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HERITAGE SERVICES
LAND BUILDINGS AND REAL ESTATE
Stanford University
Introduction
The development of the Stanford Industrial Park was one component of the rapid post-War expansion of the City of Palo Alto, replacing orchards and farms with modern development. The City grew on three sides during this period: 1) The Stanford Shopping Center, Palo Alto- Stanford Hospital, VA Hospital and Industrial Park southwest of El Camino Real; 2) large modern suburban subdivisions along Highway 101 and across Oregon Expressway to San Antonio Road with associated commercial districts at Edgewood Plaza, Alma Plaza, and Midtown; and 3) a golf course and light industrial uses on the bay side of Highway 101 near the airport (which had opened before the war in 1940).1

Palo Alto’s residential population more than tripled from 16,774 in 1940 to 52,287 in 1960, requiring more schools and public facilities as well as commercial services to serve its growing population. By 1960 agricultural uses had nearly disappeared within the city limits, replaced by a thriving local economy based on education, technology and health care.2

2 http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/cities/PaloAlto50.htm#1940
Additional light industrial areas were also developed on West Bayshore Road and in the San Antonio corridor. New retail centers, restaurants and hotels were constructed along El Camino Real. Downtown Palo Alto also experienced growth – mainly in a vertical direction as taller buildings appeared: the fifteen story Palo Alto Office Center completed in 1966, the new city hall in 1970, and several high rise residential buildings during the same period before Palo Alto adopted a 50-foot height limit in the 1970s.

The Stanford Industrial Park sits near the center of this enlarged city as a major employment center, and at the northern edge of what was soon to be known as “Silicon Valley” sprawling through the orchards to the south in the Santa Clara valley. Much has been written about the emergence of Silicon Valley in the post-War period; not all of this literature is entirely factual. For example, it is often repeated in the literature that the Stanford Industrial Park was the first university-affiliated industrial park, but that distinction belongs to the Swearingen Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma. The University of Oklahoma founded its business-research partnership institute in 1940 and its business park facility opened in 1950. Some sources date the Stanford Industrial Park to 1949 but the correct year for the opening of its first facility, Varian Associates, is 1953. (Varian was founded in San Carlos in 1948.) Cornell University’s Research Park also opened earlier (1951), as did Princeton’s Forrestal Research Center (1952), than Stanford’s Industrial Park.

This brief narrative describes the evolution of the Stanford Industrial Park and provides a context for historic preservation review of properties in the Park. Three maps follow the text: 1) a map showing the sequence of development from 1950 –1980, 2) a map showing the extent of redevelopment since 1980, and 3) a map showing the construction dates of existing structures in the Park today.

Evolution of the Stanford Industrial Park

Stanford University president Donald B. Tresidder, who assumed office in September 1943, faced several immediate challenges. The university had not yet recovered financially from the Great Depression when America joined WWII in December 1941. The university’s endowment fund was not performing well. In 1910 it was worth $18 million but by 1950 it was worth only $39.6 million ($13 million in 1910 dollars). Worse, the school’s national reputation suffered during the 1930s. Being known as “a sunny place with a good golf course and football team,” combined with a policy of accepting legacy students regardless of their academic status, had caused Stanford to be ranked number twelve in the nation, in a five-way tie with four other universities. The war years had seen the university struggle to take on thousands of additional military students and operate on 18-hour days year-round while simultaneously losing a large portion of the faculty to the war effort. In 1945...
Tresidder set up the first campus planning office, staffed part-time by San Francisco architect Eldridge “Ted” Spencer. Tresidder charged Spencer with developing long-term plans for both campus lands and campus buildings with the expectation that once the war ended, the university would experience a rapid increase in students due to the creation of the GI Bill of Rights in 1944.7

In addition to Spencer, Tresidder made another significant hire in January 1946 with Stanford alumnus Alf Brandin as the new Business Manager.8 Brandin’s responsibilities included: 1) feeding and housing the incoming students, 2) constructing, operating and maintaining all campus buildings, 3) coordinating architects, landscapers and contractors, 4) negotiating labor agreements, 5) managing police and fire services, 6) managing the faculty residential area, and 7) managing the university’s farmlands.9 Brandin was also tasked with financing all of these responsibilities, and he believed that income could be had from more intensive use of Stanford land previously devoted to agriculture. While focusing on the most immediate project—housing the projected return of a much larger student body—Brandin also began thinking very hard about developing campus lands.10 His initial two ideas were the creation of a shopping center and an industrial park on Stanford lands. The two projects received Tresidder’s whole-hearted support from the beginning.11

Brandin later recounted that he visited the San Carlos plant leased by Stanford alumni Sigurd and Russell Varian to attend Varian Associates’ one-year anniversary party.12 Russ Varian told Brandin he “would like to get back on the campus,” preferably on “about ten acres.”13 Brandin believed that a fifty-acre site on the northeast edge of campus bisected by an old railroad line could be used to “start an industrial park” that “could be screened by trees and in all sorts of ways.”14 After Brandin visited a residential suburb in Denver, Colorado that featured broad lawns and no fence lines, he became convinced “that’s what we can do with the industrial park

---

8 After Brandin graduated from Stanford in 1936 and became a fund-raising alumnus, he wondered why so much Stanford land was still being utilized only for agricultural leases. He later understood that the local population was still too small to support extensive development; this situation changed radically with the Bay Area post-war population boom. Robert de Roos, “Oral History with Alf Brandin,” (12 June 1987), unpaginated, Stanford Oral History Project Interviews: 1971-1995, SC1017, Box 8, SUA.
10 One source of outside income pursued by both Tresidder and Dean of Engineering Frederick Terman was academic research funded by industrial partners. Tresidder and Terman had corresponded throughout the end of the war—Terman was working on the East Coast on war leave—about the potential for expanding and modernizing the university through the creation of the Stanford Research Institute in November 1946, which would potentially attract top flight scientists to the university and would develop new industries shaped by academic research. The proposed industrial park was another expression of this kind of symbiotic thinking. Kiester, Donald B. Tresidder, 86-87.
11 Kiester, Donald B. Tresidder, 92.
12 The Varian brothers had worked closely with Stanford physics professor William Hansen, a former classmate of Russ Varian, beginning in the mid-1930s. The Klystron tube generated high-frequency waves at a macro level to alert a pilot flying blind at night or in fog through a radar signal that reflected an object was in the vicinity. British war planes were outfitted with the six-pound tube and gained a vast advantage over German war planes that did not carry a similar technology. The two brothers established Varian Associates in 1948. Thomas Mahon, Charged Bodies: People, Power and Paradox in Silicon Valley (New York and Ontario: New American Library, 1985), 157-158.
13 Frederick Terman was on the Varian Associates Board of Directors, along with other Stanford faculty, and several former Stanford faculty also worked at Varian. De Roos, Brandin Oral History, unpaginated; and Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 218.
14 Brandin’s fifty-acre site was actually closer to 35 acres. De Roos, unpaginated.
and that's what we'll call it, because it is going to be in a park-like setting. We'll set the buildings back in and keep the roads clear. The landscaping of parking lots would be essential to block the cars out of the line of vision. You'd just be driving through a green belt with setbacks of the buildings and the landscaping unobstructed by things coming out to the sidewalk.”

Tresidder died unexpectedly at the age of fifty-three in 1948. In October 1949, J.E. Wallace Sterling was inaugurated as Stanford’s fifth president. In his nineteen-year-long term Sterling, in close alliance with Dean of Engineering Frederick Terman—whom he would make provost in 1955—would work tirelessly to promote Stanford as a world-class university and oversee more campus construction than any of the previous presidents.

Sterling and Terman wanted Stanford to implement an organizational philosophy of “steeples of excellence” in which only the very best faculty members in rapidly growing fields were hired, subsequently producing a large number of students who were “outstanding in quality,” particularly in fields relating to the western states. Although Tresidder and Brandin had originally conceived of the Park as a site for light manufacturing to earn income for the university, Terman pushed for a new focus on “research and development activities of science-based industries.” Based on his experience at MIT doing war research during WWII, Terman believed that a new post-war relationship would now exist between the government and universities. Stanford University would be strengthened by focusing on research, and an alliance with industry would benefit both entities while strengthening the regional economy. In Terman’s mind, the income derived from the leases was incidental; the key factor was creating a strong research base near the university that “provided an important interchange between faculty, students, and neighboring scientists and engineers.”

Varian Associates was the first tenant in the Stanford Industrial Park; they signed a ninety-nine year lease in October 1951 for a ten-acre site, with already completed drawings by architect Eric Mendelsohn, who was tasked with producing a building without “industrial character.” Construction began in February 1952. Landscape design was done by Modernist San Francisco landscape architect Thomas Church.

15 Brandin did not coin the term “industrial park.” It was in use three decades before the Stanford Industrial Park was even in the planning stage. Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 127; and Mozingo, Pastoral Capitalism, 140.
16 Gillmor, Fred Terman at Stanford, 254.
18 Findlay, Magic Lands, 122-123.
19 Although Terman’s seminal role in the creation of the Stanford Industrial Park is widely accepted by numerous authors and scholars, Henry Lowood believes that Terman was motivated to promote the park only after Varian Associates had already signed their lease. Lowood posits that the development of the park was the outcome of complex pre-war and post-war conditions that existed at the university, rather than Terman’s singular vision. Gillmor, Fred Terman at Stanford, 329; and Henry Lowood, From Steeples of Excellence to Silicon Valley: The Story of Varian Associates and Stanford Industrial Park (Palo Alto: Varian Associates, 1987), unpaginated. After Mendelsohn’s death, Varian hired his surviving partner, Michael Galis, to design their next three buildings to retain continuity and ultimately developed 70 acres. Mozingo, Lowood, From Steeples of Excellence to Silicon Valley, unpaginated; and Pastoral Capitalism, 167; and Findlay, Magic Lands, 137.
20 Lowood, From Steeples of Excellence to Silicon Valley, unpaginated.
Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (SOM) were hired by Stanford in 1953 to prepare a master campus land use plan for the entire university. They concurred with the planned industrial park and the development of the shopping center—the latter sixty-acre plan had already been announced to the public—and recommended homes be built for 40,000 people on 2,933 acres. SOM also recommended that the Park be increased from 100 acres to 165 acres. The Stanford University Committee on Land and Building Development, which had been established by Sterling in 1951, studied the report and recommended that much of the undeveloped lands should be reserved for future academic uses rather than massive residential subdivisions. The committee did approve of the development of the shopping center and industrial park, both of which were already under way.

1953 also saw the Park site annexed to the city of Palo Alto and its zoning “added to Palo Alto’s municipal regulations, with additional requirements for a 90-foot landscape setback along roadways and the placement of parking behind structures to screen it from view.” By 1954, Terman was arguing that the Park, then at 209 acres, “may be too small.”

While Brandin and Terman had their competing visions for the Park, no master plan was ever prepared. The Park grew organically within a changing regulatory context of zoning guidelines, rather than following a clearly defined plan or program. A suburban park-like setting was the core concept, thus projecting values associated with the campus and neighboring communities that flourished in the twenty-five year boom that followed WWII. These values were reflected in the early guidelines the university promoted: no buildings could be higher than two stories in the early years, no smokestacks were allowed and, most importantly, noise, odors

---

22 Gillmor, Fred Terman at Stanford, 324.
23 Ibid.
24 Mozingo, Pastoral Capitalism, 168.
25 A Stanford Industrial Park map indicated only 120 acres had been developed so far. Lowood, From Steeples of Excellence to Silicon Valley, unpaginated.
26 Findlay, Magic Lands, 130.
and emissions were prohibited so as not to offend the neighbors. Ultimately, however, the Park was developed piecemeal by tenants or by local developers within evolving city and university guidelines.

As land was annexed into Palo Alto, the city created zoning restrictions that supported the park-like aesthetic. The city’s zoning required a minimum one-acre lot and that buildings take up only 40% of the lot—later no more than 20% on foothill plats—with fifty-foot setbacks composed largely of lawn. The university had approval of all architectural and landscaping plans prepared by tenants in the Park. Both the city and the university oversaw signage, architectural screening and other restrictions; the university regularly examined properties and informed lessees of any infractions. Potential clients were not put off by these restrictions; they responded favorably to the exclusivity and prestige associated with such an arrangement.

Sterling, Terman and Brandin vigorously promoted the Park to potential tenants. In 1954 Industrial and Housing Review published an issue that featured twelve tenants of the Stanford Industrial Park, including one up-and-coming company called Hewlett-Packard. Although most of the tenants met Terman’s science-based criteria, some such as Eastman Kodak and two publishing companies—Houghton Mifflin and Scott, Foresman and Company—were strictly commercial entities, although Houghton Mifflin did publish several Stanford faculty authors, including Terman and Wallace Stegner.

As the Park continued to expand, Brandin continued to recruit business tenants that did not fit into the concept of light manufacturing or science-related endeavors. In 1956 Brandin wanted to lease land for a gas station and

---

29 In 1983 Palo Alto also required approval of architectural standards. Luger and Goldstein, *Technology in the Garden*, 127.
30 Eastman Kodak decided to build in the park once their representative realized no Quonset huts—in popular use after WWII due to an ongoing shortage of building materials—would be allowed. De Roos, Brandin Oral History, unpaginated
a bank. This required rezoning from light manufacturing to planned community and the City Council, bowing to pressure from local business owners, refused. The university persevered and the city ultimately rezoned the individual parcels. 33 1956 also saw the Park expand another 125 acres to a total of 345 acres, in part to accommodate a component of Lockheed Corporation’s Missiles and Space Division. 34 In 1958 American Trust Company and Banking moved in. Within one month the institution earned $1.3 million in deposits and advertised an intention to make loans to other businesses to promote the further growth of the Park. 35 The Park continued to attract high-technology industries such as Varian and Hewlett-Packard, whose research and production focus was in line with Terman’s thinking, while several national corporations established local branches within the Park, which suited Brandin’s purpose.

In 1957 Ampex Corporation, based in nearby Redwood City, was looking to build a new campus and requested a 31-acre site in the center of the Park. 36 The company subsequently requested an 80-acre site located further into the foothills. 37 The university offered 254 additional acres for annexation to the City of Palo Alto; the City Council accepted and zoned the area LM-5, which required “minimum five-acre lots, a maximum fifteen-percent footprint, 100-foot setbacks, a thirty percent floor area ratio and a thirty-five percent open space set-aside.” 38 This move caused a group of local citizens, including Stanford faculty member Wallace Stegner, to organize an effort to “keep the factories out of the foothills.” 39 The group -- later formalized into the Committee for Green Foothills in 1962 with Stegner serving as president—forced a vote by the public. In November 1960 Palo Alto voters passed a referendum allowing the Park to expand further southward into the foothills.

The new Veteran’s Administration Hospital opened on land acquired from Stanford just north of Foothill Boulevard in 1960. Nine parcels adjacent to the hospital were developed by Park tenants in the same period and Foothill Boulevard was widened to four lanes in 1963.

33 Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 131.
34 Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 126. Most of Lockheed’s Silicon Valley facilities were located in Sunnyvale.
35 Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 129.
37 Ampex ultimately abandoned their plans and built a new campus in Redwood City. Mozingo, Pastoral Capitalism, 169.
38 Luger and Goldstein, Technology in the Garden, 131.
Although Palo Alto residents realized the contributions of the Park to the quality of life in the City, the prestige of the successful park was shadowed by traffic and air pollution concerns beginning in the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{40} One of the most controversial responses to the worsening traffic that led into the Stanford Industrial Park was the conversion of two-lane Oregon Avenue in Palo Alto between the Bayshore Freeway and El Camino Real into the four-way Oregon Expressway. Palo Altans were fiercely divided on the project, which initially called for the destruction of 107 homes. A modified plan that removed ninety homes passed a referendum in June 1962 “by a razor-thin margin of 9,432 votes in favor to 9,030 opposed.”\textsuperscript{41}

Environmental concerns were not the only problems associated with the Stanford Industrial Park. The Stanford campus became increasingly radicalized in the late 1960s with students and faculty focused on diverse and divisive issues, one of the most compelling being the Vietnam War (1955-1975).\textsuperscript{42} Terman’s patriotic vision of a new relationship between universities and the government following WWII had been realized in the Park during the 1950s and 1960s with numerous companies in the Park tied to defense-related contracts. As opposition to the Vietnam War continued to swell beginning in 1965, defense-related research facilities on the campus and in the Park became targets of protesters including many Stanford students and faculty. These activities peaked in 1969 when companies such as Watkins-Johnson, Syntex (“Rumor has it that a super-secret IBM facility is located in this building”), Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Teledyne and numerous others, even Eastman Kodak

\textsuperscript{40} Findlay, \textit{Magic Lands}, 140. \\
\textsuperscript{42} Issues included civil rights, Third World liberation, women’s liberation, the counter-culture, gay rights, labor organizing, university reform, anti-draft work, anti-imperialism, and several versions of socialism, but anti-war activity was the largest and most sustained thread. The April Third Movement (1969-1975) was one of many protest groups that were active on the Stanford campus. April Third Movement, \url{http://a3mreunion.org} (accessed 21 October 2016).
(“ordnance (explosives), $118 in DOD contracts in fiscal 1968”), became targets for protesters who picketed or blockaded buildings and blocked Park streets in order to disrupt daily business. These protests had little lasting effect on the businesses in the Park but led to the abandonment of defense-related research on the university campus and separation of the Stanford Research Institute from the university in 1969. The open, park-like character of the Park was however permanently impaired as companies installed fences, gates, and guard houses to their facilities many of which remain today.

Concerns about traffic and air pollution continued into the 1970s with noise pollution, ever-increasing capital improvement costs, higher housing costs and open space protection joining the list. In 1972 the Committee for Green Foothills sued the university and Xerox Corporation to prevent Xerox PARC from locating in the foothills. The university compromised in 1973 by agreeing to rezoning with stronger design controls and assigning four parcels of land adjacent to the site to Williamson Act contracts allowing only agricultural uses.

By 1980 the Park had expanded to its current land area with over 100 companies located on 700 acres. In 1984 the Park was renamed the Stanford Research Park to reflect the decline in industrial uses and to promote the association with the university. That year the City of Palo Alto earned some $20 million in net utility outcome, sales taxes and property taxes from businesses in the Park.

In 1988 Palo Alto published a staff report on the Park, noting that while most firms had no interest in relocating, open land for expansion was no longer available and existing 30+ year-old buildings were requiring expensive

---

43 Ibid.
upgrades causing some tenants to relocate to other cities. A major phase of redevelopment was beginning. This redevelopment increased density and by 2007 the Stanford Research Park had 150 companies with 23,000 employees occupying 162 buildings. Electronics, space technology, biotechnology, computer hardware and software, law offices, consulting firms and office space all co-existed within the park. Nearly half the properties in the Park were redeveloped between 1980 and 2016. Today a large majority of the buildings are less than 45 years old and others have undergone substantial alterations over the decades. See attached maps.

**Evaluating Properties in the Stanford Research Park**

The City of Palo Alto may require historic resource evaluation reports for properties with structures built more than 45 years ago that are proposed for major alterations or demolition. The California Register criteria have been applied to evaluate properties in the Park. The criteria ask if a property:

- *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States* (Criterion 1).
- *Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history* (Criterion 2).
- *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values* (Criterion 3).
- *Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation* (Criterion 4).

The California Register was consciously designed on the model of the National Register of Historic Places and the two programs are extremely similar, although not identical in all respects. Accordingly, the application of the California Register criteria is informed by the guidelines prepared by the National Park Service for evaluating properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

**Proposed Guidelines**

**Criterion 1: Association with Events**

While it might be observed that properties in the Park are associated with the broad patterns of development in the City of Palo Alto and “Silicon Valley,” this is not by itself sufficient to justify a finding of historical significance. All the properties in the Park are within Silicon Valley and all the businesses in the Park (like all businesses in Palo Alto) contributed to the local economy. Additional research is required to demonstrate that specific significant events took place at individual properties. Significant events generally should have taken place more than 45 years ago.

---

Historic resource evaluations should provide property-specific tenant history for the buildings under study, focusing primarily on the period between the construction of the property and 45 years ago. For properties with multiple tenants within the same building, year-by-year tenant lists may be difficult to reconstruct; at a minimum tenant lists for five year intervals should be provided (these can be determined by searching business and telephone directories). A newspaper archive search should be performed for the major tenants in the property to address whether specific, individual newsworthy events took place on the site that might prove significant even after the passage of time.

To address the issue of whether significant discoveries or technological innovations associated with the growth of Silicon Valley took place on the property it is important to document the projects that were underway in the buildings during the study period. Sources for this information include newspaper archives, company histories, collections of company papers, and oral histories with company personnel. Once it is determined what projects were undertaken on the property, objective scholarly sources should be consulted to assess the significance of the work and its relationship to the study site. Many companies in the Park had facilities at multiple locations: if significant discoveries or innovations took place it is important to link those significant events to specific sites. If the significant discovery or innovation took place less than 45 years ago the analysis should consider whether sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.\textsuperscript{52}

\textit{Criterion 2: Association with Persons}

Assessment of properties for association with significant persons builds from the property-specific history conducted for Criterion 1. Company founders and principal research staff may have achieved historical significance. This should be documented with objective scholarly sources that identity specific achievements and explain the reason for their significance.

If specific named individuals are recognized in the literature, then their personal association with the study site should be investigated. How long were they active at the study property? Was this the primary location of their work during the period they achieved significance? Did their significant contributions take place at the study site or elsewhere? If they made significant contributions to history at more than one location investigate the current status of each site and determine which surviving site is most closely associated with their contributions to history. When was the person associated with the property? If the association was less than 45 years ago, or the person is still living, additional documentation for the significance of the person’s achievements may be required.\textsuperscript{53}

For example, a company founder may have achieved significance in local civic affairs or philanthropy. These activities are unlikely to have taken place in the Stanford Industrial Park. They may have hosted important meetings or events at their home, or served on board and commissions at other locations. Documentation of the association between this person and the various sites where s/he was active would be required to demonstrate that their place of business was (or wasn’t) the location most closely associated with their significant activities.

\textsuperscript{52} California Office of Historic Preservation Technical Assistance Series #6/California Register and National Register: A Comparison (for purposes of determining eligibility for the California Register), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{53} California Office of Historic Preservation Technical Assistance Series #6/California Register and National Register: A Comparison (for purposes of determining eligibility for the California Register), p. 3.
**Criterion 3: Architecture**

Buildings more than 45 years old should be evaluated as examples of mid-20th Century commercial architecture. The original architect should be identified and an overview of his/her career provided. The building(s) should then be compared to 1) other notable buildings by the same designer and 2) other notable buildings of the same period and style. It is not sufficient to be “typical” architecture of the period – the criterion asks for the property to “embody” or exemplify the reasons for its significance. To be a significant property for design, the building should represent a fine example of its style and period, or represent an important contribution by a recognized master architect. A master architect will have achieved awards for their work, earned honors such as election as a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects, have been included in scholarly publications and/or designed other buildings that have been listed on the California or National registers.

**Criterion 4: Information Potential**

This criterion is generally reserved for sites with buried archaeological deposits but is occasionally applied to examples of unique building or construction methods. Archaeological deposits are present on some properties in the Park and should be separately analyzed by a qualified archaeologist. Stanford University maintains surveys and records for archaeological deposits and will provide additional information as needed. Archaeological site locations are confidential under State law; care should be taken in planning documents to safeguard these locations from potential damage from looters.

**Integrity Considerations**

If a property meets one or more of the criteria it should be assessed for integrity – the ability of the property to convey its period and the reasons for its significance. National Register guidance should be followed regarding how to assess integrity. The California Register relies upon the National Register framework for integrity but allows that “a resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the California Register if it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information.” The most obvious example would be an archaeological deposit associated with the site of a house that has been altered or demolished – subsurface features that might yield scientific information may be intact even if the house is not. This circumstance may exist on some properties in the Park, but would be the subject of an archaeological survey rather than a historic resource evaluation report. (It is unlikely that buried features associated with Park tenants would merit consideration under Criterion 4.)

Once the period of significance has been established through the evaluation process, documentation of physical alterations to the property since the period of significance is critical to establish whether or not the property retains integrity. There are multiple sources of information for alterations:

1. Stanford University has copies of architectural and landscape plans for many properties in the Park (contact Heritage Services for assistance).
2. The property owner may have retained building records.
3. City of Palo Alto retains building permit records, Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board records, and may have a few existing architectural and landscape plans as well.

---

54 Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.

55 California Office of Historic Preservation Technical Assistance Series #6/California Register and National Register: A Comparison (for purposes of determining eligibility for the California Register), p. 3.
minutes. Building permit records may describe alterations for which Stanford has no copies. It is not generally necessary to address every alteration to a property: the focus should be on the exterior facades visible to the public or to visitors to the property. The integrity of setting should also be addressed within this “public viewshed,” specifically the park-like quality expressed through the vegetated buffers along the street.

Summary

Properties in the Stanford Research Park (formerly Stanford Industrial Park) were gradually developed between 1953 and the early 1980s under varying zoning regulations and with no master plan(s). Many of the early buildings have been replaced or substantially altered over the decades. For these reasons, there is no concentration of buildings from any particular era within the Park, and the Park as a whole has a diverse and inconsistent architectural and landscape character.

The Stanford Industrial Park reflected a national trend towards suburban, “clean” industrial areas, often located near college campuses. Many university-affiliated business parks emerged in the same period: “Fifty university-affiliated research parks were established in the 1960s, and by the early 1980s one study counted eighty-one.”56 Within the Santa Clara Valley, “A survey conducted by county planners in 1967, before the research-oriented economy had matured fully, tallied thirty-eight industrial parks in the corridor between Palo Alto and San Jose…” 57

The recommended evaluation approach, by focusing on specific activities associated with the properties will contribute to the growing literature on Silicon Valley history. Addressing the architecture in a comparative framework will similarly engage other efforts in the region in a productive fashion that builds our understanding of this important era in local history.


This map shows the gradual expansion of land area annexed and rezoned for commercial development by the City of Palo Alto. Some properties were developed many years after rezoning, or had later infill buildings added, and others were developed and later redeveloped with lot line changes. Therefore while the general pattern has been verified, boundaries should be considered approximate. Updated Oct. 28, 2016.
This map shows lots where buildings have been demolished and replaced, and lots where building exteriors have been extensively altered such that they are no longer representative of their original design or period.

Updated Nov. 2, 2016.