

**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**  
**MEETING MINUTES – September 30, 2015**  
**Primrose Hall Conference Room**  
**1:30 – 4:00 PM**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Robin Abrams	David Bristol	Sumayya Jones-Humienny
	Steve Arndt	Gene Bressler	Kate Meurs
	Carolyn Axtman	Eric Hawkes	Randall Ramsey
	Tim Blair	Lisa Johnson	Tom Skolnicki
	Brian Boothe		

<b>Additional Distribution:</b>	Mike Harwood	Julieta Sherk	Dewayne Washington
---------------------------------	--------------	---------------	--------------------

**General Business**

The committee reviewed its charge, which is posted at the website, to advise on architectural standards, guidelines, exterior material selections, and perform peer review of the campus master plan and designs for responsiveness to the master plan standards and guidelines. Physical Master Plan posters were handed out.

Project updates include:

- 1) The Higher Ed Bond will have to go to voters with projects for community colleges, the zoo, and the university system, including two NC State University projects. No capital funding has been appropriated since 2008, so NC State proposed a split-funding approach. We are the only campus taking this approach. ECU and UNC-C had project funding cut significantly. Our two projects are:
  - a) Engineering Building Oval (EBO) will almost complete the move of the College of Engineering to Centennial Campus. The total project cost is \$154 M, \$77 M of which is appropriated. \$1 M has been funded this FY and \$1M will be funded next FY for Advance Planning. Designer selection had already occurred. PBC+L, the #1 ranked firm of the three interviewed, was purchased by Clark Nexsen, the #2 ranked firm. UNC-GA approved moving forward with Clark Nexsen since the same people remain on the design team. This approval saves the time otherwise required for designer selection. University funding will raise \$60M for the COE and the \$17M needed for the Central Utility Plant expansion will be covered by a Performance Energy Contract (PEC).
  - b) The Plant Sciences Building will split-fund the \$160M cost. Funds will come from agriculture and industry partners across the state and beyond.
- 2) Case Commons will also go before CDRP. Designer selection will occur next Tuesday to shortlist three firms based on criteria for similar project experience and team experience working together.
- 3) The Aloft Hotel is to complete in October.
- 4) The Centennial Campus Hotel is to break ground in October with a different brand, the Marriott Monograph.
- 5) For the Harrelson Demolition project, Stinson Dr. will have to be 2-way to remove debris efficiently. A plan is underway to recycle as much debris as possible. The ADA pedestrian tunnel will remain open and the north-south ADA path access will be maintained. Summer school will be in Wolf Ridge and summer start will be in Owen. During demolition, vibration will be monitored for research occurring in neighboring buildings. The selected contractor, DH Griffin, was involved in debris removal for the World Trade Center buildings.
- 6) The Carmichael addition and renovation project will have fees voted on by students this evening.
- 7) The Reuse Water project with water supplied from the City of Raleigh Garner plant is treated once, not the four times required for potable water. It will be routed along Main Campus drive and work is now in

progress. The reuse water will irrigate the Oval, Golf Course and Partners I and II green spaces. Main Campus Dr. Will be repaved next summer.

- 8) The Pedestrian Bridge project across Lake Raleigh will connect the Centennial Campus (CC) Hotel to the proposed CC Town Center and finish the multi-purpose path loop.
- 9) The extension of Pullen Rd. will finish in 2-1/2 years.
- 10) The Avent Ferry pedestrian tunnel under Western Blvd is slated for 2020.
- 11) The Blue Ridge-Hillsborough St. grade separation project fell further down on the priority list to elevate the I-440 widening project near Brickhaven and the University Club.
- 12) The intersection at Jackson St., Wolf Village Way and Gorman St. is one of the top 10 accident-inducing intersections in Raleigh. A project is under way to make Jackson St. right-turn only with a turn lane on Gorman St.
- 13) A Housing project is under way to change the appearance ES King Village by adding sloped roofs.
- 14) The Center for Technology Innovation has started construction. Mike Harwood will give an update regarding CC at a future meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The July meeting minutes were approved.

### **Projects for Review:**

#### **1. Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity House, Submittal #137**

Site: South Campus Precinct

Designer Name: HagerSmith Design, with Scott Idle and David Black

Facilities Project Manager: N/A. Housing representative from Fraternity & Sorority Life: Shelly Brown Dobek.

- a. This is the second Panel review for the Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity House project.
- b. Project Background: Greek Village guidelines are somewhat different than typical campus design guidelines. In the Greek Village redevelopment, residential lots are leased to sororities or fraternities who must comply with the Greek Village Design Guidelines. These guidelines require the new houses to be more traditional in nature than their predecessors. The Guidelines stipulate brick foundation walls, front porches, no flat roofs, discourage chimneys, encourage each house to have a distinct appearance, plus require certain safety measures, signage and exterior lighting.
- c. Project Description: The Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity house is planned for Lot 2 at NC State's Greek Village. The 19,200 gross square foot house will have 45 beds on the upper 2 stories with a walkout lower level. Other spaces will include a house director's suite, library, leadership training room, classroom/study lounge, faculty office, chapter room, and a commercial kitchen with servery. The construction cost is estimated to be \$3.5 million and the project is scheduled to break ground in early 2016.
- d. Master Plan Summary: The Greek Village master plan envisions creating a sense of community with houses facing in towards a large campus green/community space. Each house will connect to the campus path system. There will be on-street parking, but the majority of the spaces for the residents will be located behind the houses.

### **Presentation and Panel Discussion:**

- a. Previous review comments (*italics font*) and their responses (*regular font*) were addressed:
  - i) *Continue the hedge across the rear yard as a deterrent to pedestrians trying to take the shortest route from the parking across lawn.* This was done.
  - ii) *Consider other accessible ramp options that provide a more direct route and easier flow to the front porch.* The ramp has been shifted and streamlined.

- iii) *The midsection of the building elevations should contain the predominant material. Provide options that increase the midsection brick. This can be achieved in a variety of ways discussed in the meeting.* The brick color at the midsection is now consistent. The base color has been applied only to the base.
- iv) *Use brick details to provide a higher level of interest, possibly using a coarser or different pattern for the base brick.* The brick has been articulated more with bands and recesses to mimic quoins and recessed panels.
- v) *The rear elevation doesn't have the same level of detail as the other elevations. Consider a horizontal counterpoint: a vertical element to visually break up the mass.* The front gable has been reflected at the rear and the center windows were doubled. Brick detailing has been added all the way around.
- vi) *The dormer over the front entrance needs another level of detail.* The front porch was pulled out one column width, allowing a continuous gable element with a shadow line.
- vii) *The front porch columns need further study. The committee liked the use of the double column but felt the overall proportions are too heavy. Consider making them truly double columns with space between the columns.* The columns were separated and the base was dropped slightly.
- viii) *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.* The palette was tentatively approved.

**Panel Action:**

Robin Abrams abstained from voting. The Panel conditionally approved the project with the following design directives to be incorporated:

1. *Extend the brick detailing at the corners of the building to the top of the exterior wall in lieu of stopping at the first floor.*
2. *Incorporate sustainable design principles into the project and consider using them as an education opportunity.*
3. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels approved by the Office of the University Architect.*

**Project Update**

**1. Harrelson Hall Demolition, Submittal #138**

Site: North Campus Precinct

Designer Name: Kimley Horn, with Josh Griffin, Sal Musarra, and Melissa Moeller

Project Manager: Steve Bostian, Capital Project Management

- a. The demolition portion of the project was approved in July.
- b. Previous comments were addressed with feedback from the Office of the University Architect and another committee member.
- c. This landscaping/hardscaping project is a placeholder until the College of Science's Science Commons building has funding to proceed.
- d. The intent is to control pedestrian flow balanced with the minimum amount of paving. The round shape complements Dick Bell's original plan with the other two organic green spaces on either end.

**Panel Discussion:**

1. The mound is arbitrary. It needs to be simpler and flatter to accommodate play, like throwing a Frisbee.
2. The building is not important enough to which homage should be paid or any reference should be maintained.
3. OUA will follow up with the design team to make design adjustments.

**Status of Projects in Planning**

See General Business above.

**Status of Projects in Construction**

See General Business above.

**Next Meeting**

Subsequent to this meeting, the October 28 and November 11, 2015 meetings were canceled due to the lack of agenda items. There is no December meeting. The next meeting will be January 27, 2016 at 1:30 in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.

**Meeting Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.**



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**  
**MEETING MINUTES – July 29, 2015**  
**Primrose Hall Conference Room**  
**1:30 – 3:30 PM**

- |                      |                |                        |                |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Attendees:</b>    | Steve Arndt    | Eric Hawkes            | Randall Ramsey |
|                      | Carolyn Axtman | Lisa Johnson           | Julieta Sherk  |
|                      | Brian Boothe   | Sumayya Jones-Humienny | Tom Skolnicki  |
|                      | Mike Harwood   |                        |                |
| <b>Additional</b>    | Robin Abrams   |                        |                |
| <b>Distribution:</b> | Gene Bressler  |                        |                |
|                      | David Bristol  |                        |                |

**General Business**

Board of Trustee member Gayle Lanier’s term on the Buildings and Property has ended, so she will roll off the Campus Design Review Panel (CDRP). Mike Davidson’s term on the CDRP has also ended. Two new CDRP members will be appointed. Chris Gould has semi-retired, and current College of Sciences Senior Associate Dean for Administration, David Bristol, has consented to finish Chris Gould’s term.

The last CDRP meeting was in January. The University Architect issued the design directives to the design team a week after the last meeting, but the meeting minutes, which capture discussions and reiterate the design directives, typically aren’t reviewed and approved until just prior to the subsequent meeting. Given the delay in review with the cancellation of the February through June meetings, this approval process needs to be revisited.

**Approval of Minutes**

The January meeting minutes were approved.

**Projects for Review:**

**1. Harrelson Hall Demolition, Submittal #138**

Site: North Campus Precinct

Designer Name: Kimley Horn, with Josh Griffin, Sal Musarra, and Melissa Moeller

Project Manager: Steve Bostian, Capital Project Management

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Harrelson Hall Demolition project.
- b) Project Background: The plan to demolish Harrelson started in 2002. 58 classrooms had to be rescheduled/relocated, plus 2 SCALE-UP labs, for which another project is underway. Currently, no funding is available for the future Science Commons building replacement on this site.
- c) Project Description: The scope consists of isolating Harrelson Hall from campus utilities, abating hazardous materials, demolishing the structure and creating a new landscaped area, which will serve as the crossroads for many pedestrian pathways across North Campus Precinct, while maintaining vestiges of the character and features from Harrelson Hall. The documents illustrate the existing conditions, the proposed topography for the new landscaped area, the storm drainage structures and the proposed hardscape and landscape along with select details.
- d) Master Plan Summary: Extra care will be taken to preserve one of the university's nine Hallowed Places identified in the Physical Master Plan, the University Plaza or "The Brickyard." It may be several years before the future Science Commons replacement building is funded, so the design should complement the University Plaza while accommodating pedestrian flow.

**Presentation and Panel Discussion:**

- a) The design concept is to provide a permanent feeling even though it is temporary landscape amenity. The organizing principles are to:
  - i) Pay homage to the building history by outlining the footprint and preserving some pilotis, or columns.
  - ii) Establish desire lines for pedestrian circulation.
  - iii) Provide turf area seating.
  - iv) Grade for mowable turf slopes at 5:1 or less, whereas the steeper south end gets plantings.
- b) The design did not increase the amount of paving and maintained the accessible path to the south of the footprint. The paving pattern references the existing Brickyard pattern with cross banding, while a paver band around circle perimeter reinforces the former footprint.
- c) The grade mounds up in middle, but given the outfall, a Low Impact Development (LID) storm water management feature was not practical.
- d) Stone cladding (approximately 3' x 3' panels) salvaged from the building will provide a threshold at the entry paths through the site. Stacked cladding "book stacks" become seat wall features. Cladding positioned vertically become "fins" placed around the sloped mounds as aesthetic features.
- e) A simple planting palette of Loblolly pines trees for greenery plus a grove of small ornamental trees provide shade, color and defensible seating positions.
- f) The north end has a small foundation wall to control drainage and provide seat walls. Pavers will be replaced to maintain the edge pattern. A few pilotis will be saved and capped to provide some structure and rhythm. They will be cut to 8' tall and cleaned.
- g) On the south side, the retaining walls will be removed and dirt added to make up the difference. Drainage inlets will connect to storm water management drain pipes. A good quality turf will be specified and irrigated. Trees will be saved where possible.
- h) Discussion from the panel ensued regarding the intent of the design, from paying homage to Harrelson, to how seating will be used, to elements and placement of the aesthetic features, landscaping and hardscaping. Massaging of the design is encouraged to simplify it and provide groupings of defensible seating along the paths with landscaping as the backdrop behind them, thereby opening up the turf areas for play activities. Shades trees strategically placed will entice more use of the site.

- i) A meeting with OUA is needed to work out the site wall details.

**Panel Action:**

The Panel recommends approval of the site design subject to incorporation of the following design directives:

- i) The design has a lot of great ideas but perhaps a couple too many. Consider building on the best ideas.
- ii) Further evaluation (height, spacing and location) of the limestone 'book stacks' is needed. Consider locating them only in the western quadrant but more closely spaced or grouped with some shade opportunities.
- iii) Reduce or delete the limestone fins.
- iv) Considering having some of the plantings reflect the grade change. Perhaps breaking up the trees around the perimeter of the site.
- v) Study the columns in elevation to make sure that height and spacing work.
- vi) A site section would be helpful in evaluating the height of the mounds.
- vii) Consider reducing the path width where the paths intersect.
- viii) Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.

**2. Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity House, Submittal #137**

Site: South Campus Precinct

Designer Name: HagerSmith Design, with Scott Idle and David Black

Project Manager:

- a. This is the first Panel review for the Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity House project.
- b. Project Background: Greek Village leases land to developers who must comply with the design guidelines. These Greek Residences were designated to be more traditional in nature than their predecessors. The Guidelines stipulate brick foundation walls, front porches, no flat roofs, discourage chimneys, encourage each house to have a distinct appearance, plus require certain safety measures, signage and exterior lighting. However, no statement on sustainability has been specified.
- c. Project Description: The Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity house is planned for Lot 2 at NC State's Greek Village. The 19,200 gross square foot house will have 45 beds on the upper 2 stories with a walkout lower level. Other spaces will include a house director's suite, library, leadership training room, classroom/study lounge, faculty office, chapter room, and a commercial kitchen with servery. The construction cost is estimated to be \$3 million and the project is scheduled to break ground in early 2016.
- d. Master Plan Summary: The Greek Village master plan envisions creating a sense of community with houses facing in towards a large campus green/community space. Each house will connect to the campus path system. There will be on-street parking, but the majority of the spaces for the residents will be located behind the houses.

**Presentation and Panel Discussion:**

- a. This is the first Panel review for the Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity House project.
- b. The main level entry is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor off of Greek Village Dr. with a secondary entry at the rear on the lower, walk-out level.
- c. Use of permeable pavers keeps the pervious surface total under the 10,000 square footage limit. No storm water treatment is required on the lot.
- d. The landscaping is drought-tolerant. Shade trees provide screening between the houses.

- e. Condensing units are hidden in a pitched-roof, flat-bottomed well that is located over the mechanical room.
- f. Three 3 colors of brick differentiate the base, middle and relief belt course in between.
- g. The front setback site line is where the conditioned enclosed space starts.
- h. Discussion from the panel ensued regarding the barrier the front hedge needs to provide, and a more graceful line for the handicapped accessible ramp that incorporates universal design by taking advantage of the grade high point. The elevations need further study and development of: detail for the barrel dormer; the brick base articulation and its proportion relative to the middle as outlined in the Physical Master Plan; the front columns, which appear too massive; and the rear elevation, which needs vertical treatment to break down the massing to a more human scale.

**Panel Action:**

The Panel requests the following design directives be incorporated:

- i) Continue the hedge across the rear yard as a deterrent to pedestrians trying to take the shortest route from the parking across lawn.
- ii) Consider other accessible ramp options that provide a more direct route and easier flow to the front porch.
- iii) The midsection of the building elevations should contain the predominant material. Provide options that increase the midsection brick. This can be achieved in a variety of ways discussed in the meeting.
- iv) Use brick details to provide a higher level of interest, possibly using a coarser or different pattern for the base brick.
- v) The rear elevation doesn't have the same level of detail as the other elevations. Consider a horizontal counterpoint; a vertical element to visually break up the mass.
- vi) The dormer over the front entrance needs another level of detail.
- vii) The front porch columns need further study. The committee liked the use of the double column but felt the overall proportions are too heavy. Consider making them truly double columns with space between the columns.
- viii) Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.

**Status of Projects in Planning**

Not many projects are currently on the future agenda. The Engineering Building Oval will be on list. Case Commons Athletic Residence was added to Self-Liquidating list for Board of Governors' authority approval. It provides 62 beds for students and student athletes to provide more monitoring to comply with NCAA guidelines.

**Status of Projects in Construction**

The Shores started construction in July, 2015, not late 2014 as previously stated. The CBC Flex Building is no longer on hold. Construction is slated to start in November or December of 2015.

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 26, 2015 from 1:30 – 4:00 in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.

**Meeting Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.**



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 – January 28, 2015  
Primrose Hall Conference Room  
1:30 – 3:30 PM**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Robin Abrams Steve Arndt Tim Blair	Mike Harwood Eric Hawkes Lisa Johnson	Sumayya Jones-Humienny Gayle Lanier Randall Ramsey Tom Skolnicki
Additional Distribution:	Michael Davidson	Gene Bressler	Julieta Sherk

**Approval of Minutes**

The December meeting minutes were approved.

**Projects for Review:**

**1. Brickyard West ADA Path, Submittal #136**

Site: North Campus Precinct  
Designer Name: Surface 678  
Project Manager: Lynn Swank

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Brickyard West ADA Path. Tom Skolnicki gave an overview of the University’s Heritage Tree Program and Campus Gateways as an introduction to the project review.
  - i) Heritage Tree Background: The Heritage Tree Advisory Committee was appointed by Kevin MacNaughton, AVC for Facilities, and charged with forming the process by which heritage trees would be identified and protected. This process was vetted with staff representation from across campus, including JC Raulston Arboretum, faculty from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the College of Design, the College of Natural Resources and multiple departments within the Facilities Division. The definition of Heritage Trees is:  
The preservation of a landmark tree, or a grove of trees that has developed historical, or aesthetic value because of their form, setting, age, or exemplary representation of genus

or species, rarity, or association with an important event or person, or memorial significance to the University.

Currently, there are 25 trees on the list. The Heritage tree adjacent to this project site was nominated by numerous people. With a 66" diameter trunk, it has a substantial presence at the project gateway location and on campus and is an excellent example of a Willow Oak. The committee's goal for this project was to reduce the impact of the ADA path and gateway on this heritage Willow Oak.

- ii) The Panel has improved the kit of parts for gateway projects, including a mix of masonry, precast and metal elements, with design for each location reflecting the character of the neighborhood. For example, the Watauga Club Dr. Gateway has a more formal, traditional character in keeping with the architectural sensibility of the Memorial Belltower, Holladay Hall and Primrose Hall, whereas the Morrill Dr. Gateway has a larger scale appropriate for 45-mph vehicular speed along Western Blvd., and a more modern character in keeping with Jordan Hall Addition.
- b) Project Description: This project designs an accessible path between Erdahl-Cloyd Wing and Scott Hall with schematic design only for a new pedestrian gateway from the plaza at Founders Drive into campus. A campus heritage tree is located within the project limits. Utmost care and measures in both design and construction will be taken to preserve this tree. Currently, this project is only funded through design.
- c) Master Plan Summary: Universal Design is one of the physical master plan's Guiding Principles: the design of the environment should be usable by all people to the greatest extent possible. Gateways should provide open access and views in multiple directions, be designed in context with the surrounding campus, provide clear links to major campus paths, and are defined with a vertical statement.

#### **Project Presentation:**

- a. Eric Davis and Matt Biesecker presented the project.
- b. The project provides an opportunity for a threshold at the bus stop on Hillsborough St.
- c. Existing conditions include: a non-compliant 11'-6" wide walkway at 8-11% slopes along the west side of Erdahl-Cloyd with adjacent landscaping; the 66" in caliper Heritage Willow Oak; and a difference in grade of 14'-0". Two smaller oak trees near the proposed ADA compliant walkway will have to be relocated or removed. The smaller trees on the east side by Erdahl-Cloyd will remain. The project scope also includes the paved areas and bollards at Hillsborough St.
- d. The design team viewed precedent gateway designs at Auburn, USC Berkeley, and NC State. The proposed columns are 12'-6" tall with a 15'-0" wide opening at the portal and 5'10" at the shoulders with flanking shrubbery beyond. Black metal bollards with a simple chain are proposed to replace the white ones. A brick bike channel will run along the stairs/walkway and function as a drainage channel as well, but will be angled towards the walk to discourage riding.
- e. The project goals are to:
  - i. Provide an ADA compliant walkway. The 15'-0" wide walkway splits at the top where grades steepen to provide an ADA path that veers west in series of ramps that are 8'-0" wide clear with a 1:12 (8.33%) slope and handrails on both sides.
  - ii. Implement the policy to save this Willow Oak identified as a Heritage Tree. 90% of its roots are within a smaller diameter than the drip line of tree. The roots will be fertilized, watered, and protected from construction. The pavement and bollard locations within the tree drip line at the northern edge will remain as they are since the roots are entwined with them, but the actual bollards will be replaced with a sleeve condition to change out the bollard type.
  - iii. Integrate pedestrian and bike safety with bike channels.
  - iv. Replace some existing plant materials with more adaptive plant coverings along Erdahl-Cloyd to prevent "pig paths" from forming at walk intersections.

#### **Panel Discussion:**

- a. The previous existing white metal structure gateway was already removed.

- b. This is an important intersection of gateway, heritage tree and Hallowed Space; therefore the transition of the brick pattern from north to south needs to tie the two together and express the threshold to The Brickyard as a Hallowed Place.
- c. There are several main gateways to campus: Watauga Club Dr., Varsity Dr. and Dan Allen Dr. (planned). How do we differentiate internal portals from external portals? Founders Dr. Plaza could be considered the "front porch." Placed the gate further north would make it a front door feature and include the Hillsborough St. edge. A layered approach to this Gateway should also be considered but not impact the ADA path.
- d. The Memorial Belltower is considered the formal "front door," whereas this location is considered to be more of a "back door" for students and needs to be expressed / named accordingly.
- e. The scale of the gateway metal is better in Option 2, but is still not substantial enough.
- f. The drainage needs to be adequate in the green space to ensure no water freezes on the walks or mulch washes down onto it.
- g. This location is very popular with students at night. There is potential to do unique lighting treatment at the Gateway to make it welcoming. The path can be lit with the campus standard pedestrian height Kim fixture pole.
- h. The Avent Ferry Rd. and Western Blvd. intersection bike channel detail and configuration have been successful in changing behavior so riders will dismount their bikes and walk them up stairs. For pedestrian safety, it is important to use the same detail approach here.

### Panel Action

The Panel recommends **approval** of the ADA path design contingent upon the incorporation of the following design directives:

1. *Consider interesting ways to use exterior lighting to enhance the new paths and emphasize the campus entrance. This is a heavily traveled area at night by students.*
2. *Provide intentional transitions between the existing plaza brick patterns and the new path.*
3. *Final material selections will be reviewed and approved by my office.*

The Panel recommends further review of the design for the new pedestrian gateway at Founders Drive and the incorporation the following design directives:

1. *Consider gateway design options that provide a broader entrance sequence or that shift the gateway north towards Hillsborough Street. A layered approach to this gateway should be considered. The contextual site plan should include Hillsborough Street along with pedestrian crossings.*
2. *This is a major student entrance and the gateway could be less formal and more playful.*

## 2) Textiles Innovation Center, Submittal #135

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

Designer: Hager Smith Design PA

Developer: Keystone Corporation

Landscape Architect: Hager Smith Design PA

Project Manager: Harlan Stafford

- a) This is the second Panel review for the Textiles Innovation Center.
  - i) Project Background: An RFP was advertised for developers to respond with a Development Feasibility Study, which defined project terms and determined the rent for space the university wants for Textiles. The university will enter into a ground lease with Keystone.
- b) Jim Little and Michael Blount from Keystone and Brian Gibson from Hager Smith presented responses to the comments made previously at the 8/27/ 2015 review.

- i) The landscape plan is now more detailed and complies with NC State's Street Tree Master Plan to align the new shade trees with existing across the street, and to beautify the building corners and entrances. More plants were added to the parking island and the Best Management Practice (BMP). The possibility for an additional BMP at the southern green area was investigated, but too many utilities would have to be relocated.
- ii) At the service dock area, a wider path of travel past the College of Textiles (COT) stair was provided. A wider swinging gate at truck access was also provided, but the forklift door was not programmatically needed and therefore eliminated.
- iii) At the entry facing the parking deck, the canopy was lowered for better protection and a more human scale. The walkway to the parking deck has changed from asphalt pavement to a contrasting color paver material to cue drivers to proceed with caution at this pedestrian crossing.
- iv) The windows proportions now relate better to overall building rhythm.
- v) The roof screen is now set back 6'-0" from the roof parapet.
- vi) The former gathering space has become a landscaped area because it wasn't in the right location.
- vii) The high bay space is now viewable from tinted windows along Main Campus Drive.
- viii) Seating walls have been at the front entry and windows were lowered to allow better views to the inside.
- ix) The front entry element was redesigned to make it more human-scaled and finessed. The parking deck has transformed the most. The brick at the corners and the precast panels at the middle have been reversed. The sloped drive areas are painted a darker color and set back from the exterior wall mass of brick and precast panels. The parapet wall was extended beyond highest parking level. The overall bay rhythm and alignment visually ties to the building better.

**Panel Action:**

1. *Provide a safe path past the building loading/service area from the College of Textiles plaza stair. Consider adding a sidewalk along the east side of the parking deck to provide a safe alternate pedestrian route from the stair. Provide a plan that shows the exit travel path when the loading dock is in use.*
2. *Involve my office in the selection of the storm water BMP materials.*
3. *Final material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels approved by my office*

**Follow-up Notes:**

**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. *L. Johnson noted the subcommittee has done due diligence in its review and met 3 times since the last CDRP meeting on 12/3/2014 to keep the project moving for its ground breaking on April 22. The entrance canopy, stone walls and exterior materials still need further development and review. The proposed exterior materials are an elegant palette but have little red brick: the walls consist of dark brick with a metallic shimmer and tan brick for contrast. Red brick occurs only on the ground plane as pavers. This palette provides an opportunity for red-flowering plants to be placed against a darker brick wall background. Consideration will be given to some red brick in the landscape walls. OUA will review sample panels on site and these will be presented to Board of Trustees Buildings and Properties Committee on 2/19. CDRP members are welcome to see the samples in Primrose Hall as well. The proposed stone is a natural, dressed product. The challenge with the architectural style is how to reconcile tradition versus future references.*

*The preference on the roof deck above the ballroom is to decrease the broad expanse of field pattern near windows and have simple lines versus a bold geometric pattern that may conflict with the natural setting.*

**Status of Projects in Planning**

Several meetings will be canceled. The March meeting may be used instead to tour Talley.

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Feb 25<sup>th</sup> from 1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.