DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: December 6, 2002

Meeting No. 41

ATTENDEES:
- Pamela Burton
- Edward Collins
- Sarah Fenstemaker
- Marc Fisher
- Colin Gardner
- Judith Green
- Bob Haller
- Elvin Hatch
- Joel Michaelson
- Carol Pasternack
- Barton Phelps
- Ric Williams
- Buzz Yudell

OTHERS PRESENT:
- David Alpaugh
- Ray Aronson
- Michael Bade
- Barry Berkus
- Renny Bollier
- Frank Castanha
- Julie Cunningham
- Jon Cook
- David Gonzales
- Shari Hammond
- Sue Hawkins
- Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook
- Neil Kritzinger
- David Inouye

- Scott Johnson
- Ilze Landfried
- Martie Levy
- Stuart McDaniel
- Jennifer Metz
- Melba Ortiz
- Tom Roberts
- Tye Simpson
- Ron Sorgman
- Peter Steiner
- Ron Strahl
- Bob Sundberg
- Alan Walker
- Dennis Whelan
- Jack Wolever

ITEM DESCRIPTION

1. DRC will re-address the issue of approving a standard light fixture at a future meeting.

2. Progress Review: Snidecor Office Wing Seismic Replacement
   - The A.C. Martin design for Snidecor had a fairly internalized courtyard. Is it appropriate?
   - There is concern about having a lot of object buildings in small zone. Which building should be dominant or should there be a collection of marker buildings around the space?
   - Snidecor design needed to allow for future expansion so A.C. Martin did alternate schemes but all of the schemes take out the N-S bikelane which is still needed.
   - There will be a working charrette on 12/16/02 with IPD/Johnson Fain, Sasaki and A.C. Martin, the architects of these gateway buildings.
• There are issues with the Snidecor materials palette consisting of concrete block (does not match campus block that is on existing building), Durawood screens, and plaster walls.
• Architects should consider opening up the north elevation for daylight and ventilation to studios, for animating the facade, enlivening courtyard and providing participatory space.
• Possible use of the berm for seating.
• Need for stronger expression of entry. What should be the relationship of existing entry space and courtyard?
• Snidecor needs to relate to HSSB and to HSSB theatre.
• Pardall corridor influences the design of the front of the building. Lagoon and views south influence southern side. Is the project taking advantage of view to Lagoon?
• Pedestrian flow across the site needs to be directed. Pedestrian access across bikepath needs to be considered.
• Are we missing an opportunity to create an arts & humanities corridor that has energy and definition? Are we creating a series of diverse object buildings?
• Need to consider the bicyclists’ experience entering campus and moving along the bikepath.
• It might be advantageous to flip the N and S elements of the plan. A.C. Martin to be directed that DRC is interested in the potential of the flipped scheme and interested in how a sculptured element might improve the space by the Faculty Club.
• Future presentations should have a location map that shows the campus and water context.
• We should start to overlay the landscape concept plan and determine how much of it will be built by the projects.
• Should the buildings be uniformly set back from the corridor or in different layers as suggested by Polyzoides’ West Side Plan?
• Regents will be judging Snidecor with regard to context.
• Maybe a single firm should design the landscape along the corridor.
• Charette will be opportunity to try to come to agreement on what Pardall axis should be and the relationship of the buildings to it.

3. Pre-design Review: Lot 22 Parking Structure & Extended Learning Svcs Bldg
• Parking Structure on Lot 22 is not an approved project. Area is being studied to provide information for the campus decision making process. Study is to be complete in January.
• Parking structure to have minimum 600 spaces and maximum depending on budget and configuration. Extended Learning to have 12,000 to 13,000 asf.
• There are a lot of ideas for the structure in the I.V. Study. Some are ambiguous - There is possible extension of Cordova Rd. Possible view corridor to the Events Center.
• Program for Extension seems to stack in space 60’ deep by 240’ long. About half of the program wants to be on the ground floor and the rest, administrative areas, can stack in a variety of ways. Stacking is also influenced by how the parking structure is to be obscured.
• Various schemes for the parking structure were presented. It is important for the structure to contribute to making a connection between the campus and I.V. and to net about 800 spaces.
• Parking department analysis indicates that within 8 years there will be a need for 888 - 1088 new spaces (not including spaces lost to structure footprint). Parking thinks goal should be to build 1,000 to 1,200 spaces.
• Suggested that designers study circulation and entry to the Events Center and pedestrian sequence to other parts of campus. Entry to the Events Center seems to indicate going below grade one level.
• Suggested that designers do cost analysis of laminated building element to determine how deep it should be and if lamination on north as well as south is feasible.
• Parking is expecting the parking portion of the project to be between $17 to $19 million.
• To meet budget, designers should consider building in two phases, realigning the road in the future and building the parking structures so that lamination buildings can be added later.
• A lamination on the north could provide much needed surge space.
• Two buildings with laminations on north and south and possibly on east and west, one ramp and bridges at each level seems to be best scheme. Designers should do concept plan for the north structure as a second phase. DRC interested in maximizing number of parking spaces so study should address how deep the structure should go.
• The southern lamination design will be informed by the Pardall corridor study. Work to date indicates it can be organized in a number of ways and designers showed a few schemes.
• The study will address the cost involved in removing the curve in Ocean Road. The County will be asked to present their plan for I.V. to the DRC.

4. Predesign Review: Alumni House
• Barry Berkus presented concepts for site on Lot 12 including: no loss in parking spaces, straightening out bikepath (away from Phelps), open plaza with walled area at the Arts & Letters ticket drop off, possible bridge from second level down to Campbell, and upper levels of the building taking advantage of views.
• Suggestion to place the building further north on Lot 16 at triangle of University Plaza and Mesa Road more appropriate to an object building, a marker to the entrance to campus, and it would guarantee views and possibly take away fewer parking places.
• Do not know what the change of site would mean to the LRDP and review process.
• North site does not frame open space of University Plaza and alumni house would be more remote from the center of campus and other buildings. Walking to plaza and Campbell from north site could nice.
• Timing will be an issue with alumni who have waited so long and spent money with nothing to show for it. Barry can probably convince alumni that this is a better site but he must be able to tell alumni how much it will delay the project and what additional costs will be incurred.
• North site might allow for future expansion to the south when more money is available.
• There is possibility of extending the plaza northward, which would solve drop off issue.
• Thumbnail sketches showed mortar board form, a colonnade and finned areas.
• Existing pergolas should probably be accepted as pleasant well functioning elements of the campus.
• If it is an icon building, it might be better to have fewer vocabularies but maybe it is multiple pavilions.
• Barry wants to break the forms down; have qualities of home as well as campus. Wants some sloped roofs, gables, break down the scale of the building. Lower element of the wall adapts to scale of the road, image of walled village.
• Barry to analyze north site. Question of Goleta Water easement to be investigated. Hope to confirm that review process will be the about the same for both sites.
• Barry to do some more thumbnail sketches and bring them back to DRC.
5. **Update: Masterplanning**
   - FTE Plan will be done in Mar./April, which will allow estimate of physical plant needs.
   - Suggestion that DRC master planning start in fall.
   - Since selection of consultant has been done, could consultant start sooner and help inform the capacity study or could consultant concentrate on defining corridors, design criteria or some capacity studies of certain areas.
   - Consultant could start to generate something that contributes to the upcoming campus vision presentation.
   - Consultant could start looking at ordering devices, circulation, materials palette.
   - Need to get firm started and have it stay for long term relationship with campus.
   - Will find out if Housing and Parking could pitch in some money ($35,000 each) so can ask consultant what can be done for $150,000.

Minutes were prepared by: [Signature]
Ilze Landfried

cc: Committee and Attendees

Date: 1/16/03