Architectural Review Board

Staff Report

Agenda Date: March 24, 2011

From: Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager

Department: Planning and Community Environment

Subject: Stanford University Medical Center – Foundations in Medicine [10PLN-00397]: Request by Stanford University School of Medicine on behalf of The Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford Junior University for Final Architectural Review of Foundations in Medicine Building 1, containing approximately 185,000 square feet of research, office, and administrative support uses. This project is a component of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project. Existing Zone District: PF (Public Facility).

RECOMMENDATION
Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the development plans, Architectural Review findings (Attachment A) and recommend that the City Council approve the Foundations in Medicine Building 1.

BACKGROUND

Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project
The Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) comprises the general area between Sand Hill Road, Vineyard Lane, Quarry Road, Pasteur Drive, and including Welch Road and Blake Wilbur Drive. The area is zoned Medical Office and Medical Research (MOR) and Public Facilities (PF). The applicant is proposing the demolition of the existing Stanford Hospital and Clinics (SHC), construction of new hospital buildings, renovation and expansion of the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital (LPCH), reconstruction of the School of Medicine (SoM) facilities, and construction of new medical office buildings and parking structure as well as the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion to meet State mandated seismic safety standards (SB 1953) and to address capacity issues, changing patient needs and modernization requirements. The renovation and expansion project, which would be constructed over a 20-year horizon, would result in a net increase of approximately 1.3 million square feet of hospital, clinic, and office space.

An application for the project described above was filed on August 13, 2007 with the City of Palo Alto (See Attachment F for an excerpt). In summary, the applicants have requested, among other entitlements, a zoning code amendment to establish a new “Hospital” district with development standards designed to accommodate the proposed project. The applicants have requested design approval for Stanford University Medical Center Campus Design Guidelines, SHC, LPCH, a new medical office building and parking garage as well as the renovation of the
Hoover Pavilion, and the SoM's Foundations in Medicine 1 (FIM) building.

Over the course of the past two years, each of the SUMC Project components has been reviewed by the ARB through a series of study sessions and early preliminary review meetings. Each component of the SUMC Project has gone through preliminary ARB reviews and the ARB will be providing a final recommendation to the City Council for their consideration. This ARB meeting is the final review for the FIM buildings.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The architect for the School of Medicine building is Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects and Tom Leader Studio is the landscape architect. A detailed project description can be found in Attachment D.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES
The applicants have requested that the ARB provide a formal review of the FIM buildings. The project plans contain site plans, elevations, floor plans, sections, site diagrams showing the pedestrian, bicycle/cart, vehicular/service circulation patterns as well as open space, primary connectors and walkways, nodes, architectural kit of parts, landscape character, gateway designs, details for Pasteur Walk, Governor's Avenue, Cooper Lane, the Quad, courtyards and plazas, protected tree diagrams, lighting plans, signage of the proposed project (Attachment G).

Excerpts from the project application materials including the applicant's entitlement requests, project objectives, project description, design intent, text for the tree preservation alternative, compliance to the comprehensive plan and project fact sheets are contained in Attachment F.

For the final review, the applicants have updated their plans to include the following:

1. Revised landscaping at FIM Gateway to reinforce notion of gateway at ground plane: The line of trees was completely removed and the specimen tree has been moved in the plaza to the south-east. In addition, some of the proposed redwoods have also been removed in front of Beckman to keep the plaza open and welcoming.

2. As requested by the Urban Design Consultant, Bruce Fukuji, more context has been added at the FIM Quad to show the relationship to LKSC by extending the diagonal line of the bamboo grove across Cooper Lane and into the FIM Quad. Some of the Oaks along the south edge of the quad have been removed to open up the connection between LKSC and the Quad.

3. Building area calculations have been clarified. The Dec. 15, 2010 graphic submittal and the new submittal are both correct.

4. The building section (page 14, Attachment G) has been updated to describe the location of the interior light shelves which also serve as sunshades.

5. In order to address the concern about the proliferation of hedge-clipping, the Cooper Lane and Pasteur Walk views have been modified to show the hedges as less manicured.

6. Graphic clarification of elevations: the enlarged elevation (page 14, Attachment G) shows updated callouts and clarifies the difference between shadow box, vision glass, and fritted vision glass. Shadows have been removed for more clarity.
7. Per comments regarding the Northwest FIM1 plaza: a more detailed plan has been provided showing how paving would pass through existing grove of trees to get people to the door. A side path has been added to access from Governor’s Avenue. All the existing trunks have been added to the plan for clarity. The plaza hardscape has been extended to encompass all of the existing trees and pathways have been allowed through the existing grove to the FIM entrance. Also, the cross walk to the north has been removed as it no longer relates to the hospital entrance and a side path has been added from Governor’s Avenue.

**Prior ARB Review**
The ARB has earlier held a preliminary review meetings on the School of Medicine, Foundations in Medicine, FIM1 building on July 17, 2008, July 1, 2010 and October 21, 2010. In addition, the ARB held its first formal review of the LPCH on January 6, 2011. Please see Attachment D for a detailed description of these prior meetings.

During the formal review of the FIM Buildings on January 6, 2011, the ARB expressed support for the plans for the project, but requested the architects rework the landscaping at the FIM Gateway. They agreed with most of the comments from the City’s urban design consultant, Bruce Fukuji, during the meeting and requested that the applicants consider them, and make changes accordingly. In addition, the ARB requested that the views shown in the project plans should not use sheared or clipped hedges as per LEED standards, and requested that more detail be provided regarding the different glazing types used for the project. Finally, they finally requested that the applicants provide a material palette and colors for the final review.

**Zoning Development Standards**
The FIM buildings would be located in the new “Hospital” zone district. Although the site development regulations for the new “Hospital District” have not yet been approved, the Project’s conformance with the draft standards is described in Attachment B.

**Summary of Issues Identified by Urban Design Consultant**
The City’s urban design consultant, Bruce Fukuji, has provided comments on each of the Project components throughout this review process. His updated comments on the FIM buildings are contained in Attachment E.

**Design Guidelines and the School of Medicine Buildings**
The applicant has submitted under a separate cover the final Stanford University Medical Center Campus Design Guidelines. The document sections include discussion on Site Design, Building Design and Connective Elements. The ARB will review the final Design Guidelines as a separate review item. Attachment C provides a summary of how the final Guidelines relate to the proposed School of Medicine buildings.

**Environmental Impact Report**
The City has prepared an environmental impact report (EIR) for the SUMC Project. Please see Attachment D for a detailed discussion of the visual quality sections in the EIR.
The ARB review has resulted in changes from the originally proposed design that addresses the visual quality impacts identified in the EIR. The staff recommends that the ARB find that the projects are consistent with the Architectural Review Findings in Attachment A. In addition, if the ARB finds that the project is consistent with the Architectural Review Findings, then the mitigations applicable to the LPCH project have been satisfied.

The Final EIR for the SUMC Project was released on February 17, 2011. With this final review of the project, the ARB needs to find that the Project is consistent with the sixteen findings of approval. Staff’s recommended findings are contained in Attachment A. The ARB’s final recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council for their consideration.

**Conditions of Approval**

Draft conditions of approval are being prepared for the Project. These conditions will focus on the “standard” conditions that apply to development within Palo Alto, as well as specific requirements that address unique development aspects of the Project. In addition, the conditions would contain any design-related conditions that the ARB may recommend. Staff recommends that the ARB discuss appropriate conditions at the meeting. These conditions would be forwarded to the City Council for their review and decision. Staff expects to provide a draft list of conditions to the ARB at the March 24, 2011 meeting. These conditions may be modified prior to final City Council review.

**NEXT STEPS**

The ARB will review all of the Project components at the March 24 meeting and at a second meeting in April 2011. The ARB’s recommendation on all of the project components will be forwarded to both the Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council. The City Council will take action on these items after certification of the Final EIR, anticipated in May 2011.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Draft Architectural Review Findings for Approval
Attachment B: Conformance with Proposed “Hospital District” Site Development Regulations
Attachment C: Summary of Design Guidelines related to the School of Medicine buildings
Attachment D: ARB Staff Report, FIM Buildings, January 6, 2011
Attachment E: Urban Design Peer Review Memo, FIM buildings, March 14, 2011
Attachment F: SUMC Project Application Excerpt, including: Project Overview, Project Description, Comprehensive Plan Conformance, SUMC Design Intent, SUMC Applicant’s Objectives, Entitlements Request, Summary of the Tree Preservation Alternative, Fact Sheets and FAQ’s for the SUMC Project (separate attachment, previously distributed to the ARB; also available at the meeting)
Attachment G: Drawings for the proposed School of Medicine Foundations in Medicine (FIM) buildings (provided by Architects - Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects and Tom Leader Studio, ARB members only)
COURTESY COPIES
William T. Phillips, Sr. Assoc. Vice President, Stanford University – Land, Buildings & Real Estate
Jean McCown, Director of Community Relations, Office of Government and Community Relations
Zach Pozner, Project Manager, Stanford University Medical Center, Facilities
Charles Carter, Director Land Use and Environmental Planning, Stanford University
Mark Tortorich, Vice President of Facilities and Design & Construction, Stanford Hospitals & Clinics / Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital
Catherine Palter, Assistant Director Land Use and Environmental Planning, Stanford University
Bruce Fukuji, Fukuji Planning & Design

Prepared by: Ruchita Kadakia, Consulting Planner
ATTACHMENT A
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
Stanford University School of Medicine
10PLN-000397

(1) The design is consistent and compatible with applicable elements of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan in that the project is consistent with the following significant policies and programs:


(2) The design is compatible with the immediate environment of the site in that the proposed heights of the three foundations buildings are compatible with the adjacent Stanford School of Medicine campus. Further, the project utilizes the full build out potential of the site through additional square footage and the creation/completion of several quads along Pasteur Drive and Cooper Lane. Governors Avenue along the East side of the site is also strengthened. A new front door for the School of Medicine along Pasteur Drive is created in relationship with the new Stanford Hospital entry and an emphasized connection between the two campuses along Medical Center Promenade.

(3) The design is appropriate to the function of the project in that it continues the physical and programmatic needs of the Stanford School of Medicine through continued development of research facilities.

(4) In areas considered by the board as having a unified design character or historical character, the design is compatible with such character in that the project continues the language established with the Clark Center and continued with the Lorry I. Lokey building of limestone facades with red roof elements signifying major entries. The building proportions and massing are also consistent with existing buildings on the School of Medicine campus.

(5) The design promotes harmonious transitions in scale and character in areas between different designated land uses in that the Foundation in Medicine buildings create a northern edge for the School of Medicine Campus within a consistent architectural character and scale that has already been established. The articulation of the base with exposed structure and transparent glass create a consistent rhythm along the entirety of Cooper Lane. In addition, all glass entries are set back to create a series of “front porches” along Cooper Lane for student and staff interaction.

(6) The design is compatible with approved improvements both on and off the site in that it will follow Stanford Design guidelines and reference the architectural “Kit of Parts” established on the Stanford School of Medicine Campus. The project will also help
establish connector elements and walkways between the School of Medicine and the new Stanford Hospital.

(7) The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general communities in that the proposed buildings help establish a series of new quads along and "porches" along both Pasteur Drive and Cooper Lane. The buildings also complete a distinct and cohesive School of Medicine Campus.

(8) The amount and arrangement of open space are appropriate to the design and the function of the structures in that the proposed buildings create a series of open spaces and quads consistent with the scale and density of the School of Medicine campus.

(9) Sufficient ancillary functions are provided to support the main functions of the project and the same are compatible with the project's design concept in that service areas, garbage, bike parking, and other support functions are all available on or adjacent to the site as part of the campus plan and architecture.

(10) Access to the property and circulation thereon is safe and convenient for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in that the site plan creates a clear distinction for vehicular access and departure to the site on Pasteur Drive. Numerous options exist for pedestrian access including Cooper Lane connection back to Stanford University and the Medical Center Promenade that will connect pedestrians through the School of Medicine Campus to the new Stanford Hospital north of the site.

(11) Natural features are appropriately preserved and integrated with the project as the building footprints have been located in order to preserve as many of the existing mature trees as possible. The existing mature oak trees along Pasteur Drive are augmented with additional oak trees to create three large groves along the south side of the Drive.

(12) The materials, textures, colors and details of construction and plant material are appropriate expression to the design and function and whether the same are compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures, landscape elements and functions as the landscape paving and plant materials have been carefully selected to complement the existing campus palette. At the project boundaries, the design intent is to align with and, in many cases, extend the existing paving materials in order to create a seamless edge.

(13) The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors create a desirable and functional environment and whether the landscape concept depicts an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site in that the landscape design incorporates a range of open space opportunities at varying scales, from a central plaza to an open green suitable for outdoor recreational activities. Bike parking is located close to the entrances of the buildings. Plant massing, form, texture, will enhance the functionality of the open spaces, as well as provide screening where necessary.
(14) Plant material is suitable and adaptable to the site, capable of being properly maintained on the site, and is of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance in that all plant material will be native or acclimated to the site's climate zone.

(15) The design is energy efficient and incorporates renewable energy design elements in that the project will be designed in compliance with the following standards:

(A) Stanford University Guidelines for Sustainable Buildings

(B) Title 24 Green Standards

(C) Cal Green Standards

(D) All City Ordinances

(16) The design is consistent and compatible with the purpose of architectural review as set forth in Palo Alto Municipal Code, section 18.76.020(a).
### PROJECT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Stanford University School of Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Leland Stanford Junior University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Numbers</td>
<td>142-23-003,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Designation</td>
<td>Major Institution, Special Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning District</td>
<td>Public Facility (PF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land Use</td>
<td>Hospital, Medical Office, Retail, Eating &amp; Drinking, Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property size, for APs above</th>
<th>±11.08 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street frontage</td>
<td>±415-feet at Pasteur Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing buildings floor area</td>
<td>Lane- 84,700 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>Grant- 152,00 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alway- 112,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwards- 65,800 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>±30-feet from Pasteur Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>±280-feet from Campus Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side</td>
<td>±25-feet from Beckman Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.0 (entire PF site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site coverage, existing SoM buildings</td>
<td>110,934 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of existing building(s)</td>
<td>±20 to 30-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing parking facilities</td>
<td>Surface parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape features</td>
<td>Perimeter landscaping, interior plantings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED PROJECT- Foundations in Medicine 1 (FIM 1) Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIM1 Addition Area</th>
<th>±168,000 gross square feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>±28-feet at Pasteur Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>±18-feet to canopy at CCSR building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>±11-feet at Governor’s Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio, SUMC Project</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site coverage, building</td>
<td>±40,689 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of proposed building</td>
<td>±68-feet to roof, ±80-feet to top of mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>Provided at SHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td>Extensive interior gardens and perimeter landscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: CONFORMANCE WITH PROPOSED “HOSPITAL” DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Conformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (Entire SUMC Site)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area</td>
<td>No regulation</td>
<td>168,000 gsf</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire SUMC site</td>
<td>2.6 million sf</td>
<td>2.6 million sf</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIM1</td>
<td>No regulation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40,689 sf</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire SUMC site</td>
<td>No regulation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIM1</td>
<td>No regulation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Setback</td>
<td>10-feet</td>
<td>28-feet</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>130-feet</td>
<td>68-feet</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

SUMC Design Guidelines – School of Medicine, Foundations in Medicine (FIM) Buildings

a) Within the Site Design section, the applicant presents specific guidelines for the open spaces for the proposed site.

Design Guidelines: Gateways and Pathways (Pages 42 and 43 of the Guidelines)
Campus gateways often occur at the transition between buildings fronting public thoroughfares. The consistent use of landscape components that comprise gateways and pathways are a common paving palette that extends from the sidewalk across the access, a repetition of a single species of tree, and an integrated system of kiosks, campus maps, and signage. For example, the gateways located at either end of the Promenade serve as transitions to the SoM to the south, and to Welch Corridor past LPCH to the north and are similar in programming.

Pathways separate modes of circulation (peds, bikes, cars, carts, buses) into multiple systems of the connective fabric. The programming for pathways is specific to their role within the connective fabric of the campus. There are pathways that are pedestrian only – such as the Promenade – and there are other pathways that are “bicycle friendly” such as Governor’s Avenue. In general, Pathways utilize secondary paving materials from the Connective Elements section (in the Design Guidelines) that compliments primary material at plaza-like areas. Pathways and plaza areas are typically punctuated with small groves of ornamentals, or “Passage Trees”, that are artfully arranged with lighting and interspersed with other Shared Amenities such as benches, receptacles and signage.

b) Within the Building Design section, the applicant presents specific guideline categories that describe the approaches to visual hierarchy, density, pattern & context, massing & building composition, materials palette, and entry expression.

Design Guidelines: Visual Hierarchy (Page 54 of the Guidelines)
The three new FIM Buildings form a boundary to the Stanford University SoM. The placement of these buildings is influenced by recent additions of the Clark Center and the CCSR to contribute to an emerging vernacular for the SoM.

The SoM vernacular would consist of expanses of glazed wall areas framed by limestone-colored walls. The close proximity of the FIMs to one another, as well as the location of their building entries to the FIMs, flanking axial open spaces, creates gateway conditions between the SoM and the SUMC.
Design Guidelines: Density, Pattern and Context (Page 60 of the Guidelines)
The character of the SoM would be built upon a rectangular grid of avenues and walks running east-west. The three proposed FIM buildings would be long linear buildings which engage the grid and define the edge of SoM. The buildings’ use of staggered footprints breaks down the length of the facades and provides courtyards fronting the district’s axial walks. Density standards for the FIM buildings are as follows:
  • Max allowable heights: 85’ for FIM1, and 60’ for FIM 2 and 3
  • Alternate building and open space with rational density pattern
  • Enforce semi-urban qualities of the SoM campus
  • Reinforce FIM’s role in defining edge of SoM
  • Structure major and minor common open spaces
  • Strengthen connectors to SUMC.

Design Guidelines: Massing & Building Composition (Page 78 of the Guidelines)
The character of the SoM is dominated by the recently completed Clark Center and CCSR buildings. The three proposed FIM buildings are similar to these long, linear buildings that define the edge of the SoM. The use of staggered massing techniques would help to break down the length of the facades, and would provide more intimately scaled open space for entry expression. The massing technique of cantilevering would also be used to further define areas of the facade to express the building’s internal organization, lend human scale, and create protected areas around the building where it fronts exterior open spaces. The taller massing of the FIMs help provide a strong edge along Pasteur Drive which helps transition between the SHC modules and the SoM campus. Sculptural canopies further develop the main entries. Mechanical screening would be setback from the cornice at the roof, resulting in another layer of massing.

Design Guidelines: Material Palette (Page 86 of the Guidelines)
Differentiated base and body material treatments are used to further break down the lengths of the facades of the FIMs, and reinforce more intimate scaled open space for entry expression. The modulation of grouped openings and glass walled areas reinforce the massing for the FIMs to further define areas of the facade to express the building internal organization, lend human scale and create protected areas around the building fronting exterior open space. Sculptural canopies further develop the main entries. Mechanical screening would be setback from the cornice at the roof, resulting in another layer of massing.

Design Guidelines: Entry Expression (Page 95 of the Guidelines)
The FIM buildings would use a recessed volume approach to signify entries which run perpendicular to circulation avenues within the district. Taking cues from the CCSR building, this element signifies entry for each building and provides some shelter and protection for its users, clearly defining the outdoor space within the building’s boundaries. This space may create opportunities for informal gathering, interaction of users, or public amenities such as coffee shops or cafés.
Architectural Review Board

Staff Report

Agenda Date: January 6, 2011

From: Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager

Department: Planning and Community Environment

Subject: Stanford University Medical Center – Foundations in Medicine [10PLN-00397]: Request by Stanford University School of Medicine on behalf of The Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford Junior University for Architectural Review of Foundations in Medicine Building 1, containing approximately 185,000 square feet of research, office, and administrative support uses. This project is a component of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project. Existing Zone District: PF (Public Facility).

RECOMMENDATION
Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the development plans, draft architectural review findings, provide comments to the applicant and staff and continue the review until after the release of the Final Environmental Impact Report. Recommended conditions of approval will be provided at the final review meeting.

BACKGROUND
Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project
The Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) comprises the general area between Sand Hill Road, Vineyard Lane, Quarry Road, Pasteur Drive, and including Welch Road and Blake Wilbur Drive. The area is zoned Medical Office and Medical Research (MOR) and Public Facilities (PF). The applicant is proposing the demolition of the existing Stanford Hospital and Clinics (SHC), construction of new hospital buildings, renovation and expansion of the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital (LPCH), reconstruction of the School of Medicine (SoM) facilities, and construction of new medical office buildings and parking structure as well as the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion to meet State mandated seismic safety standards (SB 1953) and to address capacity issues, changing patient needs and modernization requirements. The renovation and expansion project, which would be constructed over a 20-year horizon, would result in a net increase of approximately 1.3 million square feet of hospital, clinic, and office space.

An application for the project described above was filed on August 21, 2007 with the City of Palo Alto (See Attachment D for an excerpt). In summary, the applicants have requested, among other entitlements, a zoning code amendment to establish a new “Hospital” district with development standards designed to accommodate the proposed project. The applicants have requested design approval for Stanford University Medical Center Campus Design Guidelines,
SHC, LPCH, a new medical office building and parking garage as well as the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion, and the SoM’s Foundations in Medicine 1 (FIM) building.

Over the course of the past two years, each of the SUMC Project components has been reviewed by the ARB through a series of study sessions and early preliminary review meetings. Each component of the SUMC Project has gone through preliminary ARB reviews and the ARB will be providing a final recommendation to the City Council for their consideration. This ARB meeting is the first formal review for the FIM buildings. The intention of this meeting is to present to the ARB the final design for the proposed project. Once the Final EIR is published, the ARB will take action on all of the SUMC Project components and forward recommendations to the City Council for action.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The site for the SoM replacement facilities is generally the site of the existing facilities to be replaced. The four buildings occupied by SoM within the City’s boundaries are designated as Edwards, Lane, Alway and Grant. The site includes these four buildings as well as an existing landscape area currently developed as a forecourt/garden immediately north of the Center for Clinical Sciences Research (CCSR) building. The site abuts the boundary between the City of Palo Alto and Santa Clara County campus lands.

According to the applicant, these buildings no longer serve the medical center’s clinical and translational research needs and must be replaced. Currently, the buildings house the primary faculty offices, research laboratories and administrative support for 13 of the School’s 28 academic departments, including the departments of Medicine, Neurology, Neurosurgery, Obstetrics & Gynecology, Orthopedic Surgery, and Pediatrics. In addition, the applicant has stated that upgrading the existing buildings to accommodate changes to the building requirements for occupancy separation, exiting, mechanical systems, circulation, laboratory support, and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements could only be accomplished at great cost and would result in inefficiencies in the use of space. According to the application materials, the SoM would replace the existing buildings in a series of new FIM buildings, to be constructed in phases.

**Existing gross square footage (gsf) to be demolished:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards:</td>
<td>65,800 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane:</td>
<td>84,700 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alway:</td>
<td>112,500 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant:</td>
<td>152,000 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Demolition:</strong></td>
<td><strong>415,000 gsf</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed gross square footage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIM</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>168,000 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>116,000 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>131,000 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction:</strong></td>
<td><strong>415,000 gsf</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIM1 would be the first SoM building to be constructed as part of this project. The architect for the School of Medicine building is Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects and Tom Leader Studio is the landscape architect. FIM1 is proposed to be a four story building with a basement, located at the southwest corner of the SUMC project site, adjacent to Pasture Drive, Governor’s Avenue, and the CCSR. The gross floor area would be approximately 168,000 square feet. Building heights would be approximately 68’ to the top of the building parapet and approximately 80’ to the top of the mechanical penthouse screen.

The uses within the building would consist of laboratory and laboratory support areas, offices, interior circulation, building infrastructure and “building commons” areas consisting of lobbies, elevator/stairs, and meeting room spaces.

During the course of the application review, project refinements have been developed which are discussed in the Draft EIR under the Tree Preservation Alternative. These refinements minimize tree impacts by modifying the northeast corner of the FIM 1 building. The applicants’ preferred project is now the Tree Preservation Alternative. This design is reflected in this final submittal.

There are 12 protected trees within the SoM portion of the SUMC Project. Of those 12 trees, three will be removed and two will be transplanted to other locations in the vicinity. The other seven protected trees would be retained. The EIR analyzes the removal and proposed transplanting of these protected trees.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES
The applicants have requested that the ARB provide a formal review of the FIM buildings. The project plans that accompany this staff report contain site plans, elevations, floor plans, sections, site diagrams showing the pedestrian, bicycle/cart, vehicular/service circulation patterns as well as open space, primary connectors and walkways, nodes, architectural kit of parts, landscape character, gateway designs, details for Pasteur Walk, Governor’s Avenue, Cooper Lane, the Quad, courtyards and plazas, protected tree diagrams, lighting plans, signage of the proposed project (Attachment E). Excerpts from the project application materials including the applicant’s entitlement requests, project objectives, project description, design intent, text for the tree preservation alternative, compliance to the comprehensive plan and project fact sheets are contained in Attachment D.

Prior ARB Review
The ARB has earlier held a preliminary review meetings on the School of Medicine, Foundations in Medicine, FIM1 building on July 17, 2008, July 1, 2010 and October 21, 2010. As a result of these design meetings, the project site, landscaping and buildings have evolved.

During the preliminary review meetings held on July 1, 2010 the ARB reviewed revisions to the design of the FIM buildings and the landscaping. The ARB liked the plans for the revised buildings and the site planning, but requested the architects evaluate the scale of the buildings and open spaces by relating the height and distance between the structures. They liked the overall landscaping plan and the FIM Gateway, and requested that the next submittal include the Kaplan Lawn, the relationships between FIM 1 and FIM 2, and between FIM 1 and CCSR, and the open space along Pasture Drive. They also felt that the FIM buildings lacked an entry expression at the
pedestrian level.

The landscape plans were then presented to the ARB on October 21, 2010, which included an illustrative landscape plan for the FIM buildings; details for the FIM Gateway, Pasteur Walk, the FIM Quad, details of the FIM 1 entry, the protected tree diagram and perspective views of the proposed project. The ARB generally liked the design and felt that the landscaping was thoroughly thought out. They preferred that the tree palette should be limited, and requested that details for the lighting should be included for final review. Those items are incorporated into this final submittal package.

Zoning Development Standards
The current zoning for the Stanford Hospital is the Public Facilities (PF) zone, and the SoM buildings would be located in the new Hospital zone district. As proposed by the applicant, the land within this district would be considered as one large parcel for the purposes of determining gross floor area and site coverage. As proposed, the new Hospital district would have a maximum floor area ratio of 1.5 to 1 and maximum site coverage of 40 percent. The requirements for parking would be performance-based (based upon projected needs). The new zone would also include regulations for building heights and open space.

Although the site development regulations for the new Hospital district have not yet been approved, the Project’s conformance with the draft standards is described in Attachment B.

Protected Trees
There are 11 protected trees within the SoM portion of the SUMC Project, seven of which are considered aesthetic tree resources. Of these trees, three will be removed and two will be transplanted to other locations in the vicinity. The other protected trees would be retained.

As part of the new Hospital district regulations, there would be specific regulations for tree protection, removal and replacement that would exist only for the SUMC project. The intent of these new tree regulations is to acknowledge the unique conditions of the SUMC site and the proposed project, to protect unique tree specimens, and to permit removal, replacement and/or transplantation of trees that would be protected in other zone districts.

The 3 trees to be removed would be replaced, as proposed, in accordance with the ratios set forth in Table 3-1 of the City of Palo Alto Tree Technical Manual (TTM) in order to maintain the appropriate landscape approach at the SUMC. The difference between the required tree replacement and the number of trees planted at SUMC would be mitigated through contribution to the Forestry Fund in the City of Palo Alto. Payment to the Forestry Fund would be in the amount representing the value of the replacement trees that would be required under the TTM standard if appropriate replacement tree locations cannot be identified within the proposed Hospital district.

Design Guidelines and the School of Medicine Buildings
The applicant has submitted, for preliminary review, proposed Stanford University Medical Center Campus Design Guidelines. The document sections include discussion on Site Design,
Building Design and Connective Elements. The ARB will review the final Design Guidelines in early 2011. Attachment C provides a summary of how the draft Guidelines relate to the proposed LPCH project.

*Environmental Impact Report*

The City has prepared an environmental impact report (EIR) for the SUMC Project. The Draft EIR includes an analysis of how development of the SUMC Project would affect the existing visual quality of the SUMC Sites and the vicinity. Visual quality pertains to how people see and experience the environment, particularly its visual character. The EIR identifies the following significant environmental impacts related to visual quality:

- **VQ-2:** Permanent Degradation of Visual Character Post Construction. The SUMC Project as a whole would have a significant impact pertaining to degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the SUMC Sites and their surroundings, in that 1.3 million square feet of building floor area would be added to the medical center site and the overall height limit would be raised to 130 feet.

- **VQ-3:** Alteration of Public Viewsheds, View Corridors, or Scenic Resources. The SUMC Project as a whole would result in significant impacts on views, in that the additional floor area, massing and height could impact viewsheds protected under the Compressive Plan, such as the Santa Cruz Mountains, and view corridors such as Sand Hill Road and views from other public streets.

- **VQ-5:** New Sources of Light and Glare. The SUMC Project as a whole could increase light and glare nuisance from exterior lighting, resulting in a significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure VQ-2.1 from the Draft EIR would reduce Impacts VQ-2, VQ-3 and VQ-5 to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation measure requires compliance with ARB recommendations for final design.

*VQ-2.1 Adhere to City’s Architectural Review Process and Recommendations.* The SUMC Project sponsors shall submit final building and site plans to the ARB prior to issuance of any development permits. Architectural Review shall assess the appropriateness of proposed demolitions, proposed building heights and massing, siting of buildings and structures, architecture and facade treatments, landscaping, circulation plans, and parking. The ARB may require alterations to any of the above project features, or the ARB may suggest new features, such as new landscaping or public art, to improve the proposed SUMC Project design. Any recommendations made by the ARB with respect to the design of the SUMC Project shall be implemented by the SUMC Project sponsors.

The Project applicant has submitted design drawings submitted for ARB review respond to each of the impacts identified in the Draft EIR:

- **VQ-2:** Permanent Degradation of Visual Character Post Construction. Compliance with VQ-2.1 would ensure that impact on on-site visual character and quality would be less
than significant because the ARB’s recommendations, through the Architectural Review process, would address massing, layout, landscaping, and architectural design impacts from the SUMC Project.

The School of Medicine FIM buildings has evolved through the preliminary review process to address building massing, site planning and layout, and landscaping concerns raised by the ARB. The draft Architectural Review findings in Attachment A describe how the project is appropriately designed to address the visual character impacts.

- VQ-3: Alteration of Public Viewsheds, View Corridors, or Scenic Resources. Compliance with VQ-2.1 would reduce impacts on views from the proposed buildings under the SUMC Project. The Architectural Review of the SUMC Project would consider, among other factors, whether the SUMC Project has a coherent composition and that its bulk and mass are harmonious with surrounding development.

As stated above for VQ-2, the FIM buildings have evolved through the preliminary review process to improve the composition of the massing elements, to ensure that existing natural features and significant landscape elements are preserved, that there is a harmonious transition in scale and character between land uses.

VQ-5: New Sources of Light and Glare. The mitigation measure requires compliance with ARB recommendations for final design and would reduce light and glare impacts from the proposed buildings under the SUMC Project. The Architectural Review of the SUMC Project would consider, among other factors, whether the SUMC Project incorporates quality materials, harmonious colors, appropriate ancillary features, a cohesive design with a coherent composition, and an appropriate lighting plan.

As stated above for VQ-2, the FIM 1 project has evolved to address exterior finishes, treatments, colors, and materials. The choice of exterior materials and lighting to be used would minimize excessive glare and reflectivity.

The preliminary review and study session process has resulted in changes from the originally proposed design that addresses the visual quality impacts identified in the EIR and summarized above. The staff recommends that the ARB find that the projects are consistent with the draft Architectural Review Findings in Attachment A. In addition, if the ARB finds that the project is consistent with the Architectural Review Findings, then the mitigations applicable to the FIM1 building has been satisfied.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Palo Alto is required to respond to all comments raised during the public review period for the Draft EIR. The Final EIR is made up of the Responses to Comments document and any proposed edits to the language provided in the Draft EIR. The emphasis in the Responses to Comments document will be to provide clarification and further substantiation for the analysis and conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Additionally, the responses shall seek to correct and remedy minor technical mistakes or errors identified in the Draft EIR.
Currently, the staff is in the process of preparing the Final EIR for the SUMC Project, which is expected to be released in early 2011. No formal recommendations by any board or commission may be made until the Final EIR has been released. The staff recommends that the ARB continue the review of the FIM 1 project until after the release of the Final EIR. If any additional design information is required by the ARB, this would be through conditions of approval.

With the final review of the project, the ARB will need to find that the Project is consistent with the sixteen findings of approval. Staff’s recommended draft findings are contained in Attachment A. After the ARB has completed their preliminary review of each Project component, the ARB’s final recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) and City Council for their consideration.

Summary of Issues Identified by Urban Design Consultant
The City’s urban design consultant, Bruce Fukuiji, has provided comments on each of the Project components throughout this review process. His comments on the FIM 1 building and landscaping will be provided at the meeting.

NEXT STEPS
The ARB will review the other project components through early 2011. Staff will recommend that the ARB approve the FIM 1 project once the Final EIR has been completed. The meeting to review this recommendation is expected to take place in February, 2011.

The ARB’s recommendation on all of the project components will be forwarded to both the P&TC and City Council during the first half of 2011. The City Council will take action on these items after certification of the Final EIR.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Draft Architectural Review Findings for Approval
Attachment B: Conformance with Proposed “Hospital District” Site Development Regulations
Attachment C: Summary of Design Guidelines related to the School of Medicine buildings
Attachment D: SUMC Project Application Excerpt, including: Project Overview, Project Description, Comprehensive Plan Conformance, SUMC Design Intent, SUMC Applicant’s Objectives, Entitlements Request, Summary of the Tree Preservation Alternative, Fact Sheets and FAQ’s for the SUMC Project (previously submitted to the ARB)
Attachment E: Drawings for the proposed School of Medicine Foundations in Medicine (FIM) buildings (provided by Architects - Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects and Tom Leader Studio, ARB members only)
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Attachment E

This attachment will be provided to the ARB at the meeting on March 24, 2011