessary.” (Croll and Pang 2007, p. 2). Ms. Lockey
is the central figure of the school’s legacy, which has remained true to Lockey’s vision. While Lockey is considered an important local figure, strongly associated with women’s educational development during a period that overlaps the American Women’s Suffrage Movement, the campus itself lacks sufficient integrity (as a whole) to convey any important associations since all but two of the original school buildings have been demolished. The school can no longer convey associations with Lockey’s productive life in the field of education. Therefore, the school does not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 2 as a historic district. For similar reasons concerning a lack of integrity, the locally designated Administration/Chapel building does not meet this criterion, as its setting and historical associations have been significantly compromised by new developments on the Castilleja School campus.

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

**Historic District Consideration**

Only two of the original school buildings remain on campus: the Administration and Chapel buildings, which are now connected and constitute one building. While the campus maintains the most general aspects of its original plan—a central circle feature surrounded by buildings that front adjacent streets—it lacks sufficient integrity to constitute a historic district. Much of the campus has been replaced over numerous construction periods that include the 1920s, 1960s, 1980s, and early 2000s. Furthermore, the Craftsman style of the original school buildings has been almost entirely replaced by Contemporary and Post-Modern-style buildings. Therefore, the campus does not appear eligible as a historic district of campus buildings unified by architectural aesthetic or plan.

**1960s Campus Buildings**

None of the 1960s buildings were found to be individually eligible for CRHR or local designation. While the Campus Center, Rhoades Hall, and Maintenance buildings retain their exterior integrity (the interiors have been significantly altered), they lack the character-defining features of the Contemporary style that one would expect to see in educational architecture such as use of exterior cantilevered canopies, generous expanses of glazing to convey integration with the outdoors, and expressionistic details such as butterfly and folded plate roof forms and curved/sweeping wall surfaces. Although brick and stucco are used throughout, the buildings lack the broad, unadorned expanses of these materials that are more typical of the style. The use of wooden slats on the exterior classroom and campus center buildings offers a panelized appearance, a Japanese design influence that came from Northern California, often referred to as Third Bay Tradition. The Maintenance building also nods to this mixture of styles, exhibiting a combination of concrete block and vertical wood siding.
Contemporary style features on the primary street elevations of the larger buildings are modest, with the exception of the school’s main entrance to Rhoades Hall on Bryant Street, which exhibits a flat roof supported by six square brick columns, and a glass and metal screenwall with a rectangular pattern. The mid-century style of the 1960s buildings is better conveyed on the exterior elevations that face inward toward the circle feature. The campus center exhibits exterior stairwells with metal screens; and Rhoades Hall features outdoor corridors, L-shape posts that project from the exterior walls, a butterfly roof locker structure, and open patio areas. The Maintenance building features widely overhanging eaves and trapezoidal windows on its northwest elevation.

While the 1960s buildings embody some elements of the Contemporary style, with nods to Third Bay Tradition, they are not considered a valuable example of either style, as they lack some of the more distinctive characteristics of that would better convey these styles. Further, architects Paul Huston (Campus Center and Maintenance buildings) and William Daseking (Rhoades Hall/middle school classrooms) do not appear to be master architects, although both men completed numerous projects throughout the Bay Area. Therefore, the 1960s buildings, including the Campus Center, Rhoades Hall, and Maintenance building, do not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 3 as either a district or as individual resources.

**Emerson Street Properties**

The converted single-family residences located at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street were acquired by Castilleja School in the 1990s. Records indicate that 1235 Emerson Street was constructed in 1979 and therefore does not appear eligible for the CRHR at this time. Site plans of 1263 Emerson Street from 1990 indicate that the property has undergone substantial alterations in recent years, such that the property no longer retains integrity of its original design, including modification of the original front entrance, reconfiguration of the porch, connecting a once-detached garage, and what appears to be a rear addition. The property’s setting has also been significantly altered since a portion of Melville Avenue was absorbed by the Castilleja Campus. Therefore, the two residential properties on Emerson Street appear not eligible under CRHR Criterion 3.

**Original Campus Elements**

Both the Administration and Chapel buildings were significantly altered in the early 2000s as part of a campus renovation project (see alterations presented in Table 3), which included connecting the two buildings together. These renovations completely altered the buildings’ interiors and made substantial alterations to the buildings’ exteriors. While there are enough character-defining features still present to convey the Craftsman style of both buildings, the work of master local architects has been significantly impacted by alterations that took place outside the period of significance. The Administration building was designed by architect Roy Heald and constructed by Gustav Laumeister, who have multiple buildings listed on the City’s local register and have made important
contributions to architecture in the Bay Area. The Chapel was designed by architect Birge Clark, one of the most significant architects in the history of Palo Alto. Clark designed numerous buildings throughout the City and has left an indelible mark on the City’s built environment. Despite the buildings’ associations with significant local architects and that fact that the buildings retain enough character-defining features to convey the Craftsman style, the alterations that occurred in recent years have introduced new materials and design features that prevent the buildings from conveying their original design intent or from representing a notable or important work by local master architects. The replacement of nearly all windows; reconfiguration of the entrance; replacement of shingles; replacement of stucco; the addition of a basement; enclosure of the original porch; trellis/arbor addition; and connection of the Administration and Chapel buildings has substantially impacted integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association with master local architects. Therefore, the Administration/Chapel building appears not eligible under CRHR Criterion 3 due to a lack of integrity (see Section 5.3).

**CRHR Criterion 4: Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

The Castilleja School buildings are unlikely to yield any information important to prehistory or history, nor is it associated with any archaeological resources. Therefore, the campus buildings do not appear eligible for listing under CRHR Criterion 4.

### 5.2 City of Palo Alto Evaluation Criteria

The Administration/Chapel building is currently listed as a Category 3 (Contributing Building), defined as “a good local example of an architectural style and relates to the character of a neighborhood grouping in scale, materials, proportion or other factors.” Despite significant alterations to the building in recent years, it still meets the lower bar of a Category 3 building, which may “have had extensive or permanent changes made to the original design, such as inappropriate additions, extensive removal of architectural details, or wooden facades resurfaced in asbestos or stucco.”

For all of the reasons discussed above in the CRHR significance evaluation, none of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties appear to warrant consideration for local designation, due to a lack of important historical associations and architectural merit:

- **Criterion 1:** None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties are associated with the lives of historic people or important events.
- **Criterion 2:** None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties are representative of an architectural style or way of life. While the 1960s buildings embody elements of the Contemporary style, with nods to Third Bay Tradition, they are not considered a valuable example of either style, and lack some of the more distinctive characteristics of these styles.
The converted single-family residences located at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street were acquired by Castilleja School in the 1990s. Records indicate that 1235 Emerson Street was constructed in 1979, and therefore does not appear eligible at this time. Site plans of 1263 Emerson Street from 1990 indicate that the property has undergone substantial alterations in recent years, such that the property no longer retains integrity of its original design.

- **Criterion 3:** None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties represent types of buildings that were once common but are now rare. Mid-Century Modern education buildings are not rare in the City. Further, the buildings on the Castilleja Campus are not considered valuable examples of their style, and they lack some of the more distinctive characteristics of the style. The property at 1263 Emerson Street is too altered to qualify under this criterion, especially in consideration of other Craftsman-style residences in the neighborhood that retain a much higher level of integrity. The property at 1235 Emerson Street was built relatively recently and does not appear to warrant consideration under this criterion.

- **Criterion 4:** None of the buildings are connected with a business or use that was once common but is now rare.

- **Criterion 5:** With the exception of the already designated Administration/Chapel building, none of the buildings were designed or constructed by an important architect.

- **Criterion 6:** For the reasons discussed under Criterion 3, none of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties contain elements that demonstrate outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship.

### 5.3 Integrit Considerations

Overall, the Castilleja School does not retain requisite integrity of its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The redefined school boundaries, extensive renovations and replacement of all but two of the original campus buildings compromises much of the campus’ 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, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but is must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. Within the concept of integrity, there are seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property will generally possess several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.
Location: The school’s location at 1310 Bryant Street represents the second location of the school, which moved to its current location in 1910. Although the campus has been significantly altered, the school does maintain its integrity of the school’s first purpose-built location since the move in 1910. The Administration/Chapel building was moved slightly closer to Bryant Street as part of foundation renovation activities, but this did not significantly impact its integrity of location. The two houses on Emerson Street also appear to retain integrity of location.

Design: The campus as a whole does not maintain the integrity of the original design, as all of the original buildings except two (the Administration and Chapel buildings) have been demolished. Replacement of the original Craftsman style buildings with Contemporary and Post-modern style buildings further compromises the design aesthetic of the campus. While of historic age, the 1960s buildings do not have strong character defining features of the Contemporary style and do not embody character defining features of the original Craftsman style campus buildings. The residential building at 1263 Emerson Street (now referred to as the Lockey House) has also been significantly altered from its original design with the reconfiguration of the entry, attachment to a once detached garage, kitchen addition and porch enclosures. Extensive alterations to the interior of the campus buildings further compromises the integrity of design, thus the campus as a whole does not retain integrity of design. Further, the Administration and Chapel buildings have undergone significant changes to their original design, once standing as two independent buildings and now connected as one.

Setting: The campus as a whole no longer retains its original setting integrity due to multiple alterations to the campus throughout its history. One of the most significant changes to the setting is the annexation of Melville Avenue, which was the boundary of the school for numerous years. Originally the school was bounded on the northwest by Melville Avenue but the closure and subsequent development of the street with athletic areas compromises the setting of the school. The expansion of the campus to include the Lockey House and the parcel at 1235 Emerson Avenue further disrupts the original setting as it extends the boundaries of the school and creates a sprawling urban campus concept versus the strict boundaries of the original campus under the 1310 Bryant Street parcel. While the property has always been located in a residential neighborhood, its clear historic boundaries prior to the acquisition of the Lockey House, 1235 Emerson Street and the annexation of Melville Avenue have negatively impacted the setting of the school in regards to the characteristics that existed during the school’s period of historic significance. Therefore the subject property does not retain integrity of setting.

Materials: The 1960s buildings retain their original materials with the exception of roof materials that have been replaced with modern materials in recent years. The Lockey House does not retain its original materials as there have been multiple material replacements and additions to the home that compromises its integrity of materials. While some of the original Craftsman materials from
the Administration/Chapel building remain, most original materials have been replaced with new materials. Therefore, none of the buildings retain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Taken as a whole, the campus does not retain integrity of workmanship, as nearly all of the original campus buildings have been replaced, leaving little left of the original workmanship.

**Feeling:** The subject property no longer conveys the aesthetic and historic sense that clearly defined the original campus. While the buildings are still situated around a circle feature, the replacement of all but two of the original campus buildings significantly compromises the integrity of feeling. The expansion of the original boundaries of the campus to the northwest further impacts the integrity of feeling, as one side of the campus is no longer part of a residential neighborhood, but is now bordered by a busy city street – Embarcadero. While the Administration and Chapel buildings offer the last remaining sentiment of the a campus that once consisted entirely of Craftsman style buildings, their altered design and materials adds to a loss of integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The 1960s buildings and the Lockey House have no association with the original campus only with the school. The Lockey House has been further compromised when it was converted from a single family residence to an educational building. Likewise, the original Administration/Chapel buildings have been extensively altered such that they can no longer convey associations with the original campus, and struggle to convey their associations with important architects. Therefore, the campus as a whole does not retain its integrity of association.

### 5.4 Summary of Conclusions

As a result of the significance evaluation, including consideration of CRHR and City evaluation criteria and integrity requirements, the Administration/Chapel building appears to remain eligible for listing on City’s local register as a Category 3 (Contributing Building) which allows for a building to have significant alterations. However, it does not retain requisite integrity for the CRHR.

All other buildings and structures on campus were found not eligible under all CRHR and City evaluation criteria due to a lack of historical associations and compromised integrity. Finally, the campus does not appear eligible as a historic district because nearly all of the original campus buildings have been replaced.

As a result of these findings, the Administration/Chapel building is considered an historical resource under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project has the potential to adversely impact historical resources. These potential impacts will be assessed in Section 6.1 (Identified Impacts) of the complete cultural resources study report. Recommendations to reduce impacts to historical resources are provided in Section 6.2 (Recommended Mitigation).
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
6 IMPACTS ANALYSIS

6.1 Identified Impacts

6.1.1 Direct Impacts

The project proposes to demolish six buildings associated with the Castilleja School campus. These buildings include:

- 1235 Emerson Street
- 1263 Emerson Street
- Rhoades Hall, Campus Center, Maintenance, and Fine Arts Center buildings (1310 Bryant Street)

All of these buildings were found not eligible for listing in the CRHR and the City’s local register and are not considered historical resources under CEQA. Therefore, impacts resulting from demolition of these buildings shall be considered less than significant.

6.1.2 Indirect Impacts

The following buildings will not be subject to direct impacts as a result of the proposed project; however, it is possible that proposed project activities could result in indirect impacts to the buildings:

- Administration/Chapel building
- 1215 Emerson Street

Although no project-related impacts are proposed to the Administration/Chapel building, this building is currently a designated local resource. As such, the building is considered an historical resource under CEQA. Adjacent construction activities have the potential to significantly impact this resource. However, with an appropriate level of protective mitigation, impacts to the building can be considered less than significant (see MM-CUL-1).

Although no project-related impacts are proposed to 1215 Emerson Street (which is outside, but adjacent to the northwest portion of the project area), it was previously found eligible for the NRHP and is in very close proximity to proposed project activities that have the potential to significantly impact this resource. However, with an appropriate level of protective mitigation, impacts to the building can be considered less than significant (see MM-CUL-1).
6.2 Recommended Mitigation

MM-CUL-1 In order to avoid potentially significant impacts to adjacent historical resources (as described above), adoption of the following mitigation is recommended to reduce projects impacts to these historical resources to a less-than-significant level.

An appropriate level of protection shall be provided for the Administration/Chapel Theater building and the residence at 1215 Emerson Street during proposed new construction and renovation activities. A clear and concise preservation protection plan shall be developed to provide these details. The protection plan shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation specialist and shall be appended to the final set of construction plans for each construction phase. At a minimum, the protection plan shall include the following:

- Protective fencing shall be installed approximately 15 feet from the perimeter of the Administration/Chapel Theater building and from the southern and eastern property lines of the residence at 1215 Emerson Street, or a lesser distance if recommended by a qualified historic preservation specialist. All construction workers shall be instructed to keep all people, materials, and equipment outside of the areas surrounded by protective fencing. The protective fencing shall consist of brightly-colored mesh fencing at least four feet in height. The mesh shall be mounted on six-foot tall poles, with at least two feet below ground, and spaced a maximum of six feet apart.

- Material and equipment delivery and stockpile areas shall be identified on the protection plan, and shall be located as far as practicable from the Administration/Chapel Theater building and the residence at 1215 Emerson Street.

- If cranes are used to install buildings or building components, no materials or structures shall be suspended above or within 30 feet measured horizontally from the exterior walls of the Administration/Chapel Theater building and the residence at 1215 Emerson Street.

- For demolition of the existing Classroom building, the protection plan shall document the specific nature of demolition activities that would occur on any portion of the building that touches or is within 10 feet of the Administration/Chapel Theater building and provide recommendations for
equipment usage and demolition techniques that will avoid adverse effects to the Administration/Chapel Theater building.

- The protection plan shall prescribe measures for containment of dust during demolition, excavation, and construction. This may include wetting soils and materials to prevent wind-blown dust; covering exposed materials, soil, and unfinished buildings; and use of temporary barriers to prevent any wind-blown dust from reaching historic structures.
SUMMARY AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary of Findings

7.1.1 Built Environment

As a result of the significance evaluation, including consideration of CRHR and City evaluation criteria and integrity requirements, the Castilleja School campus was found not eligible for designation as a historic district due to the fact that most of the campus has been significantly altered from its original appearance. Further, all of the 1960s buildings and the two residential properties were found not eligible at the individual level due to a lack of important historical associations and compromised integrity. However, the Administration/Chapel building appears to remain eligible for listing on City’s local register as a Category 3 ( Contributing Building ).

As a result of these findings, the Administration/Chapel building is considered an historical resource under CEQA. As such, the proposed project has the potential to adversely impact historical resources. An impacts analysis indicates that potential impacts to the Administration/Chapel building can be lessened to a less-than-significant level with implementation of an appropriate level of protective mitigation. Management recommendations to reduce significant impacts to historical resources are provided below.

7.1.2 Archaeology

No archaeological resources were identified within the project site or immediate vicinity as a result of the CHRIS records search or Native American coordination. However, it is always possible that intact archaeological deposits are present at subsurface levels. Based on geomorphological evidence, and known buried cultural deposits in the Bay Area, the project site should be treated as potentially sensitive for archaeological resources. Management recommendations to reduce potential impacts to unanticipated archaeological resources and human remains during campus construction activities are provided below.

7.2 Management Recommendations

7.2.1 Protection of Historical Resources During Demolition and Construction Activities

An appropriate level of protection shall be provided for the Administration/Chapel building during proposed new construction and renovation activities (see proposed MM-CUL-1). A clear and concise preservation protection plan shall be developed to provide these details. At a minimum, protective fencing shall be used during construction activities so historic buildings are not inadvertently impacted. The protection plan shall also examine the potential effects of
vibration on the building resulting from nearby demolition and construction activities. The final preservation protection plan shall be appended to the final set of construction plans. The plan should be completed, or at a minimum reviewed, by a qualified historic preservation specialist.

7.2.2 Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources

All construction crew should be alerted to the potential to encounter sensitive archaeological material. In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether additional study is warranted. Prehistoric archaeological deposits may be indicated by the presence of discolored or dark soil, fire-affected material, concentrations of fragmented or whole marine shell, burned or complete bone, non-local lithic materials, or the characteristic observed to be atypical of the surrounding area. Common prehistoric artifacts may include modified or battered lithic materials; lithic or bone tools that appeared to have been used for chopping, drilling, or grinding; projectile points; fired clay ceramics or non-functional items; and other items. Historic-age deposits are often indicated by the presence of glass bottles and shards, ceramic material, building or domestic refuse, ferrous metal, or old features such as concrete foundations or privies. Depending upon the significance of the find under CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

7.2.3 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the county coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the county coroner has determined, within 2 working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete his/her inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.
REFERENCES

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act


City of Palo Alto. 2007. “Figure L-8, Archaeological Resource Areas in the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan.” *City of Palo Alto General Plan*.


Cultural Resources Study for the Castilleja School Project


Cultural Resources Study for the Castilleja School Project


APPENDIX B

NAHC and Native American Coordination
February 6, 2017

Samantha Murray
Dudek

Sent by: smurray@dudek.com

RE: Castileja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, Santa Clara County

Dear Ms. Murray,

Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties. Please note that the intent above reference codes is to mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects.

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 require public agencies to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources:

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d))

The law does not preclude agencies from initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated with their jurisdictions. The NAHC believes that in fact that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d), formal notification must include a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The NAHC believes that agencies should also include with their notification letters information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the APE, such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
   - A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE;
   - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
   - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the potential APE; and
• If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
   • Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measurers.
     All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.

3. The results of any Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through Native American Heritage Commission. A search of the SFL was completed for the USGS quadrangle information provided returned negative results.

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the potential APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the potential APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRI S is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the case that they do, having the information beforehand will help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contacts

2/6/2017

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Valentin Lopez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 5272
Galt, CA 95632
vlopez@amahmutsun.org
(916) 743-5833

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28
Hollister, CA 95024
ams@indiancanyon.org
(831) 637-4238

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94062
amahmutsuntribal@gmail.com
(650) 400-4806 Cell
(650) 332-1526 Fax

North Valley Yokuts Tribe
Katherine Erolinda Perez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 717
Linden, CA 95236
canutes@verizon.net
(209) 887-3415

Northern Valley Yokuts
Bay Miwok

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
P.O. Box 360791
Milpitas, CA 95036
muwekma@muwekma.org
(408) 314-1898
(510) 581-5194

Ohlone / Costanoan

The Ohlone Indian Tribe
Andrew Galvan
P.O. Box 3152
Fremont, CA 94539
chochoenyo@aol.com
(510) 882-0527 Cell
(510) 687-9393 Fax

Ohlone/Costanoan
Bay Miwok
Plains Miwok
Patwin

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessments for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, Santa Clara County.
February 15, 2017

Ms. Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area
P.O. 360791
Milpitas, CA 95036

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Ms. Cambra:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.
Ms. Cambra:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

_____________________
Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Ms. Cambra:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
February 15, 2017

Mr. Andrew Galvan,
The Ohlone Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 3152
Fremont, CA 94539

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Mr. Galvan:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes
Mr. Galvan:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

_______________________
Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Mr. Galvan:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
February 15, 2017

Ms. Valentin Lopez, Chairperson
Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
P.O. Box 5272
Galt, CA 95632

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Ms. Lopez:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes.
Ms. Lopez:
Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

_______________________
Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Ms. Lopez:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
February 15, 2017

Ms. Katherine Erolinda Perez,
P.O. Box 717
Linden, CA 95235

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Ms. Perez:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of
Ms. Perez:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

_______________________

Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Ms. Perez:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
February 15, 2017

Ms. Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
P.O. Box 28
Hollister, CA 95024

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Ms. Sayers:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes...
Ms. Sayers:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,


Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Ms. Sayers:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
Ms. Irene Zwieriein, Chairperson
Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista Ohlone Costanoan
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94062

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

Dear Ms. Zwieriein:

Dudek was retained by the City of Palo Alto to conduct a cultural resources study for the Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project (the proposed project). The project proposal is to demolish two homes on adjacent Castilleja-owned parcels and merge the two parcels into the Castilleja campus parcel. The project involves the construction of a below-grade parking structure, the demolition of four (4) existing buildings and construction of one replacement building, the lowering of the existing pool below grade, completion of a bikeway station on Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and lowering the circular driveway below grade.

The proposed project will occur at the existing Castilleja School in Palo Alto, California located at 1310 Bryant Street and the two adjacent parcels at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. The project area falls within Sections 1 and 2 of Township 6 South, Range 3 West of the USGS 7.5-Minute Palo Alto Quadrangle (see attached map).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

The NAHC recommended that we contact you regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project. If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at 3544 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501 within 15 days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes.
Ms. Zwieriein:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California

concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto, in writing (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment: Records Search Map
Ms. Zwieriein:

Subject: Castilleja School Conditional Use Permit and Master Plan Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California
APPENDIX C

DPR Form
State of California  The Resources Agency  DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION  PRIMARY RECORD  Trinomial  NRHP Status Code

*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder)  Castilleja School

P1. Other Identifier:  Castilleja School

*Resource Description:

P2. Location:  
   a. County  Santa Clara
   b. USGS 7.5' Quad  Palo Alto  Date  1997  T 06S; R 03W; NE ¼ of SE ¼ of Sec 2;  Mount Diablo B.M.
   c. Address  1310 Bryant Street  City  Palo Alto  Zip  94301
   d. UTM:  (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources)  Zone  10S,  575042.79 mE/  4143936.66 mN
   e. Other Locational Data:  (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, decimal degrees, etc., as appropriate)

Castilleja School is a collection of adjacent parcels and addresses that include 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034), 1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031), and 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-033) in the City of Palo Alto, San Clara County, California. The property is bounded by Bryant Street to the northeast, Kingsley Avenue to the northwest, Kellogg Avenue to the southeast, and Emerson Street to the southwest. Elevation: 41 feet amsl; Decimal Degrees: 37.438878°, -122.151276°

P3a. Description:  (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

Twelve buildings make up the Castilleja School campus. These are summarized in Table 1. (See Continuation Sheet)

P3b. Resource Attributes:  (List attributes and codes)  HP15 – education building;  HP38 – women’s property;  HP29 – landscape architecture;  HP16 – religious building

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

P5a. Photograph or Drawing  (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo:  (view, date, accession #)  Administration and classroom building. Looking southeast (IMG 1782)

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:  ■ Historic  □ Prehistoric  □ Both  1907 (Croll and Pang 2007)

P7. Owner and Address:

City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

P8. Recorded by:  (Name, affiliation, and address)  Sarah Corder, MFA  Dudek
853 Lincoln Way, Suite 208
Auburn, CA 95603

P9. Date Recorded:  2/22/2017

P10. Survey Type:  (Describe)  Pedestrian

P11. Report Citation:  (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none.”)  Dudek. 2019. “Cultural Resources Study for the Castilleja School Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California.” Prepared for City of Palo Alto, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94301

*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):  

DPR 523A (9/2013)  *Required information
State of California Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
LOCATION MAP

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder)  Castilleja School
*Map Name: Palo Alto, CA  *Scale: 1:24,000  *Date of map: 1997

B1. Historic Name: Castilleja School
B2. Common Name: Castilleja School
B3. Original Use: College preparatory school and dormitory for girls
B4. Present Use: College preparatory school for girls
*B5. Architectural Style: Craftsman, Post Modern, Contemporary Style
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

(See Continuation Sheet)

*B7. Moved? □ No □ Yes □ Unknown Date: __________________________ Original Location: _________________
*B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect: Roy Heald (Administration Building); Birge Clark (Chapel); Paul Huston (Campus Center and Maintenance buildings); William Daseking (Ely Arts Center and Rhoades Hall/middle school classrooms)
b. Builder: Gustav Laumeister (Administration Building); others unknown

*B10. Significance: Theme Architecture (Contributing) Area City of Palo Alto (local)
Period of Significance 1910, 1926 Property Type Education Building Applicable Criteria Local – 3
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

(See Continuation Sheet)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

*B12. References:

(See Continuation Sheet)

B13. Remarks:

*S14. Evaluator: S. Corder
*Date of Evaluation: March 2019

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

(This space reserved for official comments.)
P3a. Description (Continued): Table 1 provides a description of all buildings and structures surveyed, including a photograph of the building, current building name, historic building name, year built, a general physical description of the building, and any alterations identified through either building development research or during the cultural resources survey.

Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunn Family Administration Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Roy Heald (architect) and Gustav Laumeister (builder)</td>
<td>This building is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City's Historic Buildings Inventory. The 2-story building is irregular in plan and now oriented to face Embarcadero Road. The building sits on a poured concrete foundation. The ground floor is clad in pebble-dash stucco, and the second story is clad in wood shingles. The roof is sheathed in wood shingles. The building was originally designed in the Craftsman style and features overhanging eaves, wood shingle detailing, paired Craftsman style windows, wooden column supports, and dormers. The building is the only remaining original building to the 1910 founding of the school and was designed by prominent local architect Roy Heald and constructed by Gustav Laumeister.</td>
<td>2000: complete reconfiguration of the interior, reconfiguration of the entrance, replacement of all windows, replacement of shingles, replacement of stucco, removal of building from the foundation for basement addition, original porch was enclosed, roof replaced, trellis/arbor addition, and connection of building to Chapel and Rhoades Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circle Feature 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The use of greenspace in the original and later designs was important to Lockey and the early students. The circle feature appears on early maps of the campus and has remained a significant element in the overall design of the campus. While much of the campus developed and built up from the original plans, the use of greenspace remains a key component with the circle feature.</td>
<td>The circle feature is largely unchanged with the exception of the grass being replaced by synthetic turf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockey House,</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>This 2-story, wood frame house that is roughly L in-plan has been significantly altered from its original appearance. The building sits on a poured concrete foundation and is clad in stucco. It features a complex hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles, and exposed rafter tails. The façade of the building is oriented to face the Castilleja School campus to the southeast, which is now the main elevation of the house. The main elevation features a poured concrete stoop that is offset to the west and accessed by brick steps under a triangular pediment. The six-panel wooden entry door is flanked by fixed wood windows, each of which features four panes. The remainder of the façade features a large four-over-one window flanked by two, two-over-one windows. The second floor windows are all three-over-one. There was an addition made to the north elevation of the building for a kitchen expansion.</td>
<td>1990s: Enclosure of the original entry way and addition of porch that is oriented toward campus, interior reconfiguration for use as Alumni house. Dates unknown: garage construction and kitchen addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Identified and Observed Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hughes Chapel Theater 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Birge Clark</td>
<td>This building is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City’s Historic Buildings Inventory. The 2-story Chapel was designed by Birge Clark in 1926. The building was originally designed as a standalone building, but was connected to the Administration building in 2000. Constructed in the Craftsman style, the building retains many visual elements of the style including overhanging eaves, side gabled roof sheathed in wood shingles, wood shingle cladding, and paired Craftsman style windows. However, the building was extensively renovated in 1980 and again in 2000 and has lost much of its exterior and interior integrity and configuration.</td>
<td>1980: Replacement and expansion of the stage area, replacement of the ceiling, and expansion of the building to the west with the addition of the step down style windows. 2000: Removal of the building from its foundation for basement construction, connection to the Administration building, replacement of the balcony and reconfiguration of the entrance from Bryant Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrillaga Family Campus Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1960-1962</td>
<td>Paul Huston</td>
<td>The 3-story building was poured in place concrete construction with a complex roofline that is roughly rectangular in plan. The building is oriented with entry from Kellogg Street to the southeast and the campus circle to the northwest.</td>
<td>1997: interior reconfiguration of second and third floors to replace the original dormitory space, reconfiguration of the first floor for the library, reconfiguration of north elevation for library entrance, additional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhoades Hall/Middle School</td>
<td>1965-1967</td>
<td>William Daseking</td>
<td>The 1967 2-story poured-in-place concrete school building was a phased construction project that is irregular in plan. The building is clad in brick veneer under the first-story windows, then clad in stucco that is accented by vertical concrete slat elements all set under a spray foam roof. The building is oriented with its main entry point facing Bryant Street. The main point of entry is recessed and accessed by a columned flat roof porch leading to an elaborately carved set of double doors slightly offset in a 2-story glass and metal wall panel. Fenestration is regular and all original metal windows are intact. The building also features one of the two sunken gardens on campus, which is located to the west of the building.</td>
<td>safety bars installed on outdoor staircase railings, and the addition of elevator. 2010: Building was reroofed with spray foam. 1998: second floor reconfigured from dormitory space to classrooms and offices, connection to Administration building and campus center building. 2010: building reroofed with a spray foam roof that is in keeping with the color and look of the original roof material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Paul Huston</td>
<td>The 2-story maintenance building was constructed in 1960. It is irregular in plan with a rear carport under a spray foam gabled roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter tails. Fenestration is irregular and a variety of metal windows is featured on all elevations. The building is clad in concrete block on the first story and vertical wood siding on the second story.</td>
<td>1980: The building was reroofed. Circa 1990: Sliding cage doors were added to the carport section of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The 2-story house is L-shaped in plan, clad in wood shingles with a gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles constructed circa 1980. The house is accessed by Emerson Street by a poured-concrete walkway. The house is surrounded by a wooden fence with a small entry door near the garage that provides access to a sizable yard with mature trees. The house has an irregular fenestration and all windows appear to be either fixed or double-hung vinyl windows. The main façade features a recessed entry point with multiple-pane French style doors.</td>
<td>No significant changes were observed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Ely Fine Arts Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>William Daseking</td>
<td>The circa 1980 2-story building is rectangular in plan and is oriented to the northeast. The building is clad with concrete block and features a flat roof. The main (east) elevation of the building features a recessed entry point that is offset to the north of the façade. The main elevation also features a wooden pergola that is supported with concrete columns with a poured concrete walkway. The building also features one of the two sunken gardens on campus, which is located to the east of building.</td>
<td>2010: Reroof of building with spray foam Date unknown: Addition of the lockers, reroof of the building, addition of door to building facing Emerson and replacement of rotted wood on the exterior trellis system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The current swimming pool, the third pool built at the same location, was installed in 2001.</td>
<td>There have been no significant changes to the pool since its installation in 2001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Castilleja School Buildings and Structures Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name, Address, and Parcel</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identified and Observed Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage Building 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The small, 1-story, flat-roofed, brick-veneer pool storage building is used for chemical and pool equipment storage.</td>
<td>There are no known alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic Center 1310 Bryant Street (APN 124-12-034)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Kornberg and Associates</td>
<td>The 2-story gymnasium is roughly rectangular in plan with a flat roof and is clad in stucco and wood shingles. The building is accessed by a glass entryway offset to the east</td>
<td>There are no known alterations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B6. Construction History (Continued): Campus Development History

Purpose-Built Campus, 1910

Shortly after the founding in 1907, the school moved to its current location at 1310 Bryant Street in 1910. At that time, Lockey purchased 4.5 acres of land from Alfred Seale, who had two daughters who would eventually graduate from Lockey’s school. The site of the new school offered an unobstructed view of the surrounding meadows, all the way to the foothills. Much of the surrounding area consisted of open space and orchards, with sparse residential development. The westerly-adjacent area now known as the Professorville Historic District had already seen substantial residential development.

With the help of local planner/builder Gustav Laumeister, Lockey developed a site plan and building plan for the campus at Bryant Street. Her plan included four buildings: a dormitory, chapel, science building, and gymnasium. Early drawings from the period show the original campus layout to be very similar to the campus today, with buildings around the outside and a large circular greenspace in the center. The greenspace of the campus was only a starting point for the development of the campus. According to a catalog from 1910 to 1911, Lockey advertised the school as follows:

These plans are especially adapted to the school and the climate, and are most attractive and practical. The buildings are strongly built and braced and have excellent fire protection; the plumbing and the heating plant are of the latest and most approved systems. Though the school lies just beyond the town limits, there is a connection with the Palo Alto sewer... The sleeping...
porch is one of the most attractive features of the building; it is situated on the third floor ... has a southern exposure, a roof, and protection from drafts and driving storms. Here, if desired, girls may sleep out of doors all winter... The spacious living rooms are especially planned for entertaining and for comfort. Small round tables are a feature of the cheery dining room. Particular attention has been paid to the lighting of all the buildings, and in the Recitation Hall every room has east or south sun (Croll and Pang 2007).

Lockey, and many other early-twentieth century educational advocates, believed in the importance of connecting educational achievement with physical surroundings. This logic is partially what inspired the original landscaping and layout for the campus. “Splendid live oak trees beautify the property, producing a park-like effect, and lawns, fruit trees, and gardens are already in a state of advanced growth and bloom possible only in a climate like that of California.” (Croll and Pang 2007:8). Trees and planting was important to Lockey, and she frequently drew analogies between the growth of trees and the growth of young girls. Upon moving to the campus in 1910, Lockey commented that the campus contained “just twenty-two live oaks and nothing more.” (Croll and Pang 2007:50). From the campus’ earliest days, students and faculty would come together to plant a tree or shrub every Arbor Day, and in 1911, the students planted an entire orchard.

Growth and Development of the Campus, 1910-1960

Shortly after the original campus was completed, students and faculty added to the beauty of the campus with annual tree plantings and creation of an orchard. Like other educational institutions, Castilleja School developed somewhat organically to support growing enrollment numbers and educational programs.

In 1921, the Western Journal of Education noted an enrollment of 230 children and described the school as follows:

Surrounded by luxurious and well-kept gardens, the Castilleja private school in Palo Alto, of which Miss Mary I. Lockey is principal, carries an air of refinement and artistic atmosphere which is most delightful. The school grounds occupies almost five acres. Outdoor study rooms are one of the features of the school. A new music and art studio is under construction and a large swimming pool on the grounds will be completed before the new term, which begins September 19 (WJE 1921).

Other early construction projects for the campus included a science lab, cottage, gymnasium, tennis courts, and a chapel. The 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company Map confirms these early construction projects mentioned in the 1921 Western Journal of Education (Croll and Pang 2007; Sanborn 1949). The figure below provides a map of the campus in the 1934 showing the original campus buildings, nearly all of which have been replaced.
Construction of the Chapel in 1926 was by far the largest construction project undertaken by the school since its move to the Bryant Street campus in 1910. The Chapel was designed by esteemed local architect Birge Clark and had a 500-seat capacity. Since the school had no specific religious affiliation and did not intend to use the Chapel as a church, the Chapel became host to a variety of activities for the school, including vespers, lectures, presentations, commencement, and performances (PAT 1926; PAW 1994).

By 1949, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps reveal that the school campus was comprised of the following buildings (Sanborn 1949):

- **Recitation Hall**: The building appears to be L-shaped in plan and have 1 story largely fronting Bryant Street. According to the map, the building was also used for classrooms.
- **Residence Hall/Dormitory**: The building appears to be 2.5 stories and L-shaped in plan largely fronting Bryant Street.
- **Chapel**: The 1.5-story building is located to the rear of the Recitation Hall and appears to be asymmetrical in plan.
**Campus Growth and Expansion, 1960–1980**

Following the elimination of the lower grades in 1958, Castilleja School decided that its buildings were outdated and decided to move forward with expansion and upgrades to the entire campus. The original plan was very ambitious and called for the replacement of all campus buildings; however, it was not fully carried out, because the Administration building and Chapel remain. Information provided by Castilleja School provided a good construction timeline for all major projects that would occur on campus between the 1960s and 1980s (Castilleja 2016).

The first project undertaken by the school was the construction of the new residence hall in 1960, which was named the Arrillaga Family Campus Center. Although formally dedicated in 1962, architectural drawings provided by the school provided a construction start date of 1960. The original design of the Campus Center planned for housing 90 students and included recreation style rooms with televisions lounges on each floor (Castilleja 2016; Croll and Pang 2007; PAT 1960; DPAT 1961).

A 1968 aerial photograph of the campus shows some changes to the building footprints on the corner of Kellogg Avenue and Bryant Street, which is consistent with the school’s account of the new building construction and architectural drawings of the multiphase construction of Rhoades Hall, with its start as a dormitory and classroom building in 1965 known as Building C and its completion as Rhoades Hall in 1967. Rhoades Hall spanned the space from the Campus Center to the Administration building and contained 20 classrooms to support the 1967 enrollment of 300 students. The 1960s construction projects revolutionized the look of the campus and remain today (Castilleja 2016; Croll and Pang 2007; PAT 1967; SFEC 1967).

**Renovations, Demolitions, and New Construction, 1970–2000**

In 1977, the Seipp-Wallace Pavilion was constructed and functioned as a gymnasium for the school until it was replaced in 2008 with the current gymnasium/fitness center (Brown 2017; Chapman 2017).

The Ely Fine Arts Center was proposed in the late 1970s and constructed in 1980. In that same year, the school completed extensive renovations on the 1926 Chapel. The interior alterations converted the Chapel from its original function to an auditorium. The school also added a 28-space parking lot to the site to support the needs of its students and faculty (Brown 2017; Chapman 2017).

Extensive renovations to the campus buildings took place in the 1990s and early 2000s. The 1991–2002 aerial photographs lack good resolution to see changes to the campus clearly; however, information provided by the City and representatives at Castilleja School helped establish a development/alteration timeline.

One of the biggest drivers for change in the 1990s was the closure of the student resident program. The lack of boarding residential students made the dormitory spaces in the Campus Center and Rhoades Hall obsolete. In 1997, renovation of the Campus Center included an interior reconfiguration to replace living spaces on the second and third floors with classrooms, reconfiguration of the first floor to house a library, and changes to the exterior iron stairwells to meet modern code compliance (Chapman 2017).
In 1998, renovations began on Rhoades Hall to remove the dormitory spaces from the second floor on the side of the building that faces Kellogg Avenue. The reconfiguration of the space resulted in removing all dormitory rooms and replacing them with classrooms and offices for the students. The removal of the dormitories allowed for a walkway along the campus-facing side of Rhoades Hall, which did not exist prior to these renovations. These renovations made Rhoades Hall the continuous classroom and office space it is today (Chapman 2017; PADN 1996; SJMN 1974).

The 1990s were also important because of the acquisition of 1263 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-033) and its renovation. The renovation of the single-family residence to an alumnae house, now called the Lockey House, took place in the late 1990s and included interior and exterior reconfigurations, as well as extensive window replacements. The building was originally oriented to face Melville Avenue, which was annexed by the school for the construction of a new softball field (SJMN 1992). The adjacent property at 1235 Emerson Street (APN 124-12-031) was also purchased by the school in the 1990s. Property records indicate that the building was constructed in 1979.

The early 2000s also represents a period of extensive change on campus with the renovation of the Chapel and Administration building. The Administration building was lifted off its foundation and moved slightly closer to Bryant Street so that a full basement and foundation could be constructed. The interior renovations to the Administration building were extensive, and there is no evidence remaining of the original interiors. Entrances to the building were also reconfigured, shingles and stucco were replaced, a porch enclosed on the southeast elevation, and all windows were replaced with double-paned wood windows that were designed to match the historic single-paned windows originally installed.

Renovations to the Chapel were also quite extensive and included replacement of the balcony, stage, and extension of the west exterior wall of the building. Another major change to the Chapel was the connection of the Chapel to the Administration building and the removal of its Bryant Street entrance on the east elevation. Presently, the Chapel is accessible from the inside of the Administration building via the east elevation (Chapman 2017).

Since 2002, the school has continued to expand. In 2007, a basement addition to the physical arts building was permitted. One of the most significant construction projects to take place since 2002 was the construction of the Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic Center in 2008.

**B10. Significance (Continued):**

Extensive archival research, combined with an intensive pedestrian survey of the Castilleja School, indicates that the campus contains one historical resource: the Administration/Chapel building, which is currently listed as a Category 3 building on the City’s inventory of historic resources; listed in the Office of Historic Preservation’s Historical Resources Inventory with a status code 5S2 (individual property that is eligible for local listing or designation). While the campus conveys its original plan on the most basic level (i.e., a central circle greenspace feature surrounded by buildings and structures on the periphery), all other buildings/features on campus were found to be ineligible for either individual listing or as a contributing element of a historic district. Only buildings and structures over 45 years old were evaluated for historical significance. Table 2 provides a summary of findings for all buildings/features on campus, and Figure 9, (Castilleja School Eligibility Findings), provides an overview of the significance evaluation findings.

**Table 2. Castilleja School Buildings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunn Family Administration Center</td>
<td>1910/1926</td>
<td>Locally listed (Category 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/ Elizabeth Hughes Chapel Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle greenspace feature</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrillaga Family Campus Center</td>
<td>1960–1962</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoades Hall</td>
<td>1965–1967</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Building</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Castilleja School Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Ely Fine Arts Center</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage Building</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Z. Lonergan Fitness and Athletic</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263 Emerson Street (Lockey House)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235 Emerson Street</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Register of Historical Resources Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1-4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria. Integrity is evaluated with reference to specific criteria.

CRHR Criterion 1:  Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.

The Castilleja School is one of the City’s oldest private schools, founded in 1907 and moved to its current location in 1910. Castilleja School was established during a major period of growth in the City as the interurban railroad was connected to larger nearby cities, streetcars began operating, and both housing and commercial developments began to spring up throughout the region. Castilleja School is associated with Palo Alto’s first boom of educational development since college preparation became a particularly important focus in the community after the opening of Stanford University in 1891 (of which Castilleja’s founder, Mary Lockey was an alumni) and the arrival of many new families to the area. Castilleja was an all-girls school specifically designed to prepare women for entry into prestigious universities like Stanford and the school is associated with Palo Alto’s educational development and women’s educational development. The current location at 1310 Bryant Street is the second location of the school. The original school (Castilleja Hall) was founded in 1907 at 1121 Bryant Street. This building has been determined eligible as a contributor to the NRHP-listed Professorville Historic District. The existing campus at 1310 Bryant Street lacks sufficient integrity (as a whole) to convey any important associations, as all but two of the original school buildings have been demolished. Therefore, the school does not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 1 as a historic district. For similar reasons, the locally designated Administration/Chapel building does not meet this criterion, as its setting and historical associations, have been significantly compromised by new developments on the Castilleja School campus.

CRHR Criterion 2:  Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

The Castilleja School is associated with an individual important in Palo Alto’s past. In 1907, Mary Ishbel Lockey (1872-1939) founded her own school at 1121 Bryant Street in Palo Alto. Three years later, the school had outgrown its original home in a small rented house and moved to its present day location down the street at 1310 Bryant Street. Lockey earned the respect and trust of then Stanford University president, David Starr Jordan, who once said that he had “implicit confidence in Miss Lockey,” such that he “would not hesitate to turn over the management of Stanford [to her], were it necessary.” (Croll and Pang 2007, p. 2). Ms. Lockey is the central figure of the school’s legacy, which has remained true to Lockey’s vision. While Lockey is considered an important local figure, strongly associated with women’s educational development during a period that overlaps the American Women’s Suffrage Movement, the campus itself lacks sufficient integrity (as a whole) to convey any important associations since all but two of the original school buildings have been demolished. The school can no longer convey associations with Lockey’s productive life in the field of education. Therefore, the school does not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 2 as a historic district. For similar reasons concerning a lack of integrity, the locally designated Administration/Chapel building does not meet this criterion, as its setting and historical
associations have been significantly compromised by new developments on the Castilleja School campus.

CRHR Criterion 3: Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

Historic District Consideration

Only two of the original school buildings remain on campus: the Administration and Chapel buildings, which are now connected and constitute one building. While the campus maintains the most general aspects of its original plan—a central circle feature surrounded by buildings that front adjacent streets—it lacks sufficient integrity to constitute a historic district. Much of the campus has been replaced over numerous construction periods that include the 1920s, 1960s, 1980s, and early 2000s. Furthermore, the Craftsman style of the original school buildings has been almost entirely replaced by Contemporary and Post-Modern-style buildings. Therefore, the campus does not appear eligible as a historic district of campus buildings unified by architectural aesthetic or plan.

1960s Campus Buildings

None of the 1960s buildings were found to be individually eligible for CRHR or local designation. While the Campus Center, Rhoades Hall, and Maintenance buildings retain their exterior integrity (the interiors have been significantly altered), they lack the character-defining features of the Contemporary style that one would expect to see in educational architecture such as use of exterior cantilevered canopies, generous expanses of glazing to convey integration with the outdoors, and expressionistic details such as butterfly and folded plate roof forms and curved/sweeping wall surfaces. Although brick and stucco are used throughout, the buildings lack the broad, unadorned expanses of these materials that are more typical of the style. The use of wooden slats on the exterior classroom and campus center buildings offers a panelized appearance, a Japanese design influence that came from Northern California, often referred to as Third Bay Tradition. The Maintenance building also nods to this mixture of styles, exhibiting a combination of concrete block and vertical wood siding.

Contemporary style features on the primary street elevations of the larger buildings are modest, with the exception of the school’s main entrance to Rhoades Hall on Bryant Street, which exhibits a flat roof supported by six square brick columns, and a glass and metal screenwall with a rectangular pattern. The mid-century style of the 1960s buildings is better conveyed on the exterior elevations that face inward toward the circle feature. The campus center exhibits exterior stairwells with metal screens; and Rhoades Hall features outdoor corridors, L-shape posts that project from the exterior walls, a butterfly roof locker structure, and open patio areas. The Maintenance building features widely overhanging eaves and trapezoidal windows on its northwest elevation.

While the 1960s buildings embody some elements of the Contemporary style, with nods to Third Bay Tradition, they are not considered a valuable example of either style, as they lack some of the more distinctive characteristics of that would better convey these styles. Further, architects Paul Huston (Campus Center and Maintenance buildings) and William Daseking (Rhoades Hall/middle school classrooms) do not appear to be master architects, although both men completed numerous projects throughout the Bay Area. Therefore, the 1960s buildings, including the Campus Center, Rhoades Hall, and Maintenance building, do not appear eligible under CRHR Criterion 3 as either a district or as individual resources.

Emerson Street Properties

The converted single-family residences located at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street were acquired by Castilleja School in the 1990s. Records indicate that 1235 Emerson Street was constructed in 1979 and therefore does not appear eligible for the CRHR at this time. Site plans of 1263 Emerson Street from 1990 indicate that the property has undergone substantial alterations in recent years, such that the property no longer retains integrity of its original design, including modification of the original front entrance, reconfiguration of the porch, connecting a once-detached garage, and what appears to be a rear addition. The property’s setting has also been significantly altered since a portion of Melville Avenue was absorbed by the Castilleja Campus. Therefore, the two residential properties on Emerson Street appear not eligible under CRHR Criterion 3.
Original Campus Elements

Both the Administration and Chapel buildings were significantly altered in the early 2000s as part of a campus renovation project (see alterations presented in Table 3), which included connecting the two buildings together. These renovations completely altered the buildings’ interiors and made substantial alterations to the buildings’ exteriors. While there are enough character-defining features still present to convey the Craftsman style of both buildings, the work of master local architects has been significantly impacted by alterations that took place outside the period of significance. The Administration building was designed by architect Roy Heald and constructed by Gustav Laumeister, who have multiple buildings listed on the City’s local register and have made important contributions to architecture in the Bay Area. The Chapel was designed by architect Birge Clark, one of the most significant architects in the history of Palo Alto. Clark designed numerous buildings throughout the City and has left an indelible mark on the City’s built environment. Despite the buildings’ associations with significant local architects and that fact that the buildings retain enough character-defining features to convey the Craftsman style, the alterations that occurred in recent years have introduced new materials and design features that prevent the buildings from conveying their original design intent or from representing a notable or important work by local master architects. The replacement of nearly all windows; reconfiguration of the entrance; replacement of shingles; replacement of stucco; the addition of a basement; enclosure of the original porch; trellis/arbor addition; and connection of the Administration and Chapel buildings has substantially impacted integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association with master local architects. Therefore, the Administration/Chapel building appears not eligible under CRHR Criterion 3 due to a lack of integrity (see Section 5.3).

CRHR Criterion 4: Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The Castilleja School buildings are unlikely to yield any information important to prehistory or history, nor is it associated with any archaeological resources. Therefore, the campus buildings do not appear eligible for listing under CRHR Criterion 4.

City of Palo Alto Evaluation Criteria

The Administration/Chapel building is currently listed as a Category 3 (Contributing Building), defined as “a good local example of an architectural style and relates to the character of a neighborhood grouping in scale, materials, proportion or other factors.” Despite significant alterations to the building in recent years, it still meets the lower bar of a Category 3 building, which may “have had extensive or permanent changes made to the original design, such as inappropriate additions, extensive removal of architectural details, or wooden facades resurfaced in asbestos or stucco.”

For all of the reasons discussed above in the CRHR significance evaluation, none of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties appear to warrant consideration for local designation, due to a lack of important historical associations and architectural merit:

• Criterion 1: None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties are associated with the lives of historic people or important events.
• Criterion 2: None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties are representative of an architectural style or way of life. While the 1960s buildings embody elements of the Contemporary style, with nods to Third Bay Tradition, they are not considered a valuable example of either style, and lack some of the more distinctive characteristics of these styles. The converted single-family residences located at 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street were acquired by Castilleja School in the 1990s. Records indicate that 1235 Emerson Street was constructed in 1979, and therefore does not appear eligible at this time. Site plans of 1263 Emerson Street from 1990 indicate that the property has undergone substantial alterations in recent years, such that the property no longer retains integrity of its original design.
• Criterion 3: None of the 1960s buildings or Emerson Street properties represent types of buildings that were once common but are now rare. Mid-Century Modern education buildings are not rare in the City. Further, the buildings on the Castilleja Campus are not considered valuable examples of their style, and they lack some of the more distinctive characteristics.

*Required information
Integrity Considerations

Overall, the Castilleja School does not retain requisite integrity of its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The redefined school boundaries, extensive renovations and replacement of all but two of the original campus buildings compromises much of the campus' 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, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but is must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. Within the concept of integrity, there are seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity, a property will generally possess several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

Location: The school’s location at 1310 Bryant Street represents the second location of the school, which moved to its current location in 1910. Although the campus has been significantly altered, the school does maintain its integrity of the school’s first purpose-built location since the move in 1910. The Administration/Chapel building was moved slightly closer to Bryant Street as part of foundation renovation activities, but this did not significantly impact its integrity of location.

Design: The campus as a whole does not maintain the integrity of the original design, as all of the original buildings except two (the Administration and Chapel buildings) have been demolished. Replacement of the original Craftsman style buildings with Contemporary and Post-modern style buildings further compromises the design aesthetic of the campus. While of historic age, the 1960s buildings do not have strong character defining features of the Contemporary style and do not embody character defining features of the original Craftsman style campus buildings. The residential building at 1263 Emerson Street (now referred to as the Lockey House) has also been significantly altered from its original design with the reconfiguration of the entry, attachment to a once detached garage, kitchen addition and porch enclosures. Extensive alterations to the interior of the campus buildings further compromises the integrity of design, thus the campus as a whole does not retain integrity of design. Further, the Administration and Chapel buildings have undergone significant changes to their original design, once standing as two independent buildings and now connected as one.

Setting: The campus as a whole no longer retains its original setting integrity due to multiple alterations to the campus throughout its history. One of the most significant changes to the setting is the annexation of Melville Avenue, which was the boundary of the school for numerous years. Originally the school was bounded on the northwest by Melville Avenue but the closure and subsequent development of the street with athletic areas compromises the setting of the school. The expansion of the campus to include the Lockey House and the parcel at 1235 Emerson Avenue further disrupts the original setting as it extends the boundaries of the school and creates a sprawling urban campus concept versus the strict boundaries of the original campus under the 1310 Bryant Street parcel. While the property has always been located in a residential neighborhood, its clear historic boundaries prior to the acquisition of the Lockey House, 1235 Emerson Street and the annexation of
Melville Avenue have negatively impacted the setting of the school in regards to the characteristics that existed during the school’s period of historic significance. Therefore the subject property does not retain integrity of setting.

Materials: The 1960s buildings retain their original materials with the exception of roof materials that have been replaced with modern materials in recent years. The Lockey House does not retain its original materials as there have been multiple material replacements and additions to the home that compromises its integrity of materials. While some of the original Craftsman materials from the Administration/Chapel building remain, most original materials have been replaced with new materials. Therefore, none of the buildings retain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Taken as a whole, the campus does not retain integrity of workmanship, as nearly all of the original campus buildings have been replaced, leaving little left of the original workmanship.

Feeling: The subject property no longer conveys the aesthetic and historic sense that clearly defined the original campus. While the buildings are still situated around a circle feature, the replacement of all but two of the original campus buildings significantly compromises the integrity of feeling. The expansion of the original boundaries of the campus to the northwest further impacts the integrity of feeling, as one side of the campus is no longer part of a residential neighborhood, but is now bordered by a busy city street – Embarcadero. While the Administration and Chapel buildings offer the last remaining sentiment of the a campus that once consisted entirely of Craftsman style buildings, their altered design and materials adds to a loss of integrity of feeling.

Association: The 1960s buildings and the Lockey House have no association with the original campus only with the school. The Lockey House has been further compromised when it was converted from a single family residence to an educational building. Likewise, the original Administration/Chapel buildings have been extensively altered such that they can no longer convey associations with the original campus, and struggle to convey their associations with important architects. Therefore, the campus as a whole does not retain its integrity of association.
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