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1. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Technical Report (HRTR) has been prepared at the request of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in preparation for the proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (Project) at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center (SCRC), located at 111 Easton Drive, Los Angeles, California at the Westwood campus of UCLA. Opened in 1966, SCRC consists of several buildings that house multipurpose rooms, offices, and a kitchen and are interconnected by open-air elevated walkways, stairways, and paved pathways. The center also includes swimming pools, locker rooms, and expansive lawns and gardens incorporating an outdoor amphitheater, picnic areas, and other amenities (Figure 1). SCRC manages the nearby tennis courts, but because they are physically separated from the main center and were developed in the 1980s, the tennis courts are not within this report's study area.

Figure 1. Aerial image of a portion of the Northwest zone of the UCLA campus with approximate area of SCRC studied in this report outlined in white. Source: Google Earth 2023. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
SCRC was previously evaluated for historic significance in October 2013. Page and Turnbull found the complex eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 as a significant representation of the work of important creative individuals, namely the architecture firm of Smith and Williams. Page and Turnbull also found the complex eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under the same criterion if added latticework were removed.

Since the 2013 evaluation, parts of the original SCRC have further deteriorated and been altered. Part of the “hat” roof at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) failed in 2018 and was removed. The “hat” roof at Unit G (Building E – Office Center) and a wood trellis connecting the office to wood stairs accessing Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) were removed in 2021/2022 due to severe deterioration and safety concerns. Since 2020, three 1966 buildings in the complex have been found structurally deficient and are no longer habitable: Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office). This HRTR includes an updated evaluation of SCRC’s eligibility as a historic resource in its current condition following current historic preservation standards, guidelines, and best practices as well as an analysis of the impacts to any eligible historic resources as a result of the proposed Project.

PROPERTY LOCATION AND SURROUNDING SETTING

SCRC is located in the Northwest zone of the UCLA campus, in proximity to the residence halls (Figure 2). Sunset Boulevard and the verdant neighborhood of Bel-Air lie off campus to the north. Although somewhat isolated when it was first constructed, the facility is now the northern terminus of a series of athletic venues that occupy the area between Westwood Plaza and the concentration of residence halls. The campus’ winding De Neve Drive wraps around SCRC’s western, northern, and eastern perimeters. A parking structure, Spieker Aquatics Center, and the SCRC Tennis Courts border the facility to the east. Sunset Village, Canyon Point and Delta Terrace student housing sit to the southeast, and Hedrick Hall and Hedrick Summit student housing lie to the southwest.

The site plan shown in Figure 3 is from the 1965 “West Campus Utilities & Site Development Project No. 940190” drawing set by Cornell, Bridgers & Troller that best represents the extent of the SCRC complex at the time, with the extent of the original development designed by Smith and Williams completed. Although parts of the site have been further developed and several built elements have been moderately altered, such as the removal of two of three the “hat” roof elements, the layout of the complex and the relationship among buildings continues to reflect the original design. The associated table provides the building names assigned by the architects on the 1963 Smith and Williams plans, UCLA’s names for the same buildings as of 2023, the site level on which each building is set, and a list of each building’s use(s) when the complex was still fully operating in early 2020. For reference, a partial existing site plan of SCRC as of 2023 follows the table (Figure 4).
Figure 2. Sunset Canyon Recreation Center is located at the Northwest zone of UCLA's main campus in Westwood, highlighted in the dash outline. Source: UCLA, November 2022, edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 3. Site plan of Sunset Canyon Recreation Area, circa 1965. Source: “West Campus Utilities & Site Development Project No. 940190,” Cornell, Bridgers & Troller, 1965, edited by Page & Turnbull.
Table 1. Historic and Current Building Names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1963 DESIGNATION¹</th>
<th>UCLA BUILDING NAME 2023²</th>
<th>SITE LEVEL</th>
<th>MOST RECENT USES (AS OF 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>Building H - Park Pool Locker Rooms</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B*</td>
<td>Building A - Vista Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Level 1 – Office and Main Entrance Level 2 – Multi-purpose room and catering kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit C*</td>
<td>Building C - Santa Fe Room</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Multi-purpose room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit D</td>
<td>Building A1 - Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Multi-purpose room and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit E*</td>
<td>Building A2 - Stair Tower/Restroom/Office</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Level 1 and Level 2 – Restrooms Level 3 – Office Stairs surrounding the building core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit F</td>
<td>Building D - Look Out/Lifeguard Station</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lifeguard/first aid station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit G*</td>
<td>Building E - Office Center³</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Offices (originally vending machines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit H</td>
<td>Building G - Family Pool Restrooms</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Family Pool locker rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit L</td>
<td>Family Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Family and Diving Pools (reconfigured 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit M</td>
<td>Part of Family Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Splash/Wading pool (reconfigured 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit N</td>
<td>Park Pool</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Olympic Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit P</td>
<td>Building H.1 - Park Pool Mechanical Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Park Pool mechanical equipment room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 1963 Designation lists nomenclature from the original architectural drawings prepared by Smith and Williams Architects and Engineers for “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530.” The date on the drawing set is not legible; presumed to be circa 1963-1964.
² 2023 Designation lists the names that UCLA uses in its facilities inventory system.
³ The Initial Study prepared for the proposed Project also identifies Building F: Electric Vault, which is an equipment room located below Unit G (Building E – Office Center) and behind a retaining wall. It is not visible and is not addressed further in this report.

* Building removed from active service due to deterioration and safety concerns and vacated in 2020-2021.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Sunset Canyon Recreation Center as a whole does not meet the criteria for listing in the National Register or California Register under Criterion A/1 related to events or patterns of history, nor under Criterion B/2 for any association with significant individuals. Evaluation under Criterion D/4 for information potential is not applicable here.

However, a portion of SCRC does meet the National Register/California Register Criterion C/3 as representing the work of Smith and Williams as important creative individuals. The portion is roughly the area that corresponds to the extent of the original development designed by Smith and Williams as the “Canyon Recreation Center” project from circa 1963-1964 and located along a northeast-southwest axis through the middle of the site across the three levels (Figure 5). This area and the historic resources therein represent a culmination of the firm’s signature aesthetic and design approach in a single mature work, most notably in its post-and-beam design with Japanese influences, seamlessly interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences, and inventive navigation of the difficult topography of the site through integrated built elements. Accordingly, this area of SCRC and its resources are considered eligible for listing as an historic district, identified herein as the
Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District (eligible Historic District). Due to the material loss and alterations over time that have compromised its design and feeling, the eligible Historic District only retains sufficient integrity to be recognizable and convey its significance as a mature work of Smith and Williams as important creative individuals under the California Register; the identified Historic District is not eligible for listing in the National Register.

The California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District is a historic resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It includes ten contributors that are the six core recreation buildings and structures, the main swimming pool (Park Pool) at the Lower Level, two swimming pool support buildings, and an overall unifying landscape and site element contributor (see Table 2). Four non-contributors located within the physical bounds of the eligible Historic District include the Family Pool and Diving Pool at the Upper Level, the Park Pool Locker Rooms at the Lower Level, and an electrical vault that is not visible.

The proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (the Project) involves the removal of six of the ten contributors, specifically the six core recreation buildings and structures, as well as aspects of the unifying landscape and site element contributor (Table 2). A new, multi-level recreation building is proposed to be constructed in approximately the same location as the existing buildings. Collectively, the buildings to be demolished are seismically deficient, substantially damaged/deteriorated (some of which are therefore no longer habitable), non-compliant with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, otherwise constrained from a programming perspective, or, in some cases, inextricably physically, structurally, or programmatically dependent upon the deficient structures. Despite such conditions, based on their removal, the Project will have a significant adverse impact on historic resources under CEQA. The loss of the six core recreation buildings and structures will render the eligible Historic District no longer recognizable nor able to convey its significance as the work of Smith and Williams, which is the integrity threshold for California Register eligibility. This significant adverse impact cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are outlined to reduce the impact on the historic resource through historic documentation, salvage of historic features, and educating the public about the property’s historic themes, associations, and architecture within broader historical and physical landscape contexts.

No other known or eligible historic resources are in the project vicinity that will be indirectly, adversely impacted, and there will be no cumulative impacts on historic resources.
Figure 5. Map of the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreational Center Historic District (eligible Historic District), with proposed Project site outlined. Base map source: UCLA Capital Programs.
Table 2: California Register-Eligible Canyon Recreation Center Historic District Contributors and Non-Contributors and Proposed in Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1963 DESIGNATION</th>
<th>UCLA BUILDING NAME 2023</th>
<th>SITE LEVEL</th>
<th>DISTRICT STATUS</th>
<th>PROPOSED IN PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>Building H - Park Pool Locker Rooms</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B*</td>
<td>Building A - Vista Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit C*</td>
<td>Building C - Santa Fe Room</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit D*</td>
<td>Building A1 - Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit E*</td>
<td>Building A2 - Stair Tower/Restroom/Office</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit F*</td>
<td>Building D - Look Out/Lifeguard Station</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor (excluding enclosure)</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit G*</td>
<td>Building E - Office Center</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit H</td>
<td>Building G - Family Pool Restrooms</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit L/M</td>
<td>Family Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit N</td>
<td>Park Pool</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit P</td>
<td>Building H.1 - Park Pool Mechanical Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Partially demolish or alter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Building F - Electric Vault</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Diving Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>N/A - Outside project boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes core recreation building.
METHODOLOGY

This report provides descriptions of the SCRC site and the nine original buildings in the complex, and a historic context providing background on the campus, the property, alterations, and the project's design team. The report also evaluates SCRC's eligibility for individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). As a constitutionally created entity of the State of California, the University of California is exempt from local land use regulations.

Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research from our prior evaluation in 2013, which involved the Smith and Williams records housed at the University of California (UC), Santa Barbara; architectural plans and drawings made available by UCLA; and newly available online resources from the Avery Index of Architectural Periodicals and the Art, Design, and Architecture Museum of UC Santa Barbara. Previously prepared historic narratives and contexts and new scholarship on the Smith and Williams practice were also examined to provide a historic context for the evaluation of the property. Page & Turnbull (Flora Chou and Stephanie Hodal) conducted a site visit on January 12, 2023. They were accompanied by representatives from UCLA Capital Programs (Kathy Fitzgerald, Director of Project Development, and Ashley Rogers, Assistant Director, Environmental Planning) and SCRC (Tracie Lockwood, Associate Director of Experiential Programs, and Staci Snyder, North Zone Venue Manager) who provided information about SCRC's alterations and current condition. All photographs in this report were taken by Page & Turnbull at the site visit, unless otherwise noted.

This report generally uses the terms from the original architectural drawing set prepared by Smith and Williams Architects and Engineers and in the folder labeled 1963-1964. Those drawings referred to buildings and the swimming pools as “units” with a description of their uses. In parentheses after the 1963 unit designation is the name that UCLA uses in its facilities system as of 2023.

The proposed Project's description was provided by UCLA, as reflected in the project's Initial Study (July 2023).
2. REGULATORY SETTING

This section describes the primary laws, regulations, and programs that relate to the treatment of historic resources.

FEDERAL

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. These resources contribute to an understanding of the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation at the national, state, or local level. Typically, properties over 50 years of age may be eligible for listing in the National Register if they meet any one of the four significance criteria and if they retain sufficient historic integrity to convey that significance. Properties under 50 years of age may be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance.” Other criteria considerations apply to cemeteries, birthplaces, graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed buildings, and properties primarily commemorative in nature. National Register criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.

Historic Significance

The National Register has four basic criteria under which a property may be considered eligible for listing. It can be found significant under one or more of the following criteria:

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

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

- **Criterion C (Design/Construction):** Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and

- **Criterion D (Information Potential):** Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
A property may be considered significant on a national, state, or local level to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

Integrity

In addition to qualifying for listing under at least one of the National Register criteria, a property must be shown to have sufficient historic integrity in order to be considered eligible for listing in the National Register. The concept of integrity is essential to identifying the important physical characteristics of historic resources and hence, in evaluating adverse changes to them. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.”

According to the National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, these seven aspects are generally defined as follows:

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

---

Integrity is a “yes” or “no” determination. A historic property either has adequate integrity, or it does not. To retain historic integrity, a property will often possess several, if not all, of the aforementioned aspects. Specific aspects of integrity may also be more important, depending on the criteria for which it is significant.

It is important to note that historic integrity is not synonymous with condition. A building or structure can possess all or many of the seven aspects of integrity, even if the condition of the materials has degraded. Condition comes into consideration when there is a substantial loss of historic material or other character-defining features.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards) have been developed by the National Park Service (NPS) within the U.S. Department of the Interior to provide guidance for reviewing proposed work on historic properties. They are accompanied by the illustrated Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (SOI Guidelines) that offer general design and technical recommendations in applying the SOI Standards.\(^5\)

The Secretary of the Interior offers four sets of standards to guide the treatment of historic properties: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. Typically, one set of standards is chosen for a project based on the project scope. However, since the proposed Project involves the removal of existing buildings and structures rather than their retention and improvement, an evaluation of compliance with the SOI Standards is not provided below. Instead, the analysis herein focuses on eligibility for listing in the relevant historic registers. Refer to Appendix B, UCLA Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Preservation Alternatives Analysis Report, for an evaluation of variations on the proposed Project that reflect compliance with the SOI Standards.

STATE

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is “an authoritative guide in California 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.” A property may be eligible for listing in the California Register if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- **Criterion 1 (Event):** Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- **Criterion 2 (Persons):** Associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- **Criterion 3 (Design/Construction):** 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; or
- **Criterion 4 (Information Potential):** Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

These criteria are based upon National Register of Historic Places criteria; however, the California Register does not impose as specific requirements for integrity and age as the National Register. Properties eligible for listing in the California Register must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. While the National Register guidelines for integrity can be applied for California Register eligibility, it is possible that resources, which may not retain sufficient integrity for listing in the National Register, may still be eligible for the California Register. Moved or reconstructed buildings, structures, or objects may also be considered for listing in the California Register under specific circumstances. In addition, properties that were constructed less than 50 years ago or which achieved significance less than 50 years ago may be eligible for inclusion in the California Register provided that sufficient time has passed to understand their significance within a historic context. With the exception of some properties with additional criteria consideration (50 years or less, moved buildings, etc.), properties that meet the National Register criteria typically also meet the California Register criteria and vice versa and are often evaluated together.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is state legislation (Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.), which provides for the development and maintenance of a high-quality environment for the present-day and future through the identification of significant environmental effects. CEQA applies to “projects” proposed to be undertaken or requiring approval from state or local government agencies. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15378, a “Project” is defined as “...the whole of

---

action, which has the potential for resulting in either a direct change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment” and which involves an activity directly undertaken by a public agency, an activity that requires public agency assistance or entitlement, or an activity that requires discretionary approval by a public agency. Historic and cultural resources are considered to be part of the environment. In general, the lead agency must complete the environmental review process as required by CEQA.

A building may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), which are defined as:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

4. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Pub. Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Pub. Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that

---

8 State of California, “CEQA Guidelines.”
the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Pub. Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.9

Properties listed or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register are listed automatically in the California Register.10 As such, they are considered historic resources under CEQA.

The CEQA Guidelines stipulate that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment.11 The Guidelines further state that a project that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (the SOI Standards) may be considered to have less than significant impacts with regard to historic resources.12

LOCAL

As a constitutionally created entity, the University of California has autonomy from local land use regulation. Accordingly, the City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance, adopted in 1962 and amended in 2007 (Administrative Code Section 22.171), and the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone ordinance adopted in 2004 (Municipal Code Section 12.20.3) do not apply.

HISTORIC SURVEYS AND EVALUATIONS

CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are listed within the Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD) and are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) of “1” to “7” to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register).13 Properties with a Status Code of “1” or “2” are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of “3” or “4” appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of “5” have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual

9 Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.
11 Title 14 CCR, Section 15064.5(b).
12 Title 14 CCR, Section 15064.5(b)(3).
importance. Properties with a Status Code of “6” are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of “7” means that the resource has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

HISTORIC STATUS OF SUNSET CANYON RECREATION CENTER

SCRC is not currently listed in the National Register or California Register. It is not currently listed in the BERD database for Los Angeles County with a status code. The most recent update to the BERD database was in September 2022.

In 2013, Page & Turnbull evaluated SCRC and found it eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant work of Smith and Williams. Page & Turnbull also found it eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C if returned to an earlier appearance through removal of the non-original latticework.
3. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Sunset Canyon Recreation Center occupies approximately nine acres of varied terrain within the Northwest zone of the UCLA campus (Figure 1 and Figure 6). SCRC retains much of the sense of isolation and quality of rusticity that it had when originally completed in 1966. This atmosphere is due, in part, to the topography and open space areas but also to the numerous mature trees that surround the primary recreation buildings at the center of the site and that dot the perimeter of the property, creating a wooded setting.

Figure 6. Birdseye view of Sunset Canyon Recreation at the Northwest zone of the UCLA campus with approximate area of SCRC (excluding tennis courts) outlined in white. Source: GoogleEarthPro 2023.
OVERALL SITE ORGANIZATION AND FEATURES

SCRC spans a challenging, variable topography. The four-level site consists of the:

- **Lower Level**, a flat terrace at the southeast where the primary access to the site is located, along with the main pool (called Unit N in the original drawing set, now referred to as the Park Pool), associated locker room and pool equipment building, and a recreation lawn where a multi-section modular building was added in 2019/2020.

- **Middle Level**, a narrow continuous slope that bridges the elevation change between the Lower and Upper Levels via a series of concrete stairways (collectively referred to as cascading stairs), perimeter circulation paths, and SCRC’s core recreation buildings.

- **Upper Level**, a large sloping bowl to the northwest with a smaller pool (called Unit L originally, and now known as the Family Pool), a large lawn, an amphitheater area with a tiered seating area, a wooded sloped picnic area on the northeast side of the large lawn, and beach volleyball courts installed in 2020 at the southwest side of the large lawn.

- **Upper Level Plateau**, a flat terraced area with an open lawn at the north edge of the Upper Level above the wooded picnic area, developed after the center first opened. The plateau now contains the modular Mesa Building, a student garden, a small lawn area, and an obstacle course known as the Challenge Course.

As shown on Figure 3, the original plan for SCRC comprised nine buildings, all extant with some modifications. The six core recreation buildings are located along a northeast-southwest axis through the middle of the site across the lower three levels. Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) are organized on three different levels around the central stair tower (Unit E [Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office]). This building group is wrapped with an open post-and-beam frame that shelters exterior footpaths and supports exterior decks, walkways, and stairs, creating the illusion of multiple treehouse pavilions. Unit F (Building D – Look Out/Lifeguard Station) at the Upper Level and Unit G (Building E – Office Center) at the Middle Level stand just beyond this core group to the southwest.

Three buildings support pool functions: Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) and Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) on the Lower Level and Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) on the Upper Level. A thematic hexagonal pattern is evident in the paving plan and landscape planters, the arrangement of retaining walls, and the built forms at the ground plane of the Lower, Middle, and Upper Levels primarily around the buildings. Other storage sheds and modular buildings have been added to the site since its opening in 1966.
Lower Level

Main access into the SCRC complex is from the Lower Level, originally through a breezeway at the first floor of the two-story Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) building. Since closure of that building in 2020, the entrance is through a portable kiosk building to the southeast of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) (Figure 7).

The Lower Level contains the first floor of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), the concrete base below the elevated Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), Unit N (Park Pool), and the two stand-alone buildings that support the swimming pool, the locker room in Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) and pool equipment storage and filtration in Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) (Figure 8 to Figure 10). Recent additions to the Lower Level include prefabricated modular buildings added in 2019 and 2020 to replace the functions in Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) once they were declared unsafe and vacated. These include the small entry kiosk and a multi-section modular building with administrative offices and a multipurpose room, which occupies an open space that
was a sitting area shortly after SCRC opened and was later altered to create a lawn for sunbathing and other recreation.

Figure 8. Lower Level at inside SCRC with Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) (right foreground) and Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) (left background) behind security fencing. Camera facing northwest.

Figure 9. Lower Level with Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) (background) and cascading stairs that access the Middle Level (right foreground). Unit G (Building E – Office Center) is visible at the Middle Level above the wood cribbing retaining wall. Camera facing southwest.

Figure 10. Lower Level overview showing Unit N (Park Pool) (center), modular administration building (center back), and the top of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) (left). Note the hexagonal paving and planters at the Lower Level. Camera facing east.
The ground plain at the Lower Level is a largely impermeable surface: brick and concrete pavers and low concrete planters arranged in hexagonal patterns define walkways near Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) and Unit N (Park Pool) (Figure 10). Concrete covers the large pool deck. The perimeter of the Lower Level is defined and shaded by a variety of mature specimen trees including eucalyptus, pine, and redwood species.

Also at the Lower Level is the start of the cascading stairs that serves as one of the site's primary circulation paths (Figure 9 and Figure 10). The stairs consist of two wide trapezoidal stairways that cross at the Middle Level to connect to the Upper Level. A third stairway is at the southwestern end of the Middle Level by the secondary SCRC entrance for students from the surrounding dormitories accessing the site. While part of the historic design of SCRC, the stairways do not include accessible access to the various levels of the site.

Middle Level

The bridging Middle Level establishes the axis for the SCRC's core recreation buildings and, with the adjoining section of the Lower Level, anchors the main northeast-southwest circulation spine within the site (Figure 11). This function is reinforced with tall trees, patios, and planting beds that also cross the site from northeast to southwest.

The Middle Level's northeast terminus is the multi-floor stair tower – Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) – that provides the other vertical circulation path to the various levels and to the three buildings that surround the stair tower, Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building
C – Santa Fe Room, and Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) (Figure 12). Unit D’s (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) stucco-clad foundation/retaining wall is visible at the Middle Level.

Directly sited on the Middle Level is Unit G (Building E – Office Center), with built-in bench seating along the wood railing around the south side of the building (Figure 13). Two elements of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) are also at the Middle Level — a wood stair that accessed its upper-level perimeter walkway and the seating area below the Santa Fe Room (Figure 14, see the description for Unit C). The curved foundation wall at the base of Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) sits on the Middle Level.

A wood trellis that originally connected Unit G (Building E – Office Center) and the wood stair to Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) at the Middle Level was removed in 2021/2022, as was the canopy-like “hat” atop Unit G (Building E – Office Center).

Upper Level

The Upper Level is the largest of the SCRC areas. It is developed naturalistically with functions appearing to organically settle into the mature plantings and rolling topography. Large specimen trees including eucalyptus, pine, redwood, and sycamore varieties shade the perimeter.

The Upper Level includes Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room), Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station), Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms), and Unit L (Family Pool) toward its southeastern edge, adjacent to the central cascading stairs from the Middle Level (Figure 15).
Figure 15. Southeast end of the Upper Level with Unit L (Family Pool) (foreground), Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) (left), Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) (center), and Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) (right). Camera facing southeast.

Figure 16. Northwest end of Upper Level with expansive lawn terminating in the amphitheater (background), sloped wooded hillside with picnic areas (right), and beach volleyball courts (left). Camera facing northwest.
Toward the northwest, an expansive lawn slopes upward through the bowl to an outdoor amphitheater featuring a concrete slab “stage” and rows of wood bench seating set into the hillside (Figure 16 and Figure 17). The northern side of the site rises away from the bowl, providing picnic and barbecue areas in a wooded glade. The same specimen trees found at the perimeter of the Upper Level are also in the wooded glade. Sand beach volleyball courts are on the southwest side of the grassy bowl, added in 2020 (Figure 18).

Other alterations to the Upper Level include student garden plots behind the amphitheater, several small portable storage units to the southwest behind Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms), and modification of the wooded area since the original construction with new and relocated picnic benches. An accessible pedestrian path connecting Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) was added at the southeast corner of the Upper Level at some point.

Upper Level Plateau

The Upper Level Plateau is located to the northeast of the Upper Level and separated from the grassy bowl by the wooded hillside (Figure 19). A set of wood steps built into the hillside and an asphalt path leads from near Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room). The area was originally undeveloped with a grassy lawn when SCRC opened in the 1960s. It now includes a modular classroom/office building (Mesa Building), the fenced Challenge Course, and additional student garden plots. A smaller lawn remains.
A concrete pad and driveway at the northern end of the Upper Level Plateau provides vehicle access from De Neve Drive to SCRC. A sloped access road from the concrete pad allows for deliveries to the southeast corner of the amphitheater.

**Typical Features**

Several common features are found at the various levels, though are primarily around the Middle Level and the core recreation buildings. These include:

- A hexagonal motif at the ground plane, seen in building and landscape element outlines, site wall configurations, and paving pattern.
  - Includes a chain of hexagonal planters at the Lower Level between Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) and Unit N (Park Pool).
- Wood cribbing at retaining walls that were used to help create the levels, either as the retaining walls or as screens in front of concrete retaining walls.
- Wood slat benches.
- Hanging globe lights (several of which were damaged and removed).
- Metal light poles with rectangular light fixtures at top (added at unknown date).
CORE RECREATION CENTER BUILDINGS

Unit B (Building A – Vista Room)

Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) is a two-story, post-and-beam-style structure that is the largest and most visible building in the complex (Figure 20 and Figure 21). On the first floor is an open breezeway that previously served as the main entrance and access control to SCRC (Figure 22). Former offices, storage, and a reception area (historically called the control room and used for ticketing at the main entrance) are located on the first floor. The second floor has a multipurpose room, known as the Vista Room, with kitchen facilities. An open-air, trellis-covered wood walkway surrounds the Vista Room. As the (former) primary entrance to Sunset Canyon Recreation Center and the largest of the core recreation buildings, Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) anchors the complex both visually and functionally.

Figure 20. Northeast (right) and southeast (left) façades of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), with the security fencing concealing the first floor. Main entrance breezeway is beneath the sign on the northeast facade. The Vista Room surrounded by the exterior wood walkway and trellis is visible on the second floor. Camera facing southwest.
The post-and-beam structure frames the building, with exposed beams extending beyond the second-floor Vista Room and walkway perimeter on four sides. A simple vertically oriented wood cladding (called “cabin lining” on the original drawings) wraps the building's exterior walls (Figure 23). Similar cabin lining cladding is also on the interior of the Vista Room continuing the exterior to the interior. Flat redwood plywood cladding is used in some exterior locations. The building features metal windows in punched openings at the first floor, except at the reception entrance, where a four-bay wide window wall with upper transoms and sliding service windows (from the 1970 alterations) was located. At the second-floor Vista Room, glazed sliding doors are present at the southeast wall, while the northeast wall has fixed glazed windows of the same height as the sliding doors (Figure 24). Vertical stained-glass windows are in between the sections.
Due to visible signs of deterioration, including dry rot and lightning strike damage, many supporting posts and beams of the building’s structure have been reinforced and protected with timber shoring and plywood plates, added flashing on the tops of beams and trellis members, and general patching and waterproofing. Numerous individual slats that were part of the overhead trellis at the second-floor exterior walkway have been removed, additional balusters and lattice have been added to the walkway railings for safety purposes, and sections of the wood walkway have been painted. In addition to accessibility limitations, this building has a UC Seismic Performance Level (or Rating) of VII, meaning that it is deemed unsafe and access should be restricted. This building was “red-tagged” (i.e., it is considered unsafe and should not be entered) by the Campus Building Official and was vacated and fenced-off in 2020 due to its structurally unsound and deteriorated conditions.

Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room)

Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) is a cabin lining-clad, single room building surrounded by elevated wood walkways (Figure 25). The room and surrounding walkways are supported by an open post-and-beam structure that partially sits atop a board-form concrete base. The room and surrounding walkways are accessed from either the stair tower at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) or from the Middle Level via a dedicated open wood stair southwest of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room).

---

14 All seismic ratings cited herein are based on evaluations conducted in accordance with the UC Seismic Safety Policy and definitions within the UC Facilities Manual, as provided by UCLA Capital Programs.
Figure 25. Southeast façade of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) with the security fencing concealing the board-formed concrete base. Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) is to the right. Camera facing northwest.

Figure 26. Post-and-beam structure and board-formed concrete base of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room). Camera facing southwest.

Figure 27. Seating area below the Santa Fe Room and surrounding walkway at Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room). Camera facing southwest.

The poured-in-place concrete base is at the Lower Level and has a vertical pattern created by the wood board-form molds (Figure 26). Horizontal openings between the base and the wood walkway deck frame views from a seating area below the Santa Fe Room looking out to the Unit N (Park Pool) deck. The seating area is accessed from the Middle Level by a set of concrete steps leading down (Figure 27).
The upper part of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) is the Santa Fe Room that provides an intimate meeting or conference space with few openings. Like the exterior, the interior is clad with vertical wood cabin lining to continue the exterior to the interior. The wood walkway surrounds all sides of the upper level, except for a centered gap on the southeast side, which prevents the walkway from connecting all the way around. A floor-to-ceiling jalousie window bisects the room’s southeast wall above this opening, creating a strong symmetrical orientation. The northeast and southeast corners of the Santa Fe Room on the exterior and interior are curved. Single doors with glazed sidelights are present at both ends of the northwestern wall (Figure 28). At the northwest wall, transom windows penetrate the center of the facade.

Additional balusters and lattice have been added to the walkway railings for safety purposes, and sections of the wood deck and railing have been painted. In addition to accessibility limitations, this building has a UC Seismic Performance rating of VII (unsafe and access-restricted). Due to the structurally unsound and deteriorated conditions of the wood post-and-beam structure, this building was red-tagged and subsequently vacated and fenced-off in 2020.

15 The original drawings show cabin lining as vertical wood 1x4’s routed to resemble bead board. It is used in both interior and exterior applications throughout the site.
Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room)

Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) is a single room building mainly visible at the Upper Level near Unit L (Family Pool) (Figure 29 and Figure 30). Its lower levels are part of the retaining wall that is around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) and visible from the Middle Level (Figure 31). It has an octagonal floor plan overlain with a rectangular concrete roof, creating voids at three sides that are enclosed by skylights. The corners of the concrete roof extend beyond the plane of the angled walls at four points, creating triangular canopies over doorways. Unlike the other major public multipurpose rooms in the complex, Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room), is finished with a rough-textured heavy-dash stucco coat, listed as “Spanish texture stucco” on the original drawings. The interior of the room is finished with a matching stucco coat. This building has a UC Seismic Performance rating of IV (compliant). However, it has non-compliant accessible access due to the entry stairs and lack of accessible connectivity to the other buildings in the complex.

Figure 29. Southwest facade of Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) with non-accessible steps to one of the entrance doors. The heavy dash stucco coat on the exterior is original and is also applied to the room’s interior walls. The Camera facing east.
Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)

Unit E (Building A2 – Buenos Aires Room) is a three-level central stair tower that serves as a vertical circulation and organizational spine for the site (Figure 32 and Figure 33). Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit D (Building A2 – Buenos Aires Room) are organized on different levels around this vertical element, with offshoot stairs, steps, or landings leading to each unit. The tower houses restrooms in the center core on its first and second floors and an office on its third floor. The center core is wrapped by an open stair with pipe railings; non-original lattice panels have been added at the pipe railings for safety purposes.

The entry to the stair tower is positioned at the site’s Lower Level, behind Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), with a shallow concrete stairway with irregular ends, similar to the stairways at the cascading stair; upper stairs become open-tread wood steps (Figure 34). Wood cribbing, typically a decorative finish in front of concrete retaining walls or itself serving as retaining walls, is visible around the tower as part of the site work that formed the Middle and Upper Levels (Figure 35). Similar wood cribbing is found around the Middle Level, Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) and at other retaining walls.

The post-and-beam stair tower was originally topped by a square hipped wood trellis roof, labeled as “trellis hat” roof on the original drawings). The “hat” was removed in 2018 after a beam failed and it fell on the Santa Fe Room at Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room). In addition to accessibility limitations, this building has a UC Seismic Performance rating of VI (priority for improvement). Due to its structurally unsound and deteriorated conditions, this structure was red-tagged and subsequently vacated and partially fenced-off in 2020.

Figure 33. Northeast facade of Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office). The “hat” roof has been removed. Camera facing southwest.
Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station)

Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) was originally built as an open shade structure comprised of a square, flat-topped, hipped wood trellis “hat” roof supported by four posts (Figure 36). It sits on a curved concrete base/retaining wall that juts out below the structure at the site’s Middle Level (Figure 37). The concrete base has sand-finish exterior plaster, which appears in the historic photograph despite the original drawings calling out heavy-dash plaster here.

The open space under the “hat” was enclosed in 2007 to create a first aid station adjacent to Unit L (Family Pool) at the Upper Level. The enclosure at Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) now consists of a band of glazing with a projecting, wood-clad fascia above. To the southeast, the glazing creates a segmented bay that follows the curve of the original concrete base that juts out at below the building at the site’s Middle Level. The enclosure is entered from the Upper Level pool deck through a double glazed door on its northwest facade. Several of the original pendent globe lights have been removed from the “hat” roof rafters, and several decorative rafter-tails, sandwiched between the paired beam ends, have been removed (Figure 38). This building has a UC Seismic Performance rating of VI (priority for improvement).
Figure 36. Northwest (right) and northeast (left) facades of the enclosure at Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) at the Upper Level. Several original pendant lights and rafter-tail ends have been removed. Camera facing southeast.

Figure 37. Curved concrete base of Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) is at the Middle Level, centered on the lower portion of the central cascading stairs. Camera facing northwest.

Figure 38. Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) with its curved concrete base, open "hat" shade structure, and non-original enclosure added in 2007. Camera facing southwest.

Unit G (Building E – Office Center)

Unit G (Building E – Office Center) was originally a stand-alone curved cabin lining wall that served as a vending machine enclosure with a shade structure “hat” roof above. Since its 1966 construction,
the northeast side has been enclosed with three sliding glass doors to create office space (Figure 39 and Figure 40).

Figure 39. Northeast facade, Unit G (Building E – Office Center). The interior was modified from a vending machine enclosure to offices by replacing the original sliding doors on the northeast side with a window wall and single-leaf glazed doors. Camera facing southwest.

Figure 40. Southwest (rear) facade, Unit G (Building E – Office Center) with cabin lining cladding visible. Camera facing northeast.

Figure 41. Overview of Unit G (Building E – Office Center) showing the extent of this building. Its original shade structure “hat” that covered the roof has been removed. Camera facing southwest.

The building sits on a raised hexagonal concrete pad, which is the roof of an electrical equipment room (Building F – Electrical Vault) that is below and screened by wood cribbing at the Lower Level.
The sheltering “hat” roof and an adjoining trellis leading from the northeast side of Unit G (Building E – Office Center) toward Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) were removed in 2021/2022 due to severe deterioration for safety reasons (Figure 41). This building has a UC Seismic Performance rating of VI (priority for improvement). The building was vacated in 2021 due to water intrusion and mold.

OTHER SUPPORT BUILDINGS

The site contains two swimming pools and three original pool facilities structures that support the pools. On the site’s Lower Level, Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) has non-original wood cladding and retains its original hexagonal footprint (Figure 42). Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) houses pool equipment storage and filtration and maintains its board-form concrete exterior (Figure 43). It has been expanded to the southwest but generally retains its distinctive hexagonal footprint.

On the southwest side of the site’s Upper Level, Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) has sand-finish stucco cladding, which appears original based on historic photographs even though the original drawings called for a heavy dash finish. The building occupies its original footprint. The flat-roofed building’s entrance is facing Unit L (Family Pool) and centered on the northeast façade (Figure 44). A stand-alone wall with curved corners to shelter vending machines that originally screened the entrance was removed at an unknown date after 1991. The rear (southwest) façade was not accessible.

Figure 42. Northeast facade Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) has non-original wood cladding. Camera facing south.

Figure 43. North facade Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) was expanded to the rear. Camera facing south.
Figure 44. Northeast (left) and northwest (right) facades of Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms). Camera facing southeast.
4. HISTORIC CONTEXT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

The University of California was established in 1868, with the Berkeley campus opening in 1873. In 1881, the Los Angeles State Normal School was founded for the purpose of teacher training. Originally located on five acres in downtown Los Angeles, the Normal School occupied a 25-acre property on North Vermont Avenue by 1919 when it became the University of California Southern Branch through an act of the state legislature. The change culminated an effort by Regent Edward Dickson to bring a campus of the state university to rapidly growing Southern California. With an enrollment of 250 students, the Southern Branch initially offered a two-year program in the College of Arts and Sciences. Two-year programs became four-year programs in 1924, and by 1925, it was apparent that the institution would soon outgrow its home.

The Regents of the University of California launched an official search for a new site in 1925. They explored possibilities from Ventura to San Diego counties. Eventually the “Beverly” site was chosen and purchased at a highly advantageous price. Property owners Edwin and Harold Janss, developers of Holmby Hills and “Westwood Hills,” a middle-class subdivision south of the proposed university location, contributed 220 acres. Alphonzo Bell, developer of Bel-Air and several portions of Brentwood and Pacific Palisades further to the west, also contributed to the land accumulation south of the Santa Monica Mountains. The cities of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, and Venice contributed money to purchase the site. In 1926, California voters approved a six-million-dollar bond issue, half of which was allocated to the new campus for its construction.

A few months before the groundbreaking in May 1927, the school was renamed the University of California at Los Angeles. The campus was laid out under the direction of architect George W. Kelham. The supervising architect of the Berkeley campus at the time, Kelham was a prominent San Francisco practitioner who had been educated at the École des Beaux Arts. His master plan, created with the assistance of Berkeley landscape architect John W. Greg, reflected traditional principles. Accessed at the east from Hilgard Avenue across a newly-built bridge that spanned a ravine (also known as an arroyo), the four original 1927-28 buildings—Royce Hall, Haines Hall, Powell Library, and Kinsey Hall (now the Humanities Building)—stylistically reflected the Romanesque and Renaissance architecture of northern Italy. Designed by Kelham and prominent Los Angeles

---

architects Allison and Allison, the buildings displayed a common palette of red brick exteriors, buff terracotta trim, and red tile roofs (Figure 45).

Additional buildings constructed during the 1930s, including the Education Building (renamed Moore Hall in 1955) and Men's and Women's Gymnasiums, continued the theme. The designs of two other buildings from the decade veered in different directions: Kerckhoff Hall incorporated a Gothic Revival motif while the Mira Hershey residence hall was more Mediterranean Revival in appearance. Spatially, the 1930s buildings remained close to the four original buildings. The Men's and Women's Gymnasiums were located west of the four original buildings, at the bottom of the broad Janss Steps (1930), extending the main east-west axis of the quadrangle westward to a lower terrace. The Education Building and Kerckhoff Hall were to the south of the lower terrace.

In 1935, David Allison of Allison and Allison became the campus' supervising architect after the death of Kelham. Ralph D. Cornell became the campus landscape architect in 1937. However, the Great Depression and then World War II curtailed campus construction. The core academic buildings remained surrounded by open space at the end of the war, at which time UCLA had approximately fifteen buildings on campus.
Postwar Campus Development

Following World War II, enrollment at UCLA surged, as veterans attended using the G.I. Bill, and the population of Southern California boomed. The university needed more space and more buildings to accommodate the exponential growth, and the state legislature made funds available from accumulated wartime taxes. The arroyo was infilled, hiding the sides of the bridge, to form courtyards that connected the campus (Figure 46). However, the immediate postwar demands did not allow for a deliberate planning process; the focus was on providing academic facilities to meet the pressing needs. Wooden barracks and Army surplus buildings temporarily housed school facilities and veterans housing as permanent buildings were constructed.

The initial building expansion in the late 1940s and early 1950s included a number of new schools and colleges starting construction, including the Business Administration and Economics Building (1948), Engineering Building (1950), Law Building (1952), Geology Building (1951), and New Chemistry Building (1951).

![Figure 46. Bird’s eye view of the extent of UCLA campus in 1950, with the infilled arroyo’s two cross-axial courtyards visible at the top left. Proposed new buildings are called out in the image. Source: “UCLA Campus Humming with Building Projects.” Los Angeles Times, October 1, 1950.]

---

The campus’ Office of Architects and Engineers was established in 1944, headed by Carl C. McElvy. This office participated in and coordinated each phase of the campus’ building program, including as the liaison with the outside supervising (later consulting) architect and landscape architect. Initially under David Allison as the supervising architect, the new postwar buildings were still low-rise and red brick, although more modern in style.

In 1948, the architectural firm of Wurdeman and Becket succeeded Allison as UCLA’s supervising architect, with the subsequent firm of Welton Becket and Associates taking over following Wurdeman’s death in 1949. The campus architecture under Becket shifted to a more deliberately modern idiom. The buildings generally remained low-scale and maintained a common palette of red or buff brick-clad exteriors with cast stone or concrete accents. However, they became less consistent with this visual theme as development grew further from the original core of the campus (Figure 47).

Figure 47. The physical growth of the UCLA campus can be seen in the campus map from the 1944-45 General Catalog (left) compared to the one in the 1960-61 catalog (right). The four original 1927-1928 buildings are highlighted for reference. Source: UCLA General Catalog, 1944-45 and 1960-61.

22 Campus Planning Committee and Office of Architects and Engineers, UCLA Long Range Development Plan (Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1963), 6.
After the initial postwar boom, construction and enrollment slowed in the mid-1950s with the outbreak of the Korean War, only to pick up at the end of the 1950s. The anticipated population growth in Southern California, and the corresponding increase in enrollment, resulted in more funds becoming available and allowed for deliberate space use planning. Construction on the Medical Center complex, which opened its first building in 1955, dominated this period. Much of the new Court of Sciences at the southern end of the campus near the Medical Center also occurred in the 1950s with funding from bond issues in the mid-1950s.23

The late 1950s and early 1960s also saw the construction of non-academic facilities, such as the first of four multi-story residence halls (Dykstra Hall, 1959) and Ackerman Student Union (1960). Welton Becket (1902-1969) served as supervising and later consulting architect to UCLA, originally with his partner William Wurdeman (1903-1949). That consulting contract lasted from 1948 until 1960. In addition, Wurdeman & Becket (until 1949) and later Welton Becket and Associates designed at least 21 buildings at UCLA during their two-decade tenure.

In 1960, the California Master Plan for Higher Education codified the state’s tripartite higher education system – junior colleges, state colleges that became California State Universities, and the University of California campuses. Existing UC research institutes in Riverside, San Diego, Davis, and elsewhere became general education universities, joining Berkeley and UCLA, with a focus on research and graduate programs.24

With greater efforts to plan for increase enrollment, UCLA adopted its first Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) in 1963 to guide future development. Voters passed three successive state bond measures in 1962, 1964, and 1966, providing UCLA with $95 million for campus building expansion. With an additional $55 million through matching federal funds, gifts, and other sources, UCLA undertook a substantial building program in the 1960s that erected over 50 buildings.25

The buildings in the 1960s tended to be larger in scale and decidedly modern without the previous unifying materials palette. They attempted continuity with the original Romanesque architecture by incorporating arches, porticos, arcades, patios, and/or large covered areas, and often included artworks like sculpture, murals, and fountains. Examples include Maynard Lyndon's Bunche Hall (1964) for Social Sciences, the first modern high-rise academic building on campus; Franz Tower (1967) for the Psychology Department designed by Paul Williams and his associate Claude Coyne;

25 Dundjerski, UCLA: The First Century, 147.
and the three additional multi-story residence halls at the far west end of campus built between 1959 and 1964. Designed by Welton Becket and Associates, these dormitories, including Dykstra Hall, were unapologetically modern, with a modular, repetitive design executed in concrete.

California Governor Ronald Reagan announced budget cuts in his 1970-71 budget that included cuts to UC funding for construction, faculty positions, financial aid, and minority student programs. Coming after several years of cuts, the budget allocated only $34.8 million of the $110.9 million requested by the UC system for construction. In general, the 1970s was a period of decelerated growth and enrollment throughout the UC system reflecting the economic downturn experienced by the country. As a result, construction and development on the UCLA campus slowed in the early and mid-1970s before expanding again in the mid to late 1970s. Significant projects in the late 1970s included the James E. West Alumni Center (1976), Molecular Biology Institute (1976), North Campus Student Facility (1976), the Placement & Career Planning Center (1976), and the Jerry Lewis Neuromuscular Research Center (c. 1978).

With the state's budget cuts, few of the 1970s buildings were funded by state funds. Instead, UCLA started to cultivate private funding through alumni and friends and eventually broke with long-standing tradition in the 1980s to raise funds from private institutions and the community.

---
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DESIGN TEAM

Architect – Smith and Williams

Whitney R. Smith and Wayne R. Williams founded their architectural firm in 1946 (Figure 48). Both graduates of the University of Southern California (USC) School of Architecture, the architects remained firm partners until 1973. Each achieved fellowship in the American Institute of Architects.

Over the course of their joint and individual careers, they completed hundreds of commissions, designing residential and commercial buildings and complexes; churches, schools, and government buildings; recreational facilities; and master plans. Although widely known and appreciated in the West, and Southern California in particular, Smith and Williams were not as extensively published as some of their contemporaries in the national press. However, Sunset magazine, the popular and influential guide to and chronicler of western lifestyles, featured Smith and Williams over thirty times between 1940 and 1961. Arts and Architecture, also an influential postwar California-based publication, featured the duo nearly as many times. Julius Shulman, the noted architectural photographer, was quoted in the Los Angeles Times, “Their work was instrumental in bringing architecture down to earth, to level of the average client. But they didn’t beat their drums loud enough; that’s why they didn’t become world famous.”

Figure 48. Whitney Smith and Wayne Williams at their office in Pasadena, circa 1960. Source: Smith and Williams Records, Architecture and Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum; University of Santa Barbara.

30 Several sources cite 1949 as the year the Smith and Williams partnership was formed. However, Williams began working in Smith’s office in the mid-1940s while still a student and Smith’s own resume stated 1946 marked the inception of the Smith and Williams firm.

KEY DESIGNERS

Principal partner Whitney Rowland Smith (1911-2002) was born in 1911 in Pasadena and received his Bachelor of Architecture degree from USC in 1934. His tenure at USC coincided with a marked break with traditional, Beaux Arts-inspired architectural education, as the school forged a modern approach to architectural design based on problem resolution and regionalism rather than style.\(^{32}\) As a student and after graduation, he worked for several architects and designers, many of them quite prominent, including Garrett Van Pelt; Harold Bissner; Joseph Weston (both at the San Francisco office of the Farm Security Administration and in his own firm); Lawrence Test; Marsh, Smith, and Powell; Paul Frankl; Kem Weber; Walker and Eisen; and Harwell Hamilton Harris.\(^{33}\) In 1940, Smith became a licensed architect and opened his own practice. Shortly thereafter, Smith became an instructor of Advanced Planning and Architecture at USC, and there encountered student Wayne R. Williams.\(^{34}\)

Born in Los Angeles in 1919, Wayne Richard Williams (1919-2007) graduated from the USC School of Architecture in 1947. During World War II, Williams designed airplane hangars and other military buildings as part of his Army service. He began working in Smith’s office while still a student. He received his California architect's license in 1949. While the Smith and Williams practice embraced multiple building types, Williams developed a specialty in recreation planning, and published the book, *Recreation Places*, in 1958.\(^{35}\) According to an article published in the *Los Angeles Times*, Williams and Robert Meyerhof designed SCRC.\(^{36}\)

In 1955, architect Robert Paul Meyerhof (1919-2014) joined the Smith and Williams firm. Born in Germany in 1919, Meyerhof studied in Switzerland and at Cambridge University in the United Kingdom in the 1930s. Following World War II, he received his Bachelor of Architecture from the University of California at Berkeley in 1950. In the years prior to joining Smith and Williams, he worked as a draftsman in the offices of Richard J. Neutra and Wise and Eisner. Like Williams, Meyerhof had a particular interest in recreational projects and his resume under the subtitle “Research” lists “Playground and Recreation Facilities Design in Europe, 1956.”\(^{37}\)

---


DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

A 2013 exhibition at the Art, Design & Architecture Museum at the University of California, Santa Barbara devoted to the work of Smith and Williams described their architectural design as a balance of opposites: closed versus open, private versus public, restraint versus exuberance, and light versus shadow. Rather than labeling themselves as modernists, Smith and Williams approached architecture as a problem-solving activity conditioned by the constraints and opportunities of the site, with landscape regarded as integral to the building and the overall design. Wayne Williams summarized their convictions in an interview in 1960, stating, “good architecture grows out of a problem.”

By the mid-1960s, Smith and Williams had a diversified and prosperous practice and had earned the respect of both the architectural community and clients. Although their work cannot be pigeonholed into any one idiom, the Smith and Williams firm was noted for its work in the “post and beam” genre of modern architecture. An outgrowth of the International Style, which architectural historian Kenneth Frampton has characterized as “little more than a convenient phrase denoting a cubistic mode of architecture,” post-and-beam architecture was a regional interpretation responsive to the southern California climate, topography, and lifestyle. It was characterized by wood construction, glass walls, and a close integration of interior and exterior spaces.

JAPANESE INFLUENCES: POST-AND-BEAM MODERNISM

The post-and-beam architecture also reflected California's proximity to the Pacific Rim and longstanding Japanese influences introduced to the region by the early 20th-century Arts and Crafts movement. By the 1940s, the USC School of Architecture, merging International Style and Asian impulses, was promoting a Japanese-influenced modern aesthetic and planning methodology, a “wood post-and-beam structural system that allowed free-flowing interior spaces to open generously onto the surrounding landscape.” Because many of style's practitioners worked from Pasadena, shared an interest in Japanese design, or had attended USC in the postwar years, they became known as the “Pasadena-USC School.” Smith and Williams were amongst the foremost

practitioners of post-and-beam architecture, in the company of architects Buff and Hensman, A. Quincy Jones, Harwell Hamilton Harris, and others.

Additional scholarship on Smith and Williams has focused on the Japanese influences that shaped the firm’s decades-long evolution of post-and-beam modernism. Writing in the 1950s, Esther McCoy noted Japanese principles of simplicity, calm, and clarity guiding their work.\(^\text{44}\) Other scholars have identified their penchant for borrowing and translating traditional Japanese concepts for use in contemporary Western culture. Signature Smith and Williams approaches such as shaping spaces as layered volumes suggested by panels rather than defined by walls derives from the sliding shoji screen; rooms and buildings connected by exterior walkways and connected raised decks derives from the engawa, a covered corridor around the outside perimeter of a pavilion.\(^\text{45}\)

Early residential commissions exhibited specifically Japanese strategies such as expressive framing and attention to site design that put landscape on an equal footing with architecture. Their Rene Lavenant house (Pasadena, 1953) was a “sheltered pavilion perched above the earth, as in so many Japanese temples” and their Robert Crowell House (Pasadena, 1952-1953) achieved “a strong Japanese character” through the modular spacing of wood posts, floor joists projecting past exterior walls, and a structure cantilevered to create the effect of buildings floating above the landscape.\(^\text{46}\)

The firm utilized these approaches in more than residential work, expanding them to commercial, civic, and recreational commissions. The design of UCLA’s SCRC exhibits a mature expression of these principles at large scale involving both architecture and landscape.

**WORK OF SMITH AND WILLIAMS**

One of the earliest projects for which Smith received acclaim, prior to joining forces with Williams, was the Linda Vista Shopping Center (1944) constructed to support defense housing in San Diego. Arranged around a central green space, the outdoor mall was pedestrian-scaled and one of the first of its type. Extended eaves shaded walkways and were partially deconstructed in a grid pattern that created a pattern of light and shade and solid and void, an early use of a favorite Smith and William architectural stratagem.

Following World War II, Smith contributed two unbuilt residential designs to the seminal Case Study House program of *Arts and Architecture* magazine. These marked additional milestones in Smith’s


evolution with qualities that would permeate the later work of the firm. Both showcased an intimate connection to the site, thoughtful consideration of the client’s needs, and ample integration of interior and exterior spaces. In Case Study House #5 (The Loggia House, designed 1945), a large central loggia is the fulcrum of the design, with interior spaces arranged around it. The house was conceived as “a series of four separate rooms within a garden, or ‘living islands under one roof,’” a theme which Smith and Williams would explore several times over the course of their careers, including within SCRC.47 A year later, Case Study House #12 (The Lath House, designed 1946) saw a continuation of the re-thinking of a traditional floor plan that had been evident in the earlier exercise. An X-shaped layout permitted each wing to access the garden on two or three sides. Open lath walls and roofs sheltered the garden areas on two ends. Both the innovative floor plan and the integration of lath-enclosed garden areas would re-appear two decades later in SCRC.

Over the years, the firm won several American Institute of Architects awards including in 1959 for the celebrated office building for Community Facilities Planners in South Pasadena (Figure 49). Smith had worked with an interdisciplinary team during his time with the Farm Security Administration in the 1930s. The Smith and Williams practice frequently followed the collective project approach Smith experienced during the Depression, teaming with favored collaborators including landscape architect Garret Eckbo and planner Simon Eisner, among others. The Community Facilities Planners office building was configured to encourage this teaming structure and interdisciplinary approach to design. Built to house Smith and Williams with their loose confederation of design and planning professionals, the office occupied “a garden covered by a metal-mesh vault roof.”48 The building showcased several hallmarks of the Smith and Williams approach to architecture, including the architects’ preference that the program for the building shape its design, rather

---

than the opposite. In this case, a flexible space allowed for both individual practices as well as cooperative ventures. The integration of the garden into the space was a paramount consideration. The overhead mesh created patterns of light and shade, and a wood “umbrella” within the space created further shelter. These concepts also are evident at SCRC.

The firm also amassed a small but impressive portfolio of recreation-related projects including the Girl’s Camp (1949) in Griffith Park (designed by Smith as part of an association with A. Quincy Jones and Edgardo Contini); a civic center for Buena Park (1956); a Master Park Plan and four parks for the City of Lakewood (1956-1966); the Master Plan for a 55-acre recreation center in Rialto (1957); and Newport Dunes combining recreation, retail, public, and commercial space (1970). As at SCRC, the design for Buena Park encompassed six rectangular post-and-beam buildings in a park-like setting connected by covered outdoor walkways. About the same time as SCRC was completed, the firm was also finishing another facility, the Japanese Tea House in Descanso Gardens (Figure 50). Although clearly reflecting its Japanese heritage, the Tea House incorporates signature Smith and Williams elements, including a series of wood decks and walkways whose vertical and horizontal elements create rhythmic patterns of light, shade, solid, and void.

OTHER COMMISSIONS AT UCLA

In addition to SCRC, Smith and Williams designed a Cyclotron building at the UCLA Medical Center (undated, demolished 2002) and after the partnership ended in 1973, Wayne Williams designed the campus’ Associated Students North Campus Facility (1977).

---

Landscape Architect - Cornell, Bridgers & Troller

The landscape architecture firm Cornell, Bridgers & Troller is responsible for the landscape design at SCRC. The firm was part of the original design team under Smith and Williams for the “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set in circa 1963-1964. Their landscaping plans in that set included the site's concrete retaining walls, wood deck and fencing, and hexagonal paving plan immediately adjacent to the swimming pools and core recreation buildings. In addition, the firm developed the “West Campus Utilities & Site Development: Site Development and Landscape” drawing set dated June 4, 1965 that included the amphitheater and initial barbeque areas at SCRC's Upper Level, the sitting area in the Lower Level (replaced by lawn at an unknown date and where the modular building was added in 2019/2020), the jagged-edge concrete stairway toward the southwest end of the Middle Level at the secondary student entrance to SCRC (to match the two existing stairways of the central cascading stairs already in place), and many of the plantings on the site (Figure 51).

Figure 51. Cover sheet to the June 4, 1965 “West Campus Utilities & Site Development: Site Development and Landscaping” drawing set by Cornell, Bridgers & Troller, with the Amphitheater Area and Sitting Area at SCRC designed by the landscape architects called out. Source: UCLA Capital Programs.
Cornell, Bridgers & Troller was founded in 1955 by Ralph Cornell (1890-1972), one of California's leading landscape architects, who had worked in solo practice between 1933 and 1955. Junior partners S. William Bridgers and Howard E. Troller joined Cornell in 1955. As Cornell, Bridgers & Troller, the firm was responsible for the landscape design of several prominent sites in Los Angeles, including several in downtown, such as Parker Center, the Department of Water and Power Building, the Music Center, and the Civic Center Mall and completed hundreds of projects for city parks (including Beverly Garden, on the north side of Santa Monica Boulevard, Beverly Hills) and colleges (such as Pomona College). Cornell and the firm had a long working relationship with Welton Becket and Associates.

Cornell oversaw development of other universities and colleges but was the consulting landscape architect for the UCLA campus landscape from 1937 until his death in 1972. Starting in 1955, Cornell, Bridgers & Troller designed the major landscape projects at UCLA as well as various common features that unified the landscape. The intent was to develop “A coordinated framework of patios, courts, walkways, and interconnecting plantings... to complement the different styles of architecture and draw them together into a coherent, aesthetically pleasing, and functional entity.” Among the firm's finest work is UCLA's Franklin D. Murphy Sculpture Garden and Inverted Fountain, located adjacent to Knudsen Hall.

Jere Hazlett became a partner in the firm in 1969, and the firm was renamed Cornell, Bridgers, Troller and Hazlett. Following the death of Ralph Cornell in 1972, the firm continued as Bridgers, Troller & Hazlett Landscape Architects. Hazlett, who had previously worked as a landscape architectural draftsman and UCLA campus landscape architect before joining the firm, was appointed to the roll of consulting landscape architect for UCLA following Cornell's death. As Bridgers, Troller & Hazlett, the firm's known commissions include a sculpture garden for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) and Culver/Slauson Park in Culver City. In 1978, Troller left to establish an independent practice, and in 1979, Bridgers followed suit. Hazlett continued to work as a consulting landscape architect for UCLA until at least the mid-1980s.

---
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Supervising Architect - Welton Becket and Associates

Welton Becket and Associates is listed as the supervising architect on the Smith and Williams plans for Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. Welton Becket (1902-1969) served as supervising architect, originally with his partner William Wurdeman (1903-1949) as Wurdeman and Becket, and later as Welton Becket and Associates from 1948 until 1960. In 1960, the title changed from supervising to consulting architect, and Becket continued to serve as UCLA’s consulting architect until his death in 1969. In addition, Wurdeman & Becket (until 1949) and later Welton Becket and Associates designed at least 21 buildings at UCLA during Becket’s two-decade tenure. The first of that group was the Service Building (no longer extant) which was completed in 1948. Welton Becket Associates designed the original UCLA Medical Center and more than 1.5 million square feet of space in at least ten medical buildings at the Center for Health Sciences between 1954 and 1967.

As supervising/consulting architect for UCLA, Welton Becket and Associates typically had a role in reviewing and commenting on the design of new campus buildings developed by other firms who were the executive architects. Their input was provided usually during the schematic and design development phases, but their specific involvement and contribution to SCRC as the Supervising Architect on the project is unknown.
5. SITE HISTORY

PLANNING AND DESIGN

In a 1966 *Los Angeles Times* article, Associate Dean of Students Norman Miller recalled that physical planning for the Canyon Recreation Center, as it was originally known, started as early as 1955. Faced with the steady expansion of the campus and growth in the student and faculty populations, campus administration identified a need to “have different kinds of environments on campus...to preserve some sort of park atmosphere and natural areas” where the student experience could transcend the impersonality and formality of traditional campus settings.\(^{56}\) Prior to this, UC Berkeley opened its Strawberry Canyon Recreation Center in the hills above the campus’ Memorial Stadium in 1959.\(^{57}\)

By 1962, programming was underway for SCRC on one of those preserved sites, a nine-acre plot adjacent to four newly completed residence halls.\(^{58}\) The planning shifted to social goals focused on “providing a place where young people might develop their own values through informal, out-of-class education,” an area to enhance “educational objectives through creative uses of leisure time on campus and to reduce the anonymity...of a large urban university.”\(^{59}\) The administration envisioned a space that would accommodate visual arts, music, theater, aquatics, outdoor living and contemplation. They hoped it would act as a meeting ground for faculty, students, and university families, a place both informal and intimate outside the anonymity of a massive institution, a place to break barriers between discipline and specialties, status and age.\(^{60}\)

UCLA contracted with the architectural firm of Smith and Williams in 1963 to design spaces for “the new leisure.”\(^{61}\) Firm partner Wayne Williams, who authored a leisure source book in 1958 called *Recreation Places*, possessed both the experience as a recreation planner and the preferred approach. He was noted as “an authority on re-defining recreation in terms of individual growth” and a “passionate opponent of men who continue to ‘think in two kinds of time’—work versus play, either-or.”\(^{62}\) The architects were given few program specifics: provide large and small pools, outdoor


\(^{58}\) “New Center Ready at UCLA,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 23, 1966. The article also stated that the property had been deeded to the university by the Bel-Air Association with the stipulation that the land not be used for large buildings or parking, however this assertion is not borne out by UCLA’s correspondence records.


\(^{60}\) Seidenbaum, “Working on Answers to the New Leisure.”
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\(^{62}\) Seidenbaum, “Working on Answers to the New Leisure.”
areas wired for performance or concerts, snack spaces and barbeque pits, and lounges suitable for receptions or poetry readings or bull sessions.\textsuperscript{63} Further, they were tasked with maximizing open space with few physical boundaries in order to encourage informal mingling of faculty and students.\textsuperscript{64}

![Site plan (Sheet A2) in the Smith and Williams “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set with the extent of the initial proposed development at SCRC, circa 1963-1964. Source: UCLA Capital Programs.](image)

The site plan in the “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set from circa 1963-1964 shows the extent of the initial development (Figure 52).\textsuperscript{65} Smith and Williams, as the Executive Architect and working with Welton Becket and Associates as the Consulting Architects (campus architect), Cornell, Bridgers & Troller as the Landscape Architects, John Kariotis and Associates as the Structural Engineer, and Holladay and Westcott as the Mechanical and Electrical Engineer, largely retained the natural contours of the site topography. The plans located the swimming pools and

\textsuperscript{63} Seidenbaum, “Working on Answers to the New Leisure.”
\textsuperscript{64} Gibbs, “Planning and Recreation Projects,” 82.
\textsuperscript{65} The date on the drawing set is not legible. It is in a folder from UCLA Capital Programs dated as 1963-1964.
associated locker and pool equipment buildings on advantageous flat areas at the Upper and Lower Levels and placed the core recreation center buildings and circulation across or adjacent to the sloping center of the land, (Figure 53).

Figure 53. Plot plan (Sheet A4) in the Smith and Williams “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set with placement of buildings across the site's topography. Source: UCLA Capital Programs.

The plans addressed formal movement between elevation changes with cascading staircases and navigated other site extremes with a small number of concrete and wood crib retaining walls (Figure 54 and Figure 55). The landscape plans in this original set by Cornell Bridgers & Troller laid out a hexagonal paving plan for the site's hardscape that would complement the hexagonal footprint of some adjacent buildings.
Within the Smith and Williams firm, Wayne Williams and Robert Meyerhof had primary design responsibility for the project buildings. Meyerhof was the day-to-day architect for SCRC; his signature appears on the project drawings and on project-related correspondence. As the design principal, Williams eschewed the idea of single-purpose buildings whose uses were dictated by design. The concept for SCRC was purposefully non-rectangular, and intended to be a blank canvas upon which the users of the Center could leave their imprint: “We wanted to say, these buildings are yours, hoping the walls would be attacked by art students, figuring that undergraduates had enough formal programming in their lives.”

---
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The designers focused on creating a place that would defy the constricting modules and defined spaces of a typical student building, instead putting an “emphasis…on non-emphasis, to make something people could shape to their own needs.” The solution was a series of small stand-alone pavilions in a garden setting. The core recreation center buildings hugged the Middle Level of the site, visually unified by their wood post-and-beam circulation system of decks, elevated walkways and stairs, and distinguishing trellis and “hat” roofs (Figure 54). The site’s masonry pathway system, characterized by hexagonally shaped paving blocks, large scale hexagonally shaped paving patterns, and hexagonally-or zig-zag-shaped planters, anchored the core buildings. The circulation systems allowed the various core buildings to be approached from different sides.

Open floor plans within the buildings accommodated a variety of uses and allowed easy reconfiguration. These buildings provided a ticketed entry area and offices, a kitchen for catered events, and three flexible meeting rooms in three separate buildings.

The competition Unit N (Park Pool) and Units L and M (Family Pools) with their associated locker and pool equipment buildings used a design vocabulary in contrast with the predominantly wood post-and-beam buildings at the core of the complex. The Lower Level Units A and P (Building H – Park Pool Locker Room and Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) featured hexagonal footprints, Unit P with board-formed concrete walls and Unit A with stucco clad walls and an altered northeast façade with vertical wood cladding. Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) featured a rectangular footprint with curved corners, a small entrance enclosure for vending equipment, and both heavy dash and sand finish stucco-clad exterior.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPENING

The project’s site preparation, architectural design refinements, and construction progressed over several years, with the plans evolving between 1963 and 1965 as Smith and Williams worked with the expected users of the center. For example, the large pool, Unit N (Park Pool), was enlarged to Olympic length and given both marked lanes and observation windows at the request of the swim coaching staff and family dressing rooms were added to Unit L (Family Pool) (Figure 56).

Landscape design commenced in mid-1965. That plan, under the subsequent drawing set, “West Campus Utilities & Site Development Project No. 940190,” by Cornell Bridgers & Troller, dated June 4, 1965, included the designs for the informal sitting area adjacent to the Lower Level pool, as well as the amphitheater and barbeque area at the Upper Level. It also introduced several scales of plant material to create edges, emphasis, and texture within the acreage. Tall specimen and common tree

---
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species were planned for the perimeter of the entire site, the wooded glade on the north side of the Upper Level, and along the northeast-southwest circulation axis through the center of the site. A palette of lower shrubs and ground covers along with varieties of vines, perennials, bulbs, orchids, and bromeliads was identified for the planting beds, patios, cribbing walls, and deep shade areas.

![Image of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center](image-url)

Figure 56. Sunset Canyon Recreation Center as it neared completion and opening, circa 1965. Source: University Archives, UCLA Library Special Collections.

Built using $850,000 in student incidental fees, SCRC eventually cost $960,000.69 SCRC opened on February 7, 1966. According to a report in the *Los Angeles Times* at the time of its completion, SCRC was considered by some University officials to be “one of the most handsome structures ever built on campus, with its naturally finished wood, angled in an informal way, its textured concrete, wide-shaded balconies and patios with wide overhangs.”70 Open year-round, it was free to UCLA students and their families and available for a modest fee to University faculty and staff.

---


70 *Los Angeles Times*, “New Center Ready at UCLA.”
However, it appears that the facility was completed with little fanfare or even awareness around campus. The same *Los Angeles Times* article stated that the *Daily Bruin* had mentioned the project when it was conceived but had hardly mentioned it since.\(^{71}\) Five months later, usage was still low, averaging 100 to 500 people daily and spiking on weekends and holidays.\(^{72}\) Eventually, SCRC became a highly popular fixture in the lives of the populations it was intended to serve. Three years after opening, an article noted “the rural calm and informal atmosphere” at the facility, as the complex lacked signs giving direction, which added to its relaxed and peaceful demeanor. Trees and grass also contributed to this atmosphere, in contrast with the concrete and hustle of other areas of campus (Figure 57).\(^{73}\) In 1970, SCRC received a national first place landscape award from the American Association of Nurserymen for landscape contributing to environmental improvement with its forest-like atmosphere.\(^{74}\)

Since its opening, SCRC appears to have been broadly used as intended, serving all members of the campus population as a relaxing recreational facility. The Olympic-sized Unit N (Park Pool) has been an occasional exception. For many years, the men’s water polo team utilized it for practice and

---
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\(^{73}\) *Los Angeles Times*, “Signs, Rules Yield to People at Sunset Canyon,” August 17, 1969.

matches. During the 1984 Olympics, aquatics teams housed in the adjacent dormitories used the pool for training and practice. Currently, the US Artistic Swimming Team uses the pool for training.

ALTERATIONS

Between the facility opening in 1966 and 2000, modifications, updates, and repairs altered aspects of the property. The most visually substantial changes expanded Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room) housing pool equipment storage and filtration, to the rear in 1968; reconfigured the Unit L (Family Pool) and deck paving in 1974 at the same site location; carried out dry rot repairs around the wood walkways and decking at the core recreation buildings including replacement of flooring with a differently-dimensioned planking and replacement of assorted beams; added handicapped ramps to the site; and changed the Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) cladding from stucco to wood in 1991.

Since 2000, the property has been altered by the removal of additional materials due to wood rot. Decay and deterioration have resulted in failing posts, beams, joists, and trellis rafters, some of which have been removed and some repaired or replaced, such as at the underside of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room). SCRC’s appearance has been modified by the introduction of wood piles and reinforcing plates to stabilize the post and beam structure at Unit B (Building A – Vista Room). Exterior decks and walkways have been further adjusted to address code violations, infilling open railings with occasional reinforcing balusters and protective lattice at unknown dates. The open Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station), which was originally only the “hat” roof structure, was enclosed at the base in 2007 for use as a first-aid station.

Figure 58. Failed arm of Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) “hat” roof that once was above Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) (right) and fell on its roof. Camera facing northeast. April 2018

Figure 59. Collapsed “hat” roof of Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) (upper right) resting on roof of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) (left). Camera facing south. March 2018
In 2018, an arm of the “hat” at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) failed and collapsed onto Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) (Figure 58 to Figure 59). Following historic building photography documentation of the site, the “hat” was removed from Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office). The photo-documentation followed guidelines for the Historic American Building Survey guidelines and is in the UCLA Special Collections archive.

In 2020, Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) were found structurally deficient and removed from active service. By 2021, they were enclosed behind chain-link construction fencing. A multi-section modular building was installed on the Lower Level lawn to house SCRC staff administration, a multipurpose room, and the support spaces lost in the building closures. The new administration building leaves a fraction of the lawn’s original area open for sunbathing and lounging. A new portable site entrance kiosk now lies between Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and the lawn.

In 2021 to 2022, the “hat” at Unit G (Building E – Office Center) was removed due to safety concerns, as was the trellis connecting Unit G with the Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) wood stair at the Middle Level. A more detailed alterations chronology is below.

ALTERATIONS CHRONOLOGY

The following list of site and building exterior alterations is based upon review of architectural and engineering drawings up to 2007 provided by UCLA and the record of changes since 2013. Observed alterations not found in the drawing archive or with unknown dates are at the end of the list. Interior alterations are not listed.

1968  Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room), housing pool equipment storage and filtration, expanded to the southwest with the addition of a new storage room (construction drawings prepared by University of California Los Angeles Campus Architects and Engineers, April 1968).

1970  Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) first-floor Control Building (reception area) expanded five feet to the northeast and northwest, providing additional seating and an office. New windows included jalousie (louvered), fixed, and sliding windows to match the original, and the exterior was clad in “cabin-lining”, Douglas fir 1x4s run vertically, to match the existing cladding. (Construction drawings prepared by University of California Los Angeles Campus Architects and Engineers, December 1970).

1971  Wood louvers installed above the glazed walls of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room, northwest wall) and Unit G (Building E – Office Center, northeast wall) to screen roof-top
mechanical equipment (construction drawings prepared by University of California Los Angeles Office of Architects and Engineers, May 1971).

1973
Amphitheater access road built between northeast side of stage and loading pad adjacent to De Neve Drive. (Construction drawings prepared by University of California Los Angeles Campus Architects and Engineers, February 1973).

1974
Original Unit L (Family Pool) and Unit M splash pool removed and replaced with a larger pool and associated pool deck/paving. A separate dive pool was created to the southwest and a shallow wading pool to the northeast. The pool expansion added a screened pool equipment area to the southwest of Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms). (Construction drawings prepared by Smith & Williams Architects and Engineers, dated September 1974, and landscape drawings produced by Bridgers, Troller, and Hazlett Landscape Architects, November 1974 (Figure 60)).

Figure 60. Plan showing reconfigured Unit L (Family Pool). Source: Drawing L-3 produced by Bridgers, Troller, and Hazlett Landscape Architects, November 1974.

1976
Modifications to existing planting, walkways, and irrigation around Unit L (Family Pool) (landscape drawings produced by Bridgers, Troller, and Hazlett Landscape Architects, May 1976).
1979  Barbecue pits and picnic benches added to forested area northeast of amphitheater and northwest of existing pits and benches. (Drawings prepared by University of California Los Angeles Campus Architects, June 1979).

1979  Wood deck extension to southeast of the Unit N (Park Pool) and modification to surge tank plumbing (as-built drawings by John B. Ferguson & Associates Architects-Engineers, September 1979 and January 1980).


1982  Dry rot repair, including:
- Removal and replacement of wood decking at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) central stair tower landings.
- Repair of second-floor exterior wood decks/walkways surrounding Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) including removal of existing 2x3 wood laminated decking and replacement with new 3x6 tongue and groove treated planking. The new planking was covered with a deck coating.
- Construction of a new wood handicap ramp/elevated walkway connecting the second-floor exterior walkway to the north of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) to a paved drive to the northwest. The new ramp matched the detailing of the existing exterior walkways (Figure 37).
- Replacement of several 9x13 timber beams below the second-floor exterior walkway surrounding Unit B (Building A – Vista Room).
- Replacement of three 10x12 timber beams below the southeast and northwest walls of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room)
- Replacement of several planks and a one wood pole at the wood retaining walls northwest of Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office).

(Record drawings prepared by Al Whittle Associates, Inc., October 1982.)

1983-4  Unit N (Park Pool) plumbing, lighting, and equipment rehabilitation; including new starting platforms, dive towers, and handicap lift. The work required removal and replacement of the concrete pool apron (as-built drawings prepared by Rowley International Hydro, Solar, Filtration Engineering, dated June 1984).

1991  Locker room remodeling, including:
- Installation of a concrete ramp to the northwest of Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) creating an accessible path of travel to Unit L (Family Pool) and associated Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms).
Installation of a concrete handicap ramp to the northwest of Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) creating an accessible path of travel to the room.

Complete interior renovation of Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms).

Renovation of the northeast (front) facade of Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms). The cement plaster cladding was removed and replaced with vertical wood siding. Door openings were re-organized to provide disabled access and privacy screens were added to the northwest and southeast of the building (Figure 61 and Figure 62).

Figure 61. Portion of an original Smith and Williams’ section drawing (Sheet A-13, circa 1963-1964) showing the pool-facing elevation of Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms).

Figure 62. Wood cladding at northeast facade of Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) added in 1991 renovation. Camera facing southwest.

1999  Installation of modular Mesa Room building along the northern side of the Upper Level Plateau (Capital Programs and SCRC staff during 2023 walk).

2007  Construction to enclose Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) underneath the “hat” roof (construction drawings by UCLA Facilities Management, September 2007).

2015-17  Healthy Campus Initiative (HCI) garden installed between northwest side of Amphitheater and De Neve Drive (Capital Programs and SCRC staff during 2023 walk).

2018  The “hat” was removed from Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) after an arm collapsed (Historic Building Documentation, April 2018) (Figure 63 and Figure 64).

Figure 63. Circa 1965 at Upper Level with Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room), the original Unit L (Family Pool), and the “hat” roofs of Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) and Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station. Source: Smith and Williams Records, Architecture and Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum; University of California, Santa Barbara.

Figure 64. Altered but recognizable view in 2023 at Upper Level, with the “hat” at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) removed. Camera facing northeast.
2020 Construction of beach volleyball courts and removal of existing sycamore trees on southwest side of Amphitheater lawn (Capital Programs and SCRC staff during 2023 walk).

2020-21 Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) were found structurally deficient and removed from active service. They were then enclosed behind chain-link construction fencing. A multi-section modular building was installed on the Lower Level lawn for SCRC staff administration functions. A portable kiosk was installed between Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and the lawn to serve as new entry kiosk (Capital Programs and SCRC staff during 2023 walk).

2021-22 Removal of post-and-beam trellis between Unit G (Building E – Office Center) and the wood stair at the southwest end of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), as well as the “hat“ and pendant globe lights at Unit G (Building E – Office Center) (Capital Programs and SCRC staff during 2023 walk).

Unknown Construction of storage shed to the northeast of Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room).

Unknown Expansion of first-floor offices and storage areas in Unit B (Building A – Vista Room).

Unknown Exterior elevated walkways (Figure 65):
  - Installation of wood lattice at handrails.
  - Removal of 2x2 wood trellis atop the post-and-beam walkways surrounding Unit B (Building A – Vista Room).
  - Installation of wood bracket supports below beams.
  - Installation of ceiling-mount exterior lights.

Unknown Installation of exterior lights at elevated walkways.

Unknown Modification of entry on northeast facade of Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms), removing the vending equipment enclosure (1991 drawings show the original configuration).

Unknown Installation of temporary storage sheds southwest of Unit H (Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) against southwest perimeter of site.

Unknown Flashing added to top edge of select exposed beams throughout.
Unknown Painting of select deck and stair posts and rails throughout.

Unknown Removal of select pendant lights from Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station).

Unknown Conversion of the landscaped sitting area at the Lower Level open space into a passive lawn.

Figure 65. Comparison of the exterior elevated walkway on southeast side of the Vista Room at Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), circa 1966 (left) and in 2023 (right). Source: (Left) Smith and Williams Records, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara. Camera facing southwest.
6. EVALUATION

The following section concurrently examines the eligibility of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center for listing in the National Register and California Register:

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

- **Criterion B/2 (Persons):** Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

- **Criterion C/3 (Design/Construction):** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master or of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values.

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

EVALUATING HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Both the National Register and California Register define property types that are eligible for listing as buildings, structures, objects, sites, or districts. Historic districts are defined by the National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation as, “A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.”

The California Office of Historic Preservation provides a more extended definition,

> Historic districts are unified geographic entities which contain a concentration of historic buildings, structures, or sites united historically, culturally, or architecturally. Historic districts are defined by precise geographic boundaries. Therefore, districts with unusual boundaries require a description of what lies outside the area, in order to define the edge of the district and to explain the exclusion of adjoining areas. The district must meet at least one of the criteria for significance [...].

---

75 National Park Service, National Register Bulletin Number 15, 5.
Features in a historic district may be individually distinctive, or lack individual distinction if the grouping achieves significance as a whole within its historic context. However, the majority of the components should add or contribute to the district's historic character, and each component must possess integrity along with the district as a whole.

DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

The boundaries of a district typically encompass the area of land containing the significant concentration of buildings, sites, structures, or objects that convey a shared significant context. A district's significance and historic integrity should help determine the boundaries with consideration of visual barriers, visual changes, boundaries of a specific time, and clearly differentiated patterns of historic development.

The National Park Service's *National Register Bulletin 21: Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties* further lists integrity, setting and landscape features, use, and research potential as factors to consider when defining boundaries. Also factors to take into account when selecting boundaries include:

- Distribution of resources
- Current legal boundaries
- Historic boundaries
- Natural features
- Cultural features
- Cartographic features
- Reasonable limits

Ownership objections may affect the listing of entire properties, but not the identification of boundaries.

District Contributors and Non-Contributors

In addition, historic districts may have contributing and non-contributing buildings, sites, structures, objects, or open spaces. A contributor adds to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a property is significant because:

---

- It was present during the period of significance, relates to the documented significance of the property, and possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period; or
- It independently meets the California Register criteria.

A non-contributor does not add to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a property is significant because:

- It was not present during the period of significance or does not relate to the documented significance of the property;
- Due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period; or
- It does not independently meet the California Register criteria.

DISTRICT INTEGRITY
For a district to retain integrity, the majority of the components that make up the district’s historic character must possess integrity even if they are individually undistinguished. The relationships among the district’s components also must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance. Intrusions within a district may impact its integrity based on the relative number, size, scale, design, and location of the components. A district is not eligible if it contains so many alterations or new intrusions that it no longer conveys the sense of a historic environment.78

As SCRC is a concentration of buildings, structures, and sites that are united historically and architecturally, the following evaluation addresses it as a historic district. See Figure 3 for the historic extent of SCRC that is the focus of this evaluation. If eligible historic resources are found as a result of the evaluation, they are discussed later in this section.

Criterion A/1 (Events)
While SCRC is associated with a period of substantial growth at UCLA’s Westwood campus, namely the 1960s decade when approximately 50 projects were constructed, it does not appear to be individually significant within this context. In building SCRC, UCLA was following a precedent established by the earlier construction of the Strawberry Canyon Recreation Center in the hills above the Berkeley campus. The growth of UCLA’s campus in the 1960s followed the substantial post-World War II building boom at UCLA that shaped its campus beyond the initial 1920s buildings and main quadrangle. The 1960s construction was a mix of academic and non-academic facilities of

---

78 National Park Service, National Register Bulletin Number 15, 46.
varying sizes, scales, and Modern idioms that infilled the campus with more student amenities and expanded educational offerings.

SCRC attracted relatively little notice upon its opening in this period of expansion. It was one among many new additions that characterized UCLA in the 1960s, but does not rise to the level of individual significance to meet Criterion A/1 for listing in the National Register or California Register.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
No associations of SCRC with the lives of persons important in history were discovered. The facility was broadly used by all members of the campus population. For many years, the UCLA men's water polo team utilized the Olympic-sized Unit N (Park Pool) for practice and matches. During the 1984 Olympics, competing aquatics teams used the pool for training and practice. While the UCLA teams and Olympic athletes achieved many successes in water sports, no individual or groups of individuals have been singled out for particular significance at this site. The subject property does not meet Criterion B/2 for listing in the National Register or California Register.

Criterion C/3 (Design/Construction)
SCRC, or a part of it, does appear to meet Criterion C/3 as representing a significant work by Smith and Williams, a firm recognized as one of the leaders of a variant of regional post-World War II modernism referred to as post-and-beam architecture. SCRC, in particular its core recreation buildings, is a culmination of the firm's signature aesthetic and design approach in a single mature work, most notably in its post-and-beam design with Japanese influences, seamlessly interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences, and inventive navigation of the difficult topography through integrated built elements.

Smith and Williams approached architecture and planning as problem-solving, with the conviction that the client's expectations for how the space would be used and the site itself should dictate the design. SCRC embodies this approach, with the multi-level placement of the buildings, pavilions, and associated pools and seating areas, efficiently responding to the contours of the land and slope. The University requested an informal setting that would encourage unplanned person-to-person interactions. Smith and Williams responded by letting the human dimension guide the scale of the buildings, and by providing a multitude of nooks and crannies, patios, and non-specific rooms where these exchanges could occur. A component of this approach was an avoidance of what the architects characterized as facadism, feeling there was no one important side to a building. Each building's exterior and interior wall material matched to further blur the lines between interior and exterior spaces. Multisided design elements, such as the hexagonal module and the use of
materials, primarily wood, were repeated in both the buildings and landscape to further reinforce the multiple levels of spatial interaction.

Smith and Williams were widely considered masters of the post-and-beam style and exemplars of the “Pasadena-USC School” that borrowed Japanese design principles and translated them for use in a modern Western setting. Their work has been characterized as simple, direct, and clear, elegantly utilizing a simple palette of materials to express structure and frame space. Although post-and-beam design is most closely associated with residential buildings, Smith and Williams expanded the application to commercial, civic, and recreational commissions over the course of their careers. Their style of post-and-beam construction often exaggerated elements, dramatically projecting beams and extending eaves, and using these vertical and horizontal elements to create rhythmic patterns of light and shade, solid and void within the structure. The firm explored roof and overhead trellis forms as a technique for uniting spaces under a single visually lightweight element. The imagery of the Japanese temple in a garden permeated their commissions from the earliest houses. These aesthetic signatures are all present at SCRC's core recreation buildings, anchored by Unit B (Building A – Vista Room).

The firm was known for the integration of landscape and buildings, for placing pavilions or buildings within a green space and connecting them with exterior walkways and decks, as expressed at SCRC's core recreation buildings. Circulation between buildings was almost entirely accomplished via exterior walkways, stair towers, and decks, with the main circulation through the site occurring at the central cascading stairs. Using wood as the primary building material in juxtaposition with the stair's concrete steps – at the cribbing that conceals concrete retaining walls, at the visible post-and-beam structures, at the “hats” and trellis – blends the natural and built worlds.

The organization of the buildings around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) as the vertical spine of the complex, distills this integration into a concentrated area that conveys a feeling of a tree house under the unifying “hat.” The occasional masonry features, such as the curved base of Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) and the board-formed concrete base of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), stand out as focal points. SCRC's site planning and integration of landscape elements reflects a collaboration with landscape architects Cornell, Bridges, and Troller that is a hallmark of the Smith and Williams firm, which historically worked with planners and landscape architects to create holistic environments. This is most evidenced by their years-long affiliation with Community Facilities Planners, landscape architect Garret Eckbo, and planner Simon Eisner.

Records of the Smith and Williams firm encompass over 850 commissions spanning approximately 33 years. The first exhibit devoted entirely to the firm's output was mounted in 2013 at the Art,
Design & Architecture Museum at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The physical exhibit was distilled into a continuing online exhibition, featuring just twelve of the firm’s projects; SCRC was one of the profiled projects. A scholarly monograph on Smith and Williams, published in 2014, also featured SCRC as an example indicating the importance of this project in understanding the Smith and Williams contribution to modern architecture in southern California.

SCRC as initially planned and designed by Smith and Williams with the core recreation buildings and swimming pools is a notable demonstration of the Smith and Williams architectural oeuvre in the post-and-beam genre, as well as evidence of their ability for complex yet cohesive site planning, integration of indoor and outdoor spaces, and careful attention to detail. This includes the accessory buildings associated with the swimming pools with the hexagonal shapes of Unit A (Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms) and Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Rooms) that recall the hexagonal motif and paving pattern at the Lower Level, and Unit N's (Park Pool) curved corners reminiscent of the same detail at the upper room of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room).

While outdoor recreational facilities were part of the original vision for SCRC, the sitting area at the Lower Level (later altered into a grassy area) and the amphitheater, expansive lawn, and wooded areas (also altered) at the Upper Level came slightly later as part of a different project led by landscape architects Cornell, Bridgers & Troller rather than Smith and Williams.

As such, it is the complex of core recreation buildings and swimming pools at SCRC as designed by Smith and Williams as the Executive Architect for the “Canyon Recreation Center” project circa 1963-1964 (Figure 53) that meets the criteria for listing in the National Register and California Register under Criterion C/3 as a significant representation of the work of important creative individuals. However, the loss of several significant features and incompatible repairs, alterations and deferred maintenance have compromised its integrity of design and feeling to the extent that the Historic District no longer has sufficient integrity for National Register listing. See the Integrity section below for a more detailed discussion.

Nonetheless, the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District retains sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing in the California Register, with its period of significance as 1966 when SCRC first opened. See the Eligible Historic District section for district contributors, non-contributors, and boundaries.
Criterion D/4 (Information Potential)

The “potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of California” typically relates to archeological resources, rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 (Information Potential) does relate to built resources, it is relevant for cases when the building itself is the principal source of important construction-related information. Evaluation under Criterion D/4 is not applicable here.

Integrity

Since the eligible Historic District at SCRC meeting Criterion C/3 is considered the historic resource, the integrity discussion focuses primarily on this complex, with the discussion of SCRC as a whole or other site features in select aspects as appropriate. See Section 2, Regulatory Settings, for definitions of the seven aspects of integrity and the difference how the National Register and California Register define integrity.

LOCATION

SCRC has not been moved from its original location at the northwestern area of the UCLA Westwood campus. The contributors within the eligible Historic District at SCRC also have not been moved from their original locations along a northeast-southwest axis through the middle of the site straddling the Lower, Middle, and Upper Levels. The eligible Historic District has integrity of location.

SETTING

The setting at SCRC retains the qualities of isolation and rusticity that it had when originally completed and has only been reinforced with the maturation of the trees planted at the SCRC opening in 1966. It continues to inhabit a rolling open topography with a distinct site organization. The several alterations and additions to the site, such as the conversion of the sitting area at the Lower Level into a passive lawn area (undated) and then the placement of the modular administration building and entry kiosk (2019/2020), additional barbeque pits and picnic benches in the wooded hillside at the Upper Level (1979) and installation of beach volleyball courts (2020), conversion of the area behind the amphitheater seating into student gardens (2015-2017), and modifications to the Upper Level Plateau for the obstacle course (undated), generally maintain the original sense of spaciousness and the site's use as a recreation center.

For the eligible Historic District, the surrounding setting has not changed substantially. No significant buildings have been added adjacent to or within the eligible district to alter its setting. The installation of protective fencing following the closure and vacation of Unit (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) in 2020-
2021 diminishes the setting somewhat by erecting barriers that interrupt the original openness and multi-point access of the buildings. However, such fencing is considered temporary and does not significantly alter the setting around the eligible Historic District enough to affect its integrity in a permanent manner.

DESIGN
The design of the eligible Historic District and its contributors has been compromised by alterations and deterioration over time. The progressive loss of wood elements — notably the top trellis section above the exterior walkway at Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), the trellis structure at the Middle Level connecting the Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) and Unit G (Building E – Office Center), and two of the three “hat” roofs — have had the most impact on the Smith and Williams design. The additive elements — lattice panels at the originally more open walkway and stair tower railings, structural bracing at the first floor of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), the mechanical screen at the roof of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), flashing added to the top edge of exposed beams, and the security fencing — further compromise the clarity of the Smith and Williams design.

However, the eligible Historic District continues to convey the planning and design intent of Smith and Williams through post-and-beam architecture with Japanese influences, interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences, and inventive navigation of a challenging site through the use of built elements. The post-and-beam structural system is still clearly visible at Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and the remaining “hat” roof at Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station). The indoor-outdoor experiences still remain when moving through the complex (to the extent access is still available), from exterior walkways to the seating areas at the lower level of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), around Unit G (Building E – Office Center), and at the edge of the Upper Level adjacent to Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station). The connection of the Lower Level to Upper Level via the Middle Level continues to reflect the firm’s site planning and organization skills, with the Middle Level as a horizontal spine and the Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) stair tower as a vertical spine. The loss of the “hat” roofs over Unit G (Building E – Office Center) and Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) and the trellis structure at the Middle Level diminishes the blending of natural and built elements along these circulation spines, but the central cascading stairs and the vertical space around the Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) remain distinctive expressions of Smith and Williams’ work.

On balance, the loss of wood elements and addition of non-compatible alterations have compromised the Smith and Williams design. However, the eligible Historic District at SCRC retains enough of its historic character and appearance to be recognizable as a mature, complete work of Smith and Williams despite the alterations.
MATERIALS
Smith and Williams completed the eligible Historic District with a limited materials palette. Wood is the dominant material that is used in various ways and finishes for the post-and-beam structural systems, cribbing at retaining walls, exterior walkway railings, exterior cabin lining cladding, the “hat” roofs, trellises, and others. Concrete is the secondary, contrasting material, seen in board formed finishes for retaining walls, the base of Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room), and the exterior of Unit P (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room). Concrete is also the paving materials at the central cascading stairs and Middle Level landing. Additional materials in the built elements include the use of plaster or stucco for building exteriors, such as at Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room) and the Middle Level curved base for Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station as well as the use of brick to outline the hexagonal pattern paving at the Lower Level.).

These materials are still present throughout the eligible district. In some areas, deterioration and loss of wood material due to age, environmental damage, and lack of maintenance have occurred. Some wood members have been replaced, typically in-kind. However, others have been removed and not replaced, most notably two of the three wood “hats,” the trellis structure at the Middle Level connecting the Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) and Unit G (Building E – Office Center), and the top trellis section above the exterior walkway at Unit B (Building A – Vista Room).

The loss of these wood elements somewhat impacts the material integrity of the eligible Historic District, but not to the extent where integrity of materials is lost. Wood remains a primary material throughout, particularly at the post-and-beam structures, the cribbing at retaining walls, the exterior cladding materials, and the remaining “hat” roof. The concrete elements remain in place with little material loss. Overall, the eligible Historic District has integrity of materials.

WORKMANSHIP
Smith and Williams were known for their attention to craftsmanship and for using materials with a direct and simple respect for their character and function. At the eligible Historic District, the firm exposed bolted post-and-beam timber connections, accentuated the concrete construction process with board-formed surfaces, suggested that building walls were material panels by applying the same cladding material to both interior and exterior room surfaces, and integrated circulation within the site with a flowing network of wood walkways and concrete block pathways. These elements remain to reflect the workmanship in assembly and construction. The eligible Historic District retains integrity of workmanship.
FEELING
The modifications to the setting, design, and materials have similarly impacted the feeling of the eligible Historic District, but also not to the extent where the integrity of feeling has been lost. Some of the openness and free flowing of spaces with access from multiple sides has been hampered by the security fencing. The entirety of Smith and Williams’ design is not as clear with the loss of features, alterations over time, and continued deterioration of materials. The treehouse-like effect around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) has been diminished with the loss of its “hat” roof and the addition of the lattice panels at the stair railings. However, enough elements remain that the eligible Historic District continues to feel like a mature, complete work of Smith and Williams from the 1960s. Though diminished, the eligible Historic District retains sufficient integrity of feeling.

ASSOCIATION
Some of the core recreation buildings have lost their association with recreational uses, as they have been deemed structurally unsound and closed. However, as SCRC as a whole continues to be associated with university recreational activities and the eligible Historic District remains as part of the site, its integrity of association also remains.

INTEGRITY SUMMARY
The eligible Historic District has experienced some material deterioration and the removal of several significant features as well as incompatible repairs, alterations and deferred maintenance that have affected its integrity of design and feeling. However, the original spatial relationships, the post-and-beam design, layout of the buildings across the three levels, interweaving of indoor and outdoor experience in the exterior walkways, landscape elements, benches, paving, and cascading staircase remain to convey the original vision of the architects. Most materials and finishes are also original.

As discussed in Section 2, Regulatory Setting, it is possible that resources may not retain sufficient integrity for listing in the National Register but may still be eligible for the California Register. In this case, the eligible Historic District at SCRC retains sufficient integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to be recognizable and convey its significance as a mature work of Smith and Williams for the California Register. If the eligible Historic District were returned to an earlier appearance, including rebuilding the missing the “hat” roofs and replacing the non-original latticework with a more compatible railing solution, then the eligible Historic District would also retain sufficient integrity for listing in the National Register.
ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

The eligible Historic District is the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District that includes the core recreation buildings and swimming pools designed by Smith and Williams in the “Canyon Recreation Center” drawing set circa 1963-1964. The district boundary excludes the Lower Level sitting area (turned grass area at an unknown date and later developed with a modular building) and the Upper Level’s expansive lawn, amphitheater, and wooded barbeque area, as these were more fully designed in the 1965 “West Campus Utilities & Site Development” project spearheaded by landscape architect Cornell, Bridges & Troller and were still under construction when SCRC opened in 1966. The Upper Level Plateau was developed even later and is not within the district boundary. Areas that have been significantly altered, such as the circular driveway and concrete paths that replaced a plaza with hexagonal paving at the main entrance, are also excluded.

The following map and table outline the eligible district’s boundary as well as contributors and non-contributors (Figure 66 and Table 3).

![Map of the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreational Center Historic District (eligible Historic District), with proposed Project site outlined. Base map source: UCLA Capital Programs.](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1963 Designation</th>
<th>UCLA Building Name 2023</th>
<th>Site Level</th>
<th>District Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B*</td>
<td>Building A – Vista Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit C*</td>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit D*</td>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit E*</td>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit F*</td>
<td>Building D – Look Out/Lifeguard Station</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor (excluding enclosure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit G*</td>
<td>Building E – Office Center</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit H</td>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit L/M</td>
<td>Family Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit N</td>
<td>Park Pool</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit P</td>
<td>Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Diving Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes core recreation building.
Character-Defining Features

For a property to be eligible for national or state designation under criteria related to type, period, or method of construction, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. These distinctive character-defining features are the physical traits that commonly recur in property types and/or architectural styles. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics to be considered a true representative of a particular type, period, or method of construction, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The character-defining features for eligible Historic District at SCRC, and the individual contributing components, are listed below.

UNIFYING LANDSCAPE AND SITE ELEMENTS
- Location at the middle of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center site
- Orientation as a northeast-southwest axis bridging three levels
- Hexagonal motif and pattern at ground plane (building and retaining wall footprints)
- Layout and spatial relationships between the various buildings, structures, and circulation elements across three levels
  - Organization of the three units (Units B, C, and D) around the vertical spine at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
  - Organization along the horizontal spine at the Middle Level
- Indoor-outdoor nature of the complex
- Cascading stairs at the center of the complex accessing the levels
  - Two trapezoidal sets of cascading concrete stairs offset at the Middle Level
  - Angled steps with jagged ends at each step for plantings
- Wood cribbing and concrete retaining walls
- Wood slat benches
- Exterior globe pendant lights
- Brick and concrete paving in hexagonal pattern and hexagonal planters at Lower Level between Unit N (Park Pool), Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room)

UNIT B (BUILDING A – VISTA ROOM)
- Anchor location as the primary entrance to Sunset Canyon Recreation Center and one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Core recreation building.
- Two-story massing
- Flat roof, rectilinear form
- Post-and-beam structure at both stories wrapping building with exterior wood walkways
  - Excludes walkway decking, which has been altered
- Recessed first floor below exterior wood walkways
- Set-back second floor surrounded by the exterior wood walkways and extended roof beams
- Vertically oriented cabin lining exterior cladding, also used on the interior to continue the indoor-outdoor blending
- Redwood plywood cladding
- Glazed sliding doors and walls at the second floor
- Stained glass at the second-floor Vista Room

UNIT C (BUILDING C – SANTA FE ROOM)
- Location as one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Core recreation building
- One-story room atop a post-and-beam structure sitting on a concrete base
  - Board formed finish and openings at the concrete base
- Exterior wood walkway surrounding the one-story room, which does not connect at the southeast side (excludes decking, which has been altered)
- Post-and-beam wood stair with wood railing at the southwest end connecting to the Middle Level
- One-story room:
  - Flat roof with curved exterior walls extending to form a low parapet
  - Rectilinear form with round corners
  - Symmetrical arrangement about a northwest-southeast axis running through the access doors and the jalousie window on the southeast facade
  - Cabin lining exterior cladding, also used on the interior to continue the indoor-outdoor blending
- Seating area below one-story room:
  - Framed views to the Unit N (Park Pool) through board-form concrete foundation wall and post-and-beam structure above
  - Concrete walls
  - Wood slat benches
  - Broad concrete steps
UNIT D (BUILDING A1 – BUENOS AIRES ROOM)

- Location as one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Core recreation building
- One-story room atop a masonry base built into the hillside
- Octagonal floor plan overlain with rectangular, flat, concrete roof
  - Corners of the roof extending beyond the angled walls at four corners as triangular canopies
- Skylights at the northeast, southwest, and northwest sides
- Rough texture (Spanish texture), heavy dash stucco exterior that is also the finish for the base and interior of the room
- One-story room:
  - Entrances at all four corner angled walls
  - Fixed window wall system with glazed transoms at the southeast wall by Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Interior fireplace with colored concrete hearth, board-form concrete mantle, and clerestory windows below the northwest skylight

UNIT E (BUILDING A2 – STAIR TOWER/RESTROOM/OFFICE)

- Core recreation building
- Multi-level, vertical massing
- Hexagonal forms at the ground level
- Spatial relationship with the three core recreation buildings (Units B, C, and D)
- Post-and-beam detailing of the structural frame
- Open wood stairway wrapping around a central almost square core
- Exterior plywood board-and-batten cladding at the central core
- Metal pipe and wood railing at the exterior stairway (excludes lattice paneling at railing)
- Open-tread steps
- Concrete angled steps at Lower Level with jagged ends for plantings

UNIT F (BUILDING D – LOOKOUT/LIFEGUARD STATION)

- Core recreation structure
- Wood open shade structure (referred to as a “hat” in original drawings)
  - Extended rafter tails with decorative ends
  - Detailing of “hat” and post and beam frame below
- Curved base/retaining wall with sand-finish exterior plaster
- Hanging globe lights
UNIT G (BUILDING E – OFFICE CENTER)
- Location at Middle Level
- Core recreation building
- One-story, flat-roof building with curved corners
- Cabin lining clad walls to the southwest, southeast, and northwest
- Surrounding hexagonal pad with built-in wood benches and wood railing

UNIT H (BUILDING G – FAMILY POOL RESTROOMS)
- Location at the Upper Level
- One-story building with flat roof
- Rectangular footprint
- Sand-finish exterior plaster walls with rounded corners
- Open entry portal centered on northeast façade

UNIT N (PARK POOL)
- Location at the Lower Level
- Approximately L-shape and footprint of the pool, with an angled corner

UNIT P (BUILDING H.1 – PARK POOL MECHANICAL ROOM)
- One-story building
- Hexagonal footprint
- Board-formed concrete exterior walls
- Clock face at northeast façade
7. ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS

This section analyzes the project-specific impacts of the proposed Project at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center on the environment, as required by CEQA.

THRESHOLD FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

According to the CEQA Guidelines, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.”

Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.”

The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register or a local register of historical resources.

Thus, a project may cause a substantial change in a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less-than-significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

Projects that comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (the SOI Standards) benefit from a regulatory presumption that they would have a less-than-significant adverse impact on a historic resource. In addition, projects that retain a historic resource's eligibility for listing are considered not to have a significant impact on historic resources.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (Project) is within the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center site (Figure 67). It involves the demolition of the existing seismically deficient, substantially damaged/deteriorated, and non-ADA compliant structures, as well as the removal of improvements that are physically, structurally, or programmatically dependent upon the deficient structures, as summarized below (Figure 68). These buildings would be replaced with a

---

70 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).
80 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).
81 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
82 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(3). Project that meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer are also considered mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource.
single building offering similar functionality, including three multi-purpose rooms, with a moderately increased floor area and a smaller overall building footprint (Figure 69).
Figure 68. Proposed demolition site plan within the Project site (dashed line) from the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Replacement Project Initial Study, July 2023 (Figure 18: Surface Demolition Plan). Building names added by Page & Turnbull.
The buildings to be removed include:

- Unit B (Building A – Vista Room)—UC Seismic Performance rating VII (unsafe and access-restricted); red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020.
- Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room)—UC Seismic Performance rating VII (unsafe and access-restricted); red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020.
- Unit D (Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room)—UC Seismic Performance rating IV (compliant); non-compliant ADA access due to entry stairs and lack of accessible connectivity to the other buildings.
- Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)—UC Seismic Performance rating VI (priority for improvement); red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020.
- Unit F (Building D – Lookout /Lifeguard Station)—UC Seismic Performance rating VI (priority for improvement).
- Unit G (Building E – Office Center)—UC Seismic Performance rating VI (priority for improvement); vacated in 2021 due to water intrusion and mold.
A shed building outside the eligible Historic District's boundaries but within the Project site boundaries will also be demolished.

The proposed program includes flexible, student-oriented multi-purpose spaces on two stories plus a rooftop deck. Similar to the existing facility, the new building will nestle into the hillside and create strong connections between indoor and outdoor spaces, with terraces and outdoor amenity areas, to capitalize on the surrounding natural setting (Figure 70). The new building will be fully ADA-compliant and will provide new ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels of SCRC with the provision of an elevator.

Figure 70. Rendering of the conceptual plan for the proposed Project at SCRC. Source: Safdie Rabines Architects (05-08-2023) from Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project Initial Study, July 2023.
More specifically, the proposed approximately 11,500 gsf building will include three multi-purpose rooms plus a teaching kitchen and a rooftop deck. These rooms will feature expansive floor-to-ceiling windows that could slide open to the surrounding terraces and decks, creating a seamless transition between the indoor and outdoor spaces. Exterior covered, unenclosed space will be provided similar to existing conditions, in addition to uncovered terrace areas. Also included are staff offices with a small conference room, gender inclusive restrooms and a family restroom, a lactation room, storage areas, custodial/mechanical space, a telecommunications/IT room, an ADA-accessible elevator, and circulation areas. A total of approximately 6,500 gsf of exterior covered, unenclosed space would be provided, including a reception area between the two ground floor multi-purpose rooms and approximately 4,000 gsf on the roof covered with a canopy of photovoltaic panels. The rooftop deck would include a small storage room and a bar area to support gatherings.

The proposed landscape plan will build upon the existing landscape at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center to maintain a wooded and natural setting. Landscaped areas will be located around the perimeter of the new building and will include trees, shrubs and ground cover, as well as bench seating, thus creating a series of intimate gathering areas. The proposed hex pavers represent a modern, modular variation on the existing hexagonal brick floor pattern (Figure 71). The slope between the lower and upper pools will also feature terraced landscaping to reference the existing setting. Proposed vegetation would include native and/or drought-tolerant species.

Figure 71. Rendering of the proposed Project at SCRC. Source: Safdie Rabines Architects (05-08-2023) from Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project Initial Study, July 2023.
Overall, the proposed design takes cues from the Smith and Williams design, particularly in its integration of indoor and outdoor spaces, use of natural materials and overhead trellises, preservation of the surrounding park atmosphere and natural areas, and use of modular hex pavers as a modern variation on the existing hexagonal brick paving pattern.

Direct Impacts
The proposed project involves demolition of six of the ten contributors in the eligible Canyon Recreation Center Historic District. This includes Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), which is the largest building and anchors the district as the main entrance to SCRC. It also includes Unit E (Building A.2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) that serves as the vertical circulation and organizational spine for the eligible district, as well as the other buildings around Unit E: Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room) and Unit D (Building A.1 – Buenos Aires Room), in addition to Unit B (Building A – Vista Room). The last remaining “hat” roof structure at Unit F (Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station) would also be demolished, along with the altered but still contributing Unit G (Building E – Office Center). Some of the associated landscape and site elements, including the cascading stairs, portions of the original hexagonal motif, and wood cribbing at the retaining walls, would also be removed. The demolition of these original built, landscape, and site elements, especially the loss of Unit B (Building A – Vista Room), would result in the eligible Historic District no longer recognizable or able to convey its significance as the work of Smith and Williams. The remaining contributors to the eligible Historic District – the Park Pool (Unit N), two swimming pool support buildings, and aspects of the unifying landscape and site elements – are not sufficient on their own to represent the work of Smith and Williams as important creative individuals. As such, loss of the California Register-eligible Historic District would cause a significant adverse impact to historic resources under CEQA.

Indirect Impacts
Based on the CEQA Guidelines, a proposed project can have a significant adverse impact if it changes the immediate surroundings of a historic resource so that the significance of the resource is “materially impaired.” A historic resource’s significance is materially impaired when it can no longer convey its significance that justifies its eligibility as a historic resource; in other words, when it has lost its integrity (discussed in 6. Evaluation above).

The remainder of SCRC located outside the boundaries of the eligible Historic District is not considered historic. No other historic resources are located in the immediately surrounding area. As such, the proposed Project will not change the immediate surroundings of any other historic resource, and therefore, will not result in indirect impacts.
Cumulative Impacts

The CEQA Guidelines define cumulative impacts as follows:

“Cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.\(^\text{83}\)

The analysis should determine the impact of the related projects and consider the cumulative impacts of the proposed and related projects as they relate to the population of resources that would remain. No other eligible historic resources are in the immediate vicinity of SCRC. While eligible historic resources are located in the Bel Air neighborhood to the north of SCRC, those are mostly residential properties designed by various architects that are not similar resource types to the eligible Historic District. As such, the focus of the cumulative impact discussion is on the population of resources that would remain, which in this case, are those that are representative of the work of Smith and Williams.

As discussed in the evaluation section, the Smith and Williams firm had over 850 commissions spanning 33 years. Many of their projects, which were primarily located in Southern California and particularly in the Pasadena area, remain. Several are listed in local, state, or national historic registers, or have been identified as eligible for such listing, which would require additional review should they be proposed for demolition or major alterations. For example, the Tea House at Descanso Gardens is a contributor in a National Register-listed resource and the Robert Crowell House in Pasadena has been identified as eligible for listing in the National Register. No other Smith and Williams example that is significant as representing their work as important creative individuals is known to be proposed for demolition at this time. Research has not uncovered any of their recreational projects or works with similar post-and-beam designs with Japanese influences as proposed for demolition. As such, the demolition of the core recreation buildings at SCRC that constitute the eligible Historic District would not result in cumulative impacts.

\(^{83}\) CEQA Guidelines, Article 20, subsection 15355.
8. PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Historic resource mitigations are typically developed on a case-by-case basis, providing the opportunity to tailor them to the characteristics and the significance of an affected resource and the impacts to it. Common mitigation measures for demolition consist of documentation of the resource, typically to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), preparation of a salvage plan for significant architectural features and materials, and a commemorative plaque or an interpretive display. While in some instances these mitigation measures are judged to reduce the level of adverse impacts to a less than significant level, they often do not sufficiently reduce the loss of community character and collective history. Section 15126.4(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines is clear in this regard: “In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by way of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur.”

With the exception of an interpretive program, the following mitigation measures are recommended in advance of the proposed demolition at SCRC. However, even with the implementation of these mitigation measures, the Project’s adverse impacts to historic resources will not be mitigated to a less than significant level.

HISTORIC BUILDING DOCUMENTATION

Much of the eligible Historic District and its siting within the context of SCRC was previously photo-documented according to the guidelines of the HABS program in 2018 following the partial collapse of the “hat” at the Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office) and the “hat’s” subsequent removal. Typically, a written description and narrative report following the most recent HABS Guidelines for Historical Reports, Outline Format, would also be recommended. However, much of the information contained within this Historic Resource Technical Report includes the same information. As such, the recommendation to complete the historic building documentation is to submit this report to UCLA Library Special Collections to accompany the prior photo-documentation. Following coordination with UCLA Library Special Collections, the report shall be submitted in their preferred format (e.g., printed on archival paper, in digital format, etc.). The drawing sets associated with Sunset Canyon Recreation Center in the possession of UCLA Capital Programs from circa 1963 through 2023 shall also be organized by project and date, and submitted digitally to UCLA Library Special Collections in an archival format.
SALVAGE PROGRAM

Salvage allows for the removal of individual architectural elements for potential reuse. Salvage has the added benefit of landfill and waste diversion. Salvaged elements could be reused at the Project site, incorporated into an interpretive display, donated to a local historical society or other owners of Smith and Williams works, and/or be given to an architectural salvage company. Examples of architectural salvage companies in Los Angeles County include Pasadena Architectural Salvage and Eric’s Architectural Salvage.

Prior to the start of demolition, the Project sponsor shall create a salvage plan identifying elements and materials that can be saved and re-used. The plan shall be developed with the assistance of a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the pendant globe light fixtures, including any intact fixtures previously removed and preserved at the site, shall be salvaged and considered for re-use in the proposed Project or offered to interested parties.

INTERPRETIVE PROGRAM

To commemorate the eligible Historic District as a work of Smith and Williams, a publicly accessible interpretive program shall be developed. The public in this case shall be the users of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. The interpretive program shall include descriptions of the architectural design, site planning, and integration of exterior and interior elements as well as the architects Smith and Williams.

Creative solutions regarding the medium and format of the interpretive program are encouraged, but all interpretive materials shall be displayed in a manner that is accessible to the public and appropriate within the context of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. Examples include an exhibit at the UCLA Library Special Collections, a video documentary, an online website, or an on-site display at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center. Interpretive media shall include both text and graphics, which may include historic photographs, maps, architectural drawings, or other imagery. The text shall be sufficient to convey the significance of the core recreational buildings as the work of Smith and Williams.

The interpretative program shall be developed with the assistance of a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. It shall be completed and available to the public prior to or upon completion of the proposed Project.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This Preservation Alternatives Analysis Report has been prepared at the request of UCLA Capital Programs to analyze alternatives that “avoid or substantially lessen” significant adverse effects to historic resources associated with the Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (Project). The Project site, as defined in the Project's Initial Study, includes the proposed new building site, the associated area that would be improved with new landscape and hardscape, and the immediate surrounding area that would be distributed during demolition and construction.\(^1\) Overlapping with the Project site is the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District (eligible Historic District) (Figure 1). Several contributors within the eligible Historic District would be demolished with implementation of the proposed Project, which would result in a significant adverse effect to historic resources under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This report was produced to provide UCLA Capital Programs with information to inform the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report being prepared pursuant to CEQA for the proposed Project. The first sections of this report summarize the eligible Historic District's significance and character-defining features and describe the proposed Project. The report then describes five alternatives and analyzes impacts on the eligible Historic District.

Page & Turnbull primarily referred to the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic Resource Technical Report (HRTR) prepared in 2023 to summarize the eligible Historic District's significance and character-defining features, as well as the proposed Project description. Project Alternative descriptions were provided by UCLA Capital Programs in consultation with Page & Turnbull.

This document primarily uses the 2023 UCLA Building Names to refer to the buildings and structures, except in the Summary of Significance where the table, map, and character-defining features are from the HRTR that uses the historic 1963 designations. The proposed Project table lists the 2023 UCLA Building Names with the 1963 designation second for reference.

\(^1\) University of California, *Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Replacement Project Initial Study*, July 2023, p. 7.
2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The 2023 HRTR determined that a portion of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) based on having sufficient integrity to be recognizable and convey its significance as a mature work of Smith and Williams as important creative individuals.

The eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District is a culmination of the firm's signature aesthetic and design approach in a single mature work, most notably in its post-and-beam design with Japanese influences, seamless interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences, and inventive navigation of the difficult site topography through integrated built elements. The period of significance is 1966 when the recreation center first opened.

Eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District

The eligible Historic District is roughly the area that corresponds to the extent of the original development designed by Smith and Williams as the “Canyon Recreation Center” project from circa 1963-1964, located generally in the middle of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center and across three topographic levels. The eligible Historic District includes ten contributors comprised of six core recreation buildings and structures, the main swimming pool at the Lower Level, two swimming pool support buildings, and the overall unifying landscape and site elements. The four non-contributors are the Family Pool (Unit L/M in the original drawings) and Diving Pool (not in original drawings) at the Upper Level, the Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms (Unit A in the original drawings) at the Lower Level, and an electrical vault that is not visible. Figure 1 and Table 1 outline the eligible Historic District's contributors and non-contributors.
Figure 1. Map of the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreational Center Historic District (eligible Historic District) with Project site overlaid. Base Map Source: UCLA Capital Programs.
Table 1. Contributors and Non-Contributors in the Eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1963 Designation</th>
<th>UCLA Building Name 2023</th>
<th>Site Level</th>
<th>District Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B*</td>
<td>Building A – Vista Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit C*</td>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit D*</td>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit E*</td>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office</td>
<td>Lower/Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit F*</td>
<td>Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor (excluding enclosure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit G*</td>
<td>Building E – Office Center</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit H</td>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit L/M</td>
<td>Family Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit N</td>
<td>Park Pool</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit P</td>
<td>Building H.1– Park Pool Mechanical Room</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements within boundaries</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Diving Pool</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes core recreation building.
Character-Defining Features

For a property to be eligible for national or state designation under criteria related to type, period, or method of construction, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. These distinctive character-defining features are the physical traits that commonly recur in property types and/or architectural styles. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics to be considered a true representative of a particular type, period, or method of construction, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The character-defining features for the eligible Historic District at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center and the individual contributing components are listed below.

UNIFYING LANDSCAPE AND SITE ELEMENTS

- Location generally at the middle of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center site
- Orientation as a northeast-southwest axis spanning three topographic levels
- Hexagonal motif and pattern at ground plane (building and retaining wall footprints)
- Layout and spatial relationships between the various buildings, structures, and circulation elements across three levels
  - Organization of the three main buildings (Units B, C, and D) around the vertical spine at Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
  - Organization along the horizontal spine at the Middle Level
- Indoor-outdoor nature of the complex
- Cascading stairs at the center of the complex accessing the three levels
  - Two trapezoidal sets of cascading concrete stairs offset at the Middle Level
  - Angled steps with jagged ends at each step for plantings
- Wood cribbing and concrete retaining walls
- Wood slat benches
- Exterior globe pendant lights
- Brick and concrete paving in hexagonal pattern and hexagonal planters at Lower Level between Unit N (Park Pool), Unit B (Building A – Vista Room) and Unit C (Building C – Santa Fe Room)

UNIT B (BUILDING A – VISTA ROOM)

- Anchor location as the primary entrance to Sunset Canyon Recreation Center and one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Core recreation building
- Two-story massing
▪ Flat roof, rectilinear form
▪ Post-and-beam structure at both stories wrapping building with exterior wood walkways; excludes walkway decking, which has been altered
▪ Recessed first floor below exterior wood walkways
▪ Set-back second floor surrounded by the exterior wood walkways and extended roof beams
▪ Vertically oriented cabin lining exterior cladding, also used on the interior to continue the indoor-outdoor blending
▪ Redwood plywood cladding
▪ Glazed sliding doors and walls at the second floor
▪ Stained glass at the second-floor Vista Room

UNIT C (BUILDING C – SANTA FE ROOM)
▪ Location as one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
▪ Core recreation building
▪ One-story room atop a post-and-beam structure sitting on a concrete base
  o Board formed finish and openings at the concrete base
▪ Exterior wood walkway surrounding the one-story room, which does not connect at the southeast side (excludes decking, which has been altered)
▪ Post-and-beam wood stair with wood railing at the southwest end connecting to the Middle Level.
▪ One-story room:
  o Flat roof with curved exterior walls extending to form a low parapet
  o Rectilinear form with round corners
  o Symmetrical arrangement about a northwest-southeast axis running through the access doors and the jalousie window on the southeast facade
  o Cabin lining exterior cladding, also used on the interior to continue the indoor-outdoor blending
▪ Seating area below one-story room:
  o Framed views to the Unit N (Park Pool) through board-form concrete foundation wall and post-and-beam structure above
  o Concrete walls
  o Wood slat benches
  o Broad concrete steps
UNIT D (BUILDING A1 – BUENOS AIRES ROOM)
- Location as one of three units around Unit E (Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Core recreation building
- One-story room atop a masonry base built into the hillside
- Octagonal floor plan overlain with rectangular, flat, concrete roof
  - Corners of the roof extending beyond the angled walls at four corners as triangular canopies
- Skylights at the northeast, southwest, and northwest sides
- Rough texture (Spanish texture), heavy dash stucco exterior that is also the finish for the base and interior of the room
- One-story room:
  - Entrances at all four corner angled walls
  - Fixed window wall system with glazed transoms at the southeast wall by Unit E (Building A2 – Star Tower/Restroom/Office)
- Interior fireplace with colored concrete hearth, board-form concrete mantle, and clerestory windows below the northwest skylight

UNIT E (BUILDING A2 – STAIR TOWER/RESTROOM/OFFICE)
- Core recreation building
- Multi-level, vertical massing
- Hexagonal forms at the ground level
- Spatial relationship with the three core recreation buildings (Units B, C, and D)
- Post-and-beam detailing of the structural frame
- Open wood stairway wrapping around a central almost square core
- Exterior plywood board-and-batten cladding at the central core
- Metal pipe and wood railing at the exterior stairway (excludes lattice paneling at railing)
- Open-tread steps
- Concrete angled steps at Lower Level with jagged ends for plantings

UNIT F (BUILDING D – LOOKOUT/LIFEGUARD STATION)
- Core recreation structure.
- Wood open shade structure (referred to as a “hat” in original drawings)
  - Extended rafter tails with decorative ends
  - Detailing of “hat” and post and beam frame below
- Curved base/retaining wall with sand-finish exterior plaster
- Hanging globe lights
UNIT G (BUILDING E – OFFICE CENTER)
- Location at Middle Level
- Core recreation building
- One-story, flat-roof building with curved corners
- Cabin lining clad walls to the southwest, southeast, and northwest
- Surrounding hexagonal pad with built-in wood benches and wood railing

UNIT H (BUILDING G – FAMILY POOL RESTROOMS)
- Location at the Upper Level
- One-story building with flat roof
- Rectangular footprint
- Sand-finish exterior plaster walls with rounded corners
- Open entry portal centered on northeast façade

UNIT N (PARK POOL)
- Location at the Lower Level
- Approximate L-shape and footprint of the pool, with an angled corner

UNIT P (BUILDING H.1 – PARK POOL MECHANICAL ROOM)
- One-story building
- Hexagonal footprint
- Board-formed concrete exterior walls
- Clock face at northeast façade
3. PROPOSED PROJECT

Proposed Project Description

The proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (Project) involves the demolition of several existing structures that are seismically deficient, substantially damaged/deteriorated, and non-compliant with the Americans with Disability Act (ADA). The Project also involves the removal of improvements that are physically, structurally, or programmatically dependent upon the deficient structures, as summarized below (Figure 2). These buildings would be replaced with a single building offering similar functionality, including three multi-purpose rooms, with an increased floor area and a smaller overall building footprint (Figure 3).

Figure 2. Proposed demolition site plan within the Project site (dashed line) from the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Replacement Project Initial Study, July 2023 (Figure 18: Surface Demolition Plan). Building names added by Page & Turnbull.
The buildings to be demolished include six of the ten contributors to the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District, which are summarized in Table 2, along with their UC Seismic Performance ratings and use or vacated status. The associated landscape and site elements surrounding the demolished building would also be removed, which will result in the partial loss of a seventh contributor, the unifying landscape and site elements contributor.
### Table 2. Proposed Project - Summary of Impacts on Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA BUILDING NAME 2023</th>
<th>1963 DESIGNATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT STATUS</th>
<th>UC SEISMIC PERFORMANCE RATING</th>
<th>USE STATUS</th>
<th>PROPOSED IN PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room</td>
<td>Unit B</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>VII (unoccupied and access-restricted)</td>
<td>Red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>Unit D</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>IV (compliant)</td>
<td>In use with non-compliant ADA access</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office</td>
<td>Unit E</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>VI (priority for improvement)</td>
<td>Red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room</td>
<td>Unit C</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>VII (unoccupied and access-restricted)</td>
<td>Red-tagged by the Campus Building Official and vacated in 2020</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station</td>
<td>Unit F</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>VI (priority for improvement)</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E – Office Center</td>
<td>Unit G</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>VI (priority for improvement)</td>
<td>Vacated in 2021 due to water intrusion and mold</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms</td>
<td>Unit H</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms</td>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room</td>
<td>Unit P</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pool</td>
<td>Unit L/M</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Pool</td>
<td>Unit N</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Pool</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Partially demolish or alter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed program includes flexible, student-oriented multi-purpose spaces on two stories plus a rooftop deck. Similar to the existing facility, the new building will nestle into the hillside and create strong connections between indoor and outdoor spaces, with terraces and outdoor amenity areas, to capitalize on the surrounding natural setting (Figure 4). The new building will be fully ADA-compliant and will provide new ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels of Sunset Canyon Recreation Center with the provision of an elevator.

More specifically, the proposed approximately 11,500 gsf building will include three multi-purpose rooms plus a teaching kitchen and a rooftop deck. These rooms will feature expansive floor-to-ceiling windows that can slide open to the surrounding terraces and decks, creating a seamless
transition between the indoor and outdoor spaces. Exterior covered, unenclosed space will be provided similar to existing conditions, in addition to uncovered terrace areas. Also included are staff offices with a small conference room, gender inclusive restrooms and a family restroom, a lactation room, storage areas, custodial/mechanical space, a telecommunications/IT room, an ADA-accessible elevator, and circulation areas. A total of approximately 6,500 gsf of exterior covered, unenclosed space will be provided, including a reception area between the two ground floor multi-purpose rooms and approximately 4,000 gsf on the roof covered with a canopy of photovoltaic panels. The rooftop deck will include a small storage room and a refreshment area to support gatherings.

The proposed landscape plan will build upon the existing landscape at Sunset Canyon Recreation Center to maintain a wooded and natural setting. Landscaped areas will be located around the perimeter of the new building and will include trees, shrubs, and ground cover, as well as bench seating, thus creating a series of intimate gathering areas. The proposed hex pavers represent a modern, modular variation on the existing hexagonal brick floor pattern (Figure 5). The slope between the lower and upper pools will also feature terraced landscaping to reference the existing setting. Proposed vegetation would include native and/or drought-tolerant species.

Figure 5. Rendering of the proposed Project. Source: Safdie Rabines Architects (05-08-2023) from Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project Initial Study, July 2023.
Overall, the proposed design takes cues from the Smith and Williams design, particularly in its integration of indoor and outdoor spaces, use of natural materials and overhead trellises, preservation of the surrounding park atmosphere and natural areas, and use of modular hex pavers as a modern variation on the existing hexagonal brick paving pattern.

CEQA Impact of the Proposed Project on the Eligible Historic District

As described in the 2023 Historic Resource Technical Report (HRTR), the proposed Project will have a significant adverse change on the eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District. The demolition of the six core recreation buildings and structures will render the eligible Historic District no longer recognizable nor able to convey its significance as the work of Smith and Williams, the integrity threshold for California Register eligibility. The remaining contributors to the eligible Historic District – the Park Pool (Unit N), two swimming pool support buildings, and aspects of the unifying landscape and site elements – are not sufficient to represent the work of Smith and Williams as important creative individuals. As such, the remaining buildings and structures collectively will no longer be eligible for listing in the California Register as a historic district. The loss of the California Register-eligible Historic District will cause a significant adverse impact to historic resources under CEQA that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level as explained in more detail in the Project SEIR, the 2023 HRTR, and below.
4. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

As discussed further in the Project SEIR, since a significant adverse effect to historic resources has been identified, several alternatives are considered that could avoid or substantially lessen the proposed Project’s significant impact to a historic resource, which is the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District. As described in the Project SEIR, the alternatives include the following, which are evaluated below:

- No Project/Mothballing Alternative
- Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative
- Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative
- SOI Standards Compliant Alternative
- Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative

Significant Adverse Change to Historic Resources

As discussed in more detail in the HRTR, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, a local register of historical resources pursuant to local ordinance or resolution. However, projects that follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings are considered to be mitigated to a less than significant level. In addition, projects that retain a historic resource's eligibility for listing are considered not to have a significant impact on historic resources. The SEIR alternatives were defined accordingly based on this guidance.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (SOI Standards)

As discussed in the HRTR, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards) have been developed by the National Park Service (NPS) within the U.S. Department of the Interior to provide guidance for reviewing proposed work on historic properties. They are accompanied by the illustrated Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and

---

2 14 Cal. Code Regs, Section 15064.5(b)(2).
3 14 Cal. Code Regs, Section 15064.5(b)(3).
Reconstructing Historic Buildings (SOI Guidelines) that offer general design and technical recommendations in applying the SOI Standards.⁴

The Secretary of the Interior offers four sets of standards to guide the treatment of historic properties: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. Typically, one set of standards is chosen for a project based on the project scope. For the purposes of the alternatives analysis, the Standards for Rehabilitation would be the most appropriate treatment, as it addresses additions, exterior alterations, and related new construction that are part of the Project alternatives scope. Please see the Appendix for the ten SOI Standards for Rehabilitation.

There are SOI Guidelines for each of the four SOI Standards treatments that outline a general hierarchical process for the treatment of historic materials and features. Within the Rehabilitation Guidelines, the hierarchy of treatment pertaining to historic buildings is:

- **Step 1**: Identify, retain, and preserve historic materials and features that are important in defining the building's historic character.
- **Step 2**: Protect and maintain historic materials and features that are important and must be retained in the process of a Rehabilitation Project.
- **Step 3**: Repair historic materials and features when warranted due to physical deterioration.
- **Step 4**: When the level of deterioration or damage of materials precludes repair, replace an entire character-defining feature in kind. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible when replacing features deteriorated beyond repair, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Approach to Analysis

Each alternative analysis begins with a general description of the alternative's development approach. If relevant, the description may outline the proposed work building by building with sufficient detail to conduct the analysis. Following the description is a discussion of the changes to the eligible Historic District. Again, building-by-building analysis is included if relevant. The changes are summarized in terms of contributors that would be demolished or altered to the extent that they would no longer contribute, as well as the number of contributors that would be retained. In the instances where a building-by-building analysis is provided, summary tables of the necessary improvements/alterations and changes to the eligible Historic District are included.
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Each alternative analysis concludes with a discussion of the impact of the alternative as a whole to historic resources under CEQA, in terms of whether the eligible Historic District would retain sufficient integrity to continue to be eligible for listing in the California Register, as well as whether the alternative would avoid, lessen, or have the same significant impact as the proposed Project. Discussion regarding how the alternative meets Project objectives is not discussed herein, as that discussion is contained in the Project SEIR.

The alternatives in this document are analyzed within the following framework:

- If the alternative complies with the SOI Standards, it is assumed to avoid the Project’s significant impact on historic resources (i.e., the eligible Historic District).
- If the alternative does not fully comply with the SOI Standards, but the eligible Historic District retains sufficient integrity to be recognizable and convey its significance as a mature work of Smith and Williams, then it would retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register. As such, the alternative is assumed to avoid the Project’s significant impact on historic resources.
- If under the alternative, the eligible Historic District is no longer able to convey its significance due to demolition or major alterations of its contributors and thus is no longer eligible for listing in the California Register, then the alternative is considered to have a significant adverse impact on historic resources, consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Project.
- If the alternative retains more contributors than the proposed Project, the impact is considered to have been lessened compared to the proposed Project’s impact. The impact could still be significant or may be avoided depending on whether the eligible Historic District would retain its eligibility for the California Register.
DISTRICT INTEGRITY

For a district to retain integrity, the majority of the components that make up the district’s historic character must possess integrity even if they are individually undistinguished (i.e., even if the contributors are not historically or architecturally significant by themselves). The relationships among the district’s components also must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance. Intrusions within a district may affect its integrity based on the relative number, size, scale, design, and location of the components. A district is not eligible if it contains so many alterations or new intrusions that it no longer conveys the sense of a historic environment.5

Application of the California Historical Building Code

As a historic district that has been determined eligible for listing in the California Register, the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District and its contributors meet the definition of a “qualified historical building or property” for which the California Historical Building Code (CHBC) can be applied. The CHBC is set forth in Title 24, Part 8 of the California Code of Regulations and is part of the California Building Code (CBC), with 2022 as the most recent and applicable edition. The intention of the CHBC is “to protect California’s architectural heritage by recognizing the unique construction problems inherent in historical buildings and offering an alternative code to deal with these issues.”

This alternative analysis assumes the CHBC could be applied where it may be used to preserve the integrity of the qualified historical buildings and properties while ensuring reasonable safety, access for persons with disabilities, and continued use. The CHBC may be used in conjunction with the general building code provisions to provide solutions to facilitate the preservation of qualified historical buildings or properties. It has specific chapters on Use and Occupancy, Fire Protection, Means of Egress, Accessibility, Structural Regulations, Archaic Materials and Methods of Construction, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Electrical Requirements, and Qualified Historical Districts, Sites and Open Spaces.

However, the CHBC does not provide blanket exemptions for historical buildings and properties; life-safety is still paramount. Alternative provisions established in some chapters only apply if strict compliance with regular building code provisions will threaten or destroy the building’s historic significance or character-defining features. The CHBC is applied by the state or local enforcing agency, which would be the UCLA Campus Building Official in this case.

NO PROJECT/MOTHBALLING ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 1 IN THE SEIR)

Description

With the No Project/Mothballing Alternative, all buildings within the Project site, including the contributors to the Historic District, would remain. California Building Code Section 116 states “structures containing an unsafe condition shall be taken down and removed or made safe, as the building official deems necessary...” (emphasis added). Thus, assuming approval by the Campus Building Official to retain the existing red-tagged or otherwise vacated buildings without major improvements, these structures would remain in place and remain unoccupied. The historic “hat” roof structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station, which is a contributor but has not been red-tagged, would be repaired or replaced in kind following Standard 6 of the SOI Standards.

Since vacant buildings cannot survive indefinitely without some degree of ongoing maintenance, and since historic buildings in particular may be prone to deterioration without proper care, a process known as “mothballing” would be undertaken to deactivate the red-tagged or otherwise vacated buildings, which are all contributors to the Historic District, for an extended period. These include Building A – Vista Room, Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office, Building C – Santa Fe Room, and Building E – Office Center. Guidance from the NPS states “[i]f a vacant property has been declared unsafe by building officials, stabilization and mothballing may be the only way to protect it from demolition.” As such, under this Alternative, the red-tagged or otherwise vacated buildings and structures in the eligible Historic District would be mothballed in accordance with NPS guidance in Preservation Brief 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings with the following steps taken:

Documentation
1. Document the architectural and historical significance of the building.
2. Prepare a condition assessment of the building.

Stabilization
3. Structurally stabilize the building, based on a professional condition assessment.
4. Exterminate or control pests, including termites and rodents.
5. Protect the exterior from moisture penetration.

---

6 California Building Code, Chapter 1, Section 116 Unsafe Structures and Equipment, 2022.
Mothballing
6. Secure the building and its component features to reduce vandalism or break-ins.
7. Provide adequate ventilation to the interior.
8. Secure or modify utilities and mechanical systems.
9. Develop and implement a maintenance and monitoring plan for protection.

Changes to Contributors and the Eligible Historic District
The No Project/Mothballing Alternative would retain all contributors in the eligible Historic District. The contributing buildings and structures that have been red-tagged or otherwise vacated would be mothballed following the guidance in NPS Preservation Brief 31, which is intended both to protect against further damage while the buildings and structures are vacant, while also ensuring that “[m]othballing measures should not result in permanent damage, and so each treatment should be weighed in terms of its reversibility and its overall benefit.” As such, mothballing the contributing buildings and structures that have been red-tagged or otherwise vacated following the NPS guidance outlined in Preservation Brief 31 would not significantly change their historic character, nor affect the eligible Historic District as a whole.

The contributing “hat” structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station would be repaired or replaced in-kind following SOI Standard 6, which calls for deteriorated historic features to be repaired but allows for in-kind replacement matching the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials, when the severity of deterioration is such that repair is no longer possible. Repair or in-kind replacement following Standard 6 would not significantly change the contributor.

Analysis of Impact to Historic Resources Under CEQA
As the No Project/Mothballing Alternative would repair and replace in kind or retain all contributors and mothball them according to preservation best practices, the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District would remain in place and retain its eligibility and level of integrity for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). This alternative would avoid any significant impact to historic resources under CEQA.

---
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PARTIAL REUSE/PARTIAL MOTBALL ALTERNATIVE

Description

The Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative would structurally improve some or portions of the existing buildings within the Project site (which would be demolished under the proposed Project) to address safety concerns and meet building and seismic requirements. Accessibility improvements would be implemented to provide access to as many building spaces as possible without major modifications. However, Building C – Santa Fe Room, the upper levels of Building A – Vista Room, and most of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would remain permanently closed, due to their deteriorated existing conditions, as well as the physically infeasibility of providing full accessibility per ADA requirements without major alterations or demolition and reconstruction. These closed spaces would be mothballed for long-term protection following the NPS guidance in Preservation Brief 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings, as discussed in the No Project/Mothballing Alternative. Table 3 outlines the proposed work at each building.

In addition, it is assumed the CHBC would be applied were possible under the provisions of the code. Where it is not possible, approaches consistent with the SOI Standards would be implemented. For example, the original design of the wood guardrails and metal pipe handrails (collectively referred to as railing) at the exterior wood stairway of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office constitute a distinct fall hazard and could not be reinstalled as they were originally designed, even when applying the CHBC. New compatible railings that meet the code requirements for height and maximum width of openings would need to be designed and installed as part of the structure’s repair in a manner that complies with the SOI Standards and to replace the existing non-compatible lattice paneling previously added to the railings for safety purposes. Where similar railings exist at areas that will be closed and mothballed, such as the upper levels of Building A – Vista Room and Building C – Santa Fe Room, such code compliance work would not be anticipated since these spaces would be mothballed.

Table 3. Partial Reuse/Partial Mothballing Alternative – Summary of Proposed Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Required Accessibility Upgrades / Mothballing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating: Repair  • Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams</td>
<td>Meet accessibility requirements at Level 1:  • Add accessible restrooms at Level 1  • Widen doorways and install automatic doors at office entrances to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>Structural Retrofit Improvements</td>
<td>Required Accessibility Upgrades / Mothballing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit</td>
<td>Remove and replace wall finishes (interior and/or exterior)</td>
<td>Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries</td>
<td>Level 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add plywood sheathing at existing walls</td>
<td>Mothball following Preservation Brief 31 and remain unoccupied (i.e., the Vista Room would not be available for use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide new transfer beams below discontinuous shear walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add new shear walls and footings at Level 1, below deck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Improve accessibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install ramp at building entrance next to Family Pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add tactile strips and handrails to stairs at entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existing outdoor ramp behind the Project site buildings would be improved to provide compliant ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:</td>
<td>Meet accessibility requirements on Level 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair: Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts, beams, and stair treads</td>
<td>Renovate restroom to meet accessibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install compatible wood and metal railings</td>
<td>Widen doorways and install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrofit: Remove and replace wall finishes</td>
<td>Add tactile strips where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries</td>
<td>Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1 and 3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Building (1963 Designation) | Structural Retrofit Improvements | Required Accessibility Upgrades / Mothballing
---|---|---
Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C) | N/A | N/A

- Building would be mothballed following Preservation Brief 31, protected/secured in place, and remain unoccupied (i.e., the Santa Fe Room would not be available for use)

Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station (Unit F) | Undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:
- Provide new lateral resisting system (e.g., timber braces, steel braces, cantilever, steel columns, etc.) at non-historic enclosure
- Repair or replace in kind the deteriorated wood canopy (i.e., historic “hat” structure) | Meet accessibility requirements:
- Install automatic door to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices
- Add tactile strips where necessary
- Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights

Building E – Office Center (Unit G) | If building is used for storage, undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:
- Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries.
- Add plywood sheathing on three walls.
- Remove and replace wall finishes.

If not used for storage, N/A:
- Building would be mothballed following Preservation Brief 31, protected/secured in place, and remain unoccupied (i.e., the Office Center would not be available for use) | If building is used for storage, meet certain accessibility requirements, although an accessible path of travel would not be available:
- Install automatic door to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices
- Add tactile strips where necessary
- Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights

If not used for storage, building would be mothballed following Preservation Brief 31, protected/secured in place, and remain unoccupied (i.e., the Office Center would not be available for use)

Building F – Electric Vault (N/A) | N/A | N/A
Preservation Alternatives Analysis Report
UCLA Sunset Canyon Recreation Center
Project Number 2271
Los Angeles, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Required Accessibility Upgrades / Mothballing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings</td>
<td>Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to Contributors and the Eligible Historic District

Building A – Vista Room

The structural repair of Building A – Vista Room would involve removing and replacing all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams. The Vista Room and exterior wood walkway at Level 2 should be able to be temporarily shored, reinforced, and lifted up (likely by hydronic jacks) to allow for replacement of deteriorated post and beam members between Level 1 and Level 2 without significantly damaging their historic (character-defining) features or fabric. Any damage would be repaired in kind following the SOI Standards.

The seismic retrofit work could be invasive with removal of the character-defining exterior cabin lining cladding to install hold-down hardware and plywood sheathing, but reinstalling the removed cladding or replacing in kind to match would meet the SOI Standards. This assumes that the added hold-down hardware and plywood sheathing would not add substantial depth to the walls. A new transfer beam likely can be accomplished with minimal impacts. However, the addition of shear walls and foundation footings below the wood walkway at Level 1 where no existing walls currently exist to transfer the load from the Level 2 walls may significantly change the character of the building. The building's spatial relationships would be altered if new shear walls enclose the entrance breezeway, or create the appearance of a much more solid lower level that no longer appears recessed. Also, adding foundation footing for the new shear walls would require removing and disturbing the hexagonal motif and pattern at the ground plane of Building A – Vista Room, which is visible due to the open nature of Level 1.

The improvements necessary to create accessible restrooms at or near Level 1, widen the existing exterior doorways, and install automatic doors should be able to be accomplished following the SOI Standards and preservation best practices without significantly altering the character of the building. The interior work would not change the building's historic character, as no interior spaces at Level 1 have been identified as character-defining.

Once stabilized through the structural repair and seismic retrofit work, the mothballing work to secure Level 2 from moisture, vandalism, break-ins, and natural disasters, as well as controlling pests, providing adequate ventilation and minimum utilities, and ensuring periodic maintenance and
monitoring will minimize further deterioration. Such work following the guidelines in Preservation Brief 31 would not damage or significantly change the historic building, as it is intended to be temporary and reversible.

Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the only aspect that has the potential to significantly change the historic character of Building A – Vista Room is the installation of shear walls at Level 1. However, as indicated above, the multipurpose room on Level 2 would remain unavailable for use.

Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room
No structural repair or seismic retrofit work is proposed, as the building does not have deteriorated structural members. It also has a seismic rating of IV, which is considered acceptable and compliant with the UC Seismic Safety Policy.

The building has one existing access ramp to the Buenos Aires Room at the northeast door. The accessibility work of adding another accessible ramp at the southwest door, near the Family Pool entrance, or modifying the existing ramp to provide access to both doors should be able to be installed following the SOI Standards and without significantly altering the historic character of the building. Access to the building from the Lower Level can continue to be from the existing ramp along the northern hillside that is located outside the Project site and the eligible Historic District. This ramp would need to be modified to meet current accessibility requirements.

Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the changes to Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room would be minimal, and the improvements likely can be SOI Standards compliant.

Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office
The structural repair work at Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would involve removal and replacement of all deteriorated structural wood members, including post, beams, and stair treads. This likely also involves repairing or replacing in kind the other wood elements of the exterior stairs, such as the landings. The seismic retrofit involves removing the board-and-batten exterior wall finishes to install plywood sheathing at existing walls and hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries. An additional aspect of the repairs would be the requirement to install code-compliant railing at the exterior stairway, as the original metal pipe handrail at the steps and the wood guardrails at the landings had wide openings that would be considered a distinct hazard.

As with Building A – Vista Room, repair and retrofit work would be invasive, but can meet the SOI Standards if deteriorated wood members are replaced in kind and assuming the added hold-down
hardware and plywood sheathing would not add substantial width to the walls. New railings meeting code requirements should be able to be designed to be compatible to the building's historic character in adherence to the SOI Standards. This may somewhat change the historic character of the building but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that has been added previously at the exterior stairway.

The accessibility work involves renovation of the existing women's restroom at Level 2, which is at the same level as Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room and would have an accessible path. Widening the doorways and installing automatic doors should be able to be accomplished following the SOI Standards and preservation best practices without significantly altering the character of the building. The interior work would not change the building's historic character, as no interior spaces at the building have been identified as historic or character-defining.

Once stabilized through the structural repair and seismic retrofit work, the mothballing work to secure the Level 1 restroom and Level 3 office would minimize further deterioration from moisture, vandalism, break-ins, and natural disasters, as well as controlling pests, providing adequate ventilation and minimum utilities, and ensuring periodic maintenance and monitoring. Such work following the guidelines in NPS Preservation Brief 31 would not damage or significantly change the historic building, as it is intended to be temporary and reversible.

Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the changes to Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would be minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant. However, the restroom on Level 1 and office on Level 3 would remain unavailable for use.

Building C – Santa Fe Room

Building C – Santa Fe Room would be mothballed due to non-compliance with ADA requirements for an accessible route. Per NPS Preservation Brief 31, structural stabilization of the building may be conducted, if necessary. Following that, the Santa Fe Room would be secured from moisture, vandalism, break-ins, and natural disasters, as well as controlling pests, providing adequate ventilation and minimum utilities, and ensuring periodic maintenance and monitoring to minimize further deterioration. The seating area under the Santa Fe Room is assumed to be mothballed and secured, as well. Such work following the guidelines in Preservation Brief 31 would not damage or significantly change the historic building, as it is intended to be temporary and reversible.

Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the changes to Building C – Santa Fe Room would be minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant. However, the multipurpose room on Level 2 and the seating area below it would remain unavailable for use.
Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station

The seismic retrofit and accessibility work would affect the non-historic building (enclosure), which would not affect historic features and would have no effect on historic resources.

The structural repair involves repairing or replacing in-kind the historic “hat” roof structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station, as its wood structural members are deteriorated. This would be accomplished following the SOI Standards, specifically Standard 6 that allows for in-kind replacement of deteriorated features when the severity of deterioration is such that repair is no longer possible. Replacing the historic “hat” roof structure in kind following the SOI Standards, matching the design, color, texture, and material, would not have a significant effect on the contributor or the eligible Historic District.

Building E – Office Center

Building E – Office Center would either be mothballed, due to non-compliance with ADA requirements for an accessible route to the Middle Level, or it could be used for storage. While adding chair lifts at multiple locations at the lower and upper cascading concrete stairs was considered to provide an accessible path of travel, such improvements would pose broader circulation restrictions at the landings and would require substantial modifications to the existing site elements (e.g., the cascading stairs, certain areas of hex paving, wood cribbing or retaining walls) to support the lifts. If used for storage, the building would be seismically retrofitted with hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries and with added plywood sheathing on the three solid exterior walls. Removing the character-defining exterior cabin lining cladding to install these components can be invasive, but reinstalling the removed cladding or replacing in kind to match would meet the SOI Standards. This assumes that the added plywood sheathing and hold-down hardware would not add substantial depth to the walls. The accessibility work if used for storage would involve installing automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices and adding tactile strips where necessary. These should be able to be accomplished following the SOI Standards and preservation best practices without significantly altering the character of the building.

If mothballed, the building would be secured from moisture, vandalism, break-ins, and natural disasters, as well as controlling pests, providing adequate ventilation and minimum utilities, and ensuring periodic maintenance and monitoring to minimize further deterioration. Such work following the guidelines in NPS Preservation Brief 31 would not damage or significantly change the historic building, as it is intended to be temporary and reversible.
Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the changes to Building E – Office Center would be minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant. However, as described above, either the Office Center would remain unavailable for use, or its use would be restricted to storage due to non-compliance with full accessibility requirements.

Building F – Electric Vault
The electric vault below Building E – Office Center would be retained and renovated on the interior to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the nearby buildings. No structural or accessibility work would be proposed.

As Building F – Electric Vault is a non-contributor to the eligible Historic District, and the proposed renovation would be on its interior, the work would not have any impacts on historic resources.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Table 4 summarizes the changes to the contributors and non-contributors of the eligible Historic District under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative. In general two contributors have the potential to be impacted (Building A – Vista Room and its associated unifying landscape and site elements), though likely not to the level where these two contributors would be lost.

Table 4. Partial Reuse/Partial Mothballing – Summary of Changes to Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>District Status</th>
<th>General Approach for Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative</th>
<th>Changes to Historic Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Meet accessibility requirements throughout Level 1. Mothball Level 2, which would remain unoccupied due to ADA non-compliance (i.e., the Vista Room would not be available for use).</td>
<td>Only potential visible change is the new shear walls at Level 1 that may alter the building's historic character, though it is likely to retain enough integrity as a contributor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>District Status</td>
<td>General Approach for Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative</td>
<td>Changes to Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building and provide one additional ADA ramp at main entrance. The existing outdoor ramp behind the Project site buildings would be improved to provide compliant ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels at Sunset Rec.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Install code-compliant and historically compatible railings at exterior stairway. Meet accessibility requirements on Level 2. Mothball Levels 1 and 3, which would remain unoccupied due to ADA non-compliance (i.e., one restroom and the office would not be available for use).</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Building would be mothballed following NPS Preservation Brief 31, protected/secured in place, and remain unoccupied. (i.e., the Santa Fe Room would not be available for use).</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D – Lookout/ Lifeguard Station (Unit F)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building (enclosure) and seismically retrofit. Meet accessibility requirements at building (enclosure). Repair or replace in-kind the deteriorated historic “hat” structure.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E – Office Center (Unit G)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. If used for storage, seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Meet accessibility requirements at building as feasible, but an accessible path of travel would not be available.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>District Status</td>
<td>General Approach for Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative</td>
<td>Changes to Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not used for storage, building would be mothballed following NPS Preservation Brief 31, protected/secured in place, and remain unoccupied (i.e., the space would not be available for public use).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings.</td>
<td>None (all work interior to non-contributor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms (Unit H)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms (Unit A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H.1–Park Pool Mechanical Room (Unit P)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pool (Unit L/M)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Pool (Unit N)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements (N/A)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Removal of some hexagonal paving at Level 1 of Building A – Vista Room</td>
<td>Minor changes to some elements, though likely to retain enough integrity as a contributor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Impact to Historic Resources Under CEQA

Under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, all ten contributors would remain. The structural and accessibility work at the contributors within the Project site is generally minor and likely can be accomplished following the SOI Standards. The only exception is at Building A – Vista Room where the addition of shear walls for the structural retrofit has the potential to be highly visible and alter the building’s historic character. However, because Building A – Vista Room would still remain in place, it would likely still retain sufficient integrity despite the visible shear walls to be a contributor to the eligible Historic District. The proposed work at the lone non-contributor, Building F – Electric Vault, would be on the interior and would have no effect on the eligible Historic District.

Overall, the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative would avoid significant impacts to historic resources by retaining the eligibility and sufficient level of integrity of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). However, many of the interior and exterior spaces, including two of the three existing multipurpose rooms, would remain unavailable for use.
BUILDING REPLACEMENT WITH REDUCED DEMOLITION ALTERNATIVE

Description

The Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative would involve the removal of the buildings that have been red-tagged or otherwise vacated. This includes Building A – Vista Room, Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office, Building C – Santa Fe Room, and Building E – Office Center. Wood cribbing and concrete retaining walls around Building A – Vista Room and Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would be demolished as well, along with hexagonal motif, pattern, and paving at the ground plan of both buildings that are part of the unifying landscape and site elements contributor. Similarly, the cascading stairs and Middle Level may need to be altered to accommodate new utilities. Building F – Electric Vault, a non-contributor, would be demolished as well. A replacement recreation building with a smaller footprint than the proposed Project would be constructed in place of the buildings to be removed under this alternative.

In addition, Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room would be retained and accessibility improvements made. Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station would also be retained. The non-historic building (enclosure) would undergo seismic retrofit and accessibility upgrades, similar to the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative. The historic “hat” roof structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station, which is a contributor but has not been red-tagged, would be repaired or replaced in kind following Standard 6 of the SOI Standards. Table 5 outlines the proposed work at each building under this alternative.

Table 5. Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative – Summary of Proposed Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRC Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Required Accessibility Upgrades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>N/A Demolish</td>
<td>N/A Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Improve accessibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Install ramp at building entrance next to Family Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add tactile strips and handrails to stairs at entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCRC Building (1963 Designation) | Structural Retrofit Improvements | Required Accessibility Upgrades
--- | --- | ---

**Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office (Unit E)**
N/A
Demolish
N/A
Demolish

**Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)**
N/A
Demolish
N/A
Demolish

**Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station (Unit F)**
Undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:
- Provide new lateral resisting system (e.g., timber braces, steel braces, cantilever, steel columns, etc.) at non-historic enclosure
- Repair or replace in kind the deteriorated wood canopy (i.e., historic “hat” structure)
Meet accessibility requirements:
- Install automatic door to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices
- Add tactile strips where necessary
- Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights

**Building E – Office Center (Unit G)**
N/A
Demolish
N/A
Demolish

**Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)**
N/A
Demolish
N/A
Demolish
Changes to Contributors and the Eligible Historic District

The Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative would demolish four contributors, instead of the six under the proposed Project. It would also demolish or alter several aspects of the unifying landscape and site elements contributor to the extent that it would no longer be a contributor, similar to the proposed Project. This alternative would retain and rehabilitate two contributors, for a total of five of the 10 contributors remaining. Table 6 summarizes the changes to on the contributors and non-contributors of the eligible Historic District under the Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative.

Table 6. Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative – Summary of Changes to Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>District Status</th>
<th>General Approach for Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative</th>
<th>Changes to Historic Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>Loss of contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building and provide one additional ADA ramp at main entrance. The existing outdoor ramp behind the Project site buildings would be improved to provide compliant ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels at Sunset Rec.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>Loss of contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>Loss of contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D – Lookout/ Lifeguard Station (Unit F)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building (enclosure) and seismically retrofit. Meet accessibility requirements at building (enclosure). Replace the historic “hat” structure in-kind.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E – Office Center (Unit G)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>Loss of contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>District Status</td>
<td>General Approach for Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative</td>
<td>Changes to Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms (Unit H)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms (Unit A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room (Unit P)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pool (Unit L/M)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Pool (Unit N)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements (N/A)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Alteration or loss of several elements around contributors that would be demolished.</td>
<td>Loss of several wood cribbing and concrete retaining walls, and hexagonal motif, pattern, and paving, along with alteration of the cascading stairs likely to result in <strong>loss of contributor</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Impact to Historic Resources Under CEQA

Although the Replacement Building with Reduced Demolition Alternative would demolish two fewer contributors than in the proposed Project, the four contributors proposed for demolition include the largest and most visible aspects of the eligible Historic District, namely the two-story Building A – Vista Room that anchors the district, Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office that provides the vertical circulation and around which three contributing buildings are situated, and Building C – Santa Fe Room that incorporates both post-and-beam and board-formed concrete construction. The loss of these three contributors would dramatically alter the eligible Historic District's layout and spatial relationships that is character-defining to the district. The demolition of the smaller-scale Building E – Office Center would compound the loss. In addition, the combined demolition of the wood cribbing and concrete walls along with the hexagonal motif, pattern, and paving at the ground plane of Building A – Vista Room and Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office, as well as the likely alteration of the cascading stair and Middle Level landing for utility connections would result in the loss of the unifying landscape and site element contributor.

No buildings with post and beam construction would remain. Very little wood material would remain – only the one remaining “hat“ structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station, which would be replaced in kind. The other remaining contributing buildings are primarily stucco-clad (Building A1 – Buena Aires Room, Building G – Family Pool Restrooms) or board-formed concrete (Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room), and do not embody the interweaving of indoor and outdoor experiences as directly as the buildings that would be demolished. Collectively, the remnants, including what remained of the unifying landscape and site elements, would no longer be recognizable nor convey the significance of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District as a mature work of Smith and Williams.

While the Replacement Building with Reduced Demolition Alternative would lessen the impacts to historic resources by retaining five of the ten contributors, the eligible Historic District would still lose its historic integrity and ability to convey its significance due to the demolition of several key contributors. The loss of the key contributors and their replacement with a single new building would substantially change the spatial and functional relationships between the district’s components that date from the period of significance. The demolitions and new construction would cause a significant adverse change that would result in the loss of California Register eligibility of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center as a historic district, and therefore, the impact on historic resources would still be significant and unavoidable.
SOI STANDARDS COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 2 IN THE SEIR)

Description

The intent of the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative is to avoid significant adverse impacts to historic resources by ensuring the eligible Historic District remains eligible for listing in the California Register with its existing level of integrity. It is also to determine if a SOI Standards compliant project could be accomplished while addressing the various structural, accessibility, and other code compliance issues.

The SOI Standards Compliant Alternative would retain and rehabilitate all district contributors within the Project site according to the SOI Standards and SOI Guidelines, and in particular, the Rehabilitation Standards. Structural improvements would be implemented to address seismic deficiencies and other structural issues caused by deterioration to the extent that such improvements would comply with the SOI Standards. Similarly, improvements to address ADA compliance would be made only to the extent they would comply with the SOI Standards. As such, more invasive changes would not be part of a SOI Standards-compliant alternative, and non-compliance with certain ADA requirements would remain in some areas.9

In addition, it is assumed the CHBC would be applied were possible under the provisions of the code. Where it is not possible, approaches consistent with the SOI Standards would be implemented. For example, the original railings at exterior wood walkways and stairs, with their open design, constitute a distinct fall hazard and could not be reinstalled as they were originally designed, even when applying the CHBC. New compatible railings that meet the code requirements for height and maximum width of openings would need to be designed and installed in a manner that complies with the SOI Standards, in order to replace the non-compatible lattice paneling at the existing railings.

Table 7 outlines the proposed work at each building under this alternative.

---

9 For example, inserting an elevator into the center core of Building A1 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would require removal of the exterior wraparound stairway to allow for elevator landings and ramps, as discussed in the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative. Constructing an exterior elevator addition that provides accessible routes to the three levels and rooms within Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would similarly require extensive modifications to the exterior wood stairway for connecting ramps. The changes to spatial relationships in this area from a sizable new element like an exterior elevator addition would also not comply with the SOI Standards.
### Table 7. SOI Standards Compliant Alternative – Summary of Proposed Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Accessibility Upgrades / Code Required Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)                     | Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
  **Repair**  
  • Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams  
  **Retrofit**  
  • Remove and replace wall finishes (interior and/or exterior)  
  • Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries  
  • Add plywood sheathing at existing walls  
  • Provide new transfer beams below discontinuous shear walls  
  • Add moment frame or other SOI Standards compliant approach instead of shear walls if permitted by Campus Building Official. | Meet accessibility requirements at Levels 1 and 2:  
• Add accessible restrooms at Level 1  
• Widen doorways and install automatic doors at all entrances to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
• Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
• Modify kitchen and other Level 2 spaces as needed  
Install elevator or platform lift on interior or exterior in conformance with the SOI Standards.  
Install new compatible railings at Level 2 exterior wood walkway. |
| Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)            | N/A                               | Improve accessibility:  
• Install ramp at building entrance next to Family Pool  
• Add tactile strips and handrails to stairs at entrance  
• Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
• Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
• The existing outdoor ramp behind the Project site buildings would be improved to provide compliant ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels |
<p>| Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office          | Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating: | Meet accessibility requirements on Level 2: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Accessibility Upgrades / Code Required Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Unit E)</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>• Renovate restroom to meet accessibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts, beams, and stair treads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repair or replace in kind other exterior wood elements, such as stair landings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrofit</td>
<td>• Widen doorways and install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove and replace wall finishes</td>
<td>• Add tactile strips where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries</td>
<td>• Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add plywood sheathing at existing walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)</td>
<td>Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:</td>
<td>Levels 1 and 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>• Renovate interiors to meet accessibility standards and rehabilitate to restroom and office uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrofit</td>
<td>• Spaces would not have accessible routes, as adding an elevator or lift system on the interior or exterior of the building would not be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove and replace wall finishes (interior and exterior)</td>
<td>Exterior Wood Stairway:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries</td>
<td>• Repair or replace in kind through structural repair work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add plywood sheathing at existing walls</td>
<td>• Install compatible wood and metal railings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install exterior elevator or platform lift in conformance with the SOI Standards to access Level 2 (Santa Fe Room) and seating area below Santa Fe Room.</td>
<td>Meet accessibility requirements at Level 2 (Santa Fe Room):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Widen doorways and install automatic doors at all entrances to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>Structural Retrofit Improvements</td>
<td>Accessibility Upgrades / Code Required Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station (Unit F)   | Undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
  - Provide new lateral resisting system (e.g., timber braces, steel braces, cantilever, steel columns, etc.) at non-historic enclosure  
  - Repair or replace in kind the deteriorated wood canopy (i.e., historic “hat” structure) | Meet accessibility requirements at seating area:  
  - Additional ramps, paving, or other modifications may be necessary  
  Install new compatible railings at Level 2 exterior wood walkway. |
| Building E – Office Center (Unit G)                | Undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
  - Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries  
  - Add plywood sheathing on three walls  
  - Remove and replace wall finishes | Meet accessibility requirements:  
  - Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
  - Add tactile strips where necessary.  
  - Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
  Remediate for water/mold damage. |
| Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)                  | N/A Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings. | N/A Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings. |
Changes to Contributors and the Eligible Historic District

Building A – Vista Room

As previously discussed in the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the structural repair and seismic retrofit at Building A – Vista Room can be accomplished while adhering to the SOI Standards. The difference in this alternative is that instead of installing new shear walls at Level 1 where no existing walls currently exist to transfer the load from Level 2 walls, another approach that would avoid altering the building's spatial relationships and thus its historic character would be pursued, if permitted by the Campus Building Official. This may include installing moment frames, which may still be visible but would be less solid than shear walls to allow the lower level to remain mostly open. In addition, the foundation footings for moment frames may be less invasive at the ground plane than new shear walls. The goal and assumption would be that an SOI Standards compliant approach to seismic retrofits for the building would be possible to meet minimum code requirements and UC Seismic Performance standards, and to allow the building to be re-occupied.

The accessible upgrades at Level 1 would also be similar to the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, and should be able to be accomplished following the SOI Standards and preservation best practices without significantly altering the character of the building. However, under this alternative, it may be possible to install an elevator or platform lift inside or on the exterior of Building A – Vista Room in an inconspicuous location to access Level 2 and still comply with the SOI Standards. The access would serve only the upper-level Vista Room and wood walkway, and not other buildings within the eligible Historic District.

Assuming Level 2 would be accessible, other accessibility modifications would be needed, including in the kitchen, at doorways, and relocating all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights. These may start to affect some of interior features of the Vista Room that are character-defining. At the Level 2 exterior wood walkway, new code-compliant guardrails designed in a manner that is compatible with the building's historic character and following the SOI Standards would also be needed. This may somewhat change the historic character of the building but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that has been added previously at the guardrails.

Under the SOI Standards Alternative, Building A – Vista Room likely could be rehabilitated according to the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation. The work would be sensitive to the historic character even as visible changes would occur – with seismic retrofits at Level 1, potential addition of an elevator or platform lift, and new code-compliant guardrails at the Level 2 wood walkways. Rehabilitating Building A – Vista Room in compliance with the SOI Standards would have no significant change to historic resources.
Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room

As the scope of work is the same for Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room as under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the result would be similarly minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant.

Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office

As previously discussed in the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, the structural repair and seismic retrofit at Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office can be accomplished while adhering to the SOI Standards.

For accessibility, the approach also would be similar to the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative, as there is no SOI Standards compliant approach that can provide accessible routes to all three levels and rooms of the building. Only the restroom at Level 2 has an accessible route, and the proposed modifications to widen the restroom doorway and install automatic doors would be accomplished in compliance with the SOI Standards. Interior improvements to the Level 2 restroom, as well as the Level 1 restroom and Level 3 office interiors can also be renovated without changing historic elements as the interiors of these spaces are not character-defining. The exterior stairway would be rehabilitated as part of the structural improvements, with new code-compliant railing designed in a manner that is compatible with the building’s architecture and following the SOI Standards. This may somewhat change the historic character of the building but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that has been added previously at the exterior stairway.

In terms of effects to historic resources, the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative would have no significant change to Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office, though not all spaces would be made accessible (i.e., code requirements could not be fully met).

Building C – Santa Fe Room

Under the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, Building C – Santa Fe Room would undergo structural repair similar to that for Building A – Vista Room. The deteriorated structural wood members, including beams and posts, would be removed and replaced. This likely means the Santa Fe Room and exterior wood walkway at Level 2 would be temporarily shored, reinforced, and lifted up (by hydraulic jacks or by a crane) to allow for the replacement of the deteriorated post and beam members between Level 1 and Level 2. Such work should be able to be accomplished without significantly damaging the building’s character-defining features or historic fabric. Any damage would be repaired in kind following the SOI Standards.
The structural retrofit would involve adding hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries and plywood sheathing at existing Level 2 walls. To install these retrofits, the character-defining cabin lining wall finish on the Santa Fe Room’s interior, exterior, or both would need to be removed. Removing the character-defining exterior cabin lining cladding could be invasive, but reinstalling the removed cladding or replacing in kind to match would meet the SOI Standards. This assumes that the added plywood sheathing and hold-down hardware would not add substantial depth to the walls.

To achieve an accessible route to the Santa Fe Room at Level 2 of Building C – Santa Fe Room, an exterior elevator or platform lift would need to be installed at the building. It may be possible to install such an addition in compliance with the SOI Standards. For example, it could be placed between this building and Building A – Vista Room with stops at the Santa Fe Room and at the seating area under the room.

If the Santa Fe Room is accessible, it is assumed renovations at the exterior wood walkways, at doorways, and on the interior to relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessibility heights would be conducted. Similarly, if the seating area becomes accessible, some additional site work, such as adding paved paths, may be required.

While collectively somewhat invasive, the accessibility work generally appears to be possible while complying with the SOI Standards. However, the accessible route would serve only to access the Santa Fe Room, wood walkway, and the seating area, and not other buildings within the eligible Historic District.

Another code required element that would need to be included is new guardrails at the exterior wood walkway at Level 2, as original wood guardrails, with their open design, constitute a distinct hazard and could not be reinstalled as originally designed even when applying the CHBC. New compatible guardrails that meet the code requirements for height and maximum width of openings would be designed and installed following the SOI Standards. This may somewhat affect the historic character of the building, but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that had been added previously at the guardrails.

Under the SOI Standards Alternative, Building C – Santa Fe Room would be rehabilitated according to the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation. The work would be sensitive to the historic character even as visible changes would occur, with the potential addition of an exterior elevator or platform lift and new code-compliant guardrails at the Level 2 wood walkways. On balance, rehabilitating Building C – Santa Fe Room in compliance with the SOI Standards would not have a significant change to historic resources, although visual changes would be apparent.
Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station
The seismic retrofit and accessibility work would only be at the non-historic building (enclosure), which would not affect historic features and would have no effect on historic resources.

The structural repair following the SOI Standards would involve repairing or replacing in kind the historic “hat” structure. Standard 6 of the SOI Standards allows for in-kind replacement of deteriorated features when the severity of deterioration is such that repair is no longer possible. Replacing the historic “hat” roof structure in kind following the SOI Standards, matching the design, color, texture, and material, would have no significant change to the contributor or the eligible Historic District.

Building E – Office Center
Under the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, Building E – Office Center would be rehabilitated, with seismic retrofits and limited accessibility work that likely can comply with the SOI Standards, as the scope is similar to other buildings and as described in the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative. The building interior would be remediated for water and mold damage, which may involve replacing the interior cabin lining in kind to comply with the SOI Standards. However, an accessible route to the building that complies with the SOI Standards is not possible without major alterations to the cascading stairs or wood cribbing and concrete retaining walls of the unifying landscape and site element contributor, or other adjacent contributors.

Rehabilitation of Building E – Office Center in compliance with the SOI Standards would have no significant change to historic resources. However, use of the building would be limited to storage due to a non-accessible path of travel to the Middle Level.

Building F – Electric Vault
The vault below Building E – Office Center would be retained and renovated on the interior to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the nearby buildings. No structural or accessibility work would be proposed.

As Building F – Electric Vault is a non-contributor to the eligible Historic District, and as the proposed renovation would be on its interior, the work would not have any effect on historic resources.
SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Table 8 summarizes the changes to the contributors and non-contributors of the eligible Historic District under the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative. In general, all contributors within the Project site boundaries could be rehabilitated following the SOI Standards while addressing most structural repair, seismic retrofits, and accessibility and other code requirements, with the notable exception of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office. Full compliance with the SOI Standards would only result in accessibility to the building’s Level 2 restroom.

Table 8. SOI Standards Compliance Alternative – Summary of Changes to Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>District Status</th>
<th>General Approach for SOI Standards Compliant Alternative</th>
<th>Changes to Historic Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating and allow for re-occupancy. Meet accessibility requirements at Level 1 and 2, including installing an elevator or lift on the interior or exterior in an inconspicuous place. Install code-compliant and historically compatible guardrails at Level 2 exterior wood walkways.</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building and provide one additional ADA ramp at main entrance. The existing outdoor ramp behind the Project site buildings would be improved to provide compliant ADA access between the Upper and Lower Levels at Sunset Rec.</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Install code-compliant and historically compatible railings at exterior stairway. Meet accessibility requirements for access at Level 2 restroom only. Levels 1 and 3 interiors can be</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>District Status</td>
<td>General Approach for SOI Standards Compliant Alternative</td>
<td>Changes to Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Meet accessibility requirements at Level 2, including installing an elevator or lift on the exterior in an inconspicuous place. Install code-compliant and historically compatible guardrails at Level 2 exterior wood walkways.</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D – Lookout/ Lifeguard Station (Unit F)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building (enclosure) and seismically retrofit. Meet accessibility requirements at building (enclosure). Repair or replace in kind the historic “hat” structure.</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E – Office Center (Unit G)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Meet certain accessibility requirements at building, although an accessible path of travel would not be available. Remediate for interior water/mold damage.</td>
<td>No significant changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings.</td>
<td>None (all work interior to non-contributor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms (Unit H)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms (Unit A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room (Unit P)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Impact to Historic Resources Under CEQA

The SOI Standards Compliant Alternative would result in the retention and rehabilitation of all contributors in the eligible Historic District. Additions, exterior alterations, and related new construction would be visible, but generally would be able to be constructed with minimal effect following the SOI Standards.

The most visible changes to the overall eligible Historic District would be those necessary to address accessibility, particularly in providing accessible paths to building interiors. In the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, the approach would be piecemeal in that ADA access would be provided at each individual building or site feature, rather than implementing an integrated approach that connects the buildings and site areas, such as a central elevator (as proposed under the Project). Thus, accessible connectivity among the buildings and levels would remain lacking, since there would not be direct ADA-compliant paths to connect all site and building levels. Additionally, at Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office, full accessibility could not be achieved for its Level 1 restroom and Level 3 office while complying with the SOI Standards. This piecemeal approach to accessibility may not ultimately be permitted by the Campus Building Official.

Overall, the SOI Standards Complaint Alternative would avoid significant impacts to historic resources by retaining the eligibility and a sufficient level of integrity of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). However, accessibility challenges would persist, certain spaces may be restricted in terms of use, and it is uncertain whether such an approach would be permitted by the Campus Building Official due to these constraints.
PARTIAL PRESERVATION AND CODE COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE
(ALTERNATIVE 3 IN THE SEIR)

Description

The Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative would rehabilitate most of the existing buildings proposed for demolition as part of the proposed Project to address the safety issues while meeting most of the seismic and accessibility requirements. It is assumed the CHBC would be applied were possible under the provisions of the code. Where it is not possible, approaches consistent with the SOI Standards would be implemented, such as designing and installing code-compliant and SOI Standards-compatible guardrails where needed.

This alternative would involve demolition of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office and its replacement with a new elevator tower to provide accessible routes and connectivity among Building A – Vista Room, Building A1 – Buena Aires Room, and Building C – Santa Fe Room (Figure 6 and Figure 7). Landings on opposite sides of the elevator shaft would be provided at a total of four levels, with ramps connecting to the three buildings:

- Landing 1: Lower Level (at 495 ft, the finished grade shown on the original 1963-1964 drawings)
- Landing 2: Building A – Vista Room Level 2 (505 ft)
- Landing 3: Building C – Santa Fe Room Level 2 (510 ft)
- Landing 4: Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room at the Upper Level (515 ft)

No landing at the Middle Level (503 ft) would be included, as insufficient height exists to allow for two stacked stops to access the Middle Level and Building C – Santa Fe Room (510 ft). Accordingly, access to Building E – Office Center would be limited due to the lack of an ADA-compliant accessible path. Therefore, it is assumed under this alternative that use of the building would be restricted to storage.

The exterior stairway of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office could not be replaced in-kind due to space constraints and new elevator landings. Therefore, a new exterior stairway would be needed at Building A – Vista Room to provide secondary emergency access. A new exterior stairway is shown among the mark-ups at the southwest corner of Building A – Vista Room, closest to the Park Pool, which would allow for the entrance sequence and path at Level 1 of the building. A new accessible restroom would also be constructed within Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room to replace restrooms that would be removed in Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office.
Figure 6. Graphic representation of replacing Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office with a new elevator tower, drawn on the original Level 1 (Sheet A6) plans from the Smith and Williams “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set, 1963-1964 where level heights are shown. Edited by Safdie Rabines Architects.
Figure 7. Graphic representation of replacing Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office with a new elevator, drawn on the Level 2 (Sheet A7,) plans from the Smith and Williams “Canyon Recreation Center Project No. 940530” drawing set, 1963-1964. Edited by Safdie Rabines Architects.
Table 9 outlines the proposed work at each building in the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative.

**Table 9, Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative - Summary of Proposed Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Accessibility Upgrades / Code Required Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)                     | Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
                                           Repair  
                                           • Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams  
                                           Retrofit  
                                           • Remove and replace wall finishes (interior and/or exterior)  
                                           • Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries  
                                           • Add plywood sheathing at existing walls  
                                           • Provide new transfer beams below discontinuous shear walls  
                                           • Add moment frame or other SOI Standards compliant approach instead of shear walls, if permitted by Campus Building Official. | Meet accessibility requirements at Levels 1 and 2:  
                                           • Add accessible restrooms at Level 1  
                                           • Add ramp from new elevator to Vista Room at Level 2  
                                           • Widen doorways and install automatic doors at all entrances to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
                                           • Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
                                           Install new compatible railings at Level 2 exterior wood walkway  
                                           Install new exterior stairway for a second means of egress |
| Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)             | N/A                               | Improve accessibility:  
                                           • Install ramp at building entrance next to Family Pool  
                                           • Add ramp from new elevator to Buenos Aires Room  
                                           • Add tactile strips and handrails to stairs at entrance  
                                           • Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
                                           • Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
                                           • Construct new accessible restroom within the Buenos Aires Room. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>Structural Retrofit Improvements</th>
<th>Accessibility Upgrades / Code Required Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/ Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>N/A Demolish existing building and replace with new elevator tower that would meet current structural codes.</td>
<td>N/A Demolish existing building and replace with new elevator tower with openings on two sides for the elevator, four new landings, and ramps from the landings to access Vista Room, Buenos Aires Room, Santa Fe Room. Exterior stairway would not be replaced, as space constraints and elevator landings would not allow for stair replacement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C) | Undergo structural repair and seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
**Repair**  
- Remove and replace all deteriorated structural wood members, including posts and beams  
**Retrofit**  
- Remove and replace wall finishes (interior and exterior)  
- Add hold-down hardware at shear wall boundaries  
- Add plywood sheathing at existing walls | Meet accessibility requirements at Level 2 (Santa Fe Room):  
- Add ramp from new elevator to Santa Fe Room  
- Install automatic doors to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
- Add tactile strips where necessary  
- Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights  
Meet accessibility requirements at seating area:  
- Additional ramps, paving, or other modifications may be necessary  
Install new compatible railings at Level 2 exterior wood walkway. |
| Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station (Unit F) | Undergo seismic retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating:  
- Provide new lateral resisting system (e.g., timber braces, steel braces, cantilever, steel columns, etc.) at non-historic enclosure  
Repair or replace in kind the deteriorated wood canopy (i.e., historic “hat” structure) | Meet accessibility requirements:  
- Install automatic door to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility devices  
- Add tactile strips where necessary.  
- Relocate all light switches, thermostats, and other controls to accessible heights |
Changes to Contributors and the Eligible Historic District

Building A – Vista Room

Building A – Vista Room would be retained and rehabilitated. The structural repair and seismic retrofit work would be the same as proposed under the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, with an assumption that a SOI Standards compliant approach such as moment frames would meet UC Seismic Performance requirements and would be permitted by the Campus Building Official. If moment frames cannot provide the same or better level of retrofit as shear walls at Level 1, then the shear walls would have the same potential to significantly change the building’s historic character as in the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative.

The accessible upgrades at Level 1 and Level 2 would also be similar to the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, though instead of an elevator or platform lift on the interior or exterior of the building, the accessible route to Level 2 would be provided by the central elevator at Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office.

The exterior wood walkway at Level 2 would also require new code-compliant railings designed in a manner that is compatible with the building’s historic character and following the SOI Standards. This may somewhat change the historic character of the building but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that has been added previously at the guardrails.
The new exterior stairway for the second means of egress for Level 2 would be highly visible and has the potential to change the building's historic character if a SOI Standards-compliant design could not be achieved. However, the relatively small stair addition would not be so intrusive as to result in the loss of integrity for the building or for it to lose its status as a district contributor.

Under the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative, Building A – Vista Room would still retain its eligibility as a contributor despite the visible alterations.

Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room
The scope of work is mostly the same for Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room as under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative and the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative, with the added construction of an accessible restroom within the room. The new restroom would remove a closet but would not have a significant change to the building. Overall, the effect of the alterations under this alternative would be minimal and likely SOI Standards compliant.

In addition, the new elevator at Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would provide an accessible route directly to the Buenos Aires Room from the Lower Level. Under the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative, the effect on Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room would be minimal and can be SOI Standards compliant.

Building A.2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office
Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office would be demolished and replaced with a new elevator tower. While the design of a new elevator tower may attempt to replicate the original architectural style, removal of the existing structure would represent the loss of a contributor to the eligible Historic District. Additionally, portions of the nearest cascading concrete steps at the Middle Level, paving, and associated site context would be modified and/or removed, thus affecting a portion of the unifying landscape and site elements contributor.

Building C – Santa Fe Room
Structural repair and seismic retrofit to Building C – Santa Fe Room would be similar to the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative. An accessible route to the Santa Fe Room at Level 2 of Building C – Santa Fe Room would be accomplished by the new elevator, and the other accessibility and code requirements would be addressed in the same manner as under the SOI Standards Compliant Alternative. This includes new code-compliant guardrails at the Level 2 exterior wood walkway designed in a manner that is compatible with the building's historic character and following the SOI Standards. This may somewhat change the historic character of the building but should be more visually compatible than the latticework that has been added previously at the guardrails.
Under the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative, the changes to Building C – Santa Fe Room would be minimal and SOI Standards compliant.

Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station
The work at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station would be the same as under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative. The seismic retrofit and accessibility work would only be at the non-historic building (enclosure), which would not affect historic features and would have no effect on historic resources.

The structural repair involves repairing or replacing in-kind the historic “hat” roof structure at Building D – Lookout/Lifeguard Station, as its wood structural members are deteriorated. This would be accomplished following the SOI Standards, specifically Standard 6 that allows for in-kind replacement of deteriorated features when the severity of deterioration is such that repair is no longer possible. Replacing the historic “hat” roof structure in kind following the SOI Standards, matching the design, color, texture, and material, would have no significant effect on the contributor or the eligible Historic District.

Building E – Office Center
Because an accessible route to the Middle Level and this building would not be accomplished by the new elevator, Building E – Office Center would be used for storage only. The work at Building E – Office Center would be the same as under the Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative with seismic retrofits and limited accessibility improvements.

Under the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative, the changes to Building E – Office Center would be minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant. However, its use would be restricted.

Building F – Electric Vault
The vault below Building E – Office Center would be retained and renovated on the interior to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the nearby buildings. No structural or accessibility work would be proposed.

As Building F – Electric Vault is a non-contributor to the eligible Historic District, and the proposed renovation would be on its interior, the work would not have any effect on historic resources.
SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO ELIGIBLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Table 10 summarizes the changes to the contributors and non-contributors of the eligible Historic District under the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative. In general, only one contributor would be lost, instead of the six under the proposed Project, and a new central elevator would be constructed in the place of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office. The five remaining contributors within the Project site boundary would be rehabilitated to address structural repair, seismic retrofits, and accessibility and other code requirements while likely complying with the SOI Standards.

Table 10. Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative - Summary of Changes to on Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</th>
<th>District Status</th>
<th>General Approach for SOI Standards Compliant Alternative</th>
<th>Changes to on Historic Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A – Vista Room (Unit B)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating and allow for re-occupancy. Meet accessibility requirements at Levels 1 and 2. Install code-compliant and historically compatible guardrails at Level 2 exterior wood walkways. Install new exterior stairway for a second means of egress.</td>
<td>Potential to change historic character depending on where new exterior stairway is located, though likely to retain enough integrity as a contributor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room (Unit D)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building and provide one additional ADA ramp at main entrance.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office (Unit E)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Demolish building and replace with new elevator tower.</td>
<td>Loss of contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C – Santa Fe Room (Unit C)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Structurally repair and seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating. Meet accessibility requirements at Level 2. Install code-compliant and historically compatible guardrails at Level 2 exterior wood walkways.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Canyon Rec Center Building (1963 Designation)</td>
<td>District Status</td>
<td>General Approach for SOI Standards Compliant Alternative</td>
<td>Changes to on Historic Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D – Lookout/ Lifeguard Station (Unit F)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building (enclosure) and seismically retrofit. Meet accessibility requirements at building (enclosure). Repair or replace in-kind the deteriorated historic “hat” structure.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E – Office Center (Unit G)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Retain building. Seismically retrofit to meet acceptable UC Seismic Performance rating and use for storage.</td>
<td>Minimal and likely can be SOI Standards compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building F – Electric Vault (N/A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Retain and renovate space as needed to accommodate replacement electrical equipment to serve the buildings.</td>
<td>None (all work interior to non-contributor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G – Family Pool Restrooms (Unit H)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H – Park Pool Locker Rooms (Unit A)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H.1 – Park Pool Mechanical Room (Unit P)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pool (Unit L/M)</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Pool (Unit N)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Not relevant. Outside project boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying landscape and site elements (N/A)</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Limited alterations related to demolition of Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office and construction of new central elevator.</td>
<td>Changes to some site elements, though likely to retain enough integrity as a contributor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Impact to Historic Resources Under CEQA

The Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative would lessen impacts to historic resources compared to the proposed Project, as fewer contributors would be lost. In addition, the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative is not expected to render the eligible Historic District no longer historic, despite the losses. Losing Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office as a contributor would further erode the eligible Historic District's integrity, but the retention of Building A – Vista Room, Building A1 – Buenos Aires Room and Building C – Santa Fe Room in their existing locations with their spatial relationships to each other and the rest of the site would still render the district as recognizable and convey its significance as a mature work of Smith and Williams. The new elevator tower would be in approximately the same location as Building A2 – Stair Tower/Restroom/Office and not expected to be highly intrusive within the district.

The addition of a new exterior stairway at Building A – Vista Room may be highly visible and affect the building's historic character, but likely not to the point where it would no longer be a contributor. The structural and accessibility work at the other contributors would generally be minor and likely can be accomplished following the SOI Standards. The proposed work at the lone non-contributor, Building F – Electric Vault, would be on the interior and would have no effect on the eligible Historic District.

Overall, the Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative would avoid significant impacts to historic resources by retaining the eligibility and sufficient level of integrity of the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). It should be noted that in this alternative, the Middle Level and Building E – Office Center would not have an accessible route from the new elevator, and thus use of that building would be restricted.
5. CONCLUSION

This report analyzes five alternatives to the proposed Sunset Canyon Recreation Replacement Building Project (Project), which was found to have a significant adverse impact on the California Register-eligible Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Historic District. Table 11 summarizes the impact of the proposed Project and each alternative based on the number of contributors that would be retained and the level of the impact to historic resources under CEQA.

Table 11. Summary of Impacts to the Eligible Historic District by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project/ Mothballing Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Reuse/ Partial Mothball Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Demolition Alternative</th>
<th>SOI Standards Compliant Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Eligible Historic District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors Demolished or Lost to Major Alterations</td>
<td>7 of 10</td>
<td>0 of 10</td>
<td>0 of 10</td>
<td>5 of 10</td>
<td>0 of 10</td>
<td>1 of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors Remaining</td>
<td>3 of 10</td>
<td>10 of 10</td>
<td>10 of 10</td>
<td>5 of 10</td>
<td>10 of 10</td>
<td>9 of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to Historic Resources under CEQA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Retains CR Eligibility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Avoids significant impact</td>
<td>Avoids significant impact</td>
<td>Lessens impact, but still significant</td>
<td>Avoids significant impact</td>
<td>Avoids significant impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the five alternatives analyzed, four would avoid significant adverse impacts by retaining the Historic District’s eligibility for the California Register, as summarized below.

- The No Project/Mothballing Alternative would retain all of the eligible Historic District’s contributors with minimal work to stabilize and secure the buildings, several of which would remain vacant and unusable.
- The Partial Reuse/Partial Mothball Alternative would retain, structurally repair and retrofit all of the contributors within the Project site as needed, while mothballing the areas that
currently have no accessible routes. Many of the spaces within the contributors would remain vacant and unusable or used for storage.

- The Building Replacement with Reduced Demolition Alternative would demolish fewer contributors than the proposed Project and would therefore lessen impacts to historic resources, but the eligible Historic District would no longer be eligible for California Register listing. The demolition of three core recreation buildings, particularly Building A – Vista Room that is the largest building and anchors the eligible Historic District, would change the historic character to the point that the eligible Historic District would no longer be recognizable or able to convey its significance as the work of Smith and Williams. The impact to historic resources under this alternative would be less than the proposed Project because two more contributors would be retained, but the Historic District would be lost, which would still result in a significant adverse impact to historic resources.

- The SOI Standards Compliant Alternative would retain all of the contributors and rehabilitate those within the Project site in compliance with the SOI Standards. Most of the structural repairs and seismic retrofit would be able to be accomplished, along with other code-required work, but providing accessible routes would not be possible to all contributors. In addition, the accessible routes that could be provided meeting the SOI Standards would not offer a connected or continuous accessible path through the site.

- The Partial Preservation and Code Compliant Alternative would demolish one contributor and replace it with a new elevator tower in approximately the same location. The retained contributors would be mostly rehabilitated in compliance with the SOI Standards for structural repairs, seismic retrofits, and other code-required work, including accessibility upgrades where the spaces would be accessible. The Middle Level would not have an accessible route even with a new central elevator.
6. REFERENCES


University of California, Sunset Canyon Recreation Center Replacement Project Initial Study, July 2023.
APPENDIX

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

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