UW Architectural Commission

Minutes of Meeting
September 28, 2015
wəɬəbʔaltxʷ – Intellectual House
Conference Room

Architectural Commission

Present			
☑	John Schaufelberger, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Richard Christie, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering	Voting
☐	Linda Jewell	Partner, Freeman & Jewell; Professor, Landscape Architecture, UC Berkeley	Voting
☑	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Weinzapfel Associates	Voting
☑	Cathy Simon	Design Principal, Perkins+Will	Voting
☑	John Syvertsen	Senior Principal, Cannon Design	Voting
☑	Ezekiel Jones	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Rebecca Barnes	University Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Charles Kennedy	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services	Ex Officio
☑	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Mike McCormick	Associate Vice President, Capital Projects Office	Ex Officio

Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The Commissioners unanimously approved the meeting agenda, and the minutes of the June 29, 2015 meeting, as submitted. Ross Braine, UW Tribal Liaison and Director of the Intellectual House welcomed the Commissioners and gave a brief overview of the history and function of the building as a cultural resource. Dean Schaufelberger introduced Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President for Capital Planning & Development. Kristine Kenney provided a detailed report of September 24, 2015 University Landscape Advisory Committee. (See minutes of meeting: http://pm.uw.edu/oua/landscape-advisory-committee-meeting-september-24-2015.)

Campus Master Plan
Requested Action: Information - Existing Conditions Analysis
Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA
Theresa Doherty, Senior Project Director, Planning and Management
Caitlyn Clauson, Romil Sheth, Dennis Pieperz, Sasaki Associates

Overview:

The University has begun the process of updating its 2003 Campus Master Plan (CMP) and anticipates the new plan will be complete and approved by the Board of Regents and the Seattle City Council in 2018. The project is being led by UW's Rebecca Barnes and Theresa Doherty; Sasaki Associates has been contracted to help craft the plan in consultation with the University community. On October 14th and 15th the University will hold two Open Houses to kick-off the CMP Environmental Impact Statement Scoping process. Sasaki presented the Phase 1 findings that the University will use to inform their request to the City of Seattle for an additional square footage allowance to meet the varied needs of the University over the next two decades.

Comments:

- The Campus Master Plan should provide an internal vision for University development, as well as fulfilling City requirements.
- One graph is needed that portrays all types of growth projections.
- The consultants were asked to provide a summary chart that overlays all growth, trends and projections, with the same baseline.
- While the goal of urbanizing west and south campus is desirable, take care to retain the "oasis" quality of central campus, and the east campus athletics complex and natural areas.
- Place real emphasis on maximizing the potential of the campus waterfront as a series of desirable public open spaces.

DRAFT

- Carefully consider quality of life in west campus, versus increased height and density; observe the example of the recent west campus student housing development.
- Corridors must be provided through south campus to connect central and south campuses to each other and with the waterfront.
- Explore the area north of the west campus MIO (Major Institution Overlay), closer to the Sound Transit Station for the development of a biotech zone, such as Cambridge's Kendall Square.
- The E-1 parking lot should be included in the Master Plan as a development site; problematic fill conditions can be overcome with proper engineering.
- Open space must be integrated with proposed density in west and south campuses; open space should be shown in overlay on the development slides in future presentations.
- The CMP should include a strong message about development of open space as a fully integrated programmatic function.

Rainier Vista & Burke Gilman Trail
Tour
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect, OUA

The Commission toured the newly completed Rainier Vista landscape renovation, including the Sound Transit pedestrian and bicycle bridge and the portions of the Burke Gilman Trail (BGT) renovated as part of the Vista project, as well as the unimproved BGT along the Life Sciences Building site.

North Campus Housing
Requested Action: Phase IV(a) Schematic Design Approval
Jon Lebo, Director, CPO
Shane Ruegamer, Project Manager
Rob Lubin, Assoc Director, Housing & Food Services
Steve Kieran, Evan Yassky, Kieran Timberlake
Richard Roark, OLIN Studios

Overview:

The North Campus Student Housing, Phase IV(a) replaces McCarty Hall with three new buildings, identified as building B, C and D on the attachment with occupancy planned for the start of Autumn Quarter 2018. The buildings will feature two floors of concrete construction with 5 floors of wood frame construction on top. McCarty Hall currently has a design capacity of 620 beds; the three new buildings will have approximately 1,870 beds.

A new dining facility in Building D will replace the dining currently located in McMahon Hall. This new dining facility will support the North Campus area. Other amenity program spaces include the regional desk, fitness center and learning resource center. The new resident halls in the North Campus will have a variety of room types for 2, 3, and 4 persons as well as suites with private bathrooms and floors where bathrooms are shared between multiple rooms.

Landscape improvements include new internal courtyards – some at grade and some rooftop, a central urban plaza (Town Square), new pedestrian access enhancing circulation between residential buildings including a mid-slope path, interconnections to the adjacent campus areas, open spaces for passive and active recreational uses (an improved Denny Field and new grove south of Building A), and the relocation of a portion of Whitman Court road. The changes developed in Phase IV(a) along with Phase IV(b) (Buildings A and E) will create a new character for this part of the campus that maintains the woodland nature of the existing area, while better serving connections within and to the broader campus.

Project Forecasted Cost	
North Campus Student Housing Phase IV(a)	$216M
Schedule	
Design	March 2015 – November 2016
Construction	February 2016 – August 2018
Occupancy	September 2018

DRAFT

Comments:

- Announcing the lounges and entries effectively add interest and identity.
- The approach taken to concluding the formal axis that begins in the Arts Quad is a good outcome.
- Simplify the landscape in the more intimately scaled courtyards.
- The introduction of brick base panels adds one too many materials; these could be done well as board-formed concrete.
- Variation in horizontal and vertical façade articulation as well as material choices might be desirable.
- Careful consideration of the lighting of the arcades, courtyards, and paths will be critical to insure safe and attractive conditions.
- A common element, subtly incorporated into all the façades, would help create a stimulating and interesting environment and to ameliorate any possible oppressiveness caused by the density of the site.

Action:

A motion was tendered and seconded to approve schematic design. A vote was unanimous in favor.

Life Sciences Building

Requested Action: Design Development Approval
Jon Lebo, Director, Major Projects, CPO
Troy Stahlecker, Project Manager, CPO
Anthony Gianopoulos, Doug Streeter, Andy Clinch, Perkins+Will
Jennifer Guthrie, GGN

Overview:

The College of Arts and Sciences Life Sciences Building (LSB) project is a five-story above-grade building with two stories below grade, plus a mechanical penthouse. The site encompasses the existing greenhouses and landscaped area located on the east side of Kincaid Hall. The existing greenhouse and associated buildings will be demolished and an approximately 212,000 gross square foot LSB will replace the existing greenhouse site and include an approximately 19,000 gross square foot greenhouse. Care has been taken to position the LSB and greenhouse on the site to optimize the building program and minimize the impact to the significant Deodar cedars along Stevens Way, as well as the trees in the woodland grove to the east and the Burke Gilman Trail on the south.

The first floor will have an active open entry to the building at grade with Stevens Way and include 4 research/teaching laboratories. The greenhouse and loading dock are at grade with the Burke Gilman Trail and designated as the Basement 1 level. The upper four floors are modular in design consisting of 10 research labs per floor with procedural programming on the north side, laboratories in the center and offices along the south bay. The Basement 1 and Basement 2 levels house growth chambers, animal housing and research facilities. The greenhouse program is integrated into the LSB and consists of research, teaching and collections.

The new LSB, together with a new, larger greenhouse offers the Department of Biology and its faculty the opportunity to expand its faculty size and take a truly integrated approach to Biology in a highly collaborative atmosphere by bringing together faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and undergraduates with overlapping research interests.

Project Budget	
Life Sciences Building	$164,750,000
Schedule	
Predesign	June 2014 – October 2014
Design	January 2015- June 2016
Construction	July 2016 – June 2018
Occupancy	July 2018 – September 2018

Comments:

- The programmatic relationships between inside and outside were greatly appreciated.
- Edit and simplifyy to recover beauty of the original “two volume” concept; simplify the perforated pattern and the over-articulation of the south and west façades.
- The screen perforation pattern must be rationalized with the seasonal movements of the sun in order not to be purely decorative.

DRAFT

- The expression of the structure of the glass atrium wall competes with the two highly patterned elements to either side and distracts from the visibility of the atrium activity and of the featured wood covering the interior elevator wall. A simple stair would be desirable.
- Make the stair landings deep enough to accommodate bench seating. Simplify and unify the soffit beneath the stairs.
- Continue to refine the Burke Gilman Trail interface to insure the maximum distance to the greenhouse walls. The Trail experience changes suddenly from a forested path to an urban corridor.
- If the 14" wall were moved south by 2' 6', it would increase the planting area to 5', reducing the width of the gravel.
- As the two feet added to the trail has only resulted in a wider gravel path; should the building be moved back to allow the Deodar cedars maximum opportunity for survival?

Action:
A motion was tendered and seconded that design development be approved with the proviso that the perforated panel, glass atrium wall and Burke Gilman Trail concerns continue to be addressed; the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

DRAFT