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**Town:** Amherst

**Place:** (neighborhood or village) University of Massachusetts

**Address:** 131 County Circle

**Historic Name:** Hampshire House

**Uses:** Present: Administrative

Original: “Dormitory & Apartment Building”

**Date of Construction:** 1948

**Source:** construction documents

UMASS Facilities Archives

**Style/Form:** no academic style

**Architect/Builder:** Alderman and Alderman

**Exterior Material:**

Foundation: concrete

Wall/Trim: concrete masonry-unit, brick

Roof: flat, built-up

**Outbuildings/Secondary Structures:** none

**Major Alterations (with dates):**

1993 addition of radio tower

**Condition:** fair to poor

**Moved:** no | x | yes | 

**Date:**

**Acreage:** 1,348 acres 2008 historic structure survey area

**Setting:** Hampshire House is located south of Middlesex House on a site that slopes from the northeast to the southwest. On the east side of the building is a bituminous concrete walk that runs the length of the building. East of the walk there is a strip of lawn with evergreen trees. On the west side of the walk there is a strip of lawn with evergreen and deciduous trees.

**Recorded by:** Jon Buono

**Organization:** EYP/ Architecture & Engineering

**Date (month / year):** August 2008

*Follow Massachusetts Historical Commission Survey Manual instructions for completing this form.*
ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

Hampshire House is one of five original concrete-block, multi-story residential structures designed to accommodate 150 persons or 30 families each. Hampshire House is one of three of the original buildings remaining of this group known as “county circle” (Hampshire, Middlesex, and Berkshire). Plymouth and Suffolk Houses, which were also part of this group and located to the north of the remaining three, were demolished in the late 1960s.

Hampshire House is a three-story concrete frame building with full basement and a flat roof. The building is oriented along a north-south axis with apartments located on the east and west sides of a central corridor.

The building entries are located on the north and south ends of the building. Both entries have a painted flush hollow metal door and sidelight set in a hollow metal frame. The entries are at the first floor level and are protected with a flat canopy roof supported by two brick piers. The canopy roofs have a painted stucco finish on the underside. Both entries have a concrete stair and landing with a painted metal handrail. The south entry also has a concrete access ramp which is not original.

The north and south facades are approximately 28-feet high by 33-feet wide with brick masonry veneer set in a running bond pattern. Centered on both of the facades is the building entry at the first floor, a six-over-nine pane wood double-hung window with aluminum triple-track storm/screen combination at the second floor level, and a similar six-over-six pane window with storm/screen combination at the third floor level.

The east and west facades of the building continue the brick veneer of the north and south facades approximately 8-feet in from the ends of the building. The central section of the east and west facades projects approximately 12” from the brick and is thirteen bays wide with the center three bays accentuated by four engaged concrete block pilasters. The concrete block facades are painted. Each bay has a six-over-nine pane wood double-hung window with aluminum triple-track storm/screen combination at the first and second floor levels, and a similar six-over-six pane window with storm/screen combination at the third floor level. Each window in the concrete block portion of the façade has a flush painted bond beam lintel and a pre-cast concrete sill. Windows in the brick portion of the façade have steel lintels and limestone sills. Basement windows have window wells.

The flat concrete roof deck cantilevers approximately sixteen inches to form an overhang and drip edge. The underside of the overhang remains unpainted and the face of the roof deck has an aluminum fascia with integral drip edge. The overhang projects out beyond the engaged pilasters that form the center three bays of the east and west facades. There are three surface-mounted down spouts at both the north and south facades which are connected to cast-iron storm water collectors at grade.

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

Overview
The University of Massachusetts, Amherst was chartered as the Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1863 but did not accept its first class until 1867. As one of two land grant universities in Massachusetts, the university’s original mission was agricultural education. Its mission, however, evolved within the first 20 years in response to the changing needs of the United States. While agriculture remains, even today, a mainstay of the University’s mission, the University now also supports engineering, science, education, and liberal arts colleges and departments.

A full historical narrative of the University of Massachusetts from its founding to 1958 is contained in the survey report. This narrative was prepared in 2009 by Carol S. Weed, Senior Archaeologist with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. Shown below are selected highlights from the text of the full historical narrative, along with additional information pertinent to the specific building that is described in this Massachusetts Historical Commission Building Form.
1863-1867: Administration and Initial Campus Layout

As the educational mission evolved in the years after 1863, so did the university's approach to its facilities and its landscape. There was no accepted plan for the layout of the college, despite the preparation of various plan proposals in the 1860s, including separate proposals from the country's preeminent landscape planners, Calvert Vaux and Frederick Law Olmsted, who had formerly worked together on the winning design for New York City's Central Park. Neither Vaux's plan, nor Olmsted's plan to create a campus around a central green, were accepted by the University Trustees.

1867-1916: The Early Growth

In the absence of a coordinated plan, the Trustees put existing buildings that were acquired with the campus land into service as agricultural laboratories. Campus development for several decades after 1863 was sporadic and focused on the construction of individual buildings to meet specific functional needs of the fledgling university. It was not until after 1900, during a period of rapid student population growth and resultant new building construction, that the University Trustees again sought proposals for comprehensive campus planning.

In 1912, a professional landscaping publication reported that Warren H. Manning, formerly affiliated with the Olmsted firm, had spent over four years preparing a comprehensive plan for the University Trustees. The Trustees had considered it imperative for the college to plan harmonious development that would conserve the beauty of campus grounds while meeting the needs of a growing student population whose expanding range of activities was unprecedented.

Manning’s plan designated three distinct sections of the campus, the Upland, Midland and Lowland Sections. Each section was intended to be the locus of specific functions, with clusters of purpose-built structures to serve those functions. For example, one section would be designated for faculty, women's and horticultural facilities. A second section would contain administration, research, science and student life (dormitory, dining hall, and sports) facilities. The third section would be dedicated to poultry, farming and sewage disposal facilities.

Although Manning’s Upland, Midland, and Lowland sections are not fully realized, it is apparent that discipline specific groupings were developed. Building clusters, especially those related to agriculture, administration, and the hard and earth sciences (physics, chemistry, and geology) continued to expand through the present day.

1916-1931: World War I and the Transition Years

Long range building programs were developed beginning with Landscape Gardening Professor F.A. Waugh’s 1919 plan. Like Manning’s 1911 plan, Waugh’s 1919 work emphasized building groups in order to maintain the proper balance between buildings, cultivated fields, meadows and lawns, forests and trees. By World War I and continuing through the 1920s, University records frequently refer to the inadequacy of the physical plant; the lack of class room space; the lack of properly ventilated and lighted spaces; and the danger of having to cancel classes because of a lack of appropriate facilities. Expansion of the campus through acquisition of additional land was considered essential if the University were to construct new and better facilities to address these deficiencies and excel as an institution of higher education.

The 1920s, however, had the fewest buildings constructed of any decade in the campus history to that point. The slow pace of building is largely attributed to the annual funding levels that were appropriated by the Massachusetts Legislature during the decade.

1931-1941: Great Depression, New Deal

The change in campus orientation wrought by the expansion of the school's mission began in the 1930s with its name change to Massachusetts State College. With that program expansion there was a concerted effort to modernize and expand the campus facilities. The campus population had grown steadily during the 1920s.

In 1933, the campus was hosting about 1,200 students in its graduate and undergraduate sections. By 1935, there were 1,300 students enrolled representing a 53 percent increase in five years and of 80 percent in ten years, prompting the University to limit the freshman class to 300 students due to the inadequacy of facilities and staff to care for a greater number. This student population was putting extreme pressure on basic resources such as the library.

Despite the growing student population and an identified need for additional and improved campus facilities in the 1920s and 1930s, the onset of the Great Depression with its wide-ranging consequences effectively restricted funding to the bare minimum.
needed to operate. By late 1933, the funding outlook had improved through the economic stimulus initiatives of the Federal Government, and National Recovery Act funds were available for the construction of a library, a new administration building, and other unspecified buildings for the University.

As part of the University’s planning effort to select a site for the new library, the Campus Planning Committee charged with this work issued a final report in late 1933, which contained five recommendations for campus development: 1) That the general organization and building program on the campus be planned so as not to interfere with the sightliness [sic] and beauty of the present central open space, 2) That buildings of such a general service nature (library, dining hall, etc.) that they affect the entire student body be located in the first zone immediately adjacent to the central open space, 3) That buildings dealing with services more specialized (agriculture, home economics, etc.), and therefore affecting only certain groups of students, occupy the second zone, 4) That buildings used by students, but not directly contributing to organized instruction (dormitories), occupy the third zone and 5) That buildings dealing with problems of general maintenance and physical service (heating plant, carpenter shop, horse barn, etc.) occupy the outer, or fourth zone.

The committee went on to note that with these five recommendations in mind, they would site newly proposed buildings according to the defined zones. These zones were basically the ones that Professor Waugh had recommended in his 1907 and 1919 planning reports and Manning had proposed in his 1911 plan. The zones or sections were designed to focus significant elements of the college’s mission to its physical core which was defined as the broad, central bench with its hallmark pond. Everything that supported these core elements were dispatched to outer zones.

By 1933, the University of Massachusetts, then known as the Massachusetts State College, was facing a severe shortage in student housing. Between 1929 and 1933 at the onset of the Great Depression, student enrollment had grown by more than 40 percent, from 862 to 1,220 students, quite unlike periods during earlier depressions when student enrollment had declined. No new dormitories for men had been added to the campus since 1868 and the one campus dormitory for women, Abigail Adams House, was completely filled, which prompted the College to stop enrolling additional women in 1932.

In response to this housing shortage, the College began construction of a dormitory complex at the southeast corner of North Pleasant Street and Eastman Lane, which ultimately consisted of ten neo-Georgian buildings now known as the Northeast Residential Area. The first building of this complex was Thatcher House, which was constructed in 1935 to the design of architect Louis Warren Ross, who was a member of the College’s class of 1917. Ross’s later works for the school include the Student Union, which was constructed in 1956. Ross also designed Johnson House in 1959, which was the last structure of the quadrangle to be completed.

Despite documents entitled “Final Report of the Campus Planning Committee,” the group operated in one form or another as the primary planning unit on campus for the next 15 years, until 1948. The committee continued to focus on where buildings and facilities would be best sited relative to the campus missions.

Hampshire House
Berkshire House, Hampshire House, and Middlesex House were originally constructed in 1948 as part of a complex of five buildings at the southern end of the campus. The area was formerly occupied by the R.O.T.C. riding grounds.

The building designs reflected the immediacy of their construction following WWII. Unlike the other campus dormitory construction, which was characterized by a thorough attention to historic style or architectural details, these buildings were simply finished with the standard building materials of concrete masonry-units and machine-made brick. Although the buildings were of solid construction, their entrances, windows, and rooflines were unadorned. The rectangular facades received only subtle details such as CMU pilasters and bays of brick veneer.

The structures were subsequently named for the Massachusetts counties Berkshire, Hampshire, Middlesex, Plymouth, and Suffolk. Plymouth and Suffolk Houses were demolished in the late 1960s after the demand for housing was offset by the development of Southwest Residential Area. The demolitions also allowed construction of Garber Field behind the Boyden Gymnasium.

The expansion and realignment of Massachusetts Avenue removed the complex’s original vehicular access, and a small parking area located to the west of the buildings was replaced by the larger parking fields to the east. Vegetation surrounding the buildings has historically consisted of deciduous and evergreen trees over mown lawn with no foundation planting.
INVENTORY FORM B CONTINUATION SHEET

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

BIBLIOGRAPHY and/or REFERENCES


Lane, Tom. 1959. “University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts” [campus plan].

Manganard, Anthony J. 1947. “University of Massachusetts, Guide Map of the Campus”.

Shurcliff, Shurcliff and Merrill, Landscape Architects and Neils H. Larsen, Architectural Consultant. June 1957. “University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, Master Plan, Prepared for the division of Building Construction”.

Continuation sheet 4
Figure 1  Campus map detail with surveyed building shaded in black.
Figure 2  2005 orthophotograph of Hampshire House (center, bottom) and surrounding landscape, north is up (MassGIS).
Figure 3 View of adjacent Hampshire House, undated.
Special Collections and Archives,
W.E.B. Du Bois Library, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Figure 4 View of adjacent Hampshire House, undated.
Records group 150, No. 0003310, Special Collections and Archives,
W.E.B. Du Bois Library, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
**Figure 5** View of adjacent Hampshire House grounds, undated. Records group 150, No. 0004509, Special Collections and Archives, W.E.B. Du Bois Library, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

**Figure 6** Demolition of Suffolk House, undated. Records group 150, No. 0005538, Special Collections and Archives, W.E.B. Du Bois Library, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Figure 7 Hampshire House southwest corner, 2009.
Figure 8  Hampshire House northeast corner, 2009.
National Register of Historic Places Criteria Statement Form

Check all that apply:

- [ ] Individually eligible
- [ ] Eligible only in a historic district
- [ ] Contributing to a potential historic district
- [ ] Potential historic district

Criteria: [ ] A [ ] B [ ] C [ ] D

Criteria Considerations: [ ] A [ ] B [ ] C [ ] D [ ] E [ ] F [ ] G

Statement of Significance by Jon Buono, Einhorn Yaffee Prescott, Architecture & Engineering

The criteria that are checked in the above sections must be justified here.

The Hampshire House (UMASS No. 8) is recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The residential structure is not recommended individually eligible as it does not possess individual significance. The building is not an outstanding example of architectural style or engineering methods. Although a large number of buildings on the campus are recommended eligible as part of a potential historic district, this peripherally-located residential structure is not considered central to defining or maintaining the character of the Institution.