

County of Santa Clara

Department of Planning and Development
Planning Office

County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Floor
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, California 95110-1705
(408) 299-5770 FAX (408) 288-9198
www.sccplanning.org



February 25, 2021

****Sent via email ****

Michael Mithen
Stanford University
340 Bonair Siding
Stanford, CA 94305
Email: mithen@stanford.edu

FILE NUMBER: PLN21-011
SUBJECT: Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Grading Approval –
Graduate School of Education (GSE) Project
SITE LOCATION: 485 N Lasuen Mall, Stanford, CA 94305
DATE RECETVED: 01/26/2021

Dear Michael Mithen:

Your application for Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Grading Approval is **incomplete**. For the application processing to resume, you must resolve the following issues and submit the information listed below.

Please note that the Department is only accepting electronic submittals due to COVID-19 closures. Please refer to procedures for Planning Resubmittals available on the County website at

<https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Iwantto/Permits/Pages/PlanningResubmittals.aspx>.

If you have any questions about the information being requested, you should first call the person whose name is listed as the contact person for that item. He or she represents a specialty or office and can provide details about the requested information.

**AN APPOINTMENT IS REQUIRED FOR THIS RESUBMITTAL.
PLEASE CALL ME AT (408) 299-5740 TO SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT.**

Please submit a complete revised plan set and a *written response* with the resubmittal materials, addressing the following items. All items must be addressed and included in the resubmittal.

PLANNING

Contact Charu Ahluwalia at (408) 299-5740 or charu.ahluwalia@pln.sccgov.org for information regarding the following items.

1. Provide an architectural site plan or revise the site alignment site plan (sheet AA0.5) with information including ground floor building footprint with dimensions, setback distance between buildings, and label scope of work, i.e, if the structure is proposed or existing, and include notes on the scope of the modification.
2. Clarify scope of remodel proposed for the North Building by providing labelled existing and proposed exhibits (floor plans, south elevation, and sections) on the same sheets. Labelled existing floor plans, south elevation and sections have not been included in the submitted set of plans.
3. Revise all North and South Building elevations (sheets NA3.1, NA3.2, SA3.1 and SA3.2) to include color rendering or label building materials and provide color samples. A color rendering or photograph of North Building existing and proposed south elevation is required to assess visual implication of proposed glass façade.
4. Provide height of curtain glazing and freestanding pergola on North Building south side exterior elevation.
5. Provide street elevation along Lasuen Mall from the Art Gallery to the Bookstore, including heights of the buildings.
6. Provide street elevations along Escondido Mall from Meyer Green to the Main Quad (facing south) and Meyer Green to the Terman Engineering Building (facing north), including heights of the buildings. This exhibit is required for height compatibility analysis.
7. Provide cross sections through the proposed new South Building along the east-west axis.
8. Provide exterior renderings shown on sheet AA2.3 without trees on a separate sheet.
9. Revise tree removal list on sheet L.1 to accurately identify trees shown on the prior Barnum Centre ASA approved landscape site plan (record number 9079-05A). Trees # 88, 90, 91, 92, 99, 100 and 101 have been incorrectly marked as not shown in the Barnum ASA. Clarify the number of protected oak and protected non-oak trees, with trunk diameter of 12 inches or larger, measured at 4.5 feet above the ground, that are proposed for removal. Clarify the location of trees proposed as replacement for protected tree removal on planting plan sheet L3.01.

10. Clarify specifications of the proposed lighting fixtures shown on landscape site plan L1.01.
11. Provide Development District Tracking Sheet with an account of GUP square footage utilized to accommodate this proposed project.
12. Revise Figure 27 and 28 in the Statement of Compatibility to be readable at any scale when zoomed in. These exhibits showing Lasuen street existing and proposed elevations are blurry and unreadable.
13. The proposed project is being peer reviewed by the County hired historical consultant JRP, Inc. as the project includes rehabilitation and modification of a potential historic resource (North Building), demolition of a part of the Barnum Hub, and construction of a new South Building in the context of historic resources. JRP may require additional information to provide a conclusive statement on the project's Statement of Compatibility and DPR Form evaluations, as prepared by Stanford. JRP's peer review comments will be forthcoming shortly.

LAND DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING

Contact Ed Duazo at (408) 299-5733 or ed.duazo@pln.sccgov.org for more information regarding the following items:

14. The C.3 Stormwater Questionnaire submitted is not the current version. Resubmit using the current questionnaire available on-line at:

https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/Stormwater_CWP_Questionnaire_NC.pdf
15. Portions of the C.3 Stormwater Questionnaire have not been completed, specifically Sections 7, 8, and 9. Please complete Sections 7, 8, and 9. In addition, re-review Section 6 to make sure all applicable site design measures, source control measures, and treatment systems have been identified. The information in the questionnaire is reported to the State Water Board; therefore, all sections of the questionnaire need to be completed as accurately as possible.
16. Sheet C6.00 (Stormwater Management Plan) indicates that the project will use in-lieu credits provided by the East Campus Regional Stormwater Capture Facility (regional facility). The DMA table indicates that treatment is based on 4% of regulated impervious area and includes columns of minimum treatment areas required and provided. However, the regional facility's treatment capacity is not based on the 4% rule and has been converted to treated impervious area (as opposed to treatment area). To avoid future confusion, delete the "treatment area" columns

from the table, and add the County file number for the regional facility (File No. 11044-17C3).

17. Submit an updated credit/capacity usage tracking sheet for the East Campus Regional Facility to ensure that there is ample in-lieu credit available for this project. Coordinate with the Stanford Water Resources and Civil Infrastructure Group.
18. There appears to be some overlap in the limits of work between this project and the Lausen/Escondido Circulation Improvements approved under PLN20-036. Where there is overlap, clarify which project will construct the improvements.

FIRE MARSHAL

Contact Alex Goff at (408) 299-5763 or alex.goff@sccfd.org for more information regarding the following items:

19. Sheet AA0.4 shows a fire hydrant north-east of the South Building Stair Tower. This emblem is different than the other hydrants.
 - a. Clarify if this fire hydrant is new or existing. If the hydrant is existing, clarify if the same will remain or is proposed to be removed.
 - b. Clarify if the fire hydrants are standard.
20. Sheet C7.01 shows a 1 in= 20 ft scale, this appears to be incorrect.
21. Plans are to clarify the entire fire department access will be drivable. Sheet C7.01 appears to show a curb as the access.
22. All parts of a structure must be within 150 ft path of travel to fire department access. Sheet C7.01 requests an exception to increase the hose reach due to increased fire sprinkler design. This is to be a Fire and Life Safety review.
23. Sheet C7.01 shows the Fire Department Connections (FDC) on the eastern portion of the structures (rear of the buildings). Further discussion is needed as to why the FDC's can't be located on the west portion (front of structures) as this is the nearest response points for apparatus.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The following comments are not an incomplete item but is information pertinent to the application.

Staff has concerns regarding compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding buildings and the immediate "neighborhood." Below are excerpts of the County's required findings for Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and the associated Guidelines established for reviewing said projects, whereby Staff is having difficulty supporting the project:

ASA Finding B:

Appearance of proposed site development and structures, including signs will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding neighborhood or zoning district.

Guideline for Architecture and Site Approval, Chapter 1- Design, Section A - Architecture, Compatibility with Neighbors:

Structures should relate in size and general appearance to adjacent buildings and to the neighborhood in which they are located. No structures will be approved which is aesthetically incompatible with the best neighboring structures. Site design, architecture and landscaping; use of similar roofing, wall material and complementary colors are means by which a proposed project can be made compatible with its neighbors.

24. The proposed three-story (approximately 40 feet high) glass and metal curtain wall on the south side of the North Building is visually dominant on the south elevation and its detailing is not responsive to the existing fenestration pattern of the North Building south side elevation existing walls (which will remain unimproved). Better design examples of glass intervention are provided in the Statement of Compatibility prepared by Stanford. Specifically, in case study #1 (University of Virginia's New Cabell Hall Revitalization Project; page 17, figures 17 and 18), pattern of the curtainwall design aligns well with window proportions on the contrasting masonry façade. In case study #2 (Leland Stanford Junior Museum), curtain wall on the secondary façade of the 1999 addition is not of full building height but instead gives the appearance of glass panels fixed in walls.
 - Staff recommends providing design scenarios/alternatives for the North Building south elevation to demonstrate more evidence regarding compatibility of design with existing North Building. This can be achieved by redesigning the curtain wall to better reflect the pattern of fenestrations of the other south side walls or reducing area of the curtain wall on the south façade.

25. Staff has concerns regarding the height and west elevation design of the South Building. The South Building is 10 feet higher than the North Building and taller than the exiting clock tower that serves as a visual guide on Lasuen Mall. As currently designed, the South Building height would not transition well to the south side of Lasuen street (towards the Bookstore). Ridge height difference between the South Building and Bookstore is over 35 feet. In addition, the west elevation design needs to demonstrate compatibility with the existing street character along Lasuen Mall. Existing buildings along Lasuen Mall including but not limited to the Green Library, North Building, Main Quad, provide a district visual character to the street. As currently designed, east and west elevation of the South Building are identical and not responsive to Lasuen Street character. For reference, North Building west elevation is designed differently from the East elevation to be more responsive to the Lasuen Mall frontage.
 - Staff recommends providing design scenarios/alternatives for the South Building to demonstrate more evidence regarding compatibility of height and west elevation design with surrounding buildings and the immediate

“neighborhood.” There are two recommendations that Staff can provide that may help achieve consistency with the County findings and ASA Guidelines. For example, Staff recommends reducing the building height by dropping the eave height of the South Building closer to the Barnum Centre roof. In the Statement of Compatibility figure 30 (exhibit of roof height variation at the Main Quad; page 23) the height difference between the roof of the lower building and eave of the higher building is approximately 4 feet thus allowing a more gradual transition between front and back buildings. With regard to west elevation design, Staff recommends South building west elevation window openings, window types, and cornice details be similar in size and proportion to the North Building west façade.

If the requested information is not submitted within 180 days, you will be required to pay a fee of 10% of the application fee at the time the information is submitted. All requested information must be submitted within 1 year of the date of this letter and will not be accepted after 1 year. **PARTIAL RESUBMITTALS WILL NOT BE PROCESSED.** Fees required at the time of resubmittal will be those in effect at that time.

In submitting this land use application, the owner/applicant included an initial application fee. As of the date of this letter, approximately 35% of the fees paid have been exhausted.

If you have any additional questions regarding this application or would like to meet to clarify Planning’s incomplete comments, please call me at (408) 299-5740 or to schedule an appointment to do so.

Sincerely,



Charu Ahluwalia
Associate Planner

cc: Manira Sandhir, Principal Planner
Alex Goff, Fire Marshal
Ed Duazo, LDE