Staff Report

Agenda Date: April 6, 2011 (HRB)
April 7, 2011 (ARB)

From: Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager

Department: Planning and Community Environment

Subject: Stanford University Medical Center – Renovation of the Hoover Pavilion [10PLN-00398]: 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 the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion. 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 Historic Resources Board (HRB) review the renovation plans, architectural review findings and provide their final comments regarding the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion to the Architectural Review Board.

Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the renovation plans, architectural review findings (Attachment A), the draft conditions of approval (Attachment B) and recommend that the City Council approve the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion.

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 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 final review for the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Architects Tom Eliot Fisch has developed the plans for the Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovations. A detailed project description can be found in the February 2011 ARB/HRB combined staff report (Attachment C).

Environmental Analysis
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. The SUMC report concluded that the Hoover Pavilion 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. Architectural Resources Group (ARG) who was hired to analyze the Project for the EIR, 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 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 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 analyzed the potential impacts of the project on the Hoover Pavilion in their report,
"Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project Impact Analysis Report," dated January 18, 2011 (Attachment E). ARG 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. As defined by CEQA, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to the Hoover Pavilion. In Section 6 of its report, however, ARG provided detailed recommendations to further reduce project impacts on the historic character of Hoover Pavilion, and to enhance consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation beyond the minimum required.

Staff is recommending that the HRB review the renovation plans and provide comments to the project applicant and City staff. These comments will be transmitted to the ARB. Although Hoover Pavilion has been determined to be a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA as described above, the building is not on the City’s Historic Preservation Inventory. Therefore, the HRB is not required to make a formal recommendation on the renovation project to the ARB. Staff’s opinion is that the HRB’s comments on the renovation project and ARG’s findings of consistency with the Standards will be helpful to the ARB and the City Council as they review the projects.

The Final EIR for the SUMC Project was released on February 17, 2011. With this 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 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.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES
Prior to the most recent HRB and ARB meetings in February 2011, the Project sponsor, Tom Eliot Fisch, Page & Turnbull, City staff and ARG met to review specific building elements of the Hoover Pavilion renovation. As a result of those discussions, revisions to the Hoover Renovation plans were made. A summary of those changes can be found in Attachment C. The HRB and ARB reviewed those changes at the February meetings.

The project plans that accompany this staff report (Attachment G) contains changes in response to the reviews by the HRB and ARB from meetings on February 2 and February 3, 2011 respectively. These changes include the following:

1. The spandrel glass at the north window was deleted and was replaced with clear glass (Sheets A3.04 and A4.03)
2. Louvers were incorporated into windows near line 7 (Sheet AH3.01)
3. Errors were fixed on drawings showing opaque glass type at bathrooms
4. As per ARB’s request, the applicants will bring the following to the meeting:
   a. recycling receptacles cut sheet
   b. contrasting stair nosing sample
   c. paint color with mica-flex sample
   d. canopy lighting cut-sheet
   e. non-reflective glass sample for North window
**Prior HRB Review**
The Historic Resources Board (HRB) reviewed the Hoover Pavilion renovations and portions of the SUMC Draft EIR at their meeting of July 7, 2010, and reviewed it last on February 2, 2011. The ARB/HRB staff report for the February 2, 2011 meeting is contained in Attachment C.

During the last HRB meeting conducted on February 2, 2011, the HRB members were overall pleased with the renovation plans for the Hoover Pavilion. The HRB found the new south stair re-design and materials to be acceptable, and agreed with the storefront window glass being recessed 3 feet from the façade. They however, expressed their concerns regarding the removal of the existing finial on top of the tower, and felt that it was a feature that is identifiable, and hence requested that new designs for the replacement should be considered, and recommended that the ARB review the proposed design. Additionally, the HRB members felt that the proposed galvanized iron / steel used for certain elements would have a shorter life span and suggested that the architects look at copper as an optional material.

**Prior ARB Review**
The ARB has held Preliminary Review Meetings on the Hoover Pavilion renovation on June 3, 2010 and August 19, 2010. Thereafter, the ARB conducted its first formal review of the Hoover Pavilion renovation on February 3, 2011. The ARB/HRB staff report for the February 3, 2011 meeting is contained in Attachment C.

During the formal review conducted by the ARB on February 3, 2011, the ARB was pleased to see the changes made as per their prior recommendations and felt that the renovation plans were well-designed and evolved. They requested that the applicants provide samples indicating the paint color, the contrasting stair nosing, and a sample of the non-reflective glass during the final review. In addition, the ARB agreed with the HRB’s request that the applicants develop a new design for the finial atop the Hoover Pavilion.

**Conditions of Approval**
Draft conditions of approval are contained in Attachment B. These conditions 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. These conditions may be modified prior to final City Council review.

**NEXT STEPS**
The ARB will review the remaining Project component, the Stanford Adult Hospital at a meeting April 21, 2011. The ARB’s recommendation on all of the project components and the HRB’s comments on the Hoover Pavilion renovations 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 June 2011.
ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Architectural Review Findings for Approval
Attachment B: Draft Conditions of Approval
Attachment C: ARB/HRB Staff Report, Hoover Pavilion Renovation, February 2 and 3, 2011
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 HRB and ARB, not attached to this staff report, but available at the meetings)
Attachment F: Staff Recommendations on Opportunities to Further Reduce Impacts to Hoover Pavilion
Attachment G: Project Plans for the proposed renovations for the Hoover Pavilion site (provided by Architects - Tom Eliot Fisch, HRB and 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: Whitney McNair, Consulting Planner
Ruchita Kadakia, Consulting Planner
ATTACHMENT A
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
Hoover Pavilion Renovations
10PLN-00397

(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:

L-1, L-2, L-3, L-4, L-5, L-6, L-7, L-8, L-45, L-46, L-48, L-49, L-50, L-70, L-75, L-76, L-77, L-78, T-1, T-3, T-19, T-42, T-48, N-6, N-14, N-16, N-17, N-18, N-20, N-21, N-22, N-23, N-24, N-28, N-29, N-35, N-39, N-40 and N-47; as described in Table 3.2-2 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and reproduced for this ARB review.

(2) The design is compatible with the immediate environment of the site in that the project would retain the existing Hoover Pavilion in the existing location. The renovation of the exterior and interior of the building will not affect compatibility with the immediate environment. New or replacement exterior elements, such as mechanical units and stairways, are designed in a manner to reduce visual and historic impacts to the existing building.

(3) The design is appropriate to the function of the project in that the renovation accommodates the physical and programmatic needs and objectives of the Hoover Pavilion to be used by community practitioners and Stanford Hospital & Clinics for clinic-related uses as proposed by the applicant;

(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 renovation project would restore and repair character defining features that have either been diminished due to previous alterations or through neglect. The improvements will allow the currently under-utilized building to be re-activated for clinic uses. The City’s historic consultant determined that the renovation project would be overall consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures and that Hoover Pavilion would retain good integrity and the physical characteristics that justify it’s eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources;

(5) The design promotes harmonious transitions in scale and character in areas between different designated land uses in that the renovation project would not alter the scale or character of Hoover Pavilion; thereby retaining the existing scale and character of the site;

(6) The design is compatible with approved improvements both on and off the site as this project is the impetus for comprehensive improvements to the existing landscape, drainage, and site utilities;
(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 community in that the proposed project uses, building types, building design, site planning and landscaping optimize shared amenities to ensure harmonious co-existence of the SUMC visitors and staff;

(8) The amount and arrangement of open space are appropriate to the design and the function of the structures in that appropriate private and public outdoor spaces are provided for the project’s uses that would serve the unique needs for all users and visitors to the site. The site planning respects the rural character of the Hoover site adjacent to the Arboretum;

(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 the parking, circulation, site features, fire access, and access to new and existing utilities are clear and considered in the site plan.;

(10) Access to the property and circulation thereon is safe and convenient for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in that the main access points for vehicular traffic is served via a shared driveway with the adjacent surface parking site to the south and an existing driveway off a secondary road (Palo Road) to the north. The site plan provides clear separation between vehicular and pedestrian circulation to reduce the likelihood of conflict or interference. Vehicular access to and departure from the site is arranged to promote smooth traffic flow around the project site;

(11) Natural features are appropriately preserved and integrated with the project in that existing street trees and other mature trees on site are retained and existing protected trees are retained, transplanted, or replaced in kind where in conflict with new buildings. Existing landscape features around Hoover Pavilion are preserved where culturally significant;

(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 in that a color and materials palette has been chosen with respect to the SUMC Design Guidelines, Tree and plant material selection, to add vibrancy and visual appeal, enhance the order of the site, and to assist its integration with the surrounding context;

(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 a variety of species types have been chosen and landscape features have been designed that will enhance the streetscape and surrounding environment in keeping with the cultural landscape assessment and the SUMC Design Guidelines;
(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 the combination of California native plants and mature majestic trees specified have low maintenance and water use requirements;

(15) The design is energy efficient and incorporates renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:

(A) Exterior energy design elements; in that the window specification and orientation of glazed areas shall minimize solar heat gain, and site lighting is specified to be high efficiency fixtures.

(B) Internal lighting service and climatic control systems in that along with the inherent benefits of building orientation and access to daylight, the light fixtures, appliances, and HVAC systems shall be specified with high efficiency ratings exceeding Title-24 standards.

(C) Building siting and landscape elements in that low-flow irrigation combined with drought resistant plant materials;

(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).
DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

A. GENERAL:

The project shall be subject to the mitigation measures as identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report’s Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) adopted by the City Council. The MMRP is attached an exhibit to the CEQA resolution.

A.1 Planning Division

A.1.1 General Conditions

1. Plan Conformance. The plans submitted for permits shall be in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified to incorporate these conditions of approval:
   a. SUMC Main Hospital: February 17, 2011
   b. Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital: December 2, 2010
   c. Hoover Renovations: February 2, 2011
   d. Hoover Site Development (MoB and parking garage): October 14, 2010
   e. School of Medicine FIM1: February 24, 2011
   f. Design Guidelines: June 24, 2010

2. Review, Oversight, and Inspections. Due to the complexity and size of the Project and a phasing schedule that is anticipated to last approximately fifteen years, the City shall hire, at the expense of the applicant, an independent consulting firm or firms and/or contractors to perform activities including, but not limited to, plan review, condition compliance review, mitigation monitoring, inspections, and report preparation. Within XX-days of Project approval, the Project sponsors and the City of Palo Alto shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that describes the initial deposit and subsequent payments, the types of contractors that could be retained, the scopes of work to be performed, procedures for amending the MOU, and reporting responsibilities, among other considerations. It is anticipated that consulting firms and contractors would be needed in the fields including, but not limited to, Planning, Building Review and Inspections, Public Works, Utilities, Fire, and Arborist.

3. Mitigation and Condition Monitoring. Within 30-days of Project approval, the Project sponsors shall meet with representatives from the Department of Planning and Community Environment to initiate a plan and process for mitigation and condition monitoring that is agreeable to all parties and is consistent with the provisions of the Development Agreement approved by City Council on___.

4. The Architectural Review resolution, including all City of Palo Alto conditions of approval for the Project shall be printed on the plans submitted for permits.

5. A copy of all development plans prepared for review under the jurisdiction of the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) shall be submitted to the City of Palo Alto Building Division for informational purposes only.
6. The proposed project shall comply with the requirements of the *Palo Alto Green Building Ordinance*, where applicable, prior to submittal for permits.

A.2 Fire Department

1. *Pay Fair Share towards OptiCom Installation.* The SUMC Project sponsors shall pay their fair-share financial contribution towards the City of Palo Alto, to assist with the installation and operation of emergency vehicle traffic signal priority (OptiCom) at all significantly impacted intersections.

2. *Develop a Work Plan for any Unknown Contaminated Sites.* During construction, if suspected contaminated soil, undocumented underground tanks, hazardous materials pipelines, or other evidence of potential hazardous materials are discovered in the soil, construction activities shall cease and the SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare a workplan to determine the potential risk to human and ecological health. The workplan shall be prepared by a Registered Environmental Assessor (REA) and in compliance with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the County Department of Environmental (DEH) guidelines and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (the "National Contingency Plan" [NCP]). Prior to starting the workplan contact the RWQCB at (510) 622-2300 for requirements or determination if the project will be under their jurisdiction or another regulatory agency.

The SUMC Project sponsors, or their representative, shall be responsible for submitting the workplan to the designated regulatory oversight agency for review and approval prior to implementing field activities. The workplan must include all information necessary for implementing field work. The workplan shall include a Site Safety Plan (SSP) and a Sampling Work Plan (SWP) at a minimum. The SSP must be submitted to the DTSC designated regulatory oversight agency in conjunction with the submittal of the SWP. The objective of the SSP is to ensure protection of the investigative team as well as the general public during sampling activities. If risk to human or ecological health is identified, the SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare and implement a Removal Action Workplan (SB 1706 Stats. 1994, Chapter 441) (non-emergency removal action or remedial action at a hazardous substance release site which is projected to cost less than $1,000,000) that is consistent with the NCP and to be consistent with the requirements of the regulatory oversight agency.

3. *Conduct Asbestos Survey at the SUMC Sites.* Prior to building renovation and/or demolition, an asbestos survey shall be performed on all areas of the building anticipated to be demolished and/or renovated. This survey shall be performed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor. In the event that asbestos is identified in the buildings proposed to be demolished and/or renovated, all asbestos containing materials shall be removed and appropriately disposed of by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor. A site health and safety plan, to ensure worker safety, in compliance with OSHA requirements (8 CCR 5208) shall be developed by the SUMC Project sponsors and in place prior to commencing renovation or demolition work on portions of buildings containing asbestos. Any asbestos abatement project, prior to start of the project shall obtain a permit (when required) by the Bay Area Air Management District (BAAQMD).

4. *Perform a “Hazardous Materials Closure” with the PAFD for any buildings or facilities, areas or rooms within the project area that stored, used or handled hazardous materials.* This includes "permitted site" as well as "unpermitted sites" discovered during the project that have or had hazardous materials. For sites where a determination has been made that have or previously had
hazardous materials and has not been closed with PAFD, a hazardous materials closure permit is required prior to removal of related materials and prior to demolition. Additionally, prior to removal or modification of the site an inspection by the fire dept is required unless otherwise determined.

A hazardous materials closure includes the physical facility and soil below or associated with the facility. Per project specific determination, a complete Phase II ESA and/or soil sampling may be required. The Hazardous Materials Closure Application and Guidelines can be found at http://www.unidocs.org or is available from PAFD. Hazardous Materials closure of the facility includes removal or addressing any items or areas to the degree that maintenance of a hazardous materials permit is no longer required. Any building, room or area shall have hazardous materials or residuals removed to a level at or below state hazardous waste levels, as agreed at the project start. Clean up level within the building will determine if there is a deed restriction on the building use. At a minimum the hazardous materials closure of a facility room or area will include items listed in the Hazardous Materials Closure Guidelines and may include for example; sampling of residues on facility surfaces such as laboratory countertops, fume hoods as well as sampling of walls, equipment, sinks, sumps, floors, and drain lines. Testing for lead containing materials may be required for any facility that previously contained x-ray equipment.

When contamination of the soil suspected or determined, a Phase II ESA or soil sampling shall include sampling and analysis of soil and associated items; sinks, sumps, floors, and drain lines at a minimum. A post closure report shall be supplied to the PAFD. The PAFD and the County DEH shall be notified by the Project sponsors if contamination remains after the hazardous materials closure is completed with the Fire Department. If soil contamination is discovered, the project will be referred to the RWQCB. The RWQCB will determine appropriate action or referral to another agency for the project. The SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare a site remediation assessment that (a) specifies measures to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards and (b) certifies that the proposed remediation measures would clean up contaminants, dispose of the wastes, and protect public health in accordance with federal, State, and local requirements. Site excavation activities shall not proceed until the site remediation has been approved by the RWQCB or the designated regulatory oversite agency and implemented by the SUMC Project sponsors. Additionally, the site remediation assessment shall be subject to review and approval by the RWQCB. All appropriate agencies shall be notified.

(Note: 701 and 703 Welch Rd. are addressed separately in this report. Other known hazardous materials use storage and handling buildings, facilities, areas or rooms are not addressed separately – such as 1101 Welch Rd, multiple medical clinics / office buildings on Welch Rd, Stanford Hospital areas being remodeled or demolished, 211 Quarry Rd structures, as well as unpermitted or unknown buildings, facility areas or rooms with hazardous materials.)
A.3 Planning Arborist

General Conditions

1. The Project shall be consistent with the Hospital District (Palo Alto Municipal Code, Section 18.XX) tree regulations including, but not limited to tree retention, relocation and removal.

2. All required Biological Resource mitigations as described in the MMRP approved by City Council shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Environment or his/her designee.

Prior to Demolition, Building or Grading permit issuance

1. Building Permit Submittal Review. Prior to submittal for staff review, the plans submitted for State or City of Palo Alto building permit shall be reviewed by the project site arborist to verify that all the arborist’s recommendations have been incorporated into the final plan set. The submittal set shall be accompanied by the project site arborist’s certification letter that the plans have incorporated the following information:

   a. Final Tree Protection Report (TPR) design changes and preservation measures as required in Mitigation Measure BR-4.1.

   b. Palo Alto Tree Technical Manual Standards, Section 2.00 and PAMC 8.10.080.

   c. Outstanding items: list of items not yet completed or resolved with reference to specific plan sheet pages where final completion or resolution will be provided, if applicable.

   d. Landscape and irrigation plans are consistent with CPA Tree Technical Manual, Section 5.45 and Appendix L, Landscaping under Native Oaks and PAMC 18.40.130.

2. Site Plan Requirements. The final Plans submitted for building permit shall include the following information and notes on the relevant plan sheets:

   a. Sheet T-1, “Tree Protection-it's Part of the Plan” Applicant shall complete the following sections on Sheet T-1: Tree Disclosure Statement, Inspections, and Monthly Reporting.

   b. The Tree Preservation Report (TPR). All sheets of the TPR approved by the City shall be printed on numbered Sheet T-1 (T-2, T-3, etc) and added to the sheet index.

   c. Conditions of Approval- the final list of City Arborist Conditions of Approval shall be printed on the numbered Sheet T-1 (T-2, T-3, etc) and added to the sheet index.

   d. Protective Tree Fencing Type. Delineate on grading plans, irrigation plans, site plans and utility plans, Type II fencing around Street Trees and Type I fencing around Protected/Designated trees as a bold dashed line enclosing the Tree Protection Zone (per the approved Tree Preservation Report) per instructions on Detail #605, Sheet T-1, and the City Tree Technical Manual, Section 6.35-Site Plans.

   e. Site Plan Note- Apply to the site plan stating, "Note #1: All tree protection and inspection schedule measures, design recommendations, watering and construction scheduling shall be implemented in full by owner and contractor, as stated in the Tree Protection Report on Sheet T-1 and the approved plans".
3. **All Other Plan Notes.** All civil plans, grading plans, irrigation plans, site plans and utility plans and relevant sheets shall include the following notes applying to the trees to be protected, including neighboring trees:

   a. "Note #1: Regulated Trees—before working in this area contact the Project Site Arborist at Tel. ___ ";

   b. “Note #2: Soils Report and excavation instructions for basement construction within the TPZ of a protected tree shall specify a vertical cut (stitch piers may be necessary) in order to avoid over-excavating into the tree root zone. Any variance from this procedure requires City Arborist approval, please call (650) 329-2441.”

   c. “Note #3: Utility trenching shall not occur within the TPZ of the protected tree. Contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that no trenching occurs within the TPZ of the protected tree by contractors, City crews or final landscape workers. See sheet T-1 for instructions.”

4. **Landscape Plans.**

   a. Provide a detailed landscape and irrigation plan encompassing on-and off-site plantable areas out to the curb shall be approved by the Architectural Review Board. A Landscape Water Use statement, water use calculations and a statement of design intent shall be submitted for the project. A licensed landscape architect and qualified irrigation consultant will prepare these plans, to include:

   i. All existing trees identified both to be retained and removed including street trees.

   ii. Complete plant list indicating tree and plant species, quantity, size, and locations.

   iii. Irrigation schedule and plan.

   iv. Fence locations.

   v. Lighting plan with photometric data.

   vi. Trees to be retained shall be irrigated, aerated and maintained as necessary to ensure survival.

   vii. Reduce heat islands--Parking lot shade tree plan. Provide a landscape sheet showing tree planting pursuant to the requirements of PAMC 18.XX.XXX)

   viii. All new trees planted within the public right-of-way (public land) shall be installed per Public Works (PW) Standard Planting Diagram #603 or 604 (include on plans), and shall have a tree pit dug at least twice the diameter of the root ball.

   ix. Landscape plan shall include planting preparation details for trees specifying digging the soil to at least 30-inches deep, backfilled with a quality topsoil and dressing with 2-inches of wood or bark mulch on top of the root ball keeping clear of the trunk by 1-inch.

   x. Automatic irrigation shall be provided to all trees. For trees, PW Detail #513 shall be included on the irrigation plans and show two bubbler heads mounted on flexible tubing placed at the edge of the root ball. Bubblers shall not be mounted inside an aeration tube. The tree irrigation system shall be connected to a separate valve from other shrubbery and ground cover, pursuant to the City's Landscape Water Efficiency
Standards. Irrigation in the right-of-way requires a street work permit per CPA Public Works standards.

xi. Landscape Plan shall ensure the backflow device is adequately obscured with the appropriate screening to minimize visibility (planted shrubbery is preferred, painted dark green, decorative boulder covering acceptable; wire cages are discouraged).

b. Planting notes to include the following mandatory criteria:

i. Prior to any planting, all plantable areas shall be tilled to 12” depth, and all construction rubble and stones over 1” or larger shall be removed from the site.

ii. Note a turf-free zone around trees 36” diameter (18” radius) for best tree performance.

c. Mandatory Landscape Architect (LA) Inspection Verification to the City. The LA of record shall verify the performance measurements are achieved with a separate letter of verification to City Planning staff, in addition to owner’s representative for each of the following:

i. Percolation & drainage checks have been performed and is acceptable.

ii. Fine grading inspection of all plantable areas has been personally inspected for tilling depth, rubble removal, soil test amendments are mixed and irrigation trenching will not cut through any tree roots.

iii. Tree and Shrub Planting Specifications, including delivered stock, meets Standards in the CPA Tree Technical Manual, Section 3.30-3.50. Girdling roots and previously topped trees are subject to rejection.

5. Tree Relocation Feasibility Plan and Memorandum of Understanding. The Project Sponsors shall complete, to the satisfactory of the Director of Planning and Community Environment, the requirements of Mitigation Measure BR-4.3 and BR 4.4, prior to the issuance of building permits.

6. Tree Protection Verification. Prior to demolition, grading or building permit issuance, a written verification from the contractor that the required protective fencing is in place shall be submitted to the Building Inspections Division. The fencing shall contain required warning sign and remain in place until final inspection of the project.

During Construction

7. Excavation Restrictions Apply (TTM, Sec. 2.20 C & D). Any approved grading, digging or trenching beneath a tree canopy shall be performed using ‘air-spade’ method as a preference, with manual hand shovel as a backup. For utility trenching, including sewer line, roots exposed with diameter of 1.5 inches and greater shall remain intact and not be damaged. If directional boring method is used to tunnel beneath roots, then Table 2-1, Trenching and Tunneling Distance, shall be printed on the final plans.

8. Plan Changes. Revisions and/or changes to plans before or during construction shall be reviewed and responded to by the project site arborist, (name of certified arborist of record and phone #), with written letter of acceptance before submitting the revision to the city for review.
9. **Conditions.** All Planning Department conditions of approval for the project shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit.

10. **Tree Protection Compliance.** The owner and contractor shall implement all protection and Contractor and Arborist Inspection Schedule measures, design recommendations and construction scheduling as stated in the TPR, and is subject to code compliance action pursuant to PAMC 8.10.080. The required protective fencing shall remain in place until final landscaping and inspection of the project. Project arborist approval must be obtained and documented in the monthly activity report sent to the City. A mandatory Monthly Tree Activity Report shall be sent monthly to the City beginning with the initial verification approval, using the template in the Tree Technical Manual, Addendum 11.

11. **Tree Damage.** Tree Damage, Injury Mitigation and Inspections apply to Contractor. Reporting, injury mitigation measures and arborist inspection schedule (1-5) apply pursuant to TTM, Section 2.20-2.30. Contractor shall be responsible for the repair or replacement of any publicly owned or protected trees that are damaged during the course of construction, pursuant to Title 8 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code, and city Tree Technical Manual, Section 2.25.

12. **General.** The following general tree preservation measures apply to all trees to be retained: No storage of material, topsoil, vehicles or equipment shall be permitted within the tree enclosure area. The ground under and around the tree canopy area shall not be altered. Trees to be retained shall be irrigated, aerated and maintained as necessary to ensure survival.

**Prior to Final Inspection by City Arborist**

13. **Landscape Inspection.** The Planning Department shall be in receipt of written verification that the Landscape Architect has inspected all trees, shrubs, planting and irrigation and that they are installed and functioning as specified in the approved plans.

14. **Tree Inspection.** The contractor shall call for an inspection by the Project Arborist and City Arborist. A final inspection and report by the project arborist shall evaluate all trees to be retained and protected, as indicated in the approved plans, the activity, health, welfare, mitigation remedies for injury, if any, and for the long term care of the trees for the new owner. The report shall provide written verification to the Planning Department that all trees, shrubs, planting and irrigation are installed and functioning as specified in the approved plans. The final arborist report shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to written request for temporary or final occupancy. The final report may be used to navigate the security guarantee return process, when applicable.

15. **Planning Inspection.** Prior to final sign off, contractor or owner shall contact the city planner (650-329-2441) to inspect and verify Special Conditions relating to the conditions for structures, fixtures, colors and site plan accessories.

**Post Construction**

16. **Maintenance.** All landscape and trees shall be maintained, watered, fertilized, and pruned according to Best Management Practices-Pruning (ANSI A300-2001 or current version). Any vegetation that dies shall be replaced or failed automatic irrigation repaired by the current property owner within 30 days of discovery.
A.4 Public Works

Prior to Submittal of Building Permit

1. *Construction Impact Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of any development permit (street work, grading, building, etc) for the SUMC project, the project sponsors shall prepare and receive approval of a Construction Impact Minimization Plan (CIMP), the minimum requirements of which are described in Mitigation Measure TR-1.8 of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP). Additional CIMP information not specifically described in MMRP TR-1.8 may be required. It is anticipated that a separate CIMP will be required for each of the project components. Please contact Public Works staff to initiate discussions on the development of the CIMP.

2. *The applicant is required to meet with Public Works Engineering (PWE) prior to final ARB submittal* to verify the basic design parameters affecting grading, drainage and surface water infiltration. The applicant is required to submit a conceptual site grading and drainage plan that conveys site runoff to the nearest adequate municipal storm drainage system. In order to address potential storm water quality impacts, the plan shall identify the Best Management Practices (BMP’s) to be incorporated into the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will be required for the project. The SWPPP shall include permanent BMP’s to be incorporated into the project to protect storm water quality. (Resources and handouts are available from Public Works – Engineering. Specific reference is made to Palo Alto’s companion document to “Start at the Source”, entitled “Planning Your Land Development Project”). The elements of the PWE-approved conceptual grading and drainage plan shall be incorporated into the building permit plans.

3. *A Grading and Excavation Permit* issued by the CPA Building Inspection Division is required for the proposed project. Any grading permit issued in conjunction with a phased project implementation plan will only authorize grading and storm drain improvements. Other site utilities may be shown on the grading plan for reference only, and should be so noted. No utility infrastructure should be shown inside the building footprint. Installation of these other utilities will be approved as part of a subsequent Building Permit application.

4. *The applicant shall submit a final grading and drainage plan to Public Works Engineering.* This plan shall show spot elevations or contours of the site and demonstrate the proper conveyance of storm water to the nearest adequate municipal storm drainage system. Existing drainage patterns, including accommodation of runoff from adjacent properties, shall be maintained.

5. *The proposed development will result in a change in the impervious area of the property.* The applicant shall provide calculations showing the adjusted impervious area with the building permit application. A Storm Drainage Fee adjustment on the applicant’s monthly City utility bill will take place in the month following the final approval of the construction by the Building Inspection Division. The impervious area calculation sheets and instructions are available from Public Works Engineering.

6. *A detailed site-specific soil report* prepared by a licensed soils or geo-technical engineer must be submitted which includes information on water table and basement construction issues. This report shall identify the current groundwater level, if encountered, and by using this and other available information, as well as professional experience, the engineer shall estimate the highest projected ground-water level likely to be encountered in the future. If the proposed basement is reasonably above the projected highest water level, then the basement can be constructed in a conventional manner with a subsurface perimeter drainage system to relieve hydrostatic pressure. If not, measures must be undertaken to render the basement waterproof and able to withstand all projected hydrostatic and soil pressures. No pumping of ground water is allowed. In general, however, Public Works
Engineering recommends that structures be constructed in such a way that they do not penetrate existing or projected ground water levels.

7. **Storm water discharge associated with construction activity.** This proposed development will disturb more than one acre of land. The applicant must apply for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) NPDES general permit for storm water discharge associated with construction activity. A Notice of Intent (NOI) must be filed for this project with the SWRCB in order to obtain coverage under the permit. The General Permit requires the applicant to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The applicant is required to submit two copies of the NOI and the draft SWPPP to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of the building permit. The SWPPP should include both permanent, post-development project design features and temporary measures employed during construction to control storm water pollution. Specific Best Management Practices (BMP’s) which apply to the work should be incorporated into the design.

8. **The applicant is required to paint the “No Dumping/Flows to San Francisquito Creek” logo in blue color on a white background, adjacent to all storm drain inlets. Stencils of the logo are available from the Public Works Environmental Compliance Division, which may be contacted at (650) 329-2598. A deposit may be required to secure the return of the stencil. Include the instruction to paint the logos on the construction grading and drainage plan. Include maintenance of these logos in the Hazardous Materials Management Plan, if such a plan is part of this project.**

9. **Dumpster/recycling area.**
   a. The project includes the construction of dumpster and recycling areas as part of a food service facility. Regulations require that the dumpster/recycling area be adequately roofed or covered.
   b. The project includes the construction of dumpster and recycling areas. City guidelines recommend that this area be covered where feasible.

10. **Storm runoff from loading docks.** The plans include a loading dock. Storm runoff from loading docks where chemicals or hazardous materials may be handled shall not drain to a street, gutter, or storm drain. See 16.09.032(b)(4)(D). It is recommended that the loading dock(s) be covered to preclude the need for a drain.

11. **Dewatering:** The project excavations will require dewatering during construction. Public Works only allows groundwater drawdown well dewatering. Open pit groundwater dewatering is disallowed. Dewatering is only allowed from April through October due to inadequate capacity in our storm drain system. The geotechnical report for this site must list the highest anticipated groundwater level. We recommend a piezometer to be installed in the soil boring. The contractor must determine the depth to groundwater immediately prior to excavation by using the piezometer or by drilling an exploratory hole if the deepest excavation will be within 3 feet of the highest anticipated groundwater level. If groundwater is found within 2 feet of the deepest excavation, a drawdown well dewatering system must be used. Public Works will require the water to be tested for contaminants prior to initial discharge and at intervals during dewatering. The contractor must retain an independent testing firm to test the discharge water for the contaminants Public Works specifies and submit the results to Public Works.

12. **Storm Water Pollution Prevention Measures.** Per Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.11, the applicant must incorporate permanent storm water pollution prevention measures that treat storm water runoff prior to discharge. As of February 10, 2011, the prevention measures shall be reviewed
by a qualified third-party reviewer who needs to certify that it complies with the Palo Alto Municipal Code requirements. This is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. The third-party reviewer shall be acquired by the applicant and needs to be on the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program’s (Program) list of qualified consultants. (http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/consultants.htm) Any consultant or contractor hired to design and/or construct a storm water treatment system for the project cannot certify the project as a third-party reviewer.

13. **Basement Shoring:** Shoring for the basement excavation, including tiebacks, must not extend onto adjacent private property or into the City right-of-way without having first obtained written permission from the private property owners and/or an encroachment permit from Public Works.

**During Construction**

14. The contractor must contact the CPA Public Works Inspector at (650) 496-6929 prior to any work performed in the public right-of-way.

15. No storage of construction materials is permitted in the street or on the sidewalk without prior approval of Public Works Engineering.

16. The developer shall require its contractor to incorporate best management practices (BMP's) for stormwater pollution prevention in all construction operations, in conformance with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project. It is unlawful to discharge any construction debris (soil, asphalt, sawcuto slurry, paint, chemicals, etc.) or other waste materials into gutters or storm drains. (PAMC Chapter 16.09).

17. All construction within the City right-of-way, easements or other property under City jurisdiction shall conform to Standard Specifications of the Public Works and Utility Departments.

**Prior to Finalization**

18. All sidewalks and curb and gutters bordering the project which have been damaged during construction shall be repaired and/or removed and replaced in compliance with Public Works approved standards. Sec. 12.08.010.

19. All unused driveways shall be removed and replaced with curb and gutter. Sec. 12.08.090.

20. The Public Works Inspector shall sign off the building permit prior to the finalization of this permit. All off-site improvements shall be finished prior to this sign-off. Similarly, all as-builts, on-site grading, drainage and post-developments BMP’s shall be completed prior to sign-off. As-Built drawings shall be drawn using NAD88 coordinates and submitted in digital format (ACAD) as well as 3 mil Mylar.

**A.5 Public Works – Water Quality**

1. **PAMC 16.09.117(c) Discharge of Groundwater.** Prior approval shall be obtained from the city engineer or designee to discharge water pumped from construction sites to the storm drain. The city engineer or designee may require gravity settling and filtration upon a determination that either or both would improve the water quality of the discharge. Contaminated ground water or water that
exceeds state or federal requirements for discharge to navigable waters may not be discharged to the storm drain. Such water may be discharged to the sewer, provided that the requirements of Section 16.09.110 are met and the approval of the superintendent is obtained prior to discharge. The City shall be compensated for any costs it incurs in authorizing such discharge, at the rate set forth in the Municipal Fee Schedule.

2. **PAMC 16.09.080 Industrial Waste Discharge Permit.** Industrial dischargers must submit an application for an industrial waste discharge permit no later than sixty days in advance of commencing discharge. (This is likely to only apply to the hospital and labs/clinics buildings)

3. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(9) Covered Parking.** Drain plumbing for parking garage floor drains must be connected to an oil/water separator with a minimum capacity of 100 gallons, and to the sanitary sewer system.

4. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(10) Dumpsters for New and Remodeled Facilities.** New buildings and residential developments providing centralized solid waste collection, except for single-family and duplex residences, shall provide a covered area for a dumpster. The area shall be adequately sized for all waste streams and designed with grading or a berm system to prevent water runon and runoff from the area.

5. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(14) Architectural Copper.** On and after January 1, 2003, copper metal roofing, copper metal gutters, copper metal down spouts, and copper granule containing asphalt shingles shall not be permitted for use on any residential, commercial or industrial building for which a building permit is required. Copper flashing for use under tiles or slates and small copper ornaments are exempt from this prohibition. Replacement roofing, gutters and downspouts on historic structures are exempt, provided that the roofing material used shall be prepatinated at the factory. For the purposes of this exemption, the definition of "historic" shall be limited to structures designated as Category 1 or Category 2 buildings in the current edition of the Palo Alto Historical and Architectural Resources Report and Inventory.

6. **PAMC 16.09.175(k) (2) Loading Docks**
   a. Loading dock drains to the storm drain system may be allowed if equipped with a fail-safe valve or equivalent device that is kept closed during the non-rainy season and during periods of loading dock operation.
   b. Where chemicals, hazardous materials, grease, oil, or waste products are handled or used within the loading dock area, a drain to the storm drain system shall not be allowed. A drain to the sanitary sewer system may be allowed if equipped with a fail-safe valve or equivalent device that is kept closed during the non-rainy season and during periods of loading dock operation. The area in which the drain is located shall be covered or protected from rainwater run-on by berms and/or grading. Appropriate wastewater treatment approved by the Superintendent shall be provided for all rainwater contacting the loading dock site.

7. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(5) Condensate from HVAC.** Condensate lines shall not be connected or allowed to drain to the storm drain system.

8. **16.09.215 Silver Processing.** Facilities conducting silver processing (photographic or X-ray films) shall either submit a treatment application or waste hauler certification for all spent silver bearing solutions. 650-329-2421.
9. **PAMC 16.09.205 Cooling Towers.** No person shall discharge or add to the sanitary sewer system or storm drain system, or add to a cooling system, pool, spa, fountain, boiler or heat exchanger, any substance that contains any of the following:

- Copper in excess of 2.0 mg/liter;
- Any tri-butyl tin compound in excess of 0.10 mg/liter;
- Chromium in excess of 2.0 mg/liter.
- Zinc in excess of 2.0 mg/liter; or
- Molybdenum in excess of 2.0 mg/liter.

10. The above limits shall apply to any of the above-listed substances prior to dilution with the cooling system, pool, spa or fountain water.

11. A flow meter shall be installed to measure the volume of blowdown water from the new cooling tower. Cooling systems discharging greater than 2,000 gallons per day are required to meet a copper discharge limit of 0.25 milligrams per liter.

12. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(b) Copper Piping.** Copper, copper alloys, lead and lead alloys, including brass, shall not be used in sewer lines, connectors, or seals coming in contact with sewage except for domestic waste sink traps and short lengths of associated connecting pipes where alternate materials are not practical. The plans must specify that copper piping will not be used for wastewater plumbing.

13. **PAMC 16.09.175(j) Traps Below Laboratory Sinks.** Sewer traps below laboratory sinks shall be made of glass or other approved transparent materials to allow inspection and to determine frequency of cleaning. Alternatively, a removable plug for cleaning the trap may be provided, in which case a cleaning frequency shall be established by the Superintendent. In establishing the cleaning frequency, the Superintendent shall consider the recommendations of the facility. The Superintendent will grant an exception to this requirement for areas where mercury will not be used; provided, that in the event such an exception is granted and mercury is subsequently used in the area, the sink trap shall be retrofitted to meet this requirement prior to use of the mercury.

14. **PAMC 16.09.175(a) Floor Drains.** Interior (indoor) floor drains to the sanitary sewer system may not be placed in areas where hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, industrial wastes, industrial process water, lubricating fluids, vehicle fluids or vehicle equipment cleaning wastewater are used or stored, unless secondary containment is provided for all such materials and equipment.

15. **PAMC 16.09.175(i) Laboratory Sinks.** Laboratory countertops and laboratory sinks shall be separated by a berm which prevents hazardous materials spilled on the countertop from draining to the sink.

16. **PAMC 16.09.180(b)(1) and 16.09.105 Segregated Plumbing and Sampling Locations.** The owner of every new commercial and industrial building or portion thereof shall cause the building to be constructed so that industrial waste is segregated, by means of separate plumbing, from domestic waste prior to converging with other waste streams in the sanitary sewer system. For the purposes of this section only, the term "new" shall also include change to a use that requires plumbing for industrial waste.

Establishments from which industrial wastes are discharged to the sanitary sewer system shall provide and maintain one or more sampling locations or metering devices or volume and flow measuring methodologies or other sampling and measuring points approved by the Superintendent which will allow the separate measuring and sampling of industrial and domestic wastes. Unless otherwise approved by the Superintendent, domestic and industrial waste shall be kept completely separated.
upstream of such sampling locations and/or measuring points. Establishments that are billed for sewer service on the basis of sewage effluent constituents shall provide a suitable means for sampling and/or measurement of flow to determine billing constituents in accordance with the utilities rules and requirements. Sampling locations shall be so located that they are safe and accessible to the Superintendent at any reasonable time during which discharge is occurring. (This is likely to only apply to the hospital and labs/clinics buildings)

17. 16.09.180(12) Mercury Switches. Mercury switches shall not be installed in sewer or storm drain sumps.

18. PAMC 16.09.205(a) Cooling Systems, Pools, Spas, Fountains, Boilers and Heat Exchangers. It shall be unlawful to discharge water from cooling systems, pools, spas, fountains boilers and heat exchangers to the storm drain system.

19. PAMC 16.09.165(h) Storm Drain Labeling. Storm drain inlets shall be clearly marked with the words "No dumping - Flows to Bay," or equivalent.

20. Designated Food Service Establishment (FSE) Project:

   A. Grease Control Device (GCD) Requirements, PAMC Section 16.09.075 & cited Bldg/Plumbing Codes

   i. The plans shall specify the manufacturer details and installation details of all proposed GCDs. (CBC 1009.2)

   ii. GCD(s) shall be sized in accordance with the 2007 California Plumbing Code.

   iii. GCD(s) shall be installed with a minimum capacity of 500 gallons.

   iv. GCD sizing calculations shall be included on the plans. See a sizing calculation example below.

   v. The size of all GCDs installed shall be equal to or larger than what is specified on the plans.

   vi. GCDs larger than 50 gallons (100 pounds) shall not be installed in food preparation and storage areas. Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health prefers GCDs to be installed outside. GCDs shall be installed such that all access points or manholes are readily accessible for inspection, cleaning and removal of all contents. GCDs located outdoors shall be installed in such a manner so as to exclude the entrance of surface and stormwater. (CPC 1009.5)

   vii. All large, in-ground interceptors shall have a minimum of three manholes to allow visibility of each inlet piping, baffle (divider) wall, baffle piping and outlet piping. The plans shall clearly indicate the number of proposed manholes on the GCD. The Environmental Compliance Division of Public Works Department may authorize variances which allow GCDs with less than three manholes due to manufacture available options or adequate visibility.

   viii. Sample boxes shall be installed downstream of all GCDs.

   ix. All GCDs shall be fitted with relief vent(s). (CPC 1002.2 & 1004)

   x. GCD(s) installed in vehicle traffic areas shall be rated and indicated on plans.
B. Drainage Fixture Requirements, PAMC Section 16.09.075 & cited Bldg/Plumbing Codes

i. To ensure all FSE drainage fixtures are connected to the correct drain lines, each drainage fixture shall be clearly labeled on the plans. A list of all fixtures and their discharge connection, i.e. sanitary sewer or grease waste line, shall be included on the plans.

ii. A list indicating all connections to each proposed GCD shall be included on the plans. This can be incorporated into the sizing calculation.

iii. All grease generating drainage fixtures shall connect to a GCD. These include but are not limited to:

iv. Pre-rinse (scullery) sinks (direct connection)

v. Three compartment sinks (pot sinks) (direct connection)

vi. Drainage fixtures in dishwashing room except for dishwashers shall connect to a GCD (direct connection)

vii. Examples: trough drains (small drains prior to entering a dishwasher), small drains on busing counters adjacent to pre-rinse sinks or silverware soaking sinks

viii. Floor drains in dishwashing area and kitchens

ix. Prep sinks (indirect connection)

x. Mop (janitor) sinks

xi. Outside areas designated for equipment washing shall be covered and any drains contained therein shall connect to a GCD.

xii. Drains in trash/recycling enclosures

xiii. Wok stoves, rotisserie ovens/broilers or other grease generating cooking equipment with drip lines (indirect connection)

xiv. Kettles and tilt/braising pans and associated floor drains/sinks

xv. The connection of any high temperature discharge lines and non-grease generating drainage fixtures to a GCD is prohibited. The following shall not be connected to a GCD:

xvi. Dishwashers (direct connection)

xvii. Steamers (indirect connection)

xviii. Pasta cookers (indirect connection)

xix. Hot lines from buffet counters and kitchens (indirect connection)

xx. Hand sinks (direct connection)

xxi. Ice machine drip lines (indirect connection)

xxii. Soda machine drip lines (indirect connection)
xxiii. Drainage lines in bar areas (indirect connection)

xxiv. No garbage disposers (grinders) shall be installed in a FSE. (PAMC 16.09.075(d)).

xxv. Plumbing lines shall not be installed above any cooking, food preparation and storage areas.

xxvi. Each drainage fixture discharging into a GCD shall be individually trapped and vented. (CPC 1014.5)

C. Covered Dumpsters, Recycling and Tallow Bin Areas PAMC, 16.09.075(q)(2)

i. New buildings constructed to house FSEs shall include a covered area for all dumpsters, bins, carts or container used for the collection of trash, recycling, food scraps and waste cooking fats, oils and grease (FOG) or tallow.

ii. The area shall be designed and shown on plans to prevent water run-on to the area and runoff from the area.

iii. Drains that are installed within the enclosure for recycle and waste bins, dumpsters and tallow bins serving FSEs are optional. Any such drain installed shall be connected to a GCD.

iv. If tallow is to be stored outside then an adequately sized, segregated space for a tallow bin shall be included in the covered area.

D. Large Item Cleaning Sink, PAMC 16.09.075(m)(2)(B)

i. FSEs shall have a sink or other area drain which is connected to a GCD and large enough for cleaning the largest kitchen equipment such as floor mats, containers, carts, etc. Recommendation: Generally, sinks or cleaning areas larger than a typical mop/janitor sink are more useful.

E. GCD sizing criteria and an example of a GCD sizing calculation (2007 CPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sizing Criteria:</th>
<th>DFUs</th>
<th>GCD Sizing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drain Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total DFUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-rinse sink</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 compartment sink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 compartment sink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep sink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mop/Janitorial sink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor drain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor sink</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example GCD Sizing Calculation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Drainage Fixture &amp; Item Number</th>
<th>DFUs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-rinse sink, Item 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 compartment sink, Item 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prep sinks, Item 3 &amp; Floor sink, Item 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mop sink, Item 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Floor trough, Item 6 &amp; tilt skillet, Item 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Floor trough, Item 6 &amp; steam kettle, Item 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Floor sink, Item 4 &amp; wok stove, Item 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Floor drains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000 gallon GCD minimum sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- All resubmitted plans to Building Department which include FSE projects shall be resubmitted to Water Quality.
- It is frequently to the FSE’s advantage to install the next size larger GCD to allow for more efficient grease discharge prevention and may allow for longer times between cleaning. There are many manufacturers of GCDs which are available in different shapes, sizes and materials (plastic, reinforced fiberglass, reinforced concrete and metal)
- The requirements will assist FSEs with FOG discharge prevention to the sanitary sewer and storm drain pollution prevention. The FSE at all times shall comply with the Sewer Use Ordinance of the Palo Alto Municipal Code. The ordinances include requirements for GCDs, GCD maintenance, drainage fixtures, record keeping and construction projects.

A.6 Transportation Division

1. **TDM Monitoring Report.** SUMC shall prepare and submit to the City an Annual TDM Monitoring Report as required by TR-2.3 – *Enhance Stanford University Transportation Demand Management Program*. The report shall include reporting on TDM projects and programs required within the Project Development Agreement including an Annual Traffic Monitoring Element to measure employee, visitor, and patients trips to the Project in relation to estimated prepared during the Project EIR.

2. **Bicycle Parking Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a building permit for each project component, the project sponsors shall review the bicycle parking plan and layout with the Transportation Division. Bicycle parking shall be consistent with all applicable codes.

3. **Bicycle Parking During Construction.** As part of the Construction Impact Minimization Plan (CIMP), the project sponsors shall include the installation of temporary bicycle parking facilities if existing facilities would be affected by construction work including bike racks, bike lockers, and covered bike racks. Prior to the submittal of the draft CIMP, please contact Transportation staff to discuss the layout, type, duration and number of spaces to be provided.

4. **Transit Facilities During Construction.** As part of the CIMP, the project sponsors shall include the installation of temporary transit facilities if existing facilities would be affected by construction work.
Prior to the submittal of the draft CIMP, please contact Transportation Division staff to discuss the transit stops that would be affected and the design of temporary facilities, which may include the placement of temporary shelters, furniture, informational signage, etc.

5. **Wayfinding Signage Plan**

   a. *During Construction.* As part of the CIMP, the project sponsors shall include the installation of temporary pedestrian wayfinding/directional signage to improve the flow and circulation of pedestrian and bicyclists around construction areas. Prior to the submittal of the draft CIMP, please contact Transportation staff to discuss the design and placement and duration of the temporary signage.

   b. *Permanent Signs.* Prior to issuance of permits, the project sponsors shall submit plans for installation of permanent pedestrian wayfinding/directional signage to improve the flow and circulation of pedestrian and bicyclists around the medical center complex and at Hoover Pavilion. Please contact Transportation staff to discuss the design and placement and duration of the temporary signage.

6. **Onsite Improvement Plans.** Prior to the submittal of building permit plans, the project sponsors shall review with Transportation Division staff the automobile and pedestrian circulations plans for each of the project components, including the interface between the driveways, walkways, parking garages, private streets and the public right-of-way.
A.7 Utilities

A.7.1 Utilities Electric

1. Applicant/developer/owner shall supply/increase the Public Utility Easement at Quarry Substation which will be used for the installation of equipment due to new electrical load demands as a result of on-going construction in the Stanford Hospital/LPCH/Welch Road area. This easement shall be required no later than December 31, 2012. The City’s electrical engineering department shall supply the dimensions of the new easement upon request from the applicant.

2. Applicant shall adhere to the requirements listed in City of Palo Alto’s Electric Service Requirements and the City of Palo Alto’s Electric Rules and Regulations.

3. Where CPAU primary electrical facilities enter private property, the applicant/developer/owner shall supply a Public Utility Easement which shall be approved by the Electric Utilities Department.

4. Only one electric service lateral is permitted per parcel.

5. The applicant/developer/owner shall provide space for installing padmount equipment (i.e. transformers, switches, and interrupters) and associated substructure as required by the City.

6. The customer shall install all electrical substructures (conduits, boxes and pads) required from the service point to the customer’s switchgear. The design and installation shall be according to the City standards and shown on plans.

7. The applicant shall be responsible to relocate and/or upgrade all CPAU electric facilities which are impacted by the projects listed under review.

8. Location of the electric panel/switchboard shall be shown on the site plan and approved by the Architectural Review Board and Utilities Department.

9. All utility meters, lines, transformers, backflow preventers, and any other required equipment shall be shown on the landscape and irrigation plans and shall show that no conflict will occur between the utilities and landscape materials. In addition, all aboveground equipment shall be screened in a manner that is consistent with the building design and setback requirements.

10. For services larger than 1600 amps, the customer will be required to provide a transition cabinet as the interconnection point between the utility’s padmount transformer and the customer’s main switchgear. The cabinet design drawings must be submitted to the Electric Utility Engineering Department for review and approval. See Drawing SR-XF-E-1020.

11. For underground services, no more than four (4) 750 MCM conductors per phase can be connected to the transformer secondary terminals; otherwise, bus duct must be used for connections to padmount transformers. If customer installs a bus duct directly between the transformer secondary terminals and the main switchgear, the installation of a transition cabinet will not be required. See Drawings SR-XF-E-1020 and DT-SE-U-1032.

12. The customer is responsible for sizing the service conductors and other required equipment according to the National Electric Code requirements and the City standards. See Drawing DT-SE-U-1032.
13. Any additional facilities and services requested by the Applicant that are beyond what the utility deems standard facilities will be subject to Special Facilities charges. The Special Facilities charges include the cost of installing the additional facilities as well as the cost of ownership.

14. The customer is responsible for installing all on-site substructures (conduits, boxes and pads) required for the electric service. No more than 270 degrees of bends are allowed in a secondary conduit run. All conduits must be sized according to National Electric Code requirements and no 1/2 - inch size conduits are permitted. All off-site substructure work will be constructed by the City at the customer’s expense. Where mutually agreed upon by the City and the Applicant, all or part of the off-site substructure work may be constructed by the Applicant.

15. All primary electric conduits shall be concrete encased with the top of the encasement at the depth of 30 inches. No more than 180 degrees of bends are allowed in a primary conduit run. Conduit runs over 500 feet in length require additional pull boxes.

16. All new underground conduits and substructures shall be installed per City standards and shall be inspected by the Electrical Underground Inspector before backfilling.

17. The customer is responsible for installing all underground electric service conductors, bus duct, transition cabinets, and other required equipment. The installation shall meet the National Electric Code and the City Standards.

18. Meter and switchboard requirements shall be in accordance with Electric Utility Service Equipment Requirements Committee (EUSERC) drawings accepted by Utility and CPA standards for meter installations.

19. Shop/factory drawings for switchboards (400A and greater) and associated hardware must be submitted for review and approval prior to installing the switchgear.

20. All new underground electric services shall be inspected and approved by both the Building Inspection Division and the Electrical Underground Inspector before energizing.

21. The Applicant shall be responsible for identification and location of all utilities, both public and private, within the work area. Prior to any excavation work at the site, the Applicant shall contact Underground Service Alert (USA) at 1-800-227-2600, at least 48 hours prior to beginning work.

22. All electrical utility installations shall meet the specifications listed in the City of Palo Alto’s Electric Service Requirement Manual.

23. Applicant shall maintain required spacing between electric facilities and all other utilities. See CPAU engineering drawing DT-SS-U-1003 for spacing requirements.

24. All conduit installation shall be in accordance with CPAU engineering drawing DT-SS-U-1003.

25. All vault and box installations shall be in accordance with CPAU engineering drawing DT-SS-U-1002.

26. Projects that require the extension of high voltage primary distribution lines or reinforcement of offsite electric facilities will be at the customer’s expense and must be coordinated with the Electric Utility.
A.7.2 Utilities Marketing

1. *Outdoor Water Efficiency and Conservation Requirements.* Please be advised that as of January 1, 2011, the City of Palo Alto is enforcing the new State Green Building Code (CALGreen) with local amendments for Palo Alto. Compliance with the tier 2 requirements for outdoor water efficiency is required for landscapes of any size when the project is a new construction, rebuild, or addition with greater than 1,000 square feet of building area. All other projects need to meet the tier 1 requirements if a landscape area included in the scope of the project is greater than 1,000 square feet. Prior to issuance of either a Building Permit or Grading Permit, the applicant will need to demonstrate compliance by providing the following documentation when applying for a Building and/or Grading Permit:
   - Landscape Water Use Statement
   - Water Use Calculations
   - Irrigation Plan
   - Grading Plan
   - Landscape Design and Planting Plan

Applicants will need to provide this documentation to the City at the Building Permit Review stage. All landscape worksheets and Green Building Permit Applications can be found on the City’s website at [www.cityofpaloalto.org/greenbuilding](http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/greenbuilding). Please contact Catherine Elvert in Utilities Marketing Services at (650) 329-2417 catherine.elvert@cityofpaloalto.org or Kristin Parineh in Planning and Community Environment at (650) 329-2189 or kristin.parineh@cityofpaloalto.org for more information.

2. *Recycled Water.* The City of Palo Alto’s Recycled Water Ordinance (Ordinance No. 5002) became effective on June 12, 2008. This ordinance has requirements for irrigation and dual plumbing that are effective immediately for certain types of projects in Palo Alto. For most projects, this requires a separate irrigation system utilizing purple irrigation pipe, appropriate fittings and the installation of an approved backflow prevention device. Please see Palo Alto Municipal Code 16.12 for more information on the recycled water ordinance.

A.8 Water, Gas and Wastewater Utilities Department

*No General Conditions of Approval at this time. Please see project specific conditions.*

A.9 Building Department

*Pending receipt of Draft Conditions of Approval.*
B. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS PER PROJECTS

For the SUMC Projects, these conditions of approval are intended to be followed in addition to Section A. General Conditions of Approval.

B.1. SHC

B.1.1. Planning Arborist

1. Kaplan Lawn Area. Prior to the submittal of Stanford Medical Center, Main Hospital building permit plans for State or City of Palo Alto review, the Project Sponsors shall provide a construction plan for the road design through the Kaplan Lawn Area. The plans shall employ a "no-cut" road design, limited to a cut no more than 4-inches from grade as feasible. This plan shall be prepared in consultation with the Project and City Arborist to preserve the root area of trees 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41.

B.1.2. Water, Gas & Wastewater Utilities Department

Prior to Issuance of Demolition Permit

1. Prior to demolition, the applicant shall submit the existing water/wastewater fixture unit loads (and building as-built plans to verify the existing loads) to determine the capacity fee credit for the existing load (for all buildings to be demolished). If the applicant does not submit loads and plans they may not receive credit for the existing water/wastewater fixtures.

2. The applicant shall submit a request to disconnect all utility services and/or meters including a signed affidavit of vacancy. Utilities will be disconnected or removed within 10 working days after receipt of request. The demolition permit will be issued by the building inspection division after all utility services and/or meters have been disconnected and removed.

Prior to Submittal For Building Permit

3. The applicant shall submit a completed water-gas-wastewater service connection application - load sheet for each set of meters (the load and location for each water and gas meter shall be separately detailed on one or more utility applications) to City of Palo Alto Utilities. The applicant must provide all the information requested for utility service demands (water in fixture units/g.p.m., gas in b.t.u.p.h., and sewer in fixture units/g.p.d.).

4. The applicant shall submit improvement plans for utility construction. The plans must show the size and location of all underground utilities within the development and the public right of way including meters, backflow preventers, fire service requirements, sewer mains, sewer cleanouts, sewer lift stations and any other required utilities.

5. Utility vaults, transformers, utility cabinets, concrete bases, or other structures cannot be placed over existing water, gas or wastewater mains/services. Maintain 1’ horizontal clear separation from the vault/cabinet/concrete base to existing utilities as found in the field. If there is a conflict with existing utilities, Cabinets/vaults/bases shall be relocated from the plan location as needed to meet field conditions.
6. The applicant must show on the site plan the existence of any auxiliary water supply, (i.e. water well, gray water, recycled water, rain catchment, water storage tank, etc).

7. The applicant shall be responsible for installing and upgrading the existing utility mains and/or services as necessary to handle anticipated peak loads. This responsibility includes all costs associated with the design and construction for the installation/upgrade of the utility mains and/or services.

8. Sewer drainage piping serving fixtures located less than one foot above the next upstream sewer main manhole cover shall be protected by an approved backwater valve per California Plumbing Code 710.0. The upstream sewer main manhole rim elevation shall be shown on the plans.

9. Flushing of the fire system to sanitary sewer shall not exceed 30 GPM. Higher flushing rates shall be diverted to a detention tank to achieve the 30 GPM flow to sewer.

10. Sewage ejector pumps shall meet the following conditions:
   a. The pump(s) be limited to a total 100 GPM capacity or less.
   b. The sewage line changes to a 4" gravity flow line at least 20' from the City clean out.
   c. The tank and float is set up such that the pump run time not exceed 20 seconds each cycle.

Prior to Issuance of Building Permit

11. The applicant's engineer shall submit flow calculations and system capacity study showing that the on-site and off-site water and sanitary sewer mains and services will provide the domestic, irrigation, fire flows, and wastewater capacity needed to service the development and adjacent properties during anticipated peak flow demands. Field testing may be required to determined current flows and water pressures on existing water main. Calculations must be signed and stamped by a registered civil engineer. The applicant is required to perform, at his/her expense, a flow monitoring study of the existing sewer main to determine the remaining capacity. The report must include existing peak flows or depth of flow based on a minimum monitoring period of seven continuous days or as determined by the senior wastewater engineer. The study shall meet the requirements and the approval of the WGW engineering section. No downstream overloading of existing sewer main will be permitted.

12. For contractor installed water and wastewater mains or services, the applicant shall submit to the WGW engineering section of the Utilities Department four copies of the installation of water and wastewater utilities off-site improvement plans in accordance with the utilities department design criteria. All utility work within the public right-of-way shall be clearly shown on the plans that are prepared, signed and stamped by a registered civil engineer. The contractor shall also submit a complete schedule of work, method of construction and the manufacture's literature on the materials to be used for approval by the utilities engineering section. The applicant's contractor will not be allowed to begin work until the improvement plan and other submittals have been approved by the water, gas and wastewater engineering section. After the work is complete but prior to sign off, the applicant shall provide record drawings (as-builts) of the contractor installed water and wastewater mains and services per City of Palo Alto Utilities record drawing procedures.
13. Existing wastewater laterals to new or remodeled buildings that are not plastic (ABS, PVC, or PE) shall be replaced at the applicant’s expense.

14. The applicant shall pay the capacity fees, connection and inspection fees associated with the installation of the new water, gas or wastewater utility services, or additional load to existing services. The approved relocation of services, meters, hydrants, or other facilities will be performed at the cost of the person/entity requesting the relocation.

15. Each unit or place of business shall have its own water and gas meter shown on the plans. An approved reduce pressure principle assembly (RPPA backflow preventer device) is required for all existing and new water connections from Palo Alto Utilities to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. The RPPA shall be installed on the owner’s property and directly behind the water meter, within 5’ of the property line. Show the location of the RPPA on the plans. Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the meter and the assembly. The applicant shall provide the City with current test certificates for all backflows.

16. An approved reduced pressure detector assembly is required for the existing or new water connection for the fire system to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. Reduced pressure detector assemblies shall be installed on the owner’s property adjacent to the property line, within 5’ of the property line. Show the location of the reduced pressure detector assembly on the plans. Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the City connection and the assembly.

17. The applicant shall secure a public utilities easement for City of Palo Alto Utilities facilities installed in private property. The applicant's engineer shall obtain, prepare, record with the county of Santa Clara, and provide the utilities engineering section with copies of the public utilities easement across the adjacent parcels as is necessary to serve the development. Where public mains are in private streets/PUEs the service agreement shall include the statement: “Public Utility Easements: If the City’s reasonable use of the Public Utility Easements, which are shown as P.U.E on the Map, results in any damage to the Common Area, then it shall be the responsibility of the Association, and not of the City, to Restore the affected portion(s) of the Common Area. This Section may not be amended without the prior written consent of the City”.

18. All existing water and wastewater services that will not be reused shall be abandoned at the main per WGW Utilities procedures before any new utility services are installed.

19. All utility installations shall be in accordance with the City of Palo Alto utility standards for water, gas & wastewater.

**During Construction**

20. For contractor installed water and wastewater mains or services, the applicant shall prepare and submit to the WGW engineering section of the Utilities Department as-built drawings of the installation of water and wastewater utilities to be owned and maintained by the City in accordance with:

a. Two sets of as-built drawings (hard copies).
b. As-built drawings in 2008 or 2010 AutoCAD format.

c. As-built drawings in .tiff format.

d. Survey points in .csv format for all new utility features.

*Note: All survey data shall be collected by a California Licensed Land Surveyor. The surveyor is responsible to setup all control points needed to perform the survey work. The accuracy for all survey data shall be +/- 1cm.*

Survey data to be collected (what’s applicable):

I. Collect horizontal and vertical data for:
   
   1. Sanitary sewer manholes (rim and invert elevations and depth)
   
   2. Storm drain manholes and catch basins (rim and invert elevations and depth)
   
   3. Water valves (cover and stem elevations)

II. Collect horizontal data only for:

   1. Service or lateral connection points at the main
   
   2. Fire hydrants
   
   3. Water meters

   4. Sanitary sewer cleanout boxes

Use CPAU WGW Engineering’s "feature codes" for naming convention available from CPAU WGW Engineering 1007 Elwell Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94303 (650) 566-4501. All drawings and survey data shall be on the California State Plane Coordinate System - Zone 3 in units of feet. The horizontal datum shall be the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83) and the vertical datum shall be based on Bestor 93.
B.2. Hoover Pavilion Site

B.2.1. Fire Department

1. *Conduct a Soil Excavation Program at the Hoover Pavilion Site.* A qualified consultant, under the SUMC Project sponsors’ direction, shall undertake the following activities:

   - Remove all buried underground storage tanks from the property after sheds and storage buildings on the Hoover Pavilion Site have been demolished;

   - To the extent necessary, additional soil sampling shall be collected to determine health risks and to develop disposal criteria;

   - If warranted based on soil sampling, contaminated soil shall be excavated, removed, and transported to an approved disposal facility in compliance with OSHA and the Dept of Toxic Substances control and 22 CCR (Title 22) requirements;

   - To the extent required based upon the results of soil sampling and the results of a health risk assessment, a Site Health and Safety Plan to ensure worker safety in compliance with OSHA requirements shall be developed by the Project sponsors, and in places prior to commencing work on any contaminated site; and

   - The SUMC Project sponsors shall submit documents to the County DEH to proceed with subsurface closure of the Hoover Pavilion Site.

   - Note: This site’s soil contamination issues are currently under the County DEH’s jurisdiction due to issues with previous leaking underground storage tanks (County DEH - LOP program) and will remain under their jurisdiction during this project unless otherwise notified.

   - Note: Any aboveground building, facility, room or area with or previously containing hazardous materials shall have a hazardous materials closure permit completed with the PAFD unless otherwise determined, prior to the “soil excavation plan” to occur for that particular location.

2. *Develop a Site Management Plan for the Hoover Pavilion Site.* The SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare a site remediation assessment that (a) specifies measures to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards, including hazards from remediation itself, and (b) certifies that the proposed remediation measures would clean up contaminants, dispose of the wastes, and protect public health in accordance with federal, State, and local requirements. Site excavation activities shall not proceed until the site remediation has been approved by the County DEH and implemented by the SUMC Project sponsors. Additionally, the site remediation assessment shall be subject to review and approval by the RWQCB. All appropriate agencies shall be notified. Note: Any aboveground building, facility, room or area with or previously containing hazardous materials shall have a hazardous materials closure permit completed with the PAFD unless otherwise determined, prior to the “site remediation assessment” to occur for that particular location.
B.2.2. Water, Gas & Wastewater Utilities Department

For Building Permit

1. The applicant shall submit a completed water-gas-wastewater service connection application - load sheet for City of Palo Alto Utilities. The applicant must provide all the information requested for utility service demands (water in fixture units/g.p.m., gas in b.t.u.p.h, and sewer in fixture units/g.p.d.).

2. The applicant shall submit improvement plans for utility construction. The plans must show the size and location of all underground utilities within the development and the public right of way including meters, backflow preventers, fire service requirements, sewer mains, sewer cleanouts, sewer lift stations and any other required utilities.

3. Utility vaults, transformers, utility cabinets, concrete bases, or other structures cannot be placed over existing water, gas or wastewater mains/services. Maintain 1’ horizontal clear separation from the vault/cabinet/concrete base to existing utilities as found in the field. If there is a conflict with existing utilities, Cabinets/vaults/bases shall be relocated from the plan location as needed to meet field conditions.

4. The applicant must show on the site plan the existence of any auxiliary water supply, (i.e. water well, gray water, recycled water, rain catchment, water storage tank, etc).

5. The applicant shall be responsible for installing and upgrading the existing utility mains and/or services as necessary to handle anticipated peak loads. This responsibility includes all costs associated with the design and construction for the installation/upgrade of the utility mains and/or services.

6. Sewer drainage piping serving fixtures located less than one foot above the next upstream sewer main manhole cover shall be protected by an approved backwater valve per California Plumbing Code 710.0. The upstream sewer main manhole rim elevation shall be shown on the plans.

7. Flushing of the fire system to sanitary sewer shall not exceed 30 GPM. Higher flushing rates shall be diverted to a detention tank to achieve the 30 GPM flow to sewer.

8. Sewage ejector pumps shall meet the following conditions:
   
   d. The pump(s) be limited to a total 100 GPM capacity or less.

   e. The sewage line changes to a 4” gravity flow line at least 20’ from the City clean out.

   f. The tank and float is set up such that the pump run time not exceed 20 seconds each cycle. The applicant's engineer may be required to submit flow calculations and system capacity study showing that the on-site and off-site water and sanitary sewer mains and services will provide the domestic, irrigation, fire flows, and wastewater capacity needed to service the development and adjacent properties during anticipated peak flow demands. Field testing may be required to determined current water and wastewater flows and water pressures on existing water and wastewater mains. Calculations must be signed and stamped by a registered civil engineer.

9. Existing wastewater laterals that are not plastic (ABS, PVC, or PE) shall be replaced at the applicant’s expense.
10. The applicant shall pay the capacity fees and connection fees associated with the installation of the new utility service/s to be installed by the City of Palo Alto Utilities or increased demand on existing water or wastewater services. The approved relocation of services, meters, hydrants, or other facilities will be performed at the cost of the person/entity requesting the relocation.

11. A separate water meter and backflow preventer is required to irrigate the approved landscape plan. Show the location of the irrigation meter on the plans. This meter shall be designated as an irrigation account as no other water service will be billed on the account. The irrigation and landscape plans submitted with the application for a grading or building permit shall conform to the City of Palo Alto water efficiency standards. An approved reduce pressure principle assembly (RPPA backflow preventer device) is required for all existing and new water connections from Palo Alto Utilities to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. The RPPA shall be installed on the owner's property and directly behind the water meter, within 5' of the property line. **Show the location of the RPPA on the plans.** Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the meter and the assembly. The applicant shall provide the City with current test certificates for all backflows.

12. An approved reduced pressure detector assembly is required for the existing or new water connection for the fire system to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. Reduced pressure detector assemblies shall be installed on the owner's property adjacent to the property line, within 5' of the property line. **Show the location of the reduced pressure detector assembly on the plans.** Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the City connection and the assembly.

13. As part of this project the applicant is required to relocate the gas meter out of the breezeway to the front of the building. Show the new gas meter location on the plans. The gas meter location must conform to utilities standard details.

14. The applicant shall secure a public utilities easement for facilities installed in private property (including the existing water meters). The applicant's engineer shall obtain, prepare, record with the county of Santa Clara, and provide the utilities engineering section with copies of the public utilities easement across the adjacent parcels as is necessary to serve the development.

15. All existing water and wastewater services that will not be reused shall be abandoned at the main per WGW utilities procedures before any new utility services are installed.

16. All utility installations shall be in accordance with the City of Palo Alto utility standards for water, gas & wastewater.

**B.2.3 Utilities Electric**

1. Applicant/developer/owner shall supply/increase the Public Utility Easement at Quarry Substation which will be used for the installation of equipment due to new electrical load demands as a result of on-going construction in the Stanford Hospital/LPCH/Welch Road area. This easement shall be required no later than December 31, 2012. The City’s electrical engineering department shall supply the dimensions of the new easement upon request from the applicant.
B.3. LPCH

B.3.1. Fire Department

1. Perform a hazardous materials closure with the Palo Alto Fire Department (PAFD) for the 701 Welch Site. A hazardous materials closure plan for this site shall include the building hazardous materials storage, use and handling areas and soil sampling. A hazardous materials closure permit is required prior to removal of related materials and prior to demolition. Additionally, prior to removal or modification of the site an inspection by the fire dept is required unless otherwise determined. The Hazardous Materials Closure Application and Guidelines can be found at http://www.unidocs.org. or is available from PAFD.

A Phase II ESA shall be performed at 701 Welch Site Building B. The hazardous materials closure and Phase II ESA shall include sampling and analysis of soil, groundwater, wastewater, and residues on surfaces such as laboratories countertops, fume hoods, sinks, sumps, floors, and drain lines. A post closure report shall be supplied to the Palo Alto Fire Department. The PAFD and the DEH shall be notified by the Project sponsors if contamination remains after the hazardous materials closure is completed with the Fire Department.

If soil contamination is discovered, the project will be referred to the RWQCB. The RWQCB will determine appropriate action or referral to another agency for appropriate action. Additionally if soil contamination is discovered, the SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare a site remediation assessment that (a) specifies measures to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards and (b) certifies that the proposed remediation measures would clean up contaminants, dispose of the wastes, and protect public health in accordance with federal, State, and local requirements. Site excavation activities shall not proceed until the site remediation has been approved by the RWQCB or the designated regulatory oversite agency and implemented by the SUMC Project sponsors. Additionally, the final site remediation assessment shall be subject to review and approval by the RWQCB. All appropriate agencies shall be notified.

2. Perform a hazardous materials closure with the PAFD for the 703 Welch Site. A hazardous materials closure plan for this site shall including the building hazardous materials storage, use and handling areas and soil sampling. A hazardous materials closure permit is required prior to removal of related materials and prior to demolition. Additionally, prior to removal or modification of the site an inspection by the fire dept is required unless otherwise determined. The Hazardous Materials Closure Application and Guidelines can be found at http://www.unidocs.org. or is available from PAFD. A Phase II ESA shall be performed at 703 Welch Site. Of particular concern for soil sampling is crawl space where piping joins and amalgam separators are located as well as the discharge points from the buildings.

The hazardous materials closure and Phase II ESA shall include sampling and analysis of soil, groundwater, wastewater, and residues on surfaces such as laboratories countertops, fume hoods, sinks, sumps, floors, and drain lines. A post closure report shall be supplied to the Palo Alto Fire Department. The PAFD and the County DEH shall be notified by the Project sponsors if contamination remains after the hazardous materials closure is completed with the Fire Department. If soil contamination is discovered, the project will be referred to the RWQCB. The RWQCB will determine appropriate action or referral to another agency for appropriate action.
Additionally if soil contamination is discovered, the SUMC Project sponsors shall prepare a site remediation assessment that (a) specifies measures to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards and (b) certifies that the proposed remediation measures would clean up contaminants, dispose of the wastes, and protect public health in accordance with federal, State, and local requirements. Site excavation activities shall not proceed until the site remediation has been approved by the RWQCB or the designated regulatory oversite agency and implemented by the SUMC Project sponsors. The final site remediation assessment shall be subject to review and approval by the RWQCB. All appropriate agencies shall be notified.
B.4. Welch Road / Durand Way

B.4.1. Transportation Division

1. **Durand Way.** Durand Way shall be constructed at the earliest opportunity to improve automobile circulation from the medical center complex in the vicinity of Welch Road and Sand Hill Road. At a minimum, to the extent feasible, the Durand Way intersection apron shall be constructed with the Welch Road improvements.

2. **Welch Road.** Welch Road shall be constructed per improvements plans approved by the City and shall include, but not be limited to: new median island that extend from key intersections to channelize left turn vehicles and restrict driveway movements near intersections; installation of pedestrian-activated flashing beacon systems with enhanced roadway markings & signage; installation of new retro-reflective signage throughout the project corridor; traffic signal improvements including intersection safety lighting enhancements; and miscellaneous roadway improvements.

3. **Quarry Road.** Improvements to the Quarry Road public street shall be reviewed by Transportation Division staff prior to the submittal for permits.

B.5. FIM1

*Note: No project specific conditions.*
Historic Resources Board
Architectural Review Board

Staff Report

Agenda Date: February 2, 2011 (HRB)
February 3, 2011 (ARB)

From: Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager

Department: Planning and Community Environment

Subject: Stanford University Medical Center – Renovation of the Hoover Pavilion [10PLN-00398]: Request by Stanford University School of Medicine on behalf of The Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford Junior University for Architectural Review of the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion. 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 Historic Resources Board (HRB) review the renovation plans and provide comments to the applicant and staff.

Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the renovation 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 C 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 renovation of the Hoover Pavilion. 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 Hoover Pavilion site is an area of approximately 10 acres located at the corner of Palo and Quarry Road between El Camino Real and Arboretum Road. The site includes approximately 84,200 square feet of the existing Hoover Pavilion, 7,400 square feet within the Arboretum Children’s Center, and 13,800 square feet of miscellaneous shops and storage outside of the Hoover Pavilion Building. Hoover Pavilion was constructed as the Palo Alto Hospital from 1930 to 1939. The building is T-shaped in plan with a five-story central block, six-story tower, and four-story wings. It is Art Deco in style, which is represented in the ziggurat form, vertical emphasis of window bays, and stylized floral and geometric terra cotta panels and fixtures.

Approximately 60,000 square feet of medical/clinic office space would be constructed in a new 60-foot high building adjacent to the Hoover Pavilion along Quarry Road and the existing Hoover Pavilion building would be renovated. Healthcare providers who currently lease space at 701, 703 and 1101 Welch Road would be offered leases in the Hoover Pavilion. The Hoover Pavilion would also continue to be used for SHC clinic-related uses, as it is used currently. 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.

In brief, components of the SUMC Project and the Hoover Pavilion site Project include:

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 project plans that accompany this staff report contain site plans, elevations, floor plans, sections, site diagrams showing construction details, details of the south stair and the mechanical penthouses, the rehabilitation scope for all elevations, restoration and repair details, views of the historic entry, the exterior opening repair schedule, exterior color selection palette and photos (Attachment F). 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 with the comprehensive plan and project fact sheets are contained in Attachment C.

Environmental Analysis
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. The SUMC report concluded that the Hoover Pavilion 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. Architectural Resources Group (ARG) who was hired to analyze the Project for the EIR, 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 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 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 analyzed the potential impacts of the project on the Hoover Pavilion in their report, “Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project Impact Analysis Report,” dated January 18, 2011 (Attachment D). ARG 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. As defined by
CEQA, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to the Hoover Pavilion. In Section 6 of its report, however, ARG provided detailed recommendations to further reduce project impacts on the historic character of Hoover Pavilion, and to enhance consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation beyond the minimum required.

Staff is recommending that the HRB review the renovation plans and provide comment to the project applicant and City staff. These comments will be transmitted to the ARB. Although Hoover Pavilion has been determined to be a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA as described above, the building is not on the City’s Historic Preservation Inventory. Therefore, the HRB is not required to make a formal recommendation on the renovation project to the ARB. Staff’s opinion is that the HRB’s comments on the renovation project and ARG’s findings of consistency with the Standards will be helpful to the ARB and the City Council as they review the projects.

Currently, the staff is in the process of preparing the Final EIR for the SUMC Project, which is expected to be released in February 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 Hoover Pavilion site 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 Architectural Review 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 City Council for their consideration.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES
Since the last ARB and HRB meetings the Project sponsor, Tom Eliot Fisch, Page & Turnbull, City staff and ARG met in December 2010 to review specific building elements of the Hoover Pavilion renovation.

As a result of that meeting, the Project sponsors made several changes to the proposed project including:

- All the mechanical penthouse screens were lowered by 18”.
- The mechanical penthouse screen along the North side was eliminated to reduce visual impact.
- The North window was recessed further, exposing existing guardrail of the north stair.
- The South side stair was simplified, and the stainless steel screen was deleted.
- Further development was made on the scope of the window renovation and other rehabilitation of the exterior.

ARG recommends investigating opportunities to further reduce impacts to the building as the project develops and materials and details are finalized. ARG provides a series of recommendations on pages 27-28 of Attachment D. Staff’s concurrence with ARG’s recommendations are described in general below and in more detail in Attachment E. The HRB
may comment on the appropriateness of ARG’s and Staff’s recommendations as possible conditions of approval.

- **Historic Entry, North Façade** - ARG has made three recommendations with regard to the proposed in-fill of the recessed two-story opening above the historic entry:

  1. ARG notes “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.” ARG recommended “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.”

    The City’s Historic Preservation Planner concurs with this recommendation. The Historic Planner refers the Boards to Sheet A3.04 where the details and dimensions of the glass storefront and its recess are presented at the left edge of the Sheet, and the materials of the storefront are cited in the Key Notes at the Sheet’s upper right. The glass storefront would contain ¼ inch tempered float glass in some areas and 1 inch clear insulating glass in other areas. The Boards may wish to discuss how these two glass materials would combine to create a unified outcome.

  2. ARG notes “Plans indicate the opening will be infilled with a storefront glazing system” and recommends “In order to maintain the appearance of depth at the two-story opening efforts should be made to reduce reflectivity of the glazing and panels.”

    The Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation, and observes that one successful strategy for visually reducing the reflectivity of large sheets of glass is to break the glass down into smaller panes framed by muntins. In addition to the reflectivity issue, the Planner recommends this approach in order to significantly enhance the compatibility of the new storefront proposal.

  3. ARG notes “Between glazing, the project proposes horizontal opaque panels that obscure utility spaces and floor planes where they intersect the opening” and recommends “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 Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation and encourages a detailed discussion of the panels at the Board meetings.
• **Rooftop Mechanical Penthouses** - Regarding the mechanical penthouses proposed for several locations on the roof of Hoover Pavilion, ARG notes “The proposed mechanical penthouses would diminish the impact of the decorative parapets because they would not longer be silhouetted against the sky. Additionally, 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. ARG recommends “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.”

The Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation and encourages the Board to thoroughly discuss the penthouse heights, materials and colors with the goal of the most unobtrusive outcome possible, especially for the penthouse proposed for the top of the north tower element of Hoover Pavilion. The 3D drawings of Hoover Pavilion on Sheet A4.01 best clarify the locations and shapes of the proposed penthouses.

• **Other Related Historic Issues** - Regarding all other historic issues of the Hoover building and site project (impact of the Medical Office Building and Parking Garage on Hoover’s visibility, details of the Hoover historic fabric restoration, the materials and colors of new elements on Hoover’s primary façades such as the new entry doors on the north façade, and landscaping) the Historic Preservation Planner refers the Boards to ARG’s extensive discussion in its report and the plans. The treatment plans for Hoover’s numerous historic windows has been defined in the plans. This subject is of particular concern to the HRB and the Board is referred to seven sheets in the plans where all the windows are individually numbered: Sheets AH3.01, 3.02, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06, and 3.07. The proposed treatment of each numbered window will be found in chart form on Sheets AH10.1 and 10.2.

The Historic Preservation Planner also requests the Board to specially consider a proposal for four windows to the left of the north façade historic entry. Key Note 21 on Sheet AH3.01 states that the four historic double-hung windows bearing the number 21 will have their existing clear glass replaced by obscure translucent glass. The matching four windows to the right of the historic entry will retain clear glass. This proposal should not be implemented because the existing design symmetry of the north façade would be impacted. ARG did not evaluate this proposal because the proposal was developed subsequent to the plans that ARG reviewed.

Also, the Historic Planner recommends that the HRB focus their review and discussion of ARG’s report on Section 4, “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards” and Section 6, “Recommendations”

*Prior ARB Review*

The ARB has held Preliminary Review Meetings on the Hoover Pavilion renovation on June 3, 2010 and August 19, 2010. Additionally, the Historic Resources Board (HRB) reviewed the Hoover Pavilion renovations and portions of the SUMC Draft EIR at their meeting of July 7, 2010.
During the last preliminary review meeting held on August 19, 2010, the ARB members generally liked the approach of the renovation project. In response to the comments made on the earlier ARB preliminary review meeting on June 3, 2010, the applicants had provided the design progress specifically to the south side staircase design, details for the west entry canopy area, changes to the north elevation which incorporated the guardrail, the bicycle parking, and detail on the materials and colors for the rooftop mechanical penthouses. The ARB was appreciative of the changes made to the design, and felt that the exterior south side stair looked better by seeming more integrated with the original structure. They felt it still retained the modern addition feeling without losing much structural expression. However, they requested further details on the stair materials, mesh and railing. They also requested that the pediatric entrance be more enhanced.

As noted earlier in this report, several changes to the project have been incorporated to be consistent with The Standards. ARB should review these proposed changes. Additionally, to address specific concerns raised by the ARB at their last meeting, further development was made on the landscape design, in response to the comments made by the ARB in the earlier review, as follows:

a. Concept: The landscape for the Hoover Pavilion has been conceptualized as part of the larger Hoover Site Development. The landscape for the Pavilion connects the historic past of the building with the contemporaneous uses of the site through simple plan geometries, and careful selection of materials, plants, and site furniture.

b. Parking: The existing parking lots are being retained to the east and west of the building. Accessible stalls, short term and long term bicycle parking are being provided to meet the current City codes 18.52 and 18.54.

c. Circulation: The circulation will be improved by the construction of at-grade pathways all around the building. Since the historic north entrance is not an accessible entrance, the accessible route from the east side to the west side of the building is around the south side. Accessible route signs have been located to direct visitors to the accessible pathway.

d. Existing trees: The Pavilion project retains all existing regulated trees as defined in the Tree Technical Manual. Trees being removed are those next to the building walls which have overgrown and have to be removed for façade preservation and those classified as low or very low suitability for preservation as part of the arborist tree survey.

e. Materials: In keeping with the original palette of materials at the site, proposed paving is to be cast-in-place concrete with pre-cast concrete pavers in subtle patterns to highlight entrances.

f. Planting: Planting and irrigation drawings for the site, including the areas around this building, are being prepared as part of the Hoover Site Improvements and Parking Garage project, since both projects are being constructed contiguous by the same general contractor. The planting adjacent to the Pavilion is planned to be evergreen pilaster trees and
low evergreen groundcovers in keeping with the historical landscape of the building, a study of which was prepared earlier by Stanford University.

g. **Furniture:** Landscape furniture including benches, planters, trash receptacles, and bollards, has been selected to be consistent with the historic aspects of the building and current SUMC standards. Furniture with no historical references such as bicycle racks, bike lockers, and bicycle shelter have been selected to be consistent with current SUMC standards.

**NEXT STEPS**
The HRB will review the final Hoover Renovation plans after the release of the Final EIR. Staff will recommend that the HRB find that the ARG report and findings, together with the Hoover Renovation project, to be acceptable. The HRB may also provide their recommendation regarding conditions of approval to the ARB. The meeting to review the final plans is expected to take place in March 2011.

The ARB will continue review the other project components through early 2011. Staff will recommend that the ARB recommend approval of the Hoover Pavilion Renovation project once the Final EIR has been completed. The meeting to review this recommendation is expected to take place in March 2011.

The ARB’s recommendation on all of the project components will be forwarded to the City Council in April 2011.

**ATTACHMENTS**
Attachment A: Draft Architectural Review Findings for Approval
Attachment B: Conformance with Proposed “Hospital District” Site Development Regulations
Attachment C: 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 HRB and ARB, not attached to this staff report, but available at the meetings)
Attachment E: Staff Recommendations on Opportunities to Further Reduce Impacts to Hoover Pavilion
Attachment F: Drawings for the proposed renovations for the Hoover Pavilion site (provided by Architects - Tom Eliot Fisch, HRB and ARB members only)
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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
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- 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.

Figure C: View looking northeast toward the west façade of the Hoover Pavilion from Quarry Road. The construction of the proposed MOB would obscure this view (photograph ARG September, 2010).

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 (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.
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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
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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
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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, 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.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
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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.)

Existing Conditions Photographs
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.)
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.)
Stanford Hoover Pavilion Renovation Project
Palo Alto, California
Impact Analysis Report

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.)
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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.)
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Figure 13: View looking north in the first floor lobby that is accessible from the west facade.

Existing Conditions Photographs
Staff Recommendations for Addressing ARB’s Recommendation for Opportunities to Further Reduce Impacts on Hoover Pavilion

- Historic Entry, North Façade- ARG has made three recommendations with regard to the proposed in-fill of the recessed two-story opening above the historic entry:

1. ARG notes “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.” ARG recommended “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.”

The City’s Historic Preservation Planner concurs with this recommendation and observes that several major Art Deco buildings in the Bay Area feature deeply recessed entries several stories high and sometimes interrupted just above the entry by a projecting canopy or stone panel. Notable examples in San Francisco include the landmark 450 Sutter building and the Stock Exchange Tower at 155 Sansome, both by Timothy Pflueger. Hoover Pavilion also employs this tall deeply recessed opening strategy to create a dramatic entry and enhance the geometrical character of Art Deco. Therefore, the Historic Preservation Planner, consistent with ARG’s recommendation, concludes that the glass storefront should be set back in line with the existing recess of the front entry doors (approximately 4 feet). This revision to move the recess back only one additional foot would preserve at a high level the Art Deco design of Hoover. In contrast, maintaining the proposed three-foot setback for the new storefront would throw off the classic entry design of Hoover. Although the existing opening above the entry doors is set back considerably more than four feet the opening still seems in line with the recess of the entry doors due to the presence within the opening of the zig zag of the existing staircase. The Historic Planner refers the Boards to Sheet A3.04 where the details and dimensions of the glass storefront and its recess are presented at the left edge of the Sheet, and the materials of the storefront are cited in the Key Notes at the Sheet’s upper right. The glass storefront would contain ¼ inch tempered float glass in some areas and 1 inch clear insulating glass in other areas. The Boards may wish to discuss how these two glass materials would combine to create a unified outcome.

2. ARG notes “Plans indicate the opening will be infilled with a storefront glazing system” and recommends “In order to maintain the appearance of depth at the two-story opening efforts should be made to reduce reflectivity of the glazing and panels.”

The Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation, and
observes that one successful strategy for visually reducing the reflectivity of large sheets of glass is to break the glass down into smaller panes framed by muntins. In addition to the reflectivity issue, the Planner recommends this approach in order to significantly enhance the compatibility of the new storefront proposal. In the Historic Planner’s opinion the proposed two-story high storefront glass is differentiated from the surrounding historic features to an excessive degree and therefore the proposal will assume a dominant character to the point of competing with historic features and undoing the Art Deco unity of the building. The goal of the Secretary’s Standards is to provide differentiated additions that are as unobtrusive as possible, that is, recessive, not dominant. The deeply recessed entries of Art Deco buildings in the Bay Area, including the two Pflueger examples cited above, all exhibit a grilled window approach that covers the rear wall of the recess above the entry doors, and this grilled feature strongly emphasizes the geometrical character of Art Deco. The Historic Planner recommends that the proposed storefront be revised to a tall metal grilled window similar to the grilled window enclosing the elevator shaft as depicted on Sheet A2.01. A photograph of the elevator shaft window is provided in the plans on Sheet AH11.3. In order to achieve the differentiation required by Secretary’s Standard #9 the panes could be larger (but should be vertically oriented) than the panes on the elevator wall. Larger panes would add a modern note while maintaining a high level of compatibility with nearby historic windows.

3. ARG notes “Between glazing, the project proposes horizontal opaque panels that obscure utility spaces and floor planes where they intersect the opening” and recommends “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 Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation and encourages a detailed discussion of the panels at the Board meetings.

- **Rooftop Mechanical Penthouses:** Regarding the mechanical penthouses proposed for several locations on the roof of Hoover Pavilion, ARG notes “The proposed mechanical penthouses would diminish the impact of the decorative parapets because they would not longer be silhouetted against the sky. Additionally, 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. ARG recommends “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.”

The Historic Preservation Planner concurs with ARG’s recommendation and
encourages the Board to thoroughly discuss the penthouse heights, materials and colors with the goal of the most unobtrusive outcome possible, especially for the penthouse proposed for the top of the north tower element of Hoover Pavilion. The 3D drawings of Hoover Pavilion on Sheet A4.01 best clarify the locations and shapes of the proposed penthouses.

- Other Related Historic Issues- Regarding all other historic issues of the Hoover building and site project (impact of the Medical Office Building and Parking Garage on Hoover’s visibility, details of the Hoover historic fabric restoration, the materials and colors of new elements on Hoover’s primary facades such as the new entry doors on the north façade, and landscaping) the Historic Preservation Planner refers the Boards to ARG’s extensive discussion in its report and the plans. The treatment plans for Hoover’s numerous historic windows has been defined in the plans. This subject is of particular concern to the HRB and the Board is referred to seven sheets in the plans where all the windows are individually numbered: Sheets AH3.01, 3.02, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06, and 3.07. The proposed treatment of each numbered window will be found in chart form on Sheets AH10.1 and 10.2.

The Historic Preservation Planner also requests the Board to specially consider a proposal for four windows to the left of the north façade historic entry. Key Note 21 on Sheet AH3.01 states that the four historic double-hung windows bearing the number 21 will have their existing clear glass replaced by obscure translucent glass. The matching four windows to the right of the historic entry will retain clear glass. This proposal should not be implemented because the existing design symmetry of the north façade would be impacted. ARG did not evaluate this proposal because the proposal was developed subsequent to the plans that ARG reviewed.

Also, the Historic Planner recommends that the HRB focus their review and discussion of ARG’s report on Section 4, “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards” and Section 6, “Recommendations”