

Winehaven
Point Molate Naval Fuel Depot
Richmond
Contra Costa County
California

HABS No. CA-2658

HABS
CAL
7-RICH,
2-

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

**Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Western Region
Department of the Interior
San Francisco, California 94107**

HABS
CAL
7-RICH,
2-

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDING SURVEY
WINEHAVEN

HABS No. CA-2658

- Location:** Point Molate Naval Fuel Depot.
Point Molate, Richmond, Contra Costa County, California
- U.S.G.S. San Quentin, 7.5' Quadrangle. UTM Coordinates:
UTM Points: A 10 / 551220 / 4200100
B 10 / 551420 / 4200080
C 10 / 551520 / 4200420
D 10 / 551180 / 4200680
- Present Owner:** U.S. Navy
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Oakland
Oakland, California 94601
- Present Use:** Naval Fuel Depot
- Significance:** Winehaven, a complex of 35 buildings constructed between 1907 and 1919, is significant historically and architecturally in the areas of wine production and industrial design. During its 12-year operation, Winehaven was one of the largest (reputable sources say it was the largest) wineries in the world, capable of storing, aging, and bottling millions of gallons of wine. Architecturally, the Winehaven complex represents an unusually intact company town, containing 29 residences, two very large winery buildings, a shipping building, and three support buildings (a power plant, fire house, and warehouse), all dating to the period in which the winery operated. In addition, the winery buildings are unusual and significant in their castellated, industrial Gothic design and as examples of fireproof and seismically-reinforced industrial buildings designed in response to the 1906 earthquake in Northern California.

1. PHYSICAL CONTEXT OF WINEHAVEN

Winehaven is a collection of 35 historic buildings, built between 1907 and 1919, occupying about 27 acres within the much larger Naval Fuel Depot at Point Molate, in western Richmond, Contra Costa County, California. Point Molate is a minor point along a larger peninsula in western Richmond, sometimes called the San Pablo Peninsula, north of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. This peninsula is used principally for industrial purposes, including the Navy facility at Point Molate. To the north of Point Molate, near Point San Pablo, Chevron Corporation maintains a fuel storage facility. A quarry exists south of Point Molate, near Castro Point. Interspersed with these industrial facilities, however, are several recreational areas, including a county park south of Point Molate and a yacht harbor at Point San Pablo. The hillsides of the peninsula are densely vegetated and the many beaches and inlets teem with wildlife, giving the area an unusual mix of natural beauty and industrial traffic, noise, and air pollution.

The historic buildings at Winehaven exist in a relatively compact area which includes few intrusions. Within the boundary of the National Register of Historic Places listing¹, there exist only 11 non-contributing buildings, most of which are small scale and generally in keeping with the character of the historic setting. Eight, for example, are multiple-vehicle garages built by the U.S. Navy to serve the 29 historic residences. Outside the National Register-listed area, however, the Naval Fuel Supply Depot comprises large fuel tanks and other apparatus associated with the Naval Fuel Depot, which has operated at this site since 1942.

2. SPECIFIC HISTORY OF WINEHAVEN

Winehaven was built between 1907 and 1919 by the California Wine Association (CWA). The CWA, established in 1894, was a corporation formed from the assets of individual wineries, wine merchants, and others in the wine industry, all of whom deeded assets to the corporation in exchange for its stock. The corporation was pieced together chiefly by San Francisco wine dealers, with S. Lachman & Co. taking the lead. Percy Morgan was president of the corporation throughout its most expansive period, 1907-1914, with B. K. Kittridge and M. J. Fontana guiding the firm during its last

¹Winehaven was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1978, based upon an undated nomination form that was approved by the California State Historic Preservation Officer in 1976. The 1976 nomination included an area of about 71 acres (erroneously identified as more than 100 acres in the nomination form), less than half of which is occupied by buildings associated with Winehaven; the remaining acreage is occupied by fuel tanks and appurtenant structures associated with the use of the land by the U.S. Navy as a Naval Fuel Depot. The U.S. Navy has completed a proposal to revise the boundaries of the nominated property to more closely reflect the extent of resources that remain from the years, 1907-1919.

years of operations.² When it was formed, seven wine dealers and wine makers were involved. In time, more and more merchants and wineries joined the firm, including the important Italian-Swiss Colony, which became part of the CWA operations in about 1917. The corporation came to represent the biggest single entity in wine production in the state and was the dominant wine maker and distributor in California between 1900 and the beginning of Prohibition in 1919.³ Assets of the company were always more than \$10 million during the period in which it operated Winehaven.

By 1906, the CWA owned facilities throughout California. Although wineries owned or controlled by CWA produced wine under individual labels, the company also sold wine under the "Calwa" and other labels. CWA wines were generally blended from overstocks from the individual wineries.⁴ CWA and its constituent wineries also produced a full complement of other wine products, including champagne and brandy. This pattern of manufacture and distribution by CWA and its constituent wineries was well-established a decade before Winehaven was constructed. The Calwa label was reserved for better wines produced by the company. These wines were sold throughout the world by the Calwa Distributing Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of CWA. CWA earned the praise of California wine industry experts for the fact that it could sell California wines in Europe, a feat rarely accomplished by other wine producers.⁵

In early 1906, the largest storehouses and wine blending and aging rooms for the CWA were in San Francisco. The San Francisco facilities and others in the Bay Area were decimated in the 1906 earthquake. It is estimated that the CWA lost ten million gallons of wine in the earthquake and fire.⁶ Although most of these losses were insured, the great destruction of buildings and product convinced the association to rebuild in "fireproof" materials and at another location. That alternative site was found at Point Molate.

² The story of the CWA is presented in greatest detail in Ruth Teiser and Catherine Harroun, *Winemaking in California*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1983, Chapter 17, "The California Wine Association." The corporation is also treated in detail in Ernest Peninou and Sidney Greenleaf, *Winemaking in California*. Santa Barbara: The Porpoise Bookstore, 1954, Vol. 2, "The California Wine Association." The business of the CWA was followed closely in the *Pacific Wine and Spirits Review*, a California-based trade journal that published from 1907 to 1919, the years in which Winehaven was in operation.

³ Teiser and Harroun; Peninou and Greenleaf; George C. Collier, "Point Molate," September 11, 1976. This paper was included as an appendix to the original National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Winehaven. Its provenance was not recorded. Mr. Collier was a prolific local historian and his work, including this piece, is well represented in the Richmond Room of the Richmond Public Library.

⁴ Peninou and Greenleaf; Teiser and Harroun.

⁵ *Pacific Wine and Spirits Review*, October 30, 1909, p. 11, hereafter PWSR.

⁶ Peninou and Greenleaf, p. 31.

In December, 1906, the CWA purchased 47 acres at Point Molate to develop a central wine cellar. Construction began in 1907, with the initial construction being a reinforced concrete wine cellar (the cellar still exists and is part of the building identified in this report as Building 6) as well as the Winehaven Hotel. (The Winehaven Hotel no longer exists; it was destroyed in 1957. The hotel was situated on a hill at the southern end of the Winehaven complex, its location denoted by Hotel Road.) The remainder of the buildings were constructed in phases after that date. A second wine cellar (Building 1) was constructed in 1908, as were the power house [Building 13], and the loading platform and refrigeration building [Building 10]. Some housing was constructed early in development of the facility but the bulk of the housing was constructed late in the 12-year life of the winery. Major expansions were made to the two major buildings, Buildings 1 and 6. Building 6 expanded to more than three times its original size in additions of 1913 and about 1915⁷, and Building 1 expanded to the north in 1917.⁸

The location at Point Molate was advantageous to the wine corporation for many reasons, chief among which was the excellent transportation network there. Richmond developed as an industrial town because of its excellent connections with transcontinental railroad lines, as well as the existence of a usable port. The San Pablo Peninsula was linked to the Richmond port and transcontinental rail lines by the Richmond Belt Line. The Richmond Belt Line, which served all of the western Richmond waterfront, had been established early in the 20th century and was a boon to industrial development throughout the area. Various spur lines from the Belt Line had been established to serve industrial operations in and near Point Molate. For example, in 1906 a quarry had been established south of Point Molate, and the Castro Point Railroad was built to connect it with the Richmond Belt Line. In addition, the Winehaven location at Point Molate was easily accessible by ship. Ocean-vessel harbors and wharfs had been established at and near Point Molate for several years prior to construction of Winehaven.⁹ As early as 1908, CWA had built its own electric rail line to move materials within the complex, carrying material from the Richmond Belt Line and from the Winehaven wharf to the winery.¹⁰ The wharf existed between Buildings 1 and 6 and included tracks for the electric rail line; it was demolished by the Navy between 1949 and 1960.

⁷PWSR, March 31, 1913, p. 45; no firm date has been established for the second addition; it occurred between 1913 and 1916.

⁸PWSR, March 31, 1917, p. 15.

⁹Susan D. Cole, *Richmond -- Windows to the Past*, Richmond: Wildcat Canyon Books, 1980.

¹⁰Dan Shelburne and B.H. Ward, *Richmond Industrial: The Industrial Railroads on Point Richmond, Richmond, California*, San Mateo, California: The Western Railroader, No. 304, 1965. The electric line was mentioned in the 1908 Annual Report, reprinted in PWSR, February 28, 1909, p. 17.

The facility constructed by the CWA at Point Molate was called Winehaven from the outset.¹¹ Winehaven was given an unusual but nonetheless very important role within the larger operations of the CWA. The CWA was, as noted, a corporate blending of numerous vintners throughout the State of California. The CWA and its constituent wineries owned many other facilities. The CWA, for example, owned a major winery in Fresno County, called Calwa, as well as many smaller wineries throughout the state, such as the Yolo Winery in Woodland, Yolo County. Other wineries, including Graystone in Napa County, were owned partially by the corporation and provided bulk wine to Winehaven while distributing bottled wine under their own labels.

Winehaven existed for several purposes. Its principal function was to store, age, and bottle the excess capacity of the member wineries. Wine was brought to Winehaven in tanker cars where it was off-loaded and stored, aged, blended, bottled and shipped. The big winery at Calwa in Fresno sent most of its product to Winehaven for this purpose, as did the small winery in Woodland. Other wineries, such as Graystone in Napa County, bottled their own product and sent only their excess wine to Winehaven.¹² The large capacity of Buildings 1 and 6 at Winehaven, as well as the excellent rail and dock services, allowed the facility to handle huge amounts of wine per year. Wine was shipped in bottles and in barrels. The *Pacific Wine and Spirit Review* often ran stories to document especially large shipments of wine in bulk, including one story, with photograph, regarding a 1914 bulk shipment of 4,250 barrels of wine, bound for New York City.¹³

The facility was also used to crush grapes and ferment wine. General histories of the California wine industry (Teiser and Harroun and Peninou and Greenleaf) contend that the Winehaven facility was used only to age, blend and bottle wines in its early years and did not acquire crushing and fermentation equipment until 1911.¹⁴ This does not, however, appear to have been the case. Indeed, one of the first major investments at Winehaven was a state-of-the-art crusher, manufactured by Toulouse & Delorieux, a San Francisco manufacturer.¹⁵ The first crush occurred in the fall of 1907, inside the west wing of Building 6, involving carloads of grapes from the Central Valley.¹⁶ From the outset, then, Winehaven was a winery in every sense, capable of crushing grapes sent to the facility from member wineries, as well as aging, blending and bottling bulk wines delivered to the

¹¹ California Wine Association, "Principal Cellars, 'Winehaven,' on San Francisco Bay, n.d. ca. 1909. Copy in California State Library, Sacramento.

¹²The operations of the facility are explained in the Annual reports, reprinted in the February issue each year of the PWSR.

¹³PWSR, January 31, 1914, p. 36.

¹⁴Peninou and Greenleaf, p. 32; Teiser and Herroun, p. 165.

¹⁵PWSR, September 30, 1907.

¹⁶PWSR, August 31, 1907.

facility from member companies.¹⁷ The heart of the operation, however, appears to have been the storage, aging, blending, and bottling of wine that was delivered to the facility by rail tankers.

The CWA built a small company town at Winehaven. Company towns were common throughout the American West during the early twentieth century. The bulk of these were built for major manufacturing facilities that were by nature situated in remote locations, particularly towns associated with the mining and timber industries.¹⁸ Winehaven was somewhat unusual among Western company towns in several respects: it was a winery, and therefore one of a small group of company towns associated with that industry; it was not nearly as isolated as most company towns, being a short distance from Richmond and Oakland¹⁹; and it did not include the full range of services, particularly commercial services, commonly associated with a fully-developed company town. Nonetheless, it certainly was a company town, providing a broad range of services for its employees, including: a place of employment (principally the wine cellars as well as the cooperage, the railroad, and other aspects of the works); housing (the existing housing units account for nearly all of the housing the company built there); basic infrastructure, such as roads, an electrical generation plant, and so forth; as well as recreational and social facilities, including a school, hotel, and social hall. Unfortunately, all of the social and recreational facilities have been destroyed. The manufacturing, housing, and most of the infrastructure elements, however, still remain.

Winehaven was the heart of the company's operations and represented a substantial part of its assets. In 1917, the company listed the value of Winehaven investments at \$3.5 million,²⁰ while the total assets of the company ranged from \$10 to \$17 million through the period 1907-1919.²¹

The type of facility constructed there, along with the relationship between historic and current conditions, may be assessed by reference to two Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the facility: one from 1916 and one from 1930. In 1916, the facility was still growing, still under construction. By the 1930s, the facility had been abandoned for nearly a decade but not yet taken over by the Navy.

¹⁷Peninou and Greenleaf, p. 32; Teiser and Herroun, p. 165. Apparently, the Winehaven port was also used to ship bottles, aged elsewhere, which could be delivered by railroad car and transhipped via the deep water harbor.

¹⁸The Western company town has been studied in great detail. Still the best single work on the subject is James B. Allen, *The Company Town in the American West*, Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1966. Mining towns have been studied in particularly close detail.

¹⁹It was not the only company town, however, in coastal Contra Costa County. Similar industrial communities had been built at Hercules and Crockett.

²⁰F. J. Hulaniski, *The History of Contra Costa County, California*, Berkeley: The Elms Publishing Company, 1917, p. 349.

²¹Annual Reports to the Stockholders of the California Wine Association, reprinted in each February edition of the PWSR.

Very little had changed there between closure of the facility in 1919 and preparation of the Sanborn map in 1930, apart from abandonment of the operation. The two maps are valuable snapshots of what occurred there historically.

In 1916 (as in 1930 and today), the industrial area of Winehaven was dominated by Buildings 1 and 6, the principal cellars. Building 1 was in 1916 about three quarters of its present area, measured in first story "footprint"; the building shown in 1916 comprised most of the current total because the addition was one story. It included a tall two-story brick building (it was actually three-story, with one story underground) with three equal-sized rooms, called Storage Cellar Nos. 1-3, numbered from south to north. A third above-ground story was built atop Storage Cellar No. 3, a "filter tower." A series of concrete platforms lined the building to the east. Railroad tracks existed on both sides of the building but platforms were found only on the east. At the rear of the building was a frame segment, only as wide as the filter tower, along with a loading platform. It was used for barrel storage and loading and unloading.

By 1930, Building 1 had been expanded to the north, matching its current footprint. A reinforced concrete addition to the north was identified as Storage Cellar No. 4. It was the largest of the cellars in Building 1, at least in terms of its first story area, being nearly twice as wide as the remaining rooms. It was, however, only one story tall.

Building 6 was nearly as large as Building 1, although Building 1 dominated the landscape, owing to its brick color and architectural detail. Building 6 at its northern two thirds included three large Storage Cellars, nearly equal in size to the original cellars of Building 1; these were identified as cellars 6, 7, and 8. [There is no indication on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the location of cellar 5, presumed to have existed or have been planned.] The southern third of the building was taken up by a room identified as Storage Cellar No. 9 and "Fermentation Room." This large room included three roof-top vents.

By 1930, Building 6 (as with all other buildings at the facility) was vacant. The functions of the rooms were, however, identified and were the same as in 1916.

Building 10 was in 1916 a building with a straight wall on the west and curved wall on the east, conforming to the alignment of railroad tracks on either side. It included a brick masonry refrigeration unit at the north. A long room in the center was used as a wash house; it was corrugated iron on "partly steel frame." A smaller room at the south was a cooper shop. There existed a long open platform at the southern end of the building. By 1930, the building was much the same except the open platform at the southern end had been filled by a building.

Building 13 was in 1916 a masonry boiler house with a smoke stack at the rear (east). It housed a 200 kw generator and two 100 kw transformers. There was a 58,500 gallon underground oil tank just south of the building. In 1930, the building housed the same equipment. Attached to Building 13 to the northwest was an "engine house," used to shelter the electric engines for the internal

railroad at the facility.²²

Immediately south of Building 13 (due east of Building 6) was the third largest building at Winehaven, behind Buildings 1 and 6. It was in the location occupied today by Building 123, the modern shop building for the Fuel Depot. The earlier structure was a woodframe building with corrugated metal siding, used for bottle storage and for Calwa's non-alcoholic grape drink bottling operation. The building was vacant but still standing in 1930.

In 1916 and 1930, there existed nearly a dozen small buildings on the flat east of Building 13. These were all woodframe, probably metal sided, and used for a variety of purposes. Several were identified simply as storage sheds. Another was a blacksmith shop, another a workshop. One building, immediately behind Building 13, was the social hall for the volunteer fire department. Of these, only one building (Building 17) still exists. It is shown as a "workshop" on both the 1916 and 1930 Sanborns. Building 63, used today as a firehouse, may be observed on the 1930 Sanborn map but not on the map of 1916. The use of Building 63 is not identified in the Sanborn.

Another major industrial building existed in 1916 and 1930 on the toe of land north of Building 1. It was occupied by the Fresno Cooperage; this building no longer exists.

The situation is somewhat confusing with respect to the housing at Winehaven. The 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance map concentrates chiefly on the industrial facility. Some housing is shown in an inset at the upper right corner of the page. That inset shows only seven frame dwellings in an area now occupied by houses numbered Buildings 45, 46, 47, 53, 54, and 56. The 1916 Sanborn map depicts only open space immediately south of these seven buildings. The 1916 Sanborn map does not include the area in which the remaining houses are located. In the 1930 Sanborn map, all existing housing units are shown, as well as a few other buildings in the housing area, buildings that have since been demolished.

The question raised by the two Sanborns is: Did the 1916 map show all of the housing that existed at the time? Or did the preparer, for whatever reason, fail to illustrate some of the housing? In the case of Buildings 41-44, it seems clear that the housing did not exist in 1916: the area those houses now occupy is shown on the map but the houses are not. The area occupied by the other housing, however, is simply not shown on the map.

It appears that both explanations are plausible and both may be true. It is known that many homes were built late in the life of the facility, after the 1916 Sanborn map was prepared. In March, 1917, for example, the *Richmond Record-Herald* reported that 11 cottages were under construction at the

²²A photograph of this engine house is shown in Dan Shelburne and B.H. Ward, *Richmond Industrial: The Industrial Railroads on Point Richmond, Richmond, California*. San Mateo, California: The Western Railroader, No. 304, 1965.

Winehaven site.²² Other evidence proves, however, that housing existed in 1916 above and beyond the houses shown in the 1916 Sanborn. There exist dozens of historic photographs of Winehaven, stored in various repositories in the Bay Area and in Sacramento. These historic views are rarely dated definitively, however, making it difficult to establish precisely when the various houses were constructed. The *Pacific Wine and Spirit Review* of December 31, 1910, includes a photograph of Winehaven, including a distant view of the housing complex. The Winemaster's House (Building 60) may be easily identified in that photograph, owing to its prominent hilltop setting and the distinctive dormers in its roofline. It is known for certain, then, that Building 60 existed prior to 1916 but is not shown on the Sanborn map of that year.

All that may be concluded about the housing at Winehaven is that much, but not all, of it was built before 1916 and that the full complement of 29 houses found there today were constructed before Winehaven was abandoned in 1919.

By 1916, then, all of the industrial buildings at Winehaven were in place as well as necessary support buildings, such as a power plant, blacksmith shop, warehouses, and so forth. Some of the housing was in place but the company continued to build housing even after 1916. The operation was growing right up to the point of its demise in 1919; only Prohibition, and not any problems with the operation itself, led to the shutdown of Winehaven.

Contemporary as well as historical accounts commonly refer to Winehaven as the largest winery in the world. The *San Francisco Examiner*, for example, referred to the plant in this manner in describing industrial facilities around Richmond Harbor:

Winehaven -- largest winery in the world. This plant, located on the deep water frontage, makes Richmond the center of the wine industry in the State. Ships bring wine from the belt railroad wharves to all parts of the world.²⁴

The *Pacific Wine and Spirits Review*, the most authoritative trade journal during the period of operation for Winehaven, also commonly referred to the facility as the "largest winery in the world."²⁵ Such superlative descriptions are difficult to prove or disprove, owing to the large number

²² *Richmond Record-Herald* March 8, 1917. Included in vertical clipping file at the Richmond Room, Richmond Public Library.

²⁴ *San Francisco Examiner*, March 28, 1914, Pp. 13-14. The claim to being the largest winery in the world is repeated by Teiser and Herroun, p. 165. Such claims are always difficult to verify; clearly, Winehaven was a very large operation by industry standards. According to Teiser and Herroun, the facility was capable of storing and aging between six and ten million gallons at a time.

²⁵ The previously referenced photograph in the December 31, 1910 edition bore a caption, "Winehaven: Largest Winery in the World." That characterization was used in many occasions in this publication.

of wineries that existed throughout the world in the early twentieth century. It is indisputable, however, that the company itself felt that Winehaven was the largest such facility and that other knowledgeable commentators agreed.

The operation, however, was short-lived. The 18th Amendment to the United States Constitution was adopted in early 1919, with approval of the necessary number of state legislatures occurring in January of that year. The Amendment provided for enforcement to occur one year after its passage. The CWA had expressed great fear of Prohibition-type legislation at the local, state, and Federal levels throughout the twentieth century, warning that such legislation would "confiscate" the property of the company. Although aware of the risks posed by the Prohibition movement, the CWA continued to expand its operations through 1918, in response to excellent market conditions relating to the destruction of French crops during World War I. In early 1919, however, the CWA began to dispose of whatever assets it could, chiefly vineyards which could be converted to non-wine production. In January, 1919, it sold its biggest vineyard in Fresno County, a 2,551-acre parcel.²⁶

The bulk of the assets of the company, however, were of little value, including the facility at Winehaven and the hundreds of thousands of gallons of wine in stock. Briefly, the corporation was able to sell off its wine stock before the 18th Amendment was enforced. Some activity persisted at the facility for a few years after passage of the 18th Amendment. In time, however, the entire operation was closed and abandoned and the residences left vacant. As to a date for the death of the Winehaven facility, the day of February 4, 1925 may suffice, that being the date in which the Winehaven postal address was withdrawn.²⁷ The property was vacant and unused for more than a decade thereafter.

The property was acquired by the U.S. Navy in 1942 and used as a Naval Fuel Depot during World War II. "Conditions Maps" from the World War II era indicate that the Navy was less interested in the Winehaven site *per se* than with the open lands around it and its access to the deep waters of San Francisco Bay. The San Pablo Peninsula, as noted, had long been used for fuel storage by private parties. The Navy simply extended that use to the open lands vacated by the winery as well as lands to the south that had not been part of the Winehaven parcel. By 1944, the Navy had installed dozens of large concrete fuel tanks uphill from Winehaven and in the hills to the south. The Navy also built a new pier at the point of land south of Winehaven -- Point Molate -- and equipped the area with drum storage areas and rail lines connecting the drum storage areas with the pier. The old Winehaven area was also used by the Navy. The Winemaster's House (Building 60) was fitted for use by the Commanding Officer. The other cottages became quarters for Navy personnel. The winery buildings (Buildings 1 and 6) were used for storage, presumably relating to storage of material needed to maintain the facility. The other buildings were adapted for Navy uses. The school house (which no longer exists) was used as a school house. Building 63 was made into a

²⁶PWSR, January 31, 1919, p. 8.

²⁷*San Francisco Call*, February 4, 1925, P. 8.

firehouse, and the warehouses for incidental tool storage, paint storage, and so forth. The Winehaven Hotel (which no longer exists) was used as a cafeteria and visiting officers' quarters.²⁸

Between 1942 and today, the Navy dramatically modified the area around the old Winehaven complex but changed the Winehaven buildings to a much lesser degree. The most important modification to the Winehaven complex came about through demolition. As the buildings were unneeded or structurally deteriorated, the Navy tore them down. Two large frame industrial buildings were demolished: one north of Building 1, which had been a cooperage, and another across the Main Road from Building 6. The school house was torn down as was the hotel. These demolitions occurred between 1949 and 1960.²⁹ The support buildings in the area of Building 13 were also torn down; it appears that most of them were demolished as soon as the property was taken over by the Navy. The Navy also made some changes to the Winehaven buildings that still stand. Building 63 was expanded in 1957. Building 6 was fitted with an internal office space, probably during World War II, a change that required new windows to be cut into the concrete walls. Miscellaneous changes have been made to the windows on Buildings 1 and 6, particularly at the second story, west wall of Building 6. The residences were modified through installation of stucco siding over the original shingles, apparently during the 1960s.

Summarizing from the narrative history of this site, conclusions may be drawn about the appearance of the facility as it was constructed originally, its appearance at the height of the operation in 1919, and its appearance today.

There is no original date of construction as such for Winehaven because it was constructed in stages between 1907 and 1919. The facility grew at a regular pace throughout this period, with the greatest amount of construction occurring during the last five years of its existence. Although exact dates cannot be assigned to all buildings, it appears that only Building 6 (along with the since-demolished hotel) were built in the first year. Buildings 1, 10, and 13 were built shortly thereafter, probably within two years. By 1916, all of the industrial buildings were in place as well as most of the support buildings. The housing units may not be dated with precision. Many were in place by 1916 but many more were built late in the life of the complex.

The Winehaven that may be seen today is remarkably similar to the appearance of the complex in 1919. The differences between then and now have to do both with historic buildings that have been demolished and buildings that were constructed after the facility closed in 1919. It appears that 14 buildings existed in 1919 that no longer exist today. These included: a large cooperage building, north of Building 1 at the water's edge; a school house within the residential compound; two small sheds between Building 1 and the cooperage; an engine house, attached to Building 13; a large

²⁸U.S. Navy, "Map of Naval Fuel Depot, San Francisco Bay Area, Molate Point, Richmond, California, Twelfth Naval District," June 30, 1944.

²⁹U.S. Navy, "Map of Naval Fuel Depot, San Francisco Bay Area, Molate Point, Richmond, California, Twelfth Naval District," June 30, 1949 and June 30, 1960.

warehouse at the site of modern Building 123; the Winehaven Hotel, south of Building 123; and seven small buildings on the flat behind Building 13, including a "social hall" for the volunteer fire department. In terms of new buildings, there exist eleven post-1919 buildings within the Winehaven boundary, i.e. the boundary for the National Register listing for Winehaven. Eight of these are garages, one is Building 123, and the others are miscellaneous structure. On balance, it may be observed that the majority of buildings ever constructed at Winehaven still exist: 35 still exist, while 14 have been demolished. Alternatively, the majority of buildings within the Winehaven boundary are associated with the 1907-1919 operation: 35 contributors versus eleven non-contributors. Major non-contributing buildings and structures exist within the Naval Fuel Depot parcel but the vast majority are outside the boundaries for Winehaven.

3. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF RESOURCES AT WINEHAVEN

Winehaven was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1978, based upon an undated nomination form that was approved by the California State Historic Preservation Officer in 1976. The 1976 nomination included an area of about 71 acres, less than half of which is occupied by buildings associated with Winehaven; the remaining acreage is occupied by fuel tanks and appurtenant structures associated with the use of the land by the U.S. Navy as a Naval Fuel Depot. The U.S. Navy has recently completed a proposal to revise the boundaries of the nominated property to more closely reflect the extent of resources that remain from the years, 1907-1919.³⁰ In the following discussion, it is presumed the appropriate boundary for the property is that of the boundary revision document.

Winehaven includes 35 contributing elements, i.e. buildings and structures built by the CWA in the years in which Winehaven was in operation. The locations of these various buildings and structures are shown in **Figure 1**, "Map of Winehaven." The resources fall into three categories: industrial buildings, support buildings, and residences. The buildings are laid out in three zones. The industrial buildings (Buildings 1, 6, and 10) are west of the Main Road. The residences (29 buildings, with numbers between 31 and 60) are located east of the Main Road, aligned along the Main Road or on Gray's Circle, a double-loop roadway that winds through the residential area. The support buildings are also east of the Main Road but south of the residences. There are three support buildings (Buildings 13, 17, and 63).

These 35 buildings and structures are located on either side of the Main Road. The boundary between the historic area and the remainder of the Navy Fuel Supply Depot is easily seen and understood, with fuel tanks and related apparatus outside the boundary, and early twentieth century industrial, residential, and support buildings within the boundary.

Buildings in the three sectors -- industrial, residential, and support buildings -- are described separately below.

3.1 Industrial Buildings

The industrial buildings were always situated at the water side of the facility, with convenient access to the Richmond Belt Line and to the company's own electric railroad, which connected with the Richmond Belt Line and included tracks down the Winehaven wharf for access to ocean-going vessels. The wharf was located at the water's edge between Buildings 1 and 6; no trace of it is still visible.

Three contributing buildings comprise the industrial complex: Buildings 1, 6, and 10. Building 1 is a steel frame building with brick walls and a concrete roof; Building 6 is a reinforced concrete

³⁰JRP Historical Consulting Services, "Proposed Boundary Revision, Winehaven, Contra Costa County, California," February, 1996. Prepared for EFA West, U.S. Navy.

building with a concrete slab roof: Building 10 is a brick and woodframe warehouse. Parts of all three buildings were built in 1907-08, at the beginning of Winehaven. Buildings 1 and 10 have not changed a great deal since that time while Building 6 was expanded to nearly three times its original size.

In addition to being the functional heart of the complex, the industrial area was also its architectural showcase. These buildings, along with Building 13 in the support area, defined the industrial Gothic character of the complex. Building 1 most clearly defines the style although the architectural theme is carried over to Buildings 6, 10, and 13 as well³¹.

These buildings were designed to face San Francisco Bay and not the residential area to the east. The west facade of Building 1 is the most carefully designed and detailed elevation in the complex. It faces the water. Historically, Building 1 carried two large signs: one read "Winehaven," the other "California Wine Association." These signs, too, faced the water and could be read from that direction only. The east side of Building 1, by contrast, included a loading dock and canopy. Building 10 could not be seen from the water, being shielded by Building 1. It was a simple, utilitarian building by contrast with Building 1. Even Building 6, a relatively plain reinforced concrete cellar, presented its most attractive facade to the water's edge.

3.1.1 Building 1.

Building 1 is the largest and most complex building at Winehaven. The building measures about 475' along its east and west sides and about 160' on the north and south. As built in 1908, the building measured 363' x 160'; the additional length is a reinforced concrete building, constructed in 1917. The storage rooms inside the building are very tall. The building is wedged into a hillside and is one story taller on the west than the east elevation. It also includes a small additional story on the east elevation, a room used as the "filter room." Thus, the building is four stories high at its extremes, including the filter room and three stories on the downhill side. The reinforced concrete addition at the north is one-story high.

As noted earlier, the west facade of this building is the defines the Gothic architectural character of the complex. The character-defining elements include: bartizan towers at the prominent corners of the pediment; crenellated parapet on all major elements, including the bartizan towers; corbeled brick features throughout the area; and Gothic hoods over the paired windows. These elements are

³¹The Gothic detailing of the buildings is so well done that the complex was almost certainly designed by a leading architect or architectural firm. Unfortunately, the architect of the building was not identified as part of the research from this documentation, despite extensive research into the subject in the literature of the architectural profession, literature on the wine industry, and various newspaper indexes for the time period. It is know that the CWA hired leading architects to design its industrial building. The major CWA warehouse in San Francisco was designed by Frederick H. Meyer. There is no reason to suspect that Meyer designed Winehaven, other than his known association with the CWA.

carried to the other elevations on Building 1 and, in a subdued manner, to Buildings 6, 10, and 13. Nowhere, however, are these Gothic elements used in such flourish as on the west side of Building 1.

The Gothic character is best seen at the parapet level. Building 1 is flat-roofed, with the roof for the original segments the same height, except for the filter tower area. The parapet on the west elevation, however, is in three heights, reflecting three heights in the parapet. These three heights correspond with the three major cellar rooms inside the building. These thick, tall parapets are steel framed, encased in concrete and faced in brick. The northern third of the parapet is the tallest, followed by the southern third. The center segment is much lower.

The tall northern parapet element includes a bartizan tower at each corner, each with a crenellated parapet. The crenellated parapet throughout Building 1 includes a concrete cap atop each of the solids and voids (merlons and embrasures). A band of round-headed arches exists below the crenellation, with the pier for each arch centered on each merlon above. The base for each pier is corbeled, with the arches being two brick courses deep. Below the parapet, the second and third stories of this segment include bands of distinctive windows, a window type reserved for the more visible and prominent elevations. The windows are paired two-over-two center-pivot steel sash, with a tall and narrow brick mullion between. The paired ensemble is surmounted by a projecting hood that appears to be made of cast iron. Five sets of windows exist on each of these stories. The bottom story (actually a basement level, below the grade of most of the rest of the building) of the building is concrete, with a single steel-clad industrial door opening, set on a top track.

The central segment of the west elevation is identical to the north segment below the parapet -- five sets of hooded windows at the second and third stories, one steel clad industrial door at the first story. The parapet is much lower, however, and includes crenellation but no bartizan towers. The southern segment is also identical to the others at the first, second, and third stories. The parapet is mid-height between the other two and includes crenellation and bartizan towers at the corners but without the arcaded element on the northern segment.

A fourth segment exists at the far northern end of the building, and is a one-story plain reinforced concrete box addition. It is a plain reinforced concrete box. The segment is accessed through three steel clad industrial doors. It includes nine pairs of tall window openings, all of which have been covered in plywood.

The south wall of Building 1 is compatible with the west wall but with few openings. A single steel-clad sliding industrial door exists on this wall. The concrete base steps up on the east side, rising to meet the grade at the east elevation, which is about 20 feet higher than that on the west. The corners of the parapet are defined by bartizan towers. The parapet is crenellated, with corbeling below the crenellation.

The east elevation of Building 1 faces the railroad tracks and is largely concealed behind a wide (18'-21') three-foot-high concrete loading dock with timber on steel posts and beam shed roof. This is generally a plain elevation by comparison with the west facade. The exception to this rule, however,

is a tall element over the northern brick segment (opposite the tall parapet on the west elevation). This was the "filter room" for the bottling operation, representing a fourth story. The tower measures about 20' x 95'. The filter tower roof is crenellated and the windows are the hooded paired steel windows found on the west facade. Two levels of such windows exist, although the tower is a single, tall story. Below the loading dock, the building includes industrial doors and a series of repetitive windows, these being paired steel center-pivot windows with brick mullions. The industrial doors are all modern roll-up steel. The northern concrete addition is about 20' narrower than the original brick element. This 20' space is open where the concrete and brick elements meet, allowing for an office space as well as an open loading dock. The bulk of this area, however, has been enclosed with board and batten siding. It appears that the board-and-batten enclosure was added by the Navy; this area was shown as an open platform in the 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map.

While clad in bricks, Building 1 is fundamentally a steel frame building, carried on sturdy steel posts and beams throughout. The interior of the building today is simply a series of large steel post and beam rooms without any equipment. The exception in terms of equipment are several large industrial elevators, leading from level to level, including the fourth-story filter room.

In general, Building 1 retains a very high degree of integrity. The most character-defining elements are in place. These include the elaborate parapet details on the west, south, and east elevations, as well as the solid steel framework and brick walls that define the structural system. The reinforced concrete addition to the north detracts from the design of the building but was built during the period of significance for the property.

3.1.2. Building 6

Building 6 is a two- and three-story reinforced concrete storehouse. The building, as noted earlier, was built in three phases: the original building -- the first industrial building at Winhaven -- in 1907; a second part, built in 1913; and the third element, built some time between 1913 and 1916. The northern segments (the 1907 and 1913 elements) are two-story on the west wall and one-story on the east. The southern segment is two-story on the east and three-story on the west. The entire building measures about 650' x 144'. The north and south segments are about 250' long, the center segment about 150'. Building 6 has a different orientation to the railroad tracks than Building 1. Building 1 has railroad tracks on the east and west sides but was served chiefly from the east (uphill) side. Building 6, by contrast, had tracks only on the west side. The east elevation is very short, being less than one-story above grade.

Only the 1907 segment was designed to conform with the general Gothic Revival program for the facility. It included small groups of crenels at the corners as well as a concrete cornice molding below the crenels. The subsequent additions did not include crenels, although the concrete cornice molding was extended to them. The additions create an awkward situation at the southern end of the original building, where the original crenels abut the northern wall of the addition, without any continuation of the feature.

Unlike Building 1, the design of Building 6 made little distinction between the west (facing the water) elevation and the east elevation. Neither was adorned with Gothic details other than the crenels and cornice. On the west elevation, the northern (original) segment is the most handsome of the three. As noted, seven crenels exist at the corner of each parapet. The crenellated element projects slightly from the plane of the rest of the wall. The segment includes eight tall window openings, each with three fixed lights, although three have been boarded over with plywood. This segment also includes three smaller window openings, all of which have been in-filled with concrete. Two top-track, steel-clad industrial doors offer access to the lower level.

The center segment on the west elevation is very similar to the original except it lacks crenellation. It includes two steel-clad, top-track sliding industrial doors, three of the same tall three-light windows, three of the smaller window openings (also in-filled with concrete), and a larger window opening, which has also been in-filled with concrete.

The southern segment of the west elevation is substantially different than the other two. It is taller, was built much later, and has been more extensively modified by the Navy. At the first story, it includes two industrial doors, similar to those found elsewhere, as well as five of the tall three-light windows, found elsewhere. The bottom story also includes a six-over-six wooden double-hung window, not like any other windows found at Winehaven; it may have been installed by the Navy during World War II. The second story includes six recently-installed, tall six-over-six vinyl windows, as well as four smaller six-over-six vinyl windows. This tall second story level also includes steel-clad sliding industrial doors. The function of these doors -- they are about 25' above grade -- is not apparent from the physical evidence or historic photographs of the facility.

The eastern elevation, as noted, is less than a full story above grade, except at the southern end, where it is two-stories above grade. The northern part of this elevation (the 1907 building) includes crenels at the corners. It includes seven window openings, all of which have been in-filled with concrete. The central segment of the east wall includes a short steel-clad industrial door. It also includes four window openings, two of which have been in-filled with concrete and one boarded over. The lone visible window is a six-light fixed wooden sash with wooden vents.

The southern segment of the east wall is taller than the other two segments and has been more modified. As constructed, it included two personnel doors (i.e., not industrial doors) and a band of windows, the sills of which were higher than the lintel for the doors. The Navy modified the building to block off about half of the upper windows and open new windows at a lower level. The purpose of these modifications was to install an office space in this building; the office space is a woodframe enclosure of part of the second story industrial space. The original windows still exist on the southern half of this segment (south of the office area); they are 12-light fixed wooden sash. The newer windows, cut into the segment, are six-over-six double-hung wooden sash. The closed windows are filled with concrete. The two door openings include paired doors, each sheltered by a half-hip roof, with a concrete step leading to the entry.

The south wall of the building includes five windows at the upper story, all boarded over with plywood. Three windows exist at the first story, two with six-over-six wooden sash, the third

boarded with plywood. There is a small steel clad industrial door at this elevation.

The north elevation is part of the original 1907 building. This elevation is dug into the hillside, taller on the west than the east. It features crenels at the corners and a concrete cornice. Seven window openings exist on this elevation, all either in-filled with concrete or boarded over. There is a metal clad industrial door with a top track, centered on the elevation.

Building 6 has been modified extensively, chiefly through the in-filling of window openings and cutting of new window openings. These modifications are less intrusive than might be supposed, owing to the scale of the building. The building still retains its most character-defining elements: the poured-in-place concrete construction, a response to the earthquake damage that destroyed other CWA buildings a year earlier; and the modest Gothic Revival detailing.

3.1.3. Building 10.

Building 10 was a storage building pinched between two lines of railroad tracks, just east of Building 1. The eastern railroad line is curved, the western line straight. Building 10 conforms with the railroad alignments and so is crescent shaped, curved on the east and straight on the west. It is about 410' long. Its width varies greatly but is never more than 30' wide. The building is also a structural hybrid, with a brick section at the south and two different types of woodframe structures on the northern two-thirds.

The brick segment is about 85' long and is best seen from the west side, the side that faces Building 1. The brick building is divided into two equal area rooms, with the northern room being taller. The brick parapets for both rooms are crenellated. The southern room includes a simple three-crenel parapet at the corner. The parapet for the northern room is crenellated all across, the center merlon taller and wider than the rest. A steel-clad door offers access to each room. The south room also features a tall flat arch window, now boarded with plywood. The brick element is nearly identical on the east elevation, except that the door to the south room has been bricked in and a new door has been cut into the northern room.

The central segment in Building 10 is a woodframe building, sided in corrugated metal, with a gabled roof and wooden ridge monitor. It is accessed through two sliding industrial doors on the west wall. It includes several window openings, all boarded in plywood. The building rests on a 3-foot tall concrete foundation and loading dock. The northern segment of Building 10 is woodframe with a flat roof. The building is sided in corrugated metal and rests on the 3-foot concrete loading dock. It features several timber sliding industrial doors, now covered in tar paper. It features several window openings, all boarded in plywood.

The integrity of Building 10 is generally intact. Its most character-defining elements include the brick work on the southern segment and the concrete loading dock. The flat-roofed frame element to the north was added between 1916 and closure of Winehaven in 1919; it nonetheless was built during the period of significance. Aside from closed off windows and some minor modifications to the brick element, the building is generally intact.

3. 2. Support Buildings

Beginning in 1907, CWA built a group of buildings in a flat area east of the Main Road and south of the residential area. These were generally small warehouses, tool sheds, the power house, and other buildings that supported the function of the industrial area as well as the residences. Most of these buildings no longer exist, although the Navy built other, similar buildings in the area. The Navy buildings are generally consistent with the appearance of the few remaining support buildings but are not treated as contributing elements of Winhaven. Three support buildings remain from the Winhaven era: Buildings 13, 17, and 63.

3.2.1. Building 13.

Building 13 was built as the power house for the Winhaven complex, apparently as part of the first wave of construction in 1907 or 1908. It is a steel-framed brick building. It includes a crenellated brick parapet, making it the only Gothic Revival building outside the industrial area. It is joined by a tall concrete smokestack, about 20' in diameter. It also includes a shed-roofed reinforced concrete addition to the north, built after 1916. The brick building is about 60' x 60', the concrete addition about 21' x 60'.

The west-facing facade includes four tall four-over-four wooden double-hung windows, one on either side of the steel clad industrial door. The south wall is identical to the west facade. The east wall originally included only a single window opening; it has been boarded over in plywood. A new opening has been cut into this elevation at a lower level, the brick held in place by steel plates. The northern concrete addition includes a one-over-one wooden double-hung window on the east wall, and a wooden industrial door on the north wall.

Building 13 generally retains a good degree of integrity. All of the original equipment has been removed and the interior is an empty room. Nearly all of the original windows and doors are in place. The concrete element is an addition that dates to the period of significance for the property.

3.2.2. Building 17.

Very little is known about the history of this woodframe shop building. It appears on the 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a "work shop." The building measures about 60' x 30'. It is woodframe with corrugated metal siding and roofing. It rests on a tall poured-in-place concrete foundation. The foundation is taller on the west than the east, conforming with the slope of the hillside. Each end wall includes double sliding industrial doors and the side elevations four one-over-one double-hung wooden sash.

It is difficult to gauge the integrity of this building because no plans or historic photographs exist to document its original appearance. There is no indication in the building itself of major alterations, except perhaps the corrugated metal siding.

3.2.3. Building 63.

Building 63 is the fire house for the Navy Fuel Depot and may have been the fire house for Winchaven as well. The history of Building 63 is, like that of Building 17, not recorded in detail. The building did not exist in 1916 (or at least was not recorded by the preparer of the Sanborn Fire Insurance map of that year) but did exist in 1930. The building was, until the 1950s, a simple rectangular building similar to Building 17. In 1957, the Navy built symmetrical shed-roofed additions to either side of it.

The original function of the building is not clear. It may be seen on the 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, identified as a "D," the Sanborn symbol for a dwelling. The building includes a dwelling unit today, in the loft area, above the equipment rooms. The building is faintly visible in historic photographs of Winchaven and appears to include wide doors, of the type associated with a fire house. It is provisionally concluded that this building was a fire house during the Winchaven era but that conclusion is supported by scant evidence.

3. 3. Residential Buildings

The housing complex includes the majority of contributing buildings at Winchaven -- 29 of 35 contributing elements. These houses are located east of the Main Road. Eighteen are aligned along the Main Road, the remainder facing Gray's Circle Road, which winds up the hillside to the east in two loops before rejoining the Main Road. The houses are all detached, single family homes but are sited close to one another, with common back and front yards. In its urban form, particularly the tight clustering of houses with common yard areas, these houses resemble other "company town" housing as well as military housing; the two functions to which these houses have been put in their eight decades of use.

The housing complex is, at first glance, very homogeneous, a common trait among housing built for industrial "company towns" throughout the United States. The Winemaster's House (Building 60) is the exception to this rule of homogeneity, again following a long standing pattern of company town design, in which the manager of the town was given a larger, more distinctive, and more prominently-situated home. Building 60 sits alone on the hillside at the middle of the loops of Gray's Circle Road, giving its occupants a broad view of the entire industrial operation and the housing below, as well as a spectacular view of San Francisco Bay. Building 60 is also unique in its architectural treatment, its Colonial Revival-influenced two-story roof with pedimented gable ends and dormers contrasting with the plain, Craftsman-influenced homes elsewhere. The remaining 28 cottages are strikingly similar, one to another. Indeed, the original National Register nomination for the Winchaven referred to them as "so identical as to look like paperdoll cut-outs."²²

²²The nomination was prepared by the Winchaven Historical Study Committee. The form is undated but was certified by Herbert Rhodes, then the California State Historic Preservation Officer, on April 26, 1976. The notice from the Keeper of the National Register is dated October 2, 1978. Although the property should be classified as a historic district, that term was not used in

Although very similar in external appearance, the housing units do differ considerably in floor plans. In analyzing the floor plans of the 29 housing units, it is possible to identify four basic types within this housing complex. The first type, of course, is that of Building 60, the Winemaster's House. It is a two-story side-gabled home with an area of 2097 square feet (sf). Only Building 60 represents this type. A second type, herein called an Elongated Three-Bedroom Plan, includes 1,362 sf. It is represented by Buildings 57, 58, and 59 and is the second largest building type within the area. A third type, herein called the Rectangular Three-Bedroom Plan, is notable for the fact that all three bedrooms, as well as the bath and a hall closet, open to a small hallway. Buildings 31, 32, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 56 represent this type. These buildings are very similar in plan and elevation, although subtle differences do exist between and among the various representatives. In general, the buildings include about 1,000 sf (996 sf to 1,008 sf). Building 56 is essentially identical to the others in plan except that the bedrooms were built larger, giving it an area of 1,244 sf. The fourth and most numerous type is a Two-Bedroom Cottage Plan. There are 17 examples of this plan: Buildings 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50. Again, there are subtle variations among the representatives of this group, although the room arrangements are very similar and the areas of the homes range only from 820 to 857 sf.

The 28 smaller cottages (all buildings other than Building 60) share many characteristics. All are woodframe with front gabled roofs. Each building is sided in stucco; this stucco was applied by the U.S. Navy over the original wooden shingle siding. (The original wooden siding may still be seen only inside the porch of Building 60.) Each building rests on a concrete perimeter foundation, with wooden posts connecting the floor beams with the concrete foundation. These posts are sometimes quite tall, as required by changes in grade for these hillside homes. The posts are hidden behind wooden drop siding. Each roof follows an unusual pattern. At the rear, the eaves are clipped. On the side elevations, the rafters are exposed. In most buildings the outside rafter tail is sawn in a decorative pattern. At the facade, the roof features a broad overhang, supported by five decorative brackets: one at the peak, two on either side of it. Each building includes an enclosed front porch accessed via wooden stairs. The porch was open originally; the multiple-light fixed sash enclosures were installed by the U.S. Navy. The stairways are sided in the same drop siding found at the foundation. All cottages rely upon combinations of three basic window types: paired 3/1 double-hung wooden sash; 1/1 double-hung wooden sash; and paired 1/1 double-hung wooden sash. These various common characteristics combine to make the home appear to be identical although, as noted, important differences exist among the three cottage types.

Building 60 is quite unlike the cottages and it will be described separately for this reason. Nonetheless, it does share some characteristics with the cottages, including the stucco siding over wooden shingles, a concrete perimeter foundation, an enclosed front porch, and use of the same vocabulary of window types.

The four basic residential building types will be discussed separately below. These building types are described in greater detail in the attached Architectural Data Forms for Buildings 41, 54, 58, and

the nomination form.

60. These four buildings were selected as representative examples, respectively, of the Two-Bedroom, Rectangular Three-Bedroom, Elongated Three-Bedroom, and Winemaster's House building types.

3.3. 1. Two-Bedroom Cottage

The Two-Bedroom Cottage building type is an essentially square building with an area of about 850 sf. As with all cottages in the area, it is woodframe and front gabled, with a roof form that includes clipped eaves at the rear, exposed rafters on the sides, and a roof overhang with five brackets at the facade. It is sided with stucco over shingles and roofed in composition shingles. It includes an enclosed porch at the facade. Windows for the home include paired 3-1 double-hung wooden sash, paired 1-1 double-hung wooden sash, and 1-1 double-hung wooden sash.

The floor plan for a typical Two-Bedroom building is shown in the Architectural Data Form for Building 41. Access is gained from an enclosed porch at the facade. These porches (like all porches in the residential area) were originally open with a half-height wooden barrier; it appears that the fixed, multiple-light enclosure was added by the U.S. Navy. Entry is gained through a front door centered on the facade; this door is a one-light, one-panel wooden door which appears to be original. There is another identical door at the rear of the building.

The front door opens into a living room, generally 16'6" by 12'6". A small kitchen is located behind the living room and a small service porch behind the kitchen. There are no interior doors separating the living room, kitchen, and service porch. At the interior side of the living room is a door (a one-panel wooden door, apparently original), which leads to a short hallway which connects to the bedrooms, bathroom, and hall closet. All of the doors leading from this hallway are one-panel wooden doors except for the closet door, which features two wooden panels.

As noted, there are slight variations between and among the Two-Bedroom Cottages. Twelve of the examples are 859 sf. These are Buildings 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 50. These models are notable for the existence of a large hall closet and small kitchen. A variation is found in Buildings 40, 48, and 49, which feature no hall closet, the remaining space being taken up by a larger kitchen; the area is otherwise the same. Buildings 33, 34, and 35 are identical to the second variant (40-48-49 model), except they include a small service porch at the rear. The laundry room allows for an expansion of the kitchen area as well as inclusion of a separate dining room area. The rear service porch area increases the square footage to 939. These service porches are probably additions made by the Navy.²²

Although generally intact, these buildings do include several modifications. The most notable is the stucco surfacing, applied over the original wooden shingle siding. A second modification was the

²²Plans were located for enlargement of some residences in January of 1968. These enlargements, however, did not include additions of rear porches to the two-bedroom buildings. These plans are found at the Navy Public Works Center, Oakland Army Base.

enclosure of the front porch area. A third, relatively minor modification was the installation of a non-functional chimney near the facade. The chimney is a rectangle, probably fashioned of steel or aluminum, faced in a material (probably vinyl) that resembles a brick appearance. Interior modifications include vinyl floors throughout; the original flooring is not known. The kitchens and baths have been remodeled entirely.

3.3.2. Rectangular Three-Bedroom Plan

The Rectangular Three-Bedroom building type is a compact residence with an area of about 1,100 sf. As with all cottages in the area, it is woodframe and front gabled, with a roof form that includes clipped eaves at the rear, exposed rafters on the sides, and a roof overhang with five brackets at the facade. It is sided with stucco-over-shingles and roofed in composition shingles. It includes an enclosed porch at the facade. Windows for the home include paired 3:1 double-hung wooden sash, paired 1:1 double-hung wooden sash, and 1:1 double-hung wooden sash. The building is not truly rectangular: the rear service porch and, in some models, one of the bedrooms extend beyond the rear plane of the rest of the building.

The floor plan for a typical Rectangular Three-Bedroom building is shown in the Architectural Data Form for Building 54. Access is gained from an enclosed porch at the facade. These porches (like all porches in the residential area) were originally open with a half-height wooden barrier; it appears that the fixed, multiple-light enclosure was added by the U.S. Navy. Entry is gained through a front door at the end of the front porch; this door is perpendicular to the plane of the facade. This door is a one-light, one-panel wooden door which appears to be original. There is a two-light, one panel door at the rear of the building.

The front door opens into a combined living-dining room, generally 26'6" by 12'6". A narrow but long kitchen is located behind the living room and a small service porch behind the kitchen. There are no interior doors separating the living room, kitchen, and service porch. The three bedrooms and the bath are stacked on the opposite side of the home from the common spaces.

The most unusual aspect of the floor plan for the building is the fact that all bedrooms as well as the bath and hall closet open to a small hallway (5' x 9'). The hallway is accessed from the dining area near its juncture with the kitchen. The hallway is akin to a small antechamber, just large enough to allow passage to these five areas. The five doors, all of which are original, can barely open within this space without striking one another.

As noted, there are slight variations between and among the various Rectangular Three-Bedroom homes. Two of the examples (Buildings 53 and 54) match the description in the attached Architectural Data Form for Building 54. These two buildings have an area of about 1,100 sf. Buildings 31, 32, 51, and 52 are about 1,000 sf each, the difference between them and Buildings 53 and 54 being a smaller living-dining area. Building 56 is generally quite similar to Buildings 53 and 54; it has the same size living-dining area and kitchen. Its square footage is larger (1,244 sf) because the bedrooms are wider.

Although generally intact, these buildings do include several modifications. The most notable is the stucco surfacing over the original wooden shingle siding. A second modification was the enclosure of the front porch area. A third, relatively minor modification was the installation of a non-functional chimney near the facade. The chimney is a rectangle, probably fashioned of steel or aluminum, faced in a material (probably vinyl) that resembles a brick appearance. Interior modifications include vinyl floors throughout; the original flooring is not known. The kitchens and baths have been remodeled entirely.

3.3.3. Elongated Three-Bedroom Plan

The Elongated Three-Bedroom building type is a long and narrow residence with an area of 1,362 sf. As with all cottages in the area, it is woodframe and front gabled, with a roof form that includes clipped eaves at the rear, exposed rafters on the sides, and a roof overhang with five brackets at the facade. It is sided with stucco over shingles and roofed in composition shingles. It includes an enclosed porch at the facade. Windows for the home include paired 3-1 double-hung wooden sash, paired 1-1 double-hung wooden sash, and 1-1 double-hung wooden sash. The building is a long rectangle, with only the front porch breaking the regularity of its form.

The floor plan for a typical Elongated Three-Bedroom building is shown in the Architectural Data Form for Building 58. Access is gained from an enclosed porch at the facade. These porches (like all porches in the residential area) were originally open with a half-height wooden barrier; it appears that the fixed, multiple-light enclosure was added by the U.S. Navy. Entry is gained through a front door at the end of the front porch; this door is perpendicular to the plane of the facade. This door is a one-light, one-panel wooden door which appears to be original. There is a two-light, one-panel door at the rear of the building.

The plan of the home includes two exactly equal halves: one half featuring the common areas (living room, dining room, kitchen and service porch), the other half featuring the bedrooms, bath, and hallway. Entry from the front and rear are gained only from the common area half; the bedrooms area is accessible only through interior passages. The front door from the enclosed porch opens into the living room, a room of about 185 sf. The dining room is behind the living room, separated from it by a flattened arch opening. The roomy (11' x 13'6") kitchen is behind the dining room, with the pantry and rear service porch behind the kitchen. The three bedrooms and the bath are stacked on the opposite side of the home from the common spaces. Access to the bedrooms half of the house is gained through a single door in the dining room, which leads to a long hallway. The three bedrooms are very similar except that the rear and middle bedrooms include walk-in closets.

There are only three examples of this type: Buildings 57, 58, and 59. The three homes are identical in every respect.

Although generally intact, these buildings do include several modifications. The most notable is the stucco surfacing. A second modification was the enclosure of the front porch area. A third, relatively minor modification was the installation of a non-functional chimney near the facade. The chimney is a rectangle, probably fashioned of steel or aluminum, faced in a material (probably vinyl)

that resembles a brick appearance. Interior modifications include vinyl floors throughout; the original flooring is not known. The kitchens and baths have been remodeled entirely.

3.3.4. Winemaster's House

The Winemaster's House, Building 60, was apparently one of the earliest residential buildings of the Winehaven operation. The building did not exist in 1909 but may be seen in a 1910 photograph. It is therefore concluded the building was constructed about 1910. It is a two-story, woodframe residence. It is stylistically quite distinct from the cottages at Winehaven. The building features a pedimented side-gabled roof with pedimented dormers at the front and rear. It also includes a flat-roofed service wing to the right of the facade. That service wing was in place in 1916 and is presumed to be original to the building. The building is sided in stucco, placed over the original wooden shingle siding. The building is a L-shaped, formed by the rectangular two-story element and the one-story service wing. The second story is only about 2/3 as large as the first, owing to the slope of the gabled roof in the area not included within the dormers.

Windows in the building mimic the pattern and vocabulary of the cottages. There are four major window types. The first is a 1/1 double-hung wooden sash, found on both stories. The second is a paired 1/1 double-hung wooden sash, also found on both stories. The third is a paired 3/1 double-hung wooden sash. This window, the most common window type in the Winehaven residential area, is found only at the second story. The fourth is a three-sided bay window, found only on the west elevation of the first story. The bay includes 1/1 double-hung wooden sash on the sides and paired 1/1 double-hung sash in the center. There is also a single aluminum sliding sash on the east wall of the enclosed porch.

Among its many exceptional characteristics, Building 60 is the only cottage to retain any trace of the original wooden shingle siding. The shingle siding still exists on the front porch area, on the inside of the exterior porch walls as well as the main wall of the house, i.e. the exterior wall of the building facing the porch area. There are also traces of the original shingles at the base of the exterior walls, just above the foundation.

Building 60 retains a high degree of integrity of interior features. These interior features are the more notable because of the quality of craftsmanship: built as the home for the manager of the facility. Building 60 was endowed with more interesting and expensive interior furnishing from the outset. Many of these still exist, particularly in the common areas on the first story.

The first and second story room arrangement for Building 60 are shown in the floor plans on the attached Architectural Data Form for this building. The first story includes a living room, dining room, kitchen, rear service porch, bath, and bedroom study, in addition to the enclosed front porch. The most notable interior features are in the living and dining areas. These rooms include hardwood floors which appear to be original and in an excellent state of repair. The dining room includes a built-in China hutch. The windows for the China hutch are in a Craftsman pattern that is repeated in the interior doorways.

Building 60 retains a remarkably high degree of integrity. Modification to it include: installation of stucco over the original shingle siding; enclosure of the open front porch; installation of an aluminum canopy at the side service entry; and installation of an aluminum sliding window within the enclosed porch (a second-generation modification).

4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Naval Fuel Depot, Point Molate, was identified for closure under the recommendations of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, along with the Oakland Fleet Industrial Supply Center, which administers the Point Molate Facility. The ultimate disposition of the buildings at the Point Molate facility is unknown at this time. The U.S. Navy is currently negotiating with the City of Richmond regarding transfer of the land and buildings at Point Molate. The U.S. Navy has initiated Section 106 consultation regarding this property and is developing a plan for disposal and reuse of the Depot, including the Winhaven buildings.

5. SOURCES

Allen, James B. *The Company Town in the American West*. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1966.

California Wine Association. Annual Reports to the Stockholders, reprinted in each February edition of the *Pacific Wine and Spirits Review*.

California Wine Association. "Principal Cellars, 'Winehaven,' on San Francisco Bay, n.d. ca. 1909. Copy in California State Library, Sacramento.

Cole, Susan D. *Richmond -- Windows to the Past*. Richmond: Wildeat Canyon Books, 1980.

Collier, George C., "Point Molate," September 11, 1976. Manuscript on file at Richmond Public Library.

Hulaniski, F. J. *The History of Contra Costa County, California*. Berkeley: The Elms Publishing Company, 1917.

JRP Historical Consulting Services. "Proposed Boundary Revision, Winehaven, Contra Costa County, California," February, 1996. Prepared for EFA West, U.S. Navy.

Pacific Wine and Spirits Review, a California-based trade journal that published from 1907 to 1919, the years in which Winehaven was in operation.

Peninou, Ernest and Sidney Greenleaf. *Wine-making in California*, Vol. 2. "The California Wine Association." The Porpoise Bookstore, Santa Barbara, 1954.

Richmond Record-Herald March 8, 1917.

San Francisco Examiner, March 28, 1914, Pp. 13-14.

Shelburne, Dan and B.H. Ward. *Richmond Industrial: The Industrial Railroads on Point Richmond, Richmond, California*. San Mateo, California: The Western Railroader, No. 304, 1965.

Teiser, Ruth and Catherine Harroun. *Winemaking in California*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1983. Chapter 17. "The California Wine Association."

U.S. Navy. "Map of Naval Fuel Depot, San Francisco Bay Area, Molate Point, Richmond, California, Twelfth Naval District." June 30, 1944.

U.S. Navy. "Map of Naval Fuel Depot, San Francisco Bay Area, Molate Point, Richmond, California, Twelfth Naval District." June 30, 1949 and June 30, 1960.

Winehaven Historical Study Committee. National Register Nomination, listed 1978.

6. PROJECT INFORMATION

The Naval Fuel Depot, Point Molate, was identified for closure under the recommendations of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, along with the Oakland Fleet Industrial Supply Center, which administers the Point Molate Facility. The ultimate disposition of the buildings at the Point Molate facility is unknown at this time. The U.S. Navy is currently negotiating with the City of Richmond regarding transfer of the land and buildings at Point Molate. The U.S. Navy has initiated Section 106 consultation regarding this property and is developing a plan for disposal and re-use of the Depot, including the Winehaven buildings.