**Special Joint Meeting of the UW Architectural Commission (UWAC) and Landscape Advisory Committee (ULAC) – to conduct Schematic Design Review of Computer Science Engineering II**

12.22.15 - Gates Commons, Allen Center

Meeting Notes

Attending

Present:

UWAC Chair, Dean John Schaufelberger (voting)

UWAC Vice-chair, Professor Rich Christie (voting)

ULAC Chair, Maggi Johnson

Jan Arntz-Richards, CPD

Rebecca Barnes, University Architect

Damon Fetters, Facilities Services

Kurtis Jensen, CPD Project Manager

Mike McCormick, AVP CPD

Gregory Miller, Professor Civil Engineering

Howard Nakase, Facilities Services

LuAnn Stokke, Facilities Services

Steve Tatge, CPD

Pedro Arduino, Professor/AVP Facilities, College of Engineering

Paul Beame, Professor of Computer Science Engineering

Ed Lazowska, Professor of Computer Science Engineering

Hank Levy, Chair, Department of Computer Science Engineering

Tracy ??, Computer Science Engineering Facilities Director

LMN - Mark Reddington, Stephen Van Dyck, Julie Adams; GLS - Matt Wittman

On-line:

Linda Jewell, UWAC (voting)

John Syvertsen, UWAC (voting)

Jennifer Jones, ULAC

(Presentation materials to be posted on the UW Architectural Commission website – FLIP PLEASE INSERT LINK HERE, get from Stephen Van Dyck at LMN if you don’t yet have it)

* Kurt Jensen, CPD Project Manager, introduced the presentation noting the following:

There is a preferred site, UW Board of Regents will be asked to approve in February 2016, following the Final EIS (which has considered the preferred and alternative sites for the building).

* Hank Levy, CSE Chair, provided some background regarding the skyrocketing demand for computer science education and degrees from students, local industry and the state legislature. Currently 2/3 of applicants must be turned away, from this, one of the top programs in the US. The department’s reputation is collegial, collaborative and friendly, a culture which architecture influences by supporting these behaviors. CSEII will create a second building that, to function more as a single place extending the Allen Center, depends on architecture that facilitates easy flows between the buildings, facilities that complement the Allen Center’s functions, having proximity as a key. Other important aspects to the building’s design are parity, a sense of community, flexibility, daylight, security and amenable relationships with its campus setting. It was noted that classrooms will be used by the broader university community.
* Mark Reddington of LMN made the visual presentation. Key issues are:

1. the building’s site placement is particularly sensitive in its relationships at every side and end, including the adjacent engineering buildings, Stevens Way, the major pedestrian route along Snohomish Lane, and the building’s touchdown points where it spans Jefferson,
2. The characterization and geometry of the grand stair serving the Snohomish Lane route,
3. The characterization and development of the façade expression and materials.

* Discussion points addressed the following:

1. Understanding more clearly the lower level functions including how service, delivery and the maker spaces interface with the pedestrian circulation on the great stair.
2. Materiality of the roof, given its extensive visibility from the Allen Center and other buildings in the vicinity.
3. The scale of the building on and in its site is extremely large (this was referenced by several speakers as an issue of concern); the facades have a big and critical job to do to mitigate the impacts of the scale of the building.
4. The approach to the stair - it mirrors itself inside and out - seems a more urban solution than fits this location. The challenge of the stair is to make it NOT seem overwhelming,
5. Concern that the interior configuration encloses too much space, by contrast with the collaborative goals mentioned; common spaces seem too separated.
6. The landscape has an important role to play in connecting CSEII with the Allen Center – that doesn’t seem to be happening yet in this design and it needs to be further developed.
7. The façade seems endless – not a positive comment! Even though the treatment of the façade is composed of small units that break it down; is there a way to “discontinue” the façade, or to create an intermediate scale in a way that also addresses the relationships with adjacent buildings?
8. From the perspective of the department of Civil Engineering regarding the main entrance to More Hall to the immediate south of CSEII on Stevens way, this design has improved over and earlier version, yet that entry still reads as an afterthought, the emphasis of the siting being the Snohomish side of the building. Civil Engineering wants to feel a part of the greater whole being created by CSEII, not at its back in a dark canyon; would prefer an entry into CSEII across the small plaza from More Hall.
9. Be careful about “perch points” for birds on the facades.

Following this discussion, the Commission voted to approve Schematic Design of CSEII, noting the several concerns to be addressed going forward.