Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm. Design Development of the Computer Science & Engineering building was approved at the June 16, 2016 Joint meeting, but Design Development of the landscape was withheld, pending this interim review. Updates addressing comments on the building design from the June meeting were also presented. The project presentation was broadcast via web conference to those Commissioners and Committee members connected via Internet, with real-time discussion via telephone.
Overview:
The project has several primary objectives, all in support of ensuring the Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) department is able to meet the growing demand for education in this field, while also maintaining its national leading position. These objectives include providing a welcoming environment and qualitative parity between the new and existing facilities; creating a unified complex for the CSE program; fostering collaboration among faculty, students, and staff; and achieving a cost-effective project that enhances campus connections and landscape.

The Computer Science Engineering Phase II building will construct a new 135,000 GSF building to provide the added capacity required to support the anticipated growth in the College of Engineering’s Computer Science program for the next 10 years. The program includes a 240 seat lecture hall, an event space, classrooms, research space, offices for faculty and graduate students, an advising suite, coffee shop and other associated support spaces. The facility is four stories on the Stevens Way side with two below grade levels that daylight as the site slopes to the East.

The site development plan will realign and enhance Snohomish Lane to improve the connection from upper campus to the athletic complex and make pedestrian routes more accessible. The landscape design will complement the surrounding campus environment and provide a natural setting for informal interactions. The building will support bicycle friendly commuting with safe and secure bicycle storage both inside and outside the building.

The building massing curves along the north and south facades reducing the width at the constrained east and west ends of the building. The building exterior has been reconsidered from an all-metal panel system to a more varied material palette, including, glass, metal panels, and terracotta. Daylight, transparency, and a forward-looking quality are important elements for the enclosure to demonstrate.

Landscape design issues from the June meeting to be addressed included the plaza paving design, clearly indicating the pedestrian and vehicular mixing zone at the Stevens Way crossing, developing the design language and quality of the landscape spaces, as well as more fully developing the roof terrace design.

Comments:
• While it was generally agreed that extending the plaza paving across the Stevens Way crossing, without curbs, fulfills the important goal of integrating the two CSE buildings while also providing ample visual cues to drivers and pedestrians, faculty and student representatives requested further exploration to ensure the safest street crossing conditions possible. The Mason way crossing must be well-considered, as well.
• Sandblasted exposed aggregate will not withstand vehicular traffic; consider simulating the continuing pattern from the plaza paving with stain or some other means.
• Salvaged wood benches will require more maintenance than is feasible. Consider teak or a similar wood.
• Be certain storm water flow across the site adheres to new City code.
• The new ADA ramp design was appreciated.
• Continue to refine the design language of the landscape to create a more holistic whole.
• Is it possible to incorporate a boardwalk from the usable rooftop deck to the “prow” of the building, working within City codes, perhaps repurposing the route to the fire stair?
• Reconsider the placement of the elements in the Mondrian-inspired rooftop composition; there may be better placement options than are dictated by the necessity of hiding service elements.

Action:
A motion was tendered and seconded that design development of the landscape be approved; a vote was unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 pm.