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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Architectural Resources Group (ARG) analyzed the potential impacts of the proposed Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project and the adjacent new construction (the Medical Office Building [MOB], Parking Garage, and Site Design) on the Hoover Pavilion. As a property that appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), the Hoover Pavilion is considered a historical resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Generally, under CEQA a project that follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (The Standards) or The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures is considered to have mitigated impacts to a historical resource to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5). ARG evaluated the project and concluded that elements of the proposed project are not consistent with The Standards. However, it is not necessary for a project to be consistent with all ten of The Standards to be considered to have a less-than-significant impact on a historical resource. The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolished or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify it inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (15064.5.b.2). If a historical resource is still able to convey its historical significance that justifies its inclusion in, or eligibility for, the California Register, the impact is considered less than significant under CEQA.

ARG evaluated the impact of the proposed project on the integrity of the historical resource and found that while integrity would be diminished, overall, the historical resource would retain good integrity and the physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. Under CEQA, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to the Hoover Pavilion.
1. INTRODUCTION

In response to a request from PBS&J, ARG has prepared this report summarizing our findings in regard to the potential impacts of the proposed Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project and the adjacent new construction, which consists of the Medical Office Building (MOB), Parking Garage, and Site Design. Public Resource Code Section 21084.1 states that “a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” CEQA Guideline §15064.5(b)(1) defines substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as the “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” CEQA Guideline §15064.5(b)(2) (A) continues, stating that a historical resource “is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register. Generally, under CEQA, a project that follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings (The Standards) is considered to have mitigated impacts to a historical resource to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5). The Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project is subject to CEQA because it is discretionary and may impact potential historical resources, the Hoover Pavilion.

The Hoover Pavilion is not currently listed on the National Register or the California Register. The property was not included in the City of Palo Alto's 1978-79 historic survey report by Beach and Boghosian that created the City’s original Historic Inventory because it was outside the boundary of the surveyed area. The Dames and Moore report “Final Survey Report Palo Alto Historical Survey Update” dated February 2001, evaluated the Hoover Pavilion and found it to appear eligible for the National Register under Criteria A and C. The significance and integrity of the Hoover Pavilion was again evaluated in the “Cultural Resources and Stanford University...
Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project” report prepared by Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) staff, undated. The SUMC report concluded that the Hoover Pavilion/Palo Alto Hospital retained integrity and appeared to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3, as an important example of pre-World War II hospital design and for its Art Deco features and original building materials. ARG concurred with the SUMC findings of eligibility for the California Register in its September 2009 report “Historic Resource Evaluation and Peer Review: Stanford University Medical Center Project.” As a property that appears to be eligible for the National and California Registers, the Hoover Pavilion is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ARG evaluated the proposed Hoover Pavilion renovation project based on the drawings set “SHP DD: Stanford Hoover Pavilion” by Tom Eliot Fisch dated 8 October 2010. The set included a section on Preservation prepared in conjunction with Page & Turnbull dated 26 March 2009, 24 March 2010, 30 March 2010, 4 May 2010, 24 June 2010, 30 August 2010, and 1 October 2010. Existing conditions plans and elevations were not provided. The analysis of adjacent new construction and site design was based on the drawing set “Hoover Site Development: Preliminary Review #2 – Hoover Site Development” prepared by WRNS Studio, dated 19 August 2010. Additional information was provided by Tom Eliot Fisch and Page & Turnbull at a meeting hosted by the City of Palo Alto on 7 December 2010. Drawings of specific building elements were provided, “Stanford Hoover Pavilion” dated 8 October 2010, 23-24 November 2010, 30 November 2010, and 2 December 2010. Project details were further clarified in a phone conversation with Ruth Todd of Page & Turnbull, 15 December 2010.

In brief, the project as indicated in plans includes:

- Hoover Pavilion
  - Interior renovations and reconfiguration
• Removal of existing penthouses and construction of new penthouses on the roof of the south wing, east wing, and fifth floor of the tower at the north façade
• Repair of concrete walls
• Alterations to main (north) façade entrance bay
• Window repair and replacement
• New exterior stairway on the south façade of the south wing
• Structural, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical upgrades

Adjacent New Construction

• Landscaping and circulation reconfiguration
• Construction of the Medical Office Building (MOB) northwest of the Hoover Pavilion
• Construction of a Parking Garage west of the Hoover Pavilion

The official project description provides the following summary:

Approximately 60,000 square feet of medical/clinic office space would be constructed in a new building at the Hoover Pavilion Site and the existing Hoover Pavilion building would be renovated, with portions converted to medical office uses. Healthcare providers who currently lease space at 1101 Welch Road would be offered long-term leases in the Hoover Pavilion. The Hoover Pavilion would also continue to be used for SHC clinic-related uses, as it is used currently. The new clinic/medical office structure would be 60 feet tall. About 13,831 square feet of shops and storage space at the Hoover Pavilion Site would be demolished to accommodate the construction under the SUMC Project.
Figure A: Stanford Hoover Pavilion and proposed Medical Office Building and Parking Garage.
3. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

OVERALL

- Irregular footprint composed of three wings (north, south, and east)
- Ziggurat (stepped) massing created by four-story wings and five- and six-story tower located at the intersection of the wings
- Board-formed concrete exterior walls
- Three-story vertical bays composed of windows with terracotta tile trim and patterned terracotta tile spandrels
- Vertical concrete piers spanning from the watertable to the parapet, concrete piers alternate with the vertical window bays
- Rusticated, board-formed concrete watertable
- Flat roof over wings with decorative parapet
- Windows
  - Three-over-three, divided-light, wood windows
  - Steel, divided-light windows (various configurations)
- Oval entrance court
  - Circular concrete fountain with central element composed of four, stepped, concrete piers supporting a circular basin

TOWER

- Five-story section
  - Flat roof
  - Decorative parapet
  - Vertical scored piers alternating with windows or panels
- Six-story tower
  - Ornamental terracotta grilles with ornate geometric pattern
  - Concrete buttresses between grilles and at corners
- Pyramidal roof with tile cladding
- Stepped stack at the apex of the pyramid with geometric metal panels

WEST FAÇADE (PRIMARY)

- Asymmetrical façade
- Metal canopy suspended by cables
  - Simple fascia trim with finials at the center and cornice
  - Curvilinear wall brackets
- Three-story vertical window bay aligned with center of the tower
NORTH FAÇADE AND WING (PRIMARY)

- Overall asymmetrical composition
- Symmetrical north façade of north wing
- Main entrance
  - Stairway
    - Three-sided stair at base
    - Upper stair flanked by concrete wing walls
  - Cast-stone side panels with geometric and abstract foliage motif
    - Stepped octagonal ornamental sconces
  - Cast-stone center panel with geometric and abstract foliage motif arranged around a Caduceus
  - Recessed entrance
  - Ornamental fixture at the ceiling of the recessed entrance
  - Abstract winged ornamental panel above entrance doors
- Deeply recessed two-story opening aligned with main entrance (open to the exterior)
  - Tile surround
  - Metal geometric balustrade spanning the opening

SOUTH WING, SOUTH FAÇADE (SECONDARY)

- One-story porte cochere with vertically scored concrete piers and ornament

SOUTH WING, EAST FAÇADE (SECONDARY)

- Two-story section
  - Vertical bay and pier construction similar to other façades but without tilework
  - Flat roof

EAST WING, SOUTH FAÇADE (SECONDARY)

- See “Overall” features

EAST WING, EAST FAÇADE (SECONDARY)

- Symmetrically composed façade
- Tripartite wood window composed of a central two-over-two, double-hung window flanked by narrower double-hung windows
INTERIOR: MAIN LOBBY

- Ornamental metal grilles
- Ornamental plasterwork
- Terrazzo stairway

4. THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS

The purpose of *The Standards* is to promote responsible preservation practices that help to protect irreplaceable cultural resources. *The Standards* are meant to provide philosophical consistency in the preservation component of a development project and to guide essential decisions about the treatments to these properties. The preamble to *The Standards* states that they “are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.”

There are four overriding treatments discussed in *The Standards*: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. This project has been analyzed according to the Rehabilitation Standards. The Rehabilitation Standards are a set of ten guidelines intended to assist with the rehabilitation process of a historical resource. Application of the Rehabilitation Standards is also beneficial for new construction projects located near historical properties in order to ensure sensitive design choices in terms of height, scale, bulk, massing, and materials, which would not negatively impact nearby historical resources or their setting.

The following is an analysis of the proposed project at the Hoover Pavilion and site for consistency with *The Standards*. Each of the ten Standards for Rehabilitation is listed below, followed by a discussion of the project’s potential for impacts. The discussion of each standard is divided into Hoover Pavilion Renovation and Adjacent New Construction, which includes the MOB, Parking Garage, and site development. It is important to note that it is not necessary for a project to be consistent with all ten of *The Standards* to be considered to have a less-than-
significant impact on a historical resource. If a historical resource is still able to convey its historical significance that justifies its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register the impact is considered less than significant under CEQA.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

   Hoover Pavilion Renovation
   The Hoover Pavilion was originally a hospital, designed by Reed & Corlett Architects for the City of Palo Alto. The building currently houses medical offices. The proposed new use, medical clinics, would require reconfiguration of the interior. While the building would not returned to its historic purpose, a hospital, it would still be used for medical purposes. Most existing interior walls would be demolished, and new partitions would be added. Because, for the most part, the interior finishes currently have poor integrity, these interior changes do not represent a substantial loss of character-defining features.

   Adjacent New Construction
   N/A

   Summary
   The project is consistent with Standard 1.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

   Hoover Pavilion Renovation
   The proposed project would enclose the large, two-story opening, which is directly above the main entrance to the building (see Appendix Figure 11). This entrance is located on the north façade, one of two primary façades, and is the most ornate feature on the building. The main entrance is recessed, and the opening is framed by elaborate bas relief, Art Deco, cast-stone panels and piers. Ornate Art Deco sconces also flank the
opening. Directly above, exterior stairs are deeply recessed in a two-story rectangular opening. The sides of the recessed entrance and its side trim are aligned with two-story opening and trim. Together, the recessed entrance and two-story opening create a strong visual element, a vertical entrance bay that dominates the north (primary) façade. The strong verticality of the entrance bay contributes to the Art Deco design of the building.

The building’s wall surfaces are predominantly flat, with very few features projecting or receding significantly from the wall plane. For example, there are no other openings, (such as windows are doors) that are deeply recessed, and the ornamental details on all elevations, such as the cast-stone panels and patterned tile work, are low relief (see Appendix Figure 8). The canopy on the west façade is the only projecting feature. As a result, this three-story receding bay (composed of the entrance and two-story opening) is a dramatic architectural feature highlighting the importance of the entrance and the north façade.

The proposed storefront system would sit approximately three feet back from the exterior wall plane. The depth is sufficient to maintain the open character and deep shadow pattern created by the two-story opening, which is particularly striking when viewed at an angle. Although no longer functioning as a railing, the existing historic guardrail that spans the two-story opening would be retained in place in front of the storefront glazing.

Adjacent New Construction

MOB: Like many buildings located on corners, the Hoover Pavilion has two primary façades, the north and the west. A primary façade is generally defined as an elevation that 1) faces an adjacent public right-of-way or 2) has a primary entrance. Many buildings have more than one primary façade. The north façade of Hoover Pavilion’s
north wing was designed as the principal entrance to the building and is the most ornate; it should be considered a primary façade. The west elevation facing Quarry Road was historically (and is currently) a significant public vantage point of the Hoover Pavilion and should be considered a primary elevation for the following reasons:

- It faces a public-right-of-way, Quarry Road.
- The building’s ziggurat massing, one of its most important Art Deco features, is most visible at the west façade.
- With the exception of the north façade of the north wing, the west façade has more architectural detail than any façade. The main features of this façade include the three-story elevator window bay and projecting canopy.
- Original plans show the ground-floor entrance covered by the canopy was historically the emergency room entrance, one of the main entry points to the building. Based on its proximity to the doctor’s parking lot, it was also likely the principal entrance for the building’s physicians.
- Trees block some views of the Hoover Pavilion from Quarry Road. However, the building is clearly visible from the public right-of-way (see Figure C). Additionally, by nature, surrounding vegetation will always change over time and eventually die, and mature vegetation cannot be considered to diminish the integrity of views or impair spatial relationships.
The proposed project would place the MOB in front of the southern half (approximate) of the west façade of the Hoover Pavilion. A roadway and planting beds would separate the two buildings, and the MOB would not directly abut the façade. The Guidelines recommend “Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.” Constructing the MOB in front of half of one of the two primary façades would significantly alter the relationship of Quarry Road and the west façade of Hoover Pavilion, disrupt this significant public vantage point, and is not consistent with this recommendation. Similarly, despite small additions to and around the Hoover Pavilion, the building has always been the dominant...
feature on the site, towering above the smaller, utilitarian structures. The location and mass, both in height and footprint, of the MOB in the proposed location obscures the Hoover Pavilion from Quarry Road and impairs the perception of the Hoover Pavilion as the principal building on the site.

Parking Garage: The proposed Parking Garage is located south of the Hoover Pavilion, and a walkway and small plaza separate the two buildings. The site for the proposed Parking Garage currently contains the Nurses’ Cottage, small auxiliary buildings, a driveway, and parking. None of these buildings or site features were determined to be historic in past evaluations and, as such, constructing a building in their place does not
interrupt an important spatial relationship with Hoover Pavilion. In addition, Hoover Pavilion’s south façade is a secondary elevation, and the proposed Parking Garage does not block views of a primary façade. Original Hoover Pavilion drawings indicate this elevation was designed with a one-story port cochere, which has since been infilled\(^1\) (see Appendix Figure 3).

**Site Design:** Historically, the site of the Hoover Pavilion had no formal landscape design. A 1948 aerial indicates there were two exceptions: a landscaped oval at the historic entrance court at the north façade and a formal axial garden. The oval bed with the central fountain was located on axis with the main entrance bay at the north façade (see Appendix Figure 10). The second formal landscape feature was located in the courtyard formed by the building’s south and east wings. This feature consisted of formal pathways laid out in concentric squares with diagonal pathways leading from the corners of the outer square to the corners of the inner square. Aerials indicate that by 1968 this second feature was no longer extant.\(^2\) No evidence of this feature remains today (see Appendix Figure 5).

A significant amount of landscaping is proposed for the Hoover Pavilion property. The proposed new features, such as pathways and planting beds, are modern and geometric in character. On the whole the proposed site design is compatible with the Hoover Pavilion and does not remove historic materials or alter features and spaces that characterize the property. The only remaining historic designed landscape feature, the oval planting bed and fountain at the historic entrance court, will be retained. In addition, many of the existing trees will be retained, which helps maintain the setting of the Hoover Pavilion.

**Summary**

The proposed project is not consistent with Standard 2 because the siting of the
proposed the MOB significantly blocks views of the west façade, one of two primary façades of the Hoover Pavilion.

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

Hoover Pavilion Renovation
No conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings would be added to the Hoover Pavilion as part of the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project does not convey a false sense of historicism.

Adjacent New Construction: N/A

Summary
The proposed project does not add conjectural features or create a false sense of historical development and is consistent with Standard 3.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have achieved historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Hoover Pavilion Renovation
Over the last century the most significant changes to the building have been to the interior. Exterior changes include the infill of the porte cochere at the south end of the south wing, the construction of the mechanical penthouses on the roof, and the installation of individual air-conditioning units at most windows. None of these alterations contribute to the significance of the structure or are significant in their own right.

Adjacent New Construction: N/A
Summary

The proposed project is consistent with Standard 4.

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

Hoover Pavilion Renovation

The most distinctive features of the Hoover Pavilion are the vertical bands created by patterned terracotta tile spandrels and window surrounds, decorative pediments, and ornamented terracotta grilles. The project drawings indicate that this feature will be retained and repaired where necessary, consistent with Standard 5. Although the project drawings indicate the cast-stone Art Deco panels at the main entry will be replaced, this element of the project has been revised based on new information, and it no longer appears necessary to replace the panels. The panels will be retained, and cracks and spalls will be patched.³

The paint will be removed from the concrete wall surface and replaced with a new coating.⁴

Adjacent New Construction: N/A

Summary

The proposed project is consistent with Standard 5.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
**Hoover Pavilion Renovation**

The proposed project would repair and replace many of the Hoover Pavilion’s windows. The project drawings (sheets AH10.01 and AH10.02) provide a window schedule. Four treatments are noted, ranging from refinishing to replacement. According to the window schedule, most windows are Class 1 Repair, which refinishes and reconditions the existing windows. Based on the schedule, it appears that *The Standards* guidance to repair rather than replace is being followed. Where too damaged or missing, replacement windows match the remaining historic materials in light configuration, wood materials, and are true divided lights. The Quantities Notes indicate acoustic sash will be installed at all windows (AH1.01), but the acoustic sash are not included in the New Window Details (AH9.01). When details of the acoustic sash are available, they should be reviewed by a qualified professional or city staff to ensure they would not damage or obscure the historic windows.

Project sheet AH1.01 indicates that the cast-stone panels at the north entrance will be removed and replaced, not repaired. This element of the project has been revised based on new information, and it no longer appears necessary to replace the panels. The panels will be retained, and cracks and spalls will be patched.⁵

Project sheet AH1.01 indicates the interior lobby plaster will be restored and replicated. The reintroduction of a larger lobby (the original has been subdivided) is dependent on the programming of the interior, which is currently being developed. If a larger lobby is created, the historic corbelled coving, which is intact only in places, will be referenced in the new design.⁶

According to sheet AH9.02, the proposed project would “remove existing roofing and replace with new clay tile roofing.” The roof system is being replaced because of deteriorated tiles and insufficient waterproofing. The proposed project would remove
the historic tiles and install a watertight roofing system. The original tiles, which are damaged, would be replaced in kind with tiles that match the historic in material, color, dimensions, finish, and texture. The proposed project includes the installation of a recreation of the tower’s historic finial. Historic drawings of this architectural feature are available, and the design for the new finial is based on this documentation. This element of the project is consistent with Standard 6.

Adjacent New Construction: N/A

Summary
The proposed project is consistent with Standard 6.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Hoover Pavilion Renovation
Numerous chemical and physical treatments are proposed for the Hoover Pavilion including cleaning of building elements, general pressure washing of the façade, paint removal on the roof’s sheet metal, cleaning of organic growth on wall surfaces, and low-pressure washing of clay tile, windows, and vents. The proposed treatments have been tested to determine the most effective methods and ensure historic materials will not be damaged.

Adjacent New Construction: N/A

Summary
The proposed project is consistent with Standard 7.
8. **Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.**

Mitigation Measure CR-2.1, as presented in the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Draft EIR, shall be undertaken.

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

**Hoover Pavilion Renovation**

*The Standards* recommend that when a rooftop addition is required for a new use that it “is set back from the wall plane and is as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.” The approach not recommended is the “construction of a rooftop addition so that the historic appearance of the building is radically changed.” The proposed project would require the installation of a replacement penthouse on the south wing, and new penthouses on the east wing and on the five-story portion of the tower’s north facade. The new penthouse on the south wing is 2 feet 6 inches taller than the penthouse it replaces.

Photo simulations of the proposed penthouses were not included in the project drawings, but it appears the penthouses would be highly visible from Quarry and Palo Roads. Additionally, the ziggurat (stepped) massing of the building is crucial to communicating the building’s Art Deco design, one of the reasons for the building’s significance and eligibility to the California Register. The penthouses change the overall stepped massing of the structure. The current penthouses and mechanical equipment, which are 10 feet in height, are visible from Quarry Road (see Appendix Figure 3). Original project drawings called for 14-foot tall mechanical penthouses. In an effort to reduce impacts, the height has been reduced to 12 feet 6 inches. According to Tom Eliot Fisch, architects for the project, the placement of the penthouse is limited by the
load requirements, the existing location of structural bays, and required proximity to the sections of the building each penthouse serves. The height of the mechanical penthouses is dictated by the mechanical equipment they house.

**Adjacent New Construction**

**MOB:** The proposed MOB has block-like massing with a flat roof. The roofline (minus roof equipment) is similar in height to the south wing of the Hoover Pavilion. In scale, the proportions of story height and window openings are similar to those of the Hoover Pavilion. Architecturally, the building is modern in character but does not overwhelm the Hoover Pavilion. The building is clearly differentiated from the pavilion, and its massing, size, scale, and architectural features as proposed are compatible with the Hoover Pavilion. However, because of its siting between the pavilion and Quarry Road, the MOB would block views of a large portion of Hoover Pavilion’s west façade (See Figure C). The siting of the MOB impacts the integrity of the property’s environment and is not consistent with Standard 9.

**Parking Garage:** Project drawings do not indicate the height of the Parking Garage or provide non-perspective elevations showing the comparative heights of Hoover Pavilion and the Parking Garage. Elevations of the Parking Garage were not provided as part of the drawing set, and architectural detail in the renderings is limited. As a result, it is difficult to assess the overall compatibility of massing, scale, and architectural features of the Parking Garage with Hoover Pavilion. However, based on the rendering of the cover of the “Hoover Site Development” 19 August 2010 set, it appears the Parking Garage will be lower in height than the south wing of the Hoover Pavilion and will be gray concrete, metal, and glass. Although the Parking Garage is massive, the elevation facing the Hoover Pavilion is not much longer than the west façade of Hoover Pavilion (the longest elevation) of the pavilion. Although the architectural details of the Parking Garage are not designed to be sympathetic to or reference the design of the Hoover Pavilion.
Pavilion, if the Parking Garage is lower in height than the west wing of the Hoover Pavilion, is designed with compatible architectural detailing, and is screened with vegetation as shown in the project renderings, the Parking Garage would be consistent with Standard 9.

*Site Design:* Overall, the landscape design is compatible with the Hoover Pavilion.

**Summary**

The project is largely consistent with Standard 9. The exception is the siting of the MOB which partially blocks views of Hoover Pavilion from Quarry Road.

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

**Hoover Pavilion Renovation**

New additions to the Hoover Pavilion include enclosure of the two-story opening on the north façade, penthouse additions, and replacement of an exterior stairway on the south façade of the south wing. The penthouse and exterior stair could be removed in the future without impacting the Hoover Pavilion. Alterations to the two-story opening at the north façade include the demolition of the staircase and extension of the floor system into the former recessed opening. Because the glazing is recessed three feet, the opening could be restored somewhat. Although the stairs could not easily be restored, they are currently deeply recessed and are not highly visible.

**Adjacent New Construction**

*MOB/Parking Garage:* Because the MOB and Parking Garage would be freestanding structures, if they were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of Hoover Pavilion and its environment would not be impaired. Therefore, the MOB and Parking Garage would be consistent with Standard 10.
Site Design: If the elements of the proposed landscape design were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of Hoover Pavilion and its environment would not be impaired. Therefore, the site design would be consistent with Standard 10.

Summary

The proposed project is consistent with Standard 10.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards Conclusion

Generally, under CEQA a project that follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (The Standards) or The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures is considered to have mitigated impacts to a historical resource to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5). Evaluated under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the rehabilitation of the Hoover Pavilion meets all ten Standards. However, evaluated under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the adjacent new construction is not consistent with Standards 2 and 9. The placement of the MOB in front of the Hoover Pavilion’s west façade (a primary façade) disrupts spatial relationships and views of the building and is not consistent with The Standards. (For CEQA impacts see 7. Conclusion on page 28.)

5. Discussion of Integrity

In order to be eligible for the California Register, the property must retain sufficient integrity to communicate the reasons for its significance. According to National Register Bulletin 15, the seven aspects of integrity are: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The SUMC report concluded that:

The Hoover Pavilion has a fairly high level of integrity for its exterior art deco features and original building materials. The interior floor plan is substantially similar and the
windows, stairwells and main entry have retained historic finishes. However, decades of interior remodeling have altered the interior finishes to such an extent that the sense of being inside a historic hospital is compromised in many of the spaces: patient rooms have been converted to offices, and the remaining medical treatment areas are thoroughly modern in character. The high level of integrity and strong character of the exterior features including the ziggurat roof profile, ornamental concrete and tile, and largely intact windows and entry give a strong sense of historical style and period to the exterior. The integrity of the characteristic zigzag modern features of the exterior is adequate to convey the feeling of the period and its architectural interest.\textsuperscript{11}

A thorough discussion of the proposed project’s impacts to architectural features has been provided above (see 4. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards). The impact of the Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project on the integrity of the Hoover Pavilion, as defined in National Register Bulletin 15, is analyzed below.

**Location**

*Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.*

The Hoover Pavilion would remain in its historic location. If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of location of the Hoover Pavilion would be retained.

**Design**

*Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.*

The building was constructed from 1930 to 1939 with a five-story central block, six-story tower, and four-story wings. The ziggurat form, vertical emphasis of window bays, and stylized floral and geometric terracotta panels and fixtures represent the Art Deco movement. The proposed project does not diminish the building’s expression of the Art Deco style.

The proposed demolition and reconstruction of all interior spaces to allow for the spatial reconfiguration necessary to meet programmatic requirements would not have a significant
negative impact on the design integrity of the building, as the interior finishes are largely compromised.

The Hoover Pavilion has two primary façades, the north façade, which contains the main entrance and faces Palo Road and El Camino Real beyond, and the west façade, which faces Quarry Road. Quarry Road was historically (and is currently) a significant public vantage point of the Hoover Pavilion. Constructing the MOB in front of half of one of the primary façades would significantly alter the relationship of Quarry Road and Hoover Pavilion and negatively impact the design integrity of the historical resource.

A large, five-story Parking Garage will be constructed southwest of the Hoover Pavilion. The Parking Garage is separated from the Hoover Pavilion by a plaza and does not block views of primary façades. As a result, the proposed Parking Garage only minimally affects the design integrity of the Hoover Pavilion.

If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of design of the Hoover Pavilion would be diminished by the placement of the MOB.

Setting

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.

The setting of the Hoover Pavilion has been affected by the construction of the Nurse’s Cottage at its south elevation and the Stanford Shopping Center across Quarry Road. The construction of the four-story MOB and Parking Garage would further alter the setting of the Hoover Pavilion. The placement of the MOB directly in front of half of the west façade is problematic because it blocks views of the west elevation, a primary façade.

If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of setting of the Hoover Pavilion would be substantially diminished. The construction of the proposed MOB would alter
important visual and spatial relationships and would have a negative impact on the integrity of the setting of the Hoover Pavilion. While the Parking Garage would further alter the setting of the Hoover Pavilion, it alone would not significantly diminish the integrity of Hoover Pavilion’s setting.

Materials

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

Overall, the proposed project would not result in a substantial loss of historic exterior material. Project drawings indicate that a majority of the architectural features and materials would be repaired rather than replaced. The exception is the demolition of the exterior stair behind the two-story opening on the north façade.

The proposed demolition of interior walls to allow for the spatial reconfiguration that is necessary to meet programmatic requirements will result in a substantial loss of building material. However, because the interior finishes have been so highly altered, the integrity at the interior is already poor, and the demolition will not further reduce the integrity of materials.

If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of design of the Hoover Pavilion would be retained.

Workmanship

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

If the proposed project were undertaken, the Hoover Pavilion’s workmanship and construction methods would remain largely intact at the exterior of the building. Some workmanship may be lost at the interior, but little historic fabric remains because of previous alterations (see Appendix Figure 13).
If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of workmanship of the Hoover Pavilion would be retained.

**Feeling**

*Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.*

Although the current setting of the Hoover Pavilion has been impacted by construction in the area, the Hoover Pavilion and site continue to strongly communicate the feeling of an Art Deco high-rise hospital from the 1930s. The loss of integrity in setting and design, caused by the proposed placement of the new the MOB in front of one of the primary façades of the Hoover Pavilion, would result in a loss of integrity of feeling.

If the proposed project were undertaken, the integrity of feeling of the Hoover Pavilion would be somewhat diminished because of significant changes to the character of the site.

**Association**

*Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. According to the National Register guidelines, a property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.*

The Hoover Pavilion is not significant for its association with a historic event, person, or activity, and, therefore, integrity of association would not be relevant in determining rather or not the historical resource would qualify for inclusion on the California Register.

**Summary of Integrity Findings**

The proposed project would diminish the Hoover Pavilion’s integrity of design, setting, and feeling. However, although the project would have a negative impact on three aspects of the historical resource’s integrity, the alterations do not impair the property’s integrity to a degree that the Hoover Pavilion would no longer convey its historical significance. If the proposed
project were undertaken, the historical resource would retain integrity. (For CEQA impacts see 7. Conclusion on page 28.)

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The restoration of the Hoover Pavilion, exclusive of adjacent new construction, appears to meet The Standards. However, there will likely be opportunities to explore further reducing impacts to the building as the project develops and materials and details are finalized. ARG recommends investigating the following project aspects:

- The proposed project proposes enclosing the deeply recessed two-story opening on the north façade.
  - In an effort to reduce impacts, the project drawings have been revised, and the storefront glazing setback has been increased from 1 ½ to 3 feet. While this approach meets The Standards, if possible, the glazing should be set back as far as possible. The ideal would be to place the infill glazing in line with the back wall of the recessed main entrance below. This configuration would retain the original appearance of a three-story vertical recessed bay interrupted only by the cast-stone panel above the entrance.
  - Plans indicate the opening will be infilled with a storefront glazing system. In order maintain the appearance of depth at the two-story opening efforts should be made to reduce reflectivity of the glazing and panels.
  - Between glazing, the project proposes horizontal opaque panels that obscure utility spaces and floor planes where they intersect the opening. Materials are currently not indicated and should be selected to reduce contrast with glazing in order to maintain the appearance of a continuous two-story void. In addition, the light and panel configuration, as well as the colors and materials of the panels, should be explored in order to devise an unobtrusive solution that does not create strong horizontal elements.
The proposed mechanical penthouses would diminish the impact of the decorative parapets because they would no longer be silhouetted against the sky. The proposed mechanical penthouses are taller than the existing penthouses: for example, the penthouse on the south wing would be 2 feet 6 inches taller than the existing penthouses. The penthouse on the fifth floor of the north façade not only negatively affects the overall ziggurat massing of the building, but interrupts the design of a primary façade and obscures historic material. The size and placement of the penthouses is dictated by structural loads and proximity to the sections of the building the equipment serves. Efforts have been made to reduce their height, and the exploration of ways to decrease the visibility and impact of these units should continue through careful selection of materials and color.

Currently there are trees planted against the west and north façades of the Hoover Pavilion. A historic photograph included in the project drawings indicates those along the west façade are later additions and were not part of an original landscape design (see Figure B). No planting adjacent to the west façade were visible. The proposed landscaping plan would replace these existing trees with tall narrow trees planted against the west and north walls of the pavilion. If possible, these trees should be moved away from the walls to make the building’s character-defining features more visible. In addition, moving the trees away from the building’s walls would have the benefit of reducing the potential for biological growth damage to the building’s walls.

7. CONCLUSION

ARG analyzed the potential impacts of the proposed Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project and the adjacent new construction (the Medical Office Building [MOB], Parking Garage and Site Design) on the Hoover Pavilion, which is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. As part of this analysis, ARG evaluated the project for consistency with The Standards and concluded that the MOB is not consistent with Standards 2 and 9. ARG further evaluated the
impact of the proposed project on the integrity of the historical resource and found that the integrity of design, setting, feeling, would be diminished but overall, the historical resource would retain good integrity. CEQA Guideline §15064.5(b)(2) (A) states that a historical resource “is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, the California Register of Historical Resources.” Although some elements of the project are not consistent with The Standards and would diminish some aspects of integrity, the Stanford Hoover Pavilion would sufficiently retain the physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for the California Register. As defined by CEQA, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse change, material impairment or cumulative impacts to the Hoover Pavilion.
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Figure 1: View looking southwest from the intersection of Quarry and Palo Roads at the north and west facades. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 2: View looking east toward the west facade from Quarry Road. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 3: View looking northeast toward the west facade. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
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Figure 4: View looking north toward the south elevation. The existing Nurses’ Cottage is visible behind the trees. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 5: View looking west toward the intersection of the south and east wings. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 6: View looking northwest at the back of the tower. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 7: View looking north toward the south facade of the east wing. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 8: View looking northwest toward the east facade of the east wing. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 9: View looking southwest toward the east and north wings. The main entrance is at the right side of the photograph. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 10: View looking south toward the north facade of the north wing, which includes the main entrance bay. The fountain of the entrance court, main entrance, two-story opening above, and the tower create an axis. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 11: View looking southwest at the north facade of the north wing. The entrance bay consists of the main entrance, cast-stone panel, and two-story opening. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 12: View looking south in the main lobby. An ornamental Art Deco style grill is visible to the left of the stair. (Photograph by ARG September 2010.)
Figure 13: View looking north in the first floor lobby that is accessible from the west facade.