



Office of Finance and Business
Facilities
Office of the University Architect

Campus Box 7519
2701 Sullivan Drive, Suite 330
Raleigh, NC 27695-7519
P: 919.515.8052

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING AGENDA – December 3, 2014
Primrose Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 3:30 PM

Attendees: Robin Abrams Gene Bressler Gayle Lanier
Steve Arndt Eric Hawkes Jennifer Mohr
Carolyn Axtman Lisa Johnson Randall Ramsey
Tim Blair Brian Jones Julieta Sherk
Brian Boothe Sumayya Jones-Humienny Tom Skolnicki

Additional Michael Davidson; Chris Gould; and Mike Harwood.
Distribution:

Approval of Minutes

The November meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Conference Center and Hotel, Submittal #017

Site: Centennial Campus Precinct
Designer Name: Cooper Carry Architects
Developer: Nobel Investments + Concord Eastridge
Project Manager: Brian Jones

- a) This is the second Panel review for the Conference Center and Hotel, named the “State View.”
- b) Project Description: The hotel is an Autograph by Marriott branded facility of approximately 164 rooms on four guestroom levels. The hotel program includes public spaces, hotel support areas, ground level fitness center and an out-door pool and terrace that is designed as an integral part of the landscape and existing natural character of the site. The project includes a one-story,

conference facility with a large ballroom that can be divided into smaller salons, and a series of smaller rooms, also divisible. Adjacent to the pre-function area of the ballroom is a large event terrace that has views to the Park Alumni Center and Lake Raleigh. The project includes about 237 on-grade terraced parking spaces. The facility will be LEED Silver Certified.

- c) Master Plan Summary: The Conference Center is a key amenity in the development of the Centennial Campus. It will complete the hospitality neighborhood and provide a pedestrian connection across the Lake Raleigh dam to the future town center. The project will enhance the shared open space between the Park Alumni Center and the Conference Center.
- d) The Design Team presented the updated revisions based on the panel feedback from the 10/29/2014 CDRP meeting.

Presentation and Panel Discussion:

1. The branding effort should incorporate the essence of the university's mission - teaching, learning, research and public engagement – in addition to the cornerstones mentioned: spirit of the pack; technology, public private partnership and sustainability.
2. The topography from the high point, where the building is located, drops ~50' to the low point at the sewer easement. The parking lot is arranged in terraced tiers with sloped, planted medians to minimize site retaining walls and a universal design ramp allows for handicapped access across the parking bays to the front entry. These are good site design solutions.
3. To maximize green space, parking is shared with existing facilities resulting in fewer spaces being provided than the City of Raleigh's zoning requires.
4. The brick mass above the glazed meeting rooms needs to be grounded by bringing brick columns to grade. The brick mass above the open area adjacent to the Event Terrace and Prefunction spaces should also be enclosed to ground the brick.
5. It may be more effective to see collaboration between meeting rooms instead of from the outside (example: Hunt Library multipurpose and conference rooms) and direct views to the natural areas rather than the parking lot.
6. The roof above the ballroom needs a very well thought-out solution that takes sun and other conditions into account. It could use small green roof sections organized into radials, or art pieces with movement/change (example: the Shimmer Wall at the downtown convention center), daylighting, etc. If a green roof is not possible at this time, consider sizing the roof structure to accommodate a future green roof or green roof areas.
7. Explore the use of sustainable practices for the building. There may be an opportunity to put some daylighting, solar collectors, wind generators, and/or solar hot water heaters on the roof by taking advantage of research groups on campus. Initiatives or methods used could be displayed in the lobby.
8. The stair leading from the lobby/terrace to the pool event area needs to be grander, more interesting and detailed.
9. There is an opportunity to make a stronger connection between the Conference Center and Park Alumni Center in the pavement and planting designs to integrate them for a unified campus feel. What is shown in the landscape plan is not what is happening now at Park Alumni. The Alumni Center is not in the scope of this project, but the Conference Center could set the stage as to what is implemented later towards Park Alumni. The University should create a path that connects to the greenway.
10. It would be helpful to see views (in the SketchUp model) from particular places instead of bird's eye views. For example, from the third floor of the Hunt Library, from the restaurant section of the Poole Clubhouse, etc.
11. The sidewalk on the northern side of the parking lot needs to be made more explicit.

Panel Action:

1. *Entry Elevation: Consider treating the southern end of the building base similarly to the northern end by bringing the masonry to the ground. Larger window openings that provide views to natural areas are appropriate in the meeting room. Masonry at the conference center end of the building will allow the conference center all-glass entrance to be more prominent. Also consider a higher level of detailing at the top of the metal panel wall to keep it from feeling top-heavy and give thought to how it will be lit at night.*
2. *Consider using interior glass in the conference center meeting rooms' corridor walls to enliven the pre-function space and showcase collaboration activities.*
3. *Lakeside Elevation: The large expanse of roof above the conference center will negatively impact views to the lake from the hotel rooms. Consider design alternatives that provide dynamic visual interest across the roof. Partial green roof options should be explored.*
4. *Lakeside Elevation: The covered area on the ground floor that connects to the Alumni Center path doesn't blend well with the rest of the building design.*
5. *Lakeside: The exterior stair from the lobby terrace to the pool deck should be a graceful feature. The stair should be a generous width with detailing that makes it special.*
6. *Provide walls sections that show the depth of the windows and brick elements. The elevations appear rich in brick detailing, which should be three dimensional to create shadow lines.*
7. *Explore more options for daylighting in the building and other sustainable design elements, such as solar panels, etc.*
8. *Site: Continue efforts to minimize the retaining walls on the east side of the parking lot.*
9. *Site: Set the stage for future design efforts to create a strong vehicular and pedestrian connection to the Park Alumni Building. Consider pedestrian path connections from the terrace to the pool deck and/or other opportunities to explore the site. Trees in the parking lot islands need to be shade specimens.*
10. *Provide exterior materials and color palette information.*

Status of Projects in Planning

The Brickyard West ADA Path and the Textile Innovation Center will be reviewed next.

Next Meeting

January 28th will be the first meeting in 2015. The meeting will begin at 1:30 in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES – October 29, 2014
Primrose Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Michael Davidson
	Steve Arndt	Chris Gould
	Carolyn Axtman	Michael Harwood
	Tim Blair	Eric Hawkes
	Gene Bressler	Lisa Johnson

Additional Distribution: Brian Boothe, Gayle Lanier, Sumayya Jones-Humienny, Randy Ramsey, Julie Sherk, and Tom Skolnicki

Guests: Brian Jones, Kevin Grass, Doug Viehman, Rob Uhrin, Jon Cakert, Brian O’Haver and Jennifer Mohr

Approval of Minutes

August meeting minutes approved.

Project for Review

Conference Center and Hotel, Submittal #017

Site: Centennial Campus Precinct
Designer Name: Cooper Carry Architects
Developer: Nobel Investments + Concord Eastridge
Project Manager: Brian Jones

- **Project Description:** The hotel is an Autograph by Marriott branded facility of approximately 164 rooms on four guestroom levels. The hotel program includes public spaces, hotel support areas, ground level fitness center and an out-door pool and terrace that is designed as an integral part of the landscape and existing natural character of the site. The project includes a one-story, conference facility with a large ballroom that can be divided into smaller salons, and a series of smaller rooms, also divisible. Adjacent to the pre-function area of the ballroom is a large event terrace that has views to the Park Alumni Center and Lake Raleigh. The project includes about 237 on-grade terraced spaces. The facility will be LEED Silver Certified.
- **Master Plan Summary:** The Conference Center is a key amenity in the development of the Centennial Campus. It will complete the hospitality neighborhood and provide a pedestrian connection across the Lake Raleigh dam to the future town center. The project will enhance the shared open space between the Park Alumni Center and the Conference Center.
- **Site:** Parking bays will step with the site contours to create smaller parking areas in lieu of a sea of parking. Diagonal "strikes" create the processional from parking to building, mirrored in architecture of building. There is a separate drive for service and loading. A cascade of planting areas step down to the service area on the lower level. A series of gardens and paths will connect the hotel to the Park Alumni Center.
- **Elevations:** Exterior building material will be from a palette that is familiar to Centennial Campus: glass, metal and masonry. The architecture has traditional elements with a modern

interpretation: columns, stacked windows, and masonry. There are two entry points, the primary, for the hotel, is glass tower expression that can be seen from a distance and the secondary, for the conference center. The all glass top is a reference to other buildings on campus which is not typical of a hotel but related to campus. The main hotel lobby has a visual connection to Lake Raleigh.

Panel Discussion

- Guest movement through the site to the Hotel and Conference Center needs further development. More attention should be given to guest arrival and path to the Conference Center entrance. The angled walk works great for the Hotel, but another walk for the Conference Center will discourage pedestrian damage to the landscaping.
- Bus circulation through the entry and parking space needs further development.
- All the focus on the NC State branding on the interior needs to be reflected on the exterior.
- Glass entry piece is fairly flat. The architect is challenged to consider the large expanses of glass and add more detailing to add interest. The NC State branding could be reflected through the entry glass.
- The building base material needs to be warm, not as light as shown in renderings.
- The exterior design looks like many other academic or research buildings on campus. The unique program should be reflected in the design with a more residential character.
- The design should use the site as a machine as much as possible. NC State strives to be the leading technology school in the east and this requires advanced ideas. The landscape architect should use these methods (grey water, etc.) when possible to show innovation.
- NC State wants the ability to hold important conferences that deal with state of the art research and procedures, the building should be a reflection of NC State's innovation. Centennial Campus is about forward-thinking.
- For new guests arriving to campus, the Hotel and Conference Center is their first impression of NC State. The building design should make a strong statement about NC State.
- The great views to the lake and to the rest of campus should be enhanced and the design should set the stage for the future Lake Raleigh pedestrian bridge to Town Center.
- The Hotel rooms facing the lake have views across the large ballroom roof; an attractive roof material or a program that would work for this roof-top space is preferable.

Panel Action:

1. *Provide site sections through the lake for a better understanding of the topography; sections through parking, retaining walls, loading dock, and other important areas; and building sections.*
2. *Provide landscape concept plans for a better understanding of the overall landscape vision.*
3. *Consideration should be given to using the site as a living machine incorporating more sustainable site design features, including the existing storm water pond.*
4. *A 'SketchUp' model would be helpful for looking at the building from a variety of view sheds. The view of the building from Achievement Drive is important, as well as across the lake from the future Town Center site.*

5. *Develop the design for guest movement to the Conference Center entrance from the parking lot and bus drop off area.*
6. *Integrate ideas of innovation and NC State branding into the exterior of the Hotel and Conference Center. The design should feel fun, innovative and creative. It should not be the typical hotel or campus building. The design can achieve a residential feel with the right materials and detailing. A higher level of detail should be incorporated in the glazing system.*
7. *Re-evaluate the design of the ballroom roof so it is functional and attractive for the rooms that have views to it.*

2014 Physical Master Plan Distribution

The Master Plan books were distributed. The group is challenged to review the master plan for feedback and discussion at the next meeting.

Status of Projects in Planning

There continue to be limited projects for review.

Next Meeting

December 3rd will be the last meeting in 2014. The meeting will begin at 1:30 in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.

Office of the University Architect
NC State University
Campus Box 7519
Raleigh, NC 27695-7519
(919) 515-6258

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
August 27, 2014
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:

Robin Abrams	Lisa Johnson
Steve Arndt	Gayle Lanier
Carolyn Axtman	Randall Ramsey
Chris Gould	Julieta Sherk
Mike Harwood	Tom Skolnicki
Eric Hawkes	

Additional Distribution: Gene Bressler, Tim Blair, Brian Boothe, Mike Davidson, and Sumayya Jones-Humienny.

Approval of the Minutes:

The March 26, 2014 meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Textiles Innovation Center #135

Site: Centennial Campus Precinct, at the corner of Main Campus Drive and Research Drive

Design-Build Team: Keystone Corporation with Hager Smith Design PA

Landscape Architect: Hager Smith Design PA

Project Manager: Harlan Stafford

- This is the first Panel review for the Textiles Innovation Center.
- Project Description: This first phase of the project is a Development Feasibility Study (DFS) which will determine the project budget. The proposed facility is located on approximately 2.56 acres at the southwest corner of Main Campus Drive and Research Drive. The proposed 102,370 GSF building includes 41,880 GSF of space for the Nonwoven Innovation Pilot Facility and 60,490 GSF of private market rate office space for lease. The project includes structured parking sufficient for the new building and the relocation of the existing parking.
- Site Description. Grades fall 30 feet from east to west. Existing loading docks to the College of Textiles will remain accessible through the site. The project is maintaining and using the existing underground BMP (immediately north of the College of Textiles.)
- Building Description: 40,000 GSF floor plate is aligned with the face of Venture I Building. High bay space of 20' in height is needed for the large equipment at the pilot facility. A mezzanine (2nd floor) is at the south end of the high bay space houses the offices for the institute. Building design accommodates possibility to add floors to extend the second floor area in case the high bay space is no longer needed in the future.

Panel Discussion:

1. The pedestrian connection from College of Textiles is neither direct nor wide enough to handle the traffic from the college. Separate pedestrians from the loading area.
2. Ground floor entrance on the west side needs to be strengthened.
3. The proposed Hearth is in a location where it would likely not be used. It would be more successful to make it a pleasant transition space.
4. Add some layering of the landscape to the north façade.
5. The south façade of the parking deck may need some brick on the columns.

6. We would like to see the BMP at the west end of the site be a better representation of the way NC State handles storm water. Consider using the space south of the building to handle some of the storm water.
7. The pattern of openings on the parking deck on the north façade show the inconsistency of the way the columns are handled on the east façade. The proportions need to be similar on all facades. Consider the views of the deck from the college, and provide more consistency in all of the deck facades.
8. It would be more interesting to celebrate the industrial work going on inside the building. Celebrate the corner where the 50 foot high bay is located. It does not need to be highly transparent.

Panel Action: the Panel recommended approval subject to the following design directives:

1. *Consider further design options for the pedestrian path through the site that connects the College of Textiles plaza stair to Research Drive. Provide a wider safe path past the building loading/service area.*
2. *Most of the people that work in the building will enter via the west entrance. Enhance the design of this entrance and the pedestrian walk across the vehicular path to the building entrance.*
3. *Reduce the amount of paving in the exterior seating area on the southeast corner of the building. This area will work better as a landscaped area with some benches.*
4. *Provide a landscape plan focusing on adjacent context and the Main Campus Drive Street Tree Master Plan.*
5. *Evaluate the opportunity for a storm water BMP between the new building and the existing College of Textiles building.*
6. *Revise the window proportions on the west elevation to better relate to the window proportions on the rest of the building.*
7. *Investigate shifting the roof screen away from the roof parapet to allow some separation between the parapet and the screen.*
8. *Consider design alternatives for the southeast corner of the building that celebrate the industrial nature of the building and the high-bay space within.*
9. *Parking Deck: There is very little design continuity between the building elevations and the deck elevations. Provide design alternatives that tie the two facilities together. All four deck elevations should work together for a consistent design. Consider ways to create horizontal lines that minimize the visual impact of the sloped deck levels on the building elevations.*

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that the next project due for review in October will be the Hotel and Conference Center, to go to the November 20th Board of Trustees meeting for site plan approval.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for October 29th from 1:30 – 4:00. The September meeting will more than likely be canceled due to a lack of agenda items.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
March 26, 2014
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees: Robin Abrams Lisa Johnson
Carolyn Axtman Sumayya Jones-Humienny
Mike Davidson Michael Lipitz
Chris Gould Randall Ramsey
Mike Harwood Tom Skolnicki

Additional Distr.: Gene Bressler; Tim Blair; Brian Boothe; Kyle Dell; Gayle Lanier; Kevin MacNaughton; Julieta Sherk

Approval of the Minutes:

The February 26, 2014 meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Indoor Practice Facility #130

Site: West Campus Precinct, at the corner of Westchase Blvd. and Stadium Dr.

Design-Build Team: Corley Redfoot Architects / 360 Architecture with TA Loving Construction

Landscape Architect: Kimley-Horn & Associates

Project Manager: Steve Bostian

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Indoor Practice Facility.
- b) Site Description:
 - i) The gravesite located on the project site, which is east of Carter Finley Stadium and south of the outdoor football practice fields, has received approval for relocation and is in the process of being moved.
 - ii) This project's proximity to the outdoor practice facility coupled with its connection to an outdoor plaza facilitates movement to its primary entry and strengthens the campus feel. A future pedestrian path to Blue Ridge Road will accommodate east-west pedestrian movement as part of the Blue Ridge Corridor Plan (but is not part of this project.)
 - iii) The west side will have street trees sited to frame views of the building, plus foundation landscaping and hardscaping at the northeast corner.
 - iv) There will be a generous walk/plaza on the NE corner to connect pedestrians to the outdoor practice field.
 - v) The east side will have artificial turf to stand up to heavy foot traffic and tailgating, new parking, and emergency vehicle staging. Future development will connect a pedestrian path to the stadium.
 - vi) The southwest area of the site has a bio retention pond, which is not really necessary, but will extend east to combine with a storm water management best management practice to address current and future parking lots.
 - vii) The plaza will have artificial turf, shade trees (in urban tree grates) and sustainable low-water demand plantings to enhance the hardscaping.
- c) Building Description:
 - i) For visual cues and the material palette, the surrounding context was surveyed. The most salient building is the Murphy Center, which has light gray and white metal panels separated by reveals, tan and black colored brick, minimal use of NC State red in its banding, and a

- slightly curved front with eyebrow windows above. These elements informed the design of the Indoor Practice Facility.
- ii) The primary entry occurs at the SE corner. The east side has a public storefront entry and the east and west sides have glazed-panel roll-up doors for player entries. The NE corner has a rollup door and high-bay entry for equipment movement and maintenance service.
 - iii) The building has a 400' x 215' footprint with a 60' clear span in the middle of building. The structure is expressed on the exterior elevations to add vertical elements that offset the long horizontal span. The downspouts are hidden inside these vertical elements.
 - iv) Proportional harmony is used to relate the 12' high brick base to the overall 45' tall tripartite elevational composition.
 - v) Players enter through 12' x 12' roll-up garage type doors with fixed, transparent panels; these will also provide natural cross-breeze ventilation when opened.
 - vi) Daylighting is provided at the four corners with translucent panels and clerestory glazing at each recessed bay door panel.
 - vii) To achieve LEED credit for a light colored roof, a light gray standing seam metal roof will be used.
 - viii) An overhang at the gable ends will shield the building from the sun.
- d) Panel Discussion:
- i) The large gable ends can be rigged to attach changeable scrim banners for athletic events, rather than permanent signage.
 - ii) It is important that the lobby be big enough to accommodate 100+ high school students for recruiting purposes and donor visits.
 - iii) The parking lot needs to accommodate numerous buses and vans.
 - iv) Currently there are no security issues but additional site lighting will be installed.
 - v) Strengthen the tie to the All Campus Path south of the facility.
 - vi) Future plans to improve the parking lots include working towards Kimley Horn's master plan study to clean up the odd geometry for better traffic flow and control.
 - vii) This project goes to the Board of Trustees Buildings and Property next month for approval in June.
- e) Panel Action: the Panel recommended approval subject to the following design directives:
- i) *It is hard to distinguish which entrance is the main building entrance. Consider adding brick around the main building entrance to provide a better visual cue.*
 - ii) *The red accent stripe should have a consistent location on all four building elevations. Adding the accent stripe to the north and south elevations could provide another level of detail that seems to be missing on these two elevations.*
 - iii) *Consider extending the curved exterior wall panel further east to better hide the service entrance.*
 - iv) *The east-west path, located on the south side of the site and that will eventually connect to Blue Ridge Road, should be a brick-branded path.*
 - v) *Investigate other branding opportunities in addition to the Block "S" on the four corners of the east and west elevations.*
 - vi) *The exterior materials will match the Murphy Center material and color palette but final material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by The Office of the University Architect.*

2) Morrill Drive Entrance #131

Site: Central Campus Precinct, at the corner of Western Blvd. and Morrill Drive.

Landscape Architect: Sears Design Group

Project Manager: Lynn Swank

- a) This is the second Panel review for the Morrill Drive Entry.

b) Project Introduction:

- i) The difference between “campus edges” and “gateways” is subtle: both are part of consistent treatment of campus edges, but gateways are larger-scale entrances with welcoming elements that include signage. NC State needs more gateways than other campuses because we have more edges, given our extensive property boundaries; therefore, the goal is to make each gateway distinct, yet recognizable, with a consistent application of branding.
- ii) The next gateway project will be the Stinson Roundabout, which incorporates hardscape and landscape features.
- iii) To recap the previous gateway implementations:
 - (1) The Watauga Club Dr. Gateway used the more traditional elements of wrought iron picket rails, and brick markers with stone caps because of its more historical building context.
 - (2) The Dan Allen Dr. Gateway has edge branding elements with 42” short markers that repeat in front of the Poole College of Management.
 - (3) The Varsity Drive Gateway has a similar kit of parts with columns, but has an arbor for distinctive character, plus a precinct sign. The precinct signs have changed by placing the Central Campus Precinct name on the smaller red blade and the NC State University name on the larger white blade to incorporate the “one-campus concept” for unification of all precincts under one university brand. This initiative addresses the broad misconception that the West Campus and Centennial Campus precincts are not part of “main” campus.
 - (4) The Varsity Dr. Gateway to Centennial Campus Precinct is somewhat different, with the lighter metal palette that is used throughout Centennial Campus.
 - (5) The Achievement Dr. Gateway to Centennial Campus Precinct is similar to The Varsity Dr. gateway, and both reach out along the streetscapes.
 - (6) The Trailwood Dr. Gateway to Centennial Campus Precinct metal is used in a different way with a horizontal span.

c) Project Description:

- i) The Morrill Dr. Gateway has a new look that moves the columns closer to Western to make more of a statement and be more visible to vehicles.
- ii) Previous Panel review comments included: the need to be more welcoming; the use of too much brick; and a heavy appearance. The redesign has scaled down, simplified, and reduced the number of columns to create more of a pedestrian gateway.
- iii) The landscaping has been extended along Western Blvd.’s right-of-way with more dense plantings at the gateway and more landscaping closer to Western Blvd.
- iv) To address the scale and traffic speed of Western Blvd., larger 16’-0” tall columns define the pedestrian threshold on the Morrill Dr. sides, with a dark metal arch, similar to the ironwork used elsewhere, spanning over the sidewalks to 12’-0” tall columns, which define the threshold on the landscaped sides. These columns are now almost 4’-0” wide to give proportional weight to the taller columns and have recessed brick detailing.
- v) A low brick wall connects the 16’-0” tall columns with the 3’-0” tall markers, increasing the depth of the whole composition, to reinforce the direction of pedestrian traffic and discourage crossing at non cross-walk areas. The wall has brick rowlock detailing and the sidewalk has the Block S insignia incorporated into the pavers.
- vi) The precinct sign is now on the east side to mirror image the precinct sign at the Varsity Dr. Gateway.

d) Panel Discussion:

- i) The changes are a nice improvement and justified by the width of Western Blvd.
- ii) The Western Blvd. design needs to be extended to incorporate the City of Raleigh’s bus stop, which currently does not have a sidewalk – this issue needs to be discussed with the City.
- iii) This design helps delineate the exit from campus as well, as a cue for vehicles to be aware of pedestrian traffic.

- e) Panel Action: the Panel recommended approval subject to the following design directives:
 - i) *Move the block 'S' in the brick path to the southern side (Western Blvd. side) of the gateway for greater visibility.*
 - ii) *Consider smaller column options for the column north of the 16-foot column.*
 - iii) *Add at least two more 3-foot markers to the grouping on the west side of Morrill Drive.*
 - iv) *Create a consistent pattern with the 5 trees on the west side of Morrill Drive.*
 - v) *Investigate options for the arched metal lintel other than tubular steel. Consider a cast metal lintel.*
 - vi) *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by The Office of the University Architect.*

3) Pullen Streetscape Roundabout #133

Site: North Campus Precinct, at the corner of Pullen Rd. and Stinson Dr. and Morrill Drive.

Landscape Designer: Lynn Swank

Project Manager: Lynn Swank

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Pullen Rd Streetscape Roundabout.
- b) Project Description:
 - i) The goal is to strengthen the campus edge along Pullen Rd. with hardscape and plantings.
 - ii) The scale of the existing plantings is off – it overwhelms the sidewalk – and needs to be appropriately scaled. 2'-1/2" tall Dwarf Hollies are proposed.
 - iii) The Yaupon Hollies at the Stinson Dr. crosswalk median get hit routinely by trucks. Removing the plantings at the median and bricking it over is proposed.
 - iv) A total of ten columns are proposed to mark the campus at the intersection of Pullen Rd. and Stinson Dr.:
 - (1) Four 6'-0" tall columns, with 6" caps, 18" precast bases, and Block S insignias facing the road and campus side, will mark the crosswalk threshold on Stinson Dr.
 - (2) Two groups of 3'-0" tall columns connected by metal rails will frame the semi-circular planting bed in front of Brooks Hall. More brick pavement at south side of planting bed will address the "pig path" and reinforce symmetry of plant bed.
 - (3) The plantings palette will include white-flowering shrubs (Viburnum and Creeping Raspberry) and trees (Snow Bell) as well as red-flowering perennials (Dianthus).
- c) Panel Discussion:
 - i) The question arose as to dressing up the wall in front of Winslow Hall equipment yard. The planting strip is too narrow, but options for the wall need to be revisited.
 - ii) Given the modernist history of Kamphoefner Hall (it had the first application of curtain wall in the country) and the modernist philosophy of the College of Design, a treatment other than metal pickets is needed between the 3'-0" tall columns. Incorporating art would be preferred.
- d) Panel Action: the Panel recommended approval subject to the following design directives:
 - i) *Consider more up-right plantings on the northern side of Stinson Drive to better tie to the southern side of the Stinson Drive Pullen Road intersection.*
 - ii) *Incorporate more plantings near the two western-most 6-foot tall columns.*
 - iii) *Investigate taller column options for the four 6-foot tall columns.*
 - iv) *In lieu of metal rail between the 3-foot tall markers consider using art for the rail that speaks to the adjacent College of Design neighborhood. The markers can be installed without the metal rail and the art can be installed at a later date. Involve Robin Abrams in the art design effort.*
 - v) *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by The Office of the University Architect.*

4) Ricks Hall Exterior Improvements #134

Site: North Campus Precinct, at the intersection of Founders Dr. and Lampe Dr.
Architect: HH Architecture
Project Manager: Steve Bostian

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Ricks Hall Exterior Improvements.
- b) Project Description:
 - i) The goal is to make the new thermally-insulated windows appear the same as the existing single pane windows. There are two color options that remain for consideration:
 - (1) clear anodized aluminum
 - (2) bone white painted wood
 - ii) The current campus standard calls for anodized aluminum thermally-insulated windows, but Ricks is different due to its more historical, traditional design with true divided-light windows.
 - iii) The campus standard calls for operable windows only when there is ownership and control of the space in office space. Operable mullions are thicker, especially where the mullions adjoin.
 - iv) Wood windows will require removal of the existing sashes plus more frequent maintenance for painting.
 - v) Steel is three times more expensive and did not fit within the project budget.
 - vi) Aluminum has a precedent on campus and goes directly over the existing steel sashes, but it cannot touch or it will cause corrosion over time due to galvanic action from dissimilar materials.
 - vii) The panels between the windows are painted tin. Painting them a lighter color is recommended or getting a stock prepainted flat panel.
 - viii) The long-term plan for the Ricks Hall Addition is demolition, so window replacement is not part of this project's scope.
 - ix) In section, the window goes over the top of the sash but maintains the existing depth from the brick face – the reveal depth reduces from about 4" to 3-3/4".
 - x) The window areaways are 14'-0" at the deepest part and 7'-0" deep at the shallowest part. They are used for fresh air intake and for physical access for repair and replacement of mechanical equipment on the First Floor.
 - xi) The west side must be excavated for basement wall condition waterproofing on the First Floor.
 - xii) A new mechanical system is planned for the 3rd Floor as part of this project's scope and budget. An area on the First Floor is being designated for equipment for a future mechanical upgrade for the rest of the building.
- c) Panel Discussion:
 - i) The aluminum option for windows and grating was preferred.
- d) Panel Action: the Panel recommended approval subject to the following design directives:
 - i) *Consider options for the painted panel between the second and third floor windows that minimizes maintenance.*
 - ii) *The Panel preferred the clear anodized aluminum finish for the new windows.*

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that the next project due for review in either July or August will be the Non-Wovens Pilot Facility, to go to the September Board of Trustees for approval.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for July 30th from 1:30 – 4:00. *Follow-up note: The July meeting was canceled. The next Panel meeting is now scheduled for August 27th from 1:30 – 4:00.*

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
February 26, 2014
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Sumayya Jones-Humienny
	Tim Blair	Gayle Lanier
	Brian Boothe	Kevin MacNaughton
	Chris Gould	Tom Skolnicki
	Mike Harwood	Lisa Johnson

Additional Distribution: Carolyn Axtman; Gene Bressler; Mike Davidson; Michael Lipitz; Randy Ramsey; and Julieta Sherk

Approval of the Minutes:

The September 25, 2013 meeting minutes were approved with one edit under d) Action Items v) to read: Final material selections will be reviewed and approved by the *Office of the University Architect*.

Projects for Review:

1. Reynolds Coliseum Renovation #128

Site: Central Campus Precinct, at the end of Dunn Avenue.

Architect: Corley Redfoot Architects / 360 Architecture

Landscape Architect: OBS Landscape Architects

Project Manager: Bill Davis

- a) This is the second Panel review for the Reynolds Coliseum Renovation.
- a) Eric Maxwell with 360 Architects reviewed the comments made at the February 26th CDRP review and noted the following revisions to the design in response:
 - i) To provide better pedestrian flow to the north entry of Reynolds, the east-west sidewalk width from back of existing columns to steps was increased to 4'-6" (from 18" previously) and the stoop depth is now 5'-6" at the ticket windows, which provides enough space for at least 2 people to queue up. Stainless steel handrails were added to the steps and centered on the door openings to allow circulation to flow around them. The ramp previously died into the southwest corner of the building but is now pulled out to allow more space at the top of the platform. Athletics may not use that western-most ticket window to avoid crowding during big events.
 - ii) The exterior ramp is a sloped floor ($\geq 1:20$) rather than a true ramp (between 1:12 and 1:20). The cheek wall is now stepped to function as a seat wall at 18" and 32" above finished grade.
 - iii) The ticket window infill is now precast versus metal panel. The question is whether to match the adjacent limestone or stoop granite since neither will be an exact match.
 - iv) The front exterior doors have been revised to reflect the panelized language of the existing wood panel doors by putting glazed insets into the panel frames. This allows more light into the lobby and provides better visibility (and safety) to see who is on other side.
 - v) On the remainder of the east, west and south doors, clear anodized door panels and glazed insets with sidelights of varying widths will be used to infill different masonry openings. All door leaves are a consistent 42" in width.
 - vi) The doors shown in the 2nd option with each side hinged on the same side are preferable to those shown with opposing side hinges, but it was noted that this won't be perceived, given the

deep inset below and solid masonry rail above, in reality – the drawing is cut away to show the full elevation.

- vii) There is a cost savings to use anodized aluminum doors instead of wood throughout.
- viii) The SE overhead garage door moves to the NE and now honors the symmetrical composition throughout the building. It can become a glass overhead garage door to allow more daylight in. The garage overhead door on the W side will be replaced with similar windows and the existing opening with the existing overhead door will be renovated back to 2 man doors. The S portal will be infilled with a single door pattern that remains the same.

b) **Discussion:**

The Panel made the following comments:

- i) The proposed ramp needs to make more of a welcoming gesture at the bottom by widening it. Extending the back wall would also help and provide an opportunity for branding.
- ii) At the ticket windows, both precast color options should be pursued, but use crushed granite versus pigment in the concrete mix.
- i) Whether the south side doors should be red was debated since so many people approach from that side – perhaps this be can explored as an alternate; however, it may send the wrong message as to where the public entry is. It may become the students' entry, but it will not be an accessible entry.

b) **Action:**

The Panel recommends approval provided that the following design directives are incorporated:

- i) *Review options for providing a more generous entrance to the exterior ramp. Consider extending the back (south) wall of the ramp and providing a larger entry landing. Provide skateboard deterrents on all low walls.*
- ii) *Offset the ramp wall from the corner of the building to express the building corner to grade.*
- iii) *Explore adding another level of detail to the transom window above the exterior doors that complements the door design.*
- iv) *Consider red doors similar to the north entrance at the south entrance.*
- v) *Final exterior material selections should be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*

2. Delta Gamma House #132

Site: South Campus Precinct, Lot 4 in Greek Village

Architect: Cline Design Associates

Landscape Architect: Cline Design Associates

Project Manager: Lisa Johnson

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Delta Gamma Sorority House.
- b) Shelly Brown Dobek with Greek Life noted that a kickoff with campus partners is scheduled in 2 weeks. Two new houses have already been built near this one.
- c) Jim Compton with Cline design gave an overview of the Greek Village master plan and the project:
 - i) Lot 4 is located at the corner of Leadership Dr. (running N-S) and Greek Village Dr. (running E-W) which are the connectors to the rest of campus.
 - ii) The existing Greek Village houses are being demolished and replaced with more traditional style larger houses.
 - iii) Lot 4 slopes front to back by 8' and this 3-level design takes advantage of the grade differential to provide an informal entry from the rear parking lot at the lowest level, the Ground Floor.
 - iv) The grand front porch announces the main entry on the First Floor, with steps in front and an accessible ramp to the east, to bridge the 3-1/2' grade difference between the sidewalk and the finish floor elevation (FFE).

- v) The landscape plan's foundation shrubs and patio plantings are complemented by street trees already there.
- vi) The massing of the house is broken down to more human scale elements by the corner bay windows, the public and private porches, and the beacon element visible from Leadership Dr. from the rear approach. The mechanical units are screened from view in a roof-top well.
- vii) The material palette consists of: cream-colored brick and columns on the Ground and First Floors; cementitious fiber siding on the bay and on portions of the First and Second Floors; wood columns on the Second Floor; and a combination of asphalt shingles and standing seam roofing.
- viii) There are 12 beds on the First Floor and 29 beds on Second Floor with laundry facilities also on the Second Floor.

c) **Discussion:**

The Panel made the following comments:

- i) Although the project involves a land lease, the CDRP's role is to review the design based on the agreed-upon Greek Village Housing Association standards, which give guidance on the building size, setbacks, material palette and overall traditional residential character. Each house is to have its own individual look while complying with the standards.
- ii) The design was approved by the Greek Village Housing Association last week.
- iii) As for energy expectations, it is the client who drives the level of energy conservation.
- iv) A private entry for the house director's apartment is important for privacy and for not disrupting activities within the main portion of the house.

e) **Action:**

The Panel recommends approval provided that the following design directives are incorporated:

- i) *Provide more architectural consistency on the Leadership Drive elevation.*
- ii) *Give the long switch-back ramp another purpose other than accessibility by providing an entrance door for the house director at the landing.*
- iii) *Verify whether or not the west building set back line is parallel with Leadership Drive. If so, angle the house to provide more separation from the adjacent house.*
- iv) *Provide sustainable design features that will be incorporated in the design.*
- v) *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*

Note: Two Panel members, Robin Abrams and Chris Gould abstained from voting on this project.

2) **Morrill Drive Entrance #131**

Site: Central Campus Precinct, at the intersection of Morrill Drive and Western Boulevard

Landscape Architect: Sears Design Group

Project Manager: Lynn Swank

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Reynolds Coliseum Renovation.
- b) Lynn Swank noted that the Sears Design Group also designed the Avent Ferry / Western Boulevard and Watauga Club Drive gateway projects. This project is the first partnership for a gateway; it is being funded by Athletics and Administration.
- c) Dan Sears gave an overview of the project:
 - i) The design challenges include a wider street cross-section with faster vehicular traffic than other campus gateway conditions, plus an undefined campus edge.
 - ii) The design, using the kit-of-parts approach, meets 11 of the 13 stipulated gateway goals.

- iii) The intent is to give the gateway more vertical height for visibility from the road with pyramidal-shaped trellis roofs, then transition to markers that step down with tapering vertical pickets on base walls for a more human scale.
- iv) The differential in grade is reconciled by scooping out the east embankment to mirror the west side condition of Morrill Drive.
- v) The NC State logo under the pergola elements and inset brick in the pavement are proposed as a threshold to define the campus edge.
- vi) Lawn in front of the gate element is proposed. Some trees are to be removed but the evergreens behind will remain.
- vii) White-blooming camellias with some perennials are proposed for plant material color and the rest is to be ground cover for relatively easy maintenance.
- viii) The plant materials extend the wall edge to frame the entry.

d) **Discussion:**

The Panel made the following comments:

- i) The renderings do not show the true intent of the design: the coloration of the trellis appears black while it is supposed to be bronze, and the roof members are rendered more like a solid mass than the open –air structure that it is, giving an overall effect that is heavy and guard-like. The design needs to be more welcoming in character.

e) **Action:**

The Panel recommends a second review to address the following design directives:

- i) *Provide design solution alternatives for the portal/trellis structures that are more contemporary.*
- ii) *Re-evaluate the height of the columns and fencing.*
- iii) *Decrease the amount of low brick walls and consider allowing a diagonal path from Jordan Hall to the intersection.*
- iv) *Strengthen the column caps.*
- v) *Final exterior material selections should be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*

Status of Projects in Planning:

Indoor Practice Facility, Morrill Drive Entrance, Pullen Road Entrance Improvements, and Ricks Hall Exterior Improvements will be reviewed next.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for March 26th from 1:30 – 4:00.