



STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
LAND, BUILDINGS AND REAL ESTATE

August 20, 2021

County of Santa Clara  
Department of Planning and Development  
70 West Hedding Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, East Wing  
San Jose, CA 95110

Attention: Charu Ahluwalia, Associate Planner

Regarding: Stanford Graduate School of Education (GSE) Project  
Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Grading Approval  
County File Number PLN21-011

**Subject: Response to Incomplete Letter dated February 25, 2021**

Dear Ms. Ahluwalia:

This letter is issued in response to your Incomplete Letter dated 2/25/2021 regarding the subject above.

**PLANNING**

- 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.

**Response:** Sheet AA0.5 has been updated to provide better clarity, and sheet AA0.6 has been added to show the first floor plan with alignments and setbacks.

- 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. Labeled existing floor plans, south elevation and sections have not been included in the submitted set of plans.

**Response:** Sheets NA0.5, NA0.6 and NA0.7 have been added to show existing and proposed plans side-by-side. Sheets NA3.1 and NA3.2 have been revised to show existing and proposed elevations side-by-side, and new sheet NA3.3 has been added to show the same.

- 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.

**Response:** North and South Building elevation sheets have been updated with a material legend and color photo of exterior finish materials. Materials are graphically depicted on the elevations via various labeled hatch patterns.

- 4) Provide height of curtain wall glazing and freestanding pergola on North Building south side exterior elevation.

**Response:** The heights of the North Building glazed curtain wall and trellis are provided on sheet NA3.3, elevation 2.

- 5) Provide street elevation along Lasuen Mall from the Art Gallery to the Bookstore, including heights of the buildings.

**Response:** Existing and proposed street elevations along Lasuen Mall are provided on new drawing AA2.0, included in revised ASA drawing set “Plans – 2”. Building heights are also provided.

- 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.

**Response:** Please refer to new elevations 3 and 4 added to sheet AA2.1 for street elevations along Escondido Mall; building heights are also provided.

- 7) Provide cross sections through the proposed new South Building along the east-west axis.

**Response:** Section 3 has been added to sheet AA2.2 to show cross-section views of the new South Building.

- 8) Provide exterior renderings shown on sheet AA2.3 without trees on a separate sheet.

**Response:** Per online discussion with County Planning and Stanford on 5/7/2021, this request for exterior renderings without trees is not required by the ASA checklist and can be deleted.

- 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.

**Response:** Tree removal list has been updated on sheet L1.00 to accurately identify trees shown on the prior Barnum Center ASA approved landscape plan. The number of protected oak and protected non-oak trees proposed for removal has been clarified. The location of trees proposed as replacements for protected tree removals has been clarified on planting plan sheet L3.01

10) Clarify specifications of the proposed lighting fixtures shown on landscape site plan L1.01.

**Response:** Per online discussion with County Planning and Stanford on 5/7/2021, specifications for lighting fixtures need not be provided at this time, as they are subject to change. This item will be converted to a Condition of Approval.

11) Provide Development District Tracking Sheet with an account of GUP square footage utilized to accommodate this proposed project.

**Response:** Please refer to the enclosed “Development District Tracking Form - 2”, which provides an accounting of GUP square footage to accommodate this project. To provide better clarity, notes have been added to sheet 3 of the Tracking Form, and also to the attached clip of the GUP square footage table from the cover sheet of the ASA drawings.

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.

**Response:** Higher resolution images are now provided in the revised Statement of Compatibility (“SOC - 2”) and the revised ASA drawing set (“Plans – 2”) to facilitate better zoomed-in views.

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.

**Response:** Acknowledged. The responses to JRP’s historical peer review comments have been addressed by Stanford in a separate cover letter dated 8/20/2021.

## **LAND DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING**

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](https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/Stormwater_CWP_Questionnaire_NC.pdf)

**Response:** A current version of the C.3 Stormwater Questionnaire is included with this ASA response package; refer to the enclosed “Clean Water Questionnaire - 2”.

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.

**Response:** The noted portions of the current C.3 Stormwater Questionnaire have been filled out accordingly. Please refer to the enclosed “Clean Water Questionnaire - 2”.

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).

**Response:** Sheet C6.00 has been updated accordingly. Treatment area columns have been deleted from the table, and the County file number (11044-17C3) for the regional facility has been added.

- 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.

**Response:** Please refer to the updated East Campus C3 Regional Facility Usage/Capacity Tracking Sheet ("C3 Tracking Sheet - 1") from 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.

**Response:** Please refer to notes added to sheet C4.01, which clarifies the overlap between the GSE project and the Lasuen/Escondido Circulation Improvements project (PLN20-036).

## **FIRE MARSHAL**

- 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.

**Response:** The fire hydrant shown on sheet AA0.4 is new and this symbol has been added to the legend. Fire hydrants are standard.

- 20) Sheet C7.01 shows a 1 in = 20 ft scale, this appears to be incorrect.

**Response:** Scale on sheet C7.01 has been revised to be 1 inch = 40 feet.

- 21) Plans are to clarify the entire fire department access will be drivable. Sheet C7.01 appears to show a curb as the access.

**Response:** The entire fire department access will be drivable. The curb shown on sheet C7.01 is flush to the fire lane. No raised curbs are included within the fire lane width.

- 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.

**Response:** Issues regarding fire department access and hose reach were discussed and generally accepted by the County Fire Marshal during an online meeting with SUFMO and the Stanford GSE

project team held on 3/25/2021. Since the North Building is existing, we respectfully request that the 160 ft hose reach be approved by the County.

- 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.

**Response:** Please refer to revised civil sheet C7.01. A wall-mounted FDC is provided on the west side of the South Building. An FDC is also provided on the west-facing (Lasuen Mall) side of the North Building. The two (2) originally proposed FDCs at the eastern portions of the buildings (near Meyer Green) are also retained in the plan.

### **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.

**Response:** Planning Staff comments are acknowledged and appreciated. Per the online discussion with County Planning and Stanford on 5/7/2021, it was agreed that design scenarios need not be provided and would not prevent this application from being deemed complete.

However, Stanford has modified the spacing, pattern and size of the glass lites and mullions in the glazed curtain wall to be more responsive to the adjacent existing south-facing windows. The curtain wall's mullion and muntin pattern has been redesigned to reflect the dimensions and proportions of the original metal windows; each bay is now sub-divided into four glass lites instead of three. Please refer to updated elevation 4 on sheet AA2.1.

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 existing 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.

**Response:** Per the online meeting with County Planning and Stanford on 5/7/2021, it was agreed that design scenarios need not be provided and would not prevent Stanford's application from being deemed complete.

JRP peer review comment #7 states that the scale, location and design of the new South Building meets applicable standards and is compatible with cultural resources in the immediate setting. Stanford agrees with JRP's assessment.

The Lasuen Mall elevation demonstrates that building heights vary all across the campus. Please refer to new sheet AA2.0, which clearly exhibits the existing and proposed eastern edge of Lasuen Mall. The Law School Building is in close proximity to the current Bookstore and Post Office. The height difference between the South Building and current Bookstore is comparable to the height difference between the current Bookstore and Law School, especially because the Law School is located much closer to the current Bookstore than the South Building. Additionally, as noted above, the historical peer review analysis concluded that the South Building is compatible with the surrounding buildings within the immediate "neighborhood".

The South Building's west façade window openings have been grouped to be more responsive to the Lasuen Mall frontage and match the proportions of the North Building west façade. Refer to elevation 2 on sheet AA21 and sheet SA3.1.

We appreciate your assistance, and please contact me at (650) 996-6754 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
Department of Project Management

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Michael Mithen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Mithen".

Michael Mithen  
Project Manager

cc: file 5363