

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC  
Monday, August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2022  
Online Meeting

**Architectural Commission**

---

X	Renee Cheng, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	AnnMarie Borys, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, College of Built Environments	Voting
	Gundula Proksch, Vice Co-Chair	Faculty Council on Campus Planning Stewardship	Voting
	Jan Wittington, Vice Co-Chair	Faculty Council on Campus Planning Stewardship	Voting
X	Cathy Simon	Design Principal	Voting
X	John Syvertsen	Chairman, Board of Regents, American Architectural Foundation	Voting
X	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Wienzapfel Associates	Voting
X	Linda Jewell	Partner, Freeman & Jewell	Voting
X	Edwin Harris	Principal & Co-Founder, EVOKE	Voting
X	Steve Tatge	Associate Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

---

Minutes by Laura Salish, Executive Assistant to the Director of Campus Architecture & Planning

**Call to Order**

The Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, Renee Cheng, called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Past Minutes and Current Agenda**

The March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and current agenda were approved.

**UWAC Member Update**

This is the last meeting for AnnMarie Borys's time as the commission's Vice Chair. Gundula Proksch and Jan Whittington are stepping into the role as co-chairs.

**CoEng Interdisciplinary Engineering Building**

Jennifer Reynolds - UWF Project Manager  
Morgan May, Kabri Lehrman Schmid - Hensel Phelps  
Billie Faircloth, David Feaster, Stephen Kieran – Kieran Timberlake

**Review of IEB Project Goals**

- Meet a small portion of the CoEng growth projections, addressing space needs in college
- The building will be an important part of the on-campus student experience and centralized space for Engineering envisioned as a "home base" or "engineering central"
- Commitment to providing support to a full range of engineering disciplines and project-based learning
- Silo-free learning environment

**Project & Permitting Schedule**

- 50% of DD phase completed, aiming to wrap up design and preconstruction by end of September.
- Lengthy permitting process with City of Seattle is continuing on schedule.

- Abatement happening this month (August)
- Demolition begins early September

### **Brick Selection**

- Anticipating onboarding our trade partner in July (Cascade Masonry), on schedule - have been working together for about a month
- Looking at IEB neighbors (Engineering library, Loew Hall, Hall Health, University Club, HUB)—lots of options for integration
- Began discussion by looking at color—went with Red Charcoal blend (blending and contrasting with colors around site)
- Discussion of texture, ¾” projection vs flush—went with flush due to performance and maintenance concerns
  - Texture of the brick itself (smooth, mission, rug), focusing on mission and rug to reflect building intentionality in its siting. Picking up shade and shadow to differentiate texture
  - Looking at a 10/90% blend of mission finish/rug blend, haven’t chosen which is dominate
- Still experimenting with mortal color and metal selections
- From Jefferson—see the building in whole, would like to bring the rug texture in whole or striating up to mission texture. The walkway creates a source of intimacy with the brick.
- Discussion and active exploration about finishes for grove & portal area

### **Portal Area Discussion**

- Cost savings discussion of a plaster ceiling (vs wood) for all areas
- Column, shaping, splitting (cannot due to structural engineering and cost), CADing.
  - Texturing the column is current strategy
  - Column is very small compared to the trees. Should we make the column such an exception? No, working towards not calling attention to it. Needs to have the same form language as the columns on the porch and along Steven’s Way.

### **Interior Discussion**

- Building equity within project, type of art and artists who will be doing the work.
- Art to be visible to interior and exterior as it messages to campus landscape (highlighted in pink)
- Hands on collaboration spaces (virtual tour), open, semi closed or behind doors—all very intentional in layout
- Just started furniture layout, seeing various approaches to the ceiling. What we’re seeing in virtual tour is about integration, not about color/finish selection
- 2<sup>nd</sup> virtual tour- welcome desk, down the stairs (art integration areas continually identified)
- Pattern in approach to windows discussion, reflect more of a street scale of windows. Connection, breakout spaces in Grove to bring work outside.
- Massing needs to make Grove feel grounded, working on negotiation between the 2 scales when the corner is turned.

### **Comments:**

- Brick studies, very impressed with how thoughtful they’ve been with assembly re: color, texture, how to achieve. Lower registers (Grove, etc) (Steven’s Way) – the color/texture difference is not great enough in contrast with the top of the building. Might be too subtle.
- Column—does have the difference in being freestanding, lots of movement around it. Can we make it circular to create more movement? More engagement. The moment that the column engages with the bench, it becomes different than the others.
  - Learning to love the column
  - Other perspective: it exists and we can stop talking it.

- Would love to see wood soffits on exterior, would like to see them on the interior ground floor as well. Might be more important to bring that wood in the ceiling plane to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor if we must choose. Create more opportunities for warmth, current design is very cool. Perhaps seeing if someone would donate the wood?
- Plaza Portal space, needs more engagement (furniture, sculpture).
- This is going to be a well-loved building, subtle of complexity.
- Connection to pavement and landscape, particularly in the portal when weaving design into existing landscape.
  - Pathways (bridge from Steven's (free floating feel) vs. stair along North edge is very different!
  - If we lose wood on ceiling of the Portal, paving needs to have pattern, texture, color, etc.
  - Do we need the door to signal somehow that it's a continuous pathway?
- Different language of elevation change, would like to see that in the next meeting.
- Requesting to send email regarding massing scale comparison.
- Commission requests updates via email for brick and elevation.

### Site W27 Project Update

Shane Ruegamer – UW Project Manager

Cathy Berg, Gene Sandoval, Eddie Kung, Brian Kenworthy – ZGF

Joe Reagan, Kyle Jardin –Wexford

John Paul Jones – Jones & Jones

### Review of Agenda

- Will discuss the successes of achieving connectivity and function of building
- Midblock crossing discussion (visual and physical)
- Connecting back to the landscape, simplicity and elegance
- Landscape to Canopy integration and detailing
- Developing dialogue between interior ceiling pain, soffits and ground floor

### Design Update

- 3x4 ft model looking at openness at all sides of building, developed in interim meetings with UWAC guidance.
- Relationship of building into Belvedere views and surrounding trails.
- Building opens up to all sides, to other buildings (Gould Hall, Midblock crossing, West Campus Utility Plant, Burke Gilman, Samuel E Kelly).
  - Softening grade across W26 & 27 properties, preserving as much active plaza on University Way as possible & relationship with Samuel E Kelly building.
    - 3 different ways of maneuvering 10 ft grade drop (interior and exterior).
    - Visual connectivity focus

### Canopy Articulation

- Refining elegance and clarity, looking into the materiality.
  - Metal that modulates between light silver and champagne-ish color, keeping with the warm tones of the campus buildings but a more contemporary take. Reflects different times of day and seasons.
  - North façade, not serrated in the same way but harmonious. Metal paneling vary in width to create a similar pattern, folds changing direction.
  - Views from North façade will read a bit different but not separate.
    - Views will be limited by W26 in the future.
    - Glazing of the corners opens up the space.
- Working to ensure that crown/penthouse/roof equipment is hidden from ground floor as much as possible.
- Scale of buildings in neighborhood are becoming taller.
  - Ensuring the 1<sup>st</sup> larger building doesn't look out of scape in landscape.

- Lighting to support that view
- Horizontal plane has been eliminated to extend the serrated visual of the building, crown reaching to the sky above. Cleaner visual.
- Interlocking of canopy and understory, working towards transparency of understory, more difficult along University Way due to service for loading and parking entry.
- Vegetation & full wall windows, virtual landscape effect of texture opens up southeast corner

### **Understory**

- Transparent glazing
- Piers- Board form concrete;
- Soffit- raked stucco
- Understory strongbacks and serrations- wood
- Understory mullions – warm gray, light response metal panel
- Active lantern effect, will still provide light in cold and dark

### **Spacing**

- Column shape also serrated, relationship to canopy above, creating functional spaces along perimeter to carve out.
- How does Belvedere reinforce building design richness? Has been a continuous guiding question.
- Modulating spaces, gathering spaces, series of terraces for view and to extend site.
- Floating conference space that provides privacy from pedestrian movement inside and outside building while allowing belvedere view towards Portage Bay. Allows life in the bigger 80 level space, avoiding the empty room feeling.
- Stucco soffit, how the articulation of ceiling interacts with ground plane is an ongoing conversation.

### **South Side Landscaping**

- From building to the south: Paving, Burke Gilman, reinforced grass, bio-retention area, Burke Gilman (again), rain garden, sidewalk & planting strip, NE Pacific St
- Will continue refining the rocks, plants, etc.
- Understory rawness compliments the groundscape/landscape around the building including native plants. Rocks will help with creating microclimates throughout the seasons.
- Forest edge includes native plants (salal, huckleberry, swordfern, etc.), easy street tree blend
- University Way is adding street trees to project site, will change how the street is perceived to traffic and pedestrians.
- Active/Reactive/Artifact water celebration integration
  - Supporting that with rock garden of alpine granite, cobble as it expresses itself along Brooklyn
  - Not a permanent water pool, temporary and intentional flooding during rainy season.
  - Building design is becoming more fluid and refined due to the ongoing feedback W27 has received

### **Comments:**

- Would love to see the model in person, renderings are helpful
- Development of façade with metal panels—very effective way to wrestle with question of scale of building and texture. The breakdown of the building with horizontal expression works well.
- Crenulation is effective, provides variety due to the variation and angle of the panel
- On board with big exhaust canons so we don't have to deal with exhaust vans from vertical arc of building
- Pier configuration remaining oriented in the similar direction is a good idea. Texture will also be important as people will be getting close to them.
  - Is footprint consistent with work for articulation?
  - Pier study in itself, would like to see something similar to panel study.

- View from the Southwest, good to see it in connection with plants and additional buildings. W26 is going to be massive scale and will be right up against W27. Envelope will likely be maxed as a public private partnership for need of usable space but likely in conflict with design excellence.
  - Hoping to see that there will be flexibility in city accepting various approaches.
  - W26 timing is unknown.
- Concern about view at top of site (near Gould), truly belies experience of the building, not as inviting as an entrance. If it is truly secondary for pedestrian walkway, less concerns.
- UW will be generating big footprint labs, what happens to those buildings in the future when they're no longer lab buildings. How can they be converted into other disciplines?
  - Massing for study does not need to be changed but it is worth considering with such large footprints as the labs become predominate in west campus.
  - Massing as a blunt instrument for W26, UW may want to consider how natural light and ventilation will factor in.
  - 3 tenants: Institute Protein, BBI, CDI
    - Federal partner may not come together.
  - Belvedere lawn is much more strategic than previous design, considerably less ambiguous.
    - Seating 18-20" retaining wall, pull back a bit to give distance from the bike path.
    - Stone Meadow, disappointed it's not below the Belvedere lawn, as a view.
      - Want to see it on a slope, want to see it large.
      - Potentially letting the forest edge go to dedicate additional space to the Riparian and Stone Meadow. Don't want it to be a token area. Can we push Burke Gilman path down to allow for it?
        - Response—agree, would like to bring more below/near Burke Gilman if the topography allows for it
  - RE: Crenulation, the skin could be studied more. Enjoy the responsiveness to each elevation. Disagreement about the orientation of the columns of the base at the north and south—should match/virtual orientation and have orientation reflective of elevation to adapt to responsiveness. Vestibule and column space.
  - Spandrel glass/vision glass mix—will that look uniform when Understory is lit up at night? Won't have striations?
    - No, will have more of a patchwork quality to it. Choosing a glass to diminish this as much as possible.
    - Which is also why public art in that area will be so important. Bring artist in for ceiling art, similar to Public Health?
      - Great potential for artwork impact. Giant wall upon entrance, conference rooms.
      - Artist hasn't been chosen yet, state funding % (100k) and supplementation, Arts Washington helps to manage the process and works with the design team. Encouraged to choose artist soon and involve them in design process.
- Stairs to the north, seems like a long run without a landing. Looks intimidating and compressed. Is it due to constraints of the garage? Suggested that the stairs wrap around with a landing to the north entrance.

### ***General Commission Discussion***

- 10 million gift from Boeing is all for IEB, confirmed
  - Did not receive additional funds from state that other projects had access to because it hasn't broken ground/started construction
  - Seems like we might be on the same page about how to configure landscape, not doing all of the eco landscapes.

- Belvedere—underground vault is setting the grade for it and the retaining wall.
- Is it Belvedere if it's not up above the rest?
- IEB- presentation is exemplary
- Design is fantastic for how clunky the expression of massing has to be (35 ft)
- W26/W27 Discussion
  - Do we have any lessons learned from retrofit renovations in Odegard? Regarding conversation about the day that the large lab buildings are no longer used as laboratories.
    - If you fill the zoning envelope, the lab folks love it but leaves a big middle
    - We know that the labs do not need a full square broad footprint, even if it is preferred.
    - If you divide floor plate into 2 slabs, have more perimeter and are connected (Site 26, not Site 27)—more usable for future space needs.
      - Experiences of doing recent retrofit in Boston, San Francisco referenced
    - Core that cannot be changed should not occupy the middle, so that the building can be changed.
      - Investing planning time into parcels and the intimidating massing and what it could be. Drive for commitment for integration. Maybe W26 doesn't use their full envelope in order to maximize all of west campus' functionality.
      - Level of granularity that west campus planning group does not currently have
      - Will end up with another wedding cake design if this is not addressed and envelope of W26 is maximized.
  - North end work on W27—it is proposed on another parcel, should be a campus design rather than the building design.
- Commission Function: How does UWAC address environmental campus impacts and sustainability plans?
  - Minimum requirements of the UW
  - Carbon footprint discussion, is a part of team and design selection
  - Design teams are motivated to use UW as a client that supports sustainability
  - Was a discussion earlier in the projects
  - Making sure we are paying attention to this, don't assume.
    - Questions to consider: should we foreground this as an agenda item so firms don't take pressure off themselves to achieve these strategies and goals? Do we have time to do this? Environmental impact statement within proposal? Similar to Hans Rosling's approach to the water system?

The next meeting will be held in person on Monday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

**Meeting Adjourned at 12PM.**