

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
November 20, 2013
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Lisa Johnson
	Carolyn Axtman	Sumayya Jones-Humienny
	Tim Blair	Gayle Lanier
	Brian Boothe	Michael Lipitz
	Mike Davidson	Kevin MacNaughton
	Kyle Dell	Randy Ramsey
	Chris Gould	Julieta Sherk
	Mike Harwood	Tom Skolnicki

Additional Distribution: Gene Bressler

Approval of the Minutes:

The September 25, 2013 meeting minutes were approved.

Physical Master Plan Update

The Springhill portion of campus in the Centennial Campus Precinct was further reviewed in November and December to refine the master planning concepts and draft layout by a small working group including Mike Harwood, Robin Abrams, Julieta Sherk, Tom Skolnicki, and Carolyn Axtman, Sumayya Jones-Humienny, and Lisa Johnson among others from the university community.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Reynolds Coliseum Renovation #128

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

Architect: Corley Redfoot Architects / 360 Architects

Landscape Architect: OBS Landscape Architects

Project Manager: Bill Davis

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Reynolds Coliseum Renovation.
- b) Andy Cruikshank with Corley Redfoot Architects introduced the project.
 - i) Reynolds Coliseum was built in 1949 and is approximately 200,000 GSF. The renovation of Reynolds Coliseum will provide a new Athletics Walk of Fame and History (WOFAH) exhibit within the northern third of the existing building. The project scope includes renovations to the women's basketball and volley ball offices as well as the ROTC spaces. Arena level improvements include modifications to the court, new telescopic courtside seating and minimal improvements to upper level seating. Also included are mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire alarm and sprinkler improvements as well as structural modifications, building code compliance upgrades.
 - ii) Reynolds Coliseum is one of the nine Hallowed Places designated in the Physical Master Plan. The Master Plan requires that any alterations to a Hallowed Place be given special consideration by the campus community. Alterations to the exterior of Reynolds will require this special consideration. Exterior changes include window and door replacements and low profile, rooftop, mechanical equipment at the southern end of the roof.

- iii) The Coaches' Corner project construction at the northwest corner is underway. OBS is the landscape architect for that project as well, so they are ensuring that both projects coordinate with each other by tying together the landscape improvements.
- iv) Minor site improvements include:
 - (1) Creating a drive-through at the Jeter Bays parking lot to eliminate the dead end conditions.
 - (2) Limbing up the existing mature trees to improve visibility of Reynolds.
 - (3) Note: The existing drop off on Dunn Avenue will remain as is.
- v) Exterior building work includes:
 - (1) Replacing all windows, including the replacement windows from 2007, to achieve a consistent look on all elevations. The frame will match the 2-1/4" existing with the original "non-secure" window muntin pattern, which has the smaller profile, 3/3 (versus 9/3 grilles for the original armory spaces), that will be applied to every window. Muntins will be applied to the interior and exterior glazing faces.
 - (a) Using the same palette for color and materials as Riddick Hall, which is an anodized aluminum finish with limestone, brick and metal panels.
 - (2) Replacing all double 2.5-foot wide doors, which do not meet code, with glass to provide natural light and make the entries more welcoming. The entries will also have glass sidelites and transoms.
 - (3) Removing the loading dock at the service yard facing Morrill Drive and bringing the loading access down to grade. This work includes replacing the service elevator cab and "guts" but will not change the way service area functions otherwise.
 - (4) Making the north entrance and ticket windows HC accessible by bringing the stoop out farther, providing a ramp and raising the ticket windows to make them accessible from the inside. The settlement cracks at the north elevation also need to be treated.
 - (5) Placing the large AHU units, which serve the arena, at the southern end of the roof make them less visible because they have a 4-story cutoff (the view angle from grade looking up) versus a 2-1/2 story cutoff at the northern end. These larger units are on the service side of Talley where the mechanical units for Talley are as well; there is no longer a cooling tower since Talley now ties into the central plant chilled water line.
 - (a) There will be no impact to the view shed from Morrill Dr.
 - (b) There will be more of an impact from the view shed along Jeter Drive parking lot but the color of the mechanical unit will be a light color to blend in with the sky.
 - (c) Once Talley is complete, the view shed from Cates Ave, will not be impacted as the new wing will block most of the unit.
 - (d) The roof and mechanical units will be visible from the view sheds of the upper levels of Talley and the future bridge. The new roof will be white.
- vi) Interior building work at the arena level involves:
 - (1) Shifting the bowl seating to the south thereby "right-sizing" the approximately 8,300 seats, many of which have poor sightlines, to approximately 5,200, all with great sightlines for the game day layout. For the concert layout with stage, there will be approximately 6,000 seats.
 - (2) Providing new telescopic seating at the ends and sides and new courtside seating, but the upper seats will only be replaced as budget allows. Not only do all seats have better visibility but now the building code is met for accessibility and for handicapped (HC) seat distribution.
 - (3) Housing the new WOFAH to showcase all teams' athletic achievements in the northern third section of the building plus inserting two smaller buildings within the footprint for Women's Basketball and Volleyball offices and mechanical space.
 - (4) Removing program space at the east and west entries to accommodate larger gatherings and the relocating the displaced ROTC spaces.
- vii) Interior building work at the concourse level involves:

- (1) Updating the graphics, adding elevators for HC accessibility to this level, more concession spaces, a new connection around the reduced bowl perimeter and an overlook at the opening of WOFAH.
 - viii) Interior building work at the upper level involves:
 - (1) Providing space for HVAC equipment on platforms. HVAC work is approximately \$10m of the \$23m cost of construction work.
 - (2) Placing the HVAC return ducts in the SE and SW corners.
 - ix) New design features include:
 - (1) Making the arena and the WOFA visible to each other with a glass wall. Colors and finishes will be determined during design development.
 - (2) Maintaining a large, clean-line volume with a small, interior arena feel while providing interest with views to the WOFAH.
 - (3) Hiding the HVAC duct runs between the existing roof structure and the new enclosure outside on the roof while supplying air through new vents in existing clerestory openings. Compared to Cameron Arena, where the ducts are visible on the roof, these will be hidden from both interior and exterior vantage points.
 - (4) Note: The press box location is being considered and a platform at center court will still be needed.
 - x) Existing conditions to remain include:
 - (1) Continue using the main entrances at the upper level mainly for emergency and regular egress.
- c) Discussion:
 The Panel made the following comments:
- i) The question arose as to whether seats to be demolished could be sold for fundraising. Because these seats are linked, a lot of metal has to be cut off, so 2 seats are lost for every one sold.
 - ii) Because the actual seating capacity in the existing arena bowl is ~7,900, the Men's Basketball game played once a year can still occur. Seating plans for all events are being developed.
 - iii) Concern was expressed over people lined up at the north entry steps and the amount of space on the stoop versus the sidewalk for east-west circulation.
 - iv) The ramp should not engage the historic corner of the building.
 - v) A 1:20 slope for the ramp would eliminate the need for handrails and comply with universal design principals.
 - vi) Roof top unit enclosures should be treated with a specular finish to blend in with the roof and sky.
 - vii) More study is needed at the entry doors. The historic character and feel of the red paneled wood doors should not be lost. The doors and sidelights need more detailing.
- d) Action:
 The Panel recommends a second review in January. The Panel recommends the following design directives be incorporated:
- i) Consider other exterior ramp design options that provide better pedestrian flow to the north building entrance, such as, widening the ramp at the entry platform, moving the ramp termination away for the building corner, and the possibility of integrating the ramp with the new entry steps.
 - ii) Provide more detail for the new entry platform/steps. Determine the right balance for the depth of the platform that provides an accessible entrance into the building, space for ticket purchase lines and good pedestrian flow along the path in front of the building.
 - iii) Minimize the impact to the exterior walls at the ticket window and provide more design detail regarding the impact.

- iv) The new entry doors and surrounding glazing on all sides of the building need to be in keeping with the original building architectural detailing. Consider options that use red doors with glazing.
- v) Final material selections will be reviewed and approved by my office.

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that there are not many upcoming projects in planning and some CDRP meetings may be canceled due to lack of agenda items.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for January 29th from 1:30 – 4:00.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
September 25, 2013
1911 Building Conference Room 129

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Kevin MacNaughton
	Carolyn Axtman	Michael Lipitz
	Tim Blair	Randy Ramsey
	Mike Davidson	Julieta Sherk
	Chris Gould	Tom Skolnicki
	Lisa Johnson	
	Sumayya Jones-Humienny	

Additional Distribution: Brian Boothe, Gene Bressler, Mike Harwood and Gayle Lanier

Approval of the Minutes:

The May 29, 2013 meeting minutes were approved.

Other Business:

Julieta Sherk announced that a joint Landscape Construction Services and Horticulture Class project won the Sir Walter Raleigh Appearance Award. Plantings previously installed at the southwest corner of Polk Hall had failed due to heat generated from an underground steam pipe. The teams worked together to problem solve, design and install a new garden with a heat barrier and extra soil to ensure that plants would thrive. The result is a beautiful garden in what had been a barren corner on Stinson Drive.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Centennial Entrance at Trailwood #129

Site: Centennial Campus, at the intersection of Main Campus Drive and Trailwood Drive

Landscape Architect: OBS Landscape Architects

Project Manager: Lynn Swank, Design and Construction Services

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Centennial Entrance at Trailwood.
- b) This project is one of the many vehicular and pedestrian gateway projects (planned, in design or already constructed) to provide unique and significant entrances to campus as well as campus edges that are recognizable as those belonging to NC State University.
- c) T. Skolnicki gave an overview of the kit of parts used for each gateway project. The gateway project process started 6 years ago from Physical Master Plan discussions recognizing the need to better identify campus edges and entries. Standard elements in the kit of parts, such as brick marker columns with pre-cast concrete bases, red and white signage identifying the campus precincts, and metal elements, create unique gateways with an underlying commonality. One example of a recently completed project is the Watauga Club Drive and Hillsborough Street gateway. One currently in construction is the gateway at Varsity Drive and Western Boulevard. One that has been designed and is waiting for funding is the Dan Allen Drive and Hillsborough Street gateway. Others needing design include: the intersection of Morrill Drive and Western Boulevard, and for the South Campus Precinct.
- d) Discussion ensued regarding the gateways. T. Blair suggested tying one gateway to the next with intermittent markers in between and using the same plant material language to strengthen the connections. J. Sherk noted that opportunities for gateways also exist at smaller intersections or

nodes. M. Davidson inquired about the project cost. T. Skolnicki answered that it depends on scope, but a typical project costs around \$300,000. The Watauga Club Drive Gateway cost \$330,000, which included the street closing. The question arose for gateways at Centennial Biomedical Campus (CBC). T. Skolnicki replied that there is a placeholder for the intersection of the future Trinity Road extension and Blue Ridge Road, and the proposed consolidated entry for the University Club and the CBC entry drive from Hillsborough Street. R. Ramsey stressed the importance of funding the gateway at Dan Allen Drive and Morrill Drive since it gets so much traffic, with more anticipated when Talley opens.

- e) The design team for the Centennial Entrance at Trailwood Drive project was introduced: Lynn Swank is the project manager for NC State's Design and Construction Services (not present); Brian Starkey is the managing principal for OBS Landscape Architects, Jonathan Blasco is a landscape architecture intern with OBS, and Mitch Craig is a civil engineer with Sepi Engineering. The design team explained the following:
 - i) The project cost is \$900,000 and paid for from the Centennial Trust Fund.
 - ii) The gateway occurs on both sides of Main Campus Drive where it intersects with Trailwood Drive and Thistledown Drive on the southwest border of Centennial Campus. Three sides of the intersection have condominiums or townhouses.
 - iii) The rest of Main Campus Drive will be widened in the future to match the widened portion that extends 200' into Centennial Campus (CC). It will be 2 lanes in each direction with a 10' wide multi-use path (trail) on the north side and a 6' wide sidewalk on the south side. The sign will be placed in the median as close to the Right of Way (ROW) as possible for most visibility.
 - iv) The grade change requires a retaining wall adjacent to the townhouses on the northern side. Placement of the gateway is constrained by the ROW, sanitary sewer line, the property line and the grade. There is a flat grade pavement area at the median for pedestrian crossing refuge.
 - v) Evergreens are placed behind the gateway elements to screen the townhouses and provide a backdrop for the marker columns and rails. The marker columns have metal accent studs with lighting behind. They questioned whether to put some type of branding on the overhead rails.
 - vi) C. Gould questioned whether the gateway will be graffiti resistant, to which Brian replied that the brick will have a coating applied to make paint easier to remove and the metal is anodized so it will be easier to clean.
- f) Discussion:
Discussion ensued regarding the amount of traffic. Peak school drop off and pick up times plus future CC build-out warrant the road widening.
- g) Action:
The Panel recommends approval with the following directives being implemented and reviewed again by the Office of the University Architect:
 - (1) Maintain a ten foot wide sidewalk on both sides of Main Campus Drive at the pedestrian gateways. The sidewalk at the south gateway should be widened to ten feet and then taper back to 6 feet wide along Main Campus Drive.
 - (2) Add a ground cover plant bed in front of the 3 foot markers using a ground cover such as Liriope.
 - (3) Be a "good neighbor" by using plant materials to soften the impact of the concrete retaining wall that faces the adjacent townhouses.
 - (4) The Panel supports the LED light concept behind the metal accent bands on the 12 foot columns.
 - (5) Final material selections will be reviewed and approved by the Office of the University Architect.

Physical Master Plan Update

The last update was given in March. Ten task forces involving the campus and City of Raleigh communities have been working since the spring and will complete their drafts this fall. The ten task forces are comprised of: Foundations; Sustainability; Transportation; Architecture; Open Spaces, Campus Edges and Wayfinding; Centennial Campus Planning (including the Centennial Biomedical Campus); Utilities, Capital Improvement Projects; Campus Design Plans; and Plan Book Design. The Foundations task force will proof all drafts and edit accordingly to ensure the verbiage is written with one voice. The major changes from the draft compilation will go before the Board of Trustees in February 2014 and the final iteration will be published in May of 2014.

The first major change is the “one campus” concept. There is a widespread perception that Centennial Campus is not part of NC State University. Students have commented that the branding is different on Centennial Campus. Measures need to be taken to unify all 5 campus precincts. These measures include: signage and branding the campus edges; strengthening the All Campus Paths, especially from the football and basketball arenas; and partnering with John Stone in Civil Engineering, whose senior class is studying options for a people mover as alternative transportation to connect the campus precincts.

The second major change is incorporating the Chancellor’s strategic plan vision throughout the document.

The third major change is reorganization of the content order, placing the most important items first, such as the one campus concept and the Chancellor’s strategic plan vision, and moving the history and process to an appendix.

Lisa reviewed the Centennial Campus Task Force planned area recommendations, which include:

- 1) Providing amenities and recreation, such as an exercise loop around Lake Raleigh.
- 2) Incorporating landmarks and art to beautify the surroundings and help with wayfinding.
- 3) Investigate bus transfer station opportunities at strategic points.

Status of Projects in Planning:

The Reynolds Coliseum Renovation will be reviewed at the next Panel meeting.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for November 20th from 1:30 – 4:00 in Primrose Hall.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
May 29, 2013
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:	Carolyn Axtman	Sumayya Jones-Humienny
	Tim Blair	Chris Kingston
	Gene Bressler	Jason Low
	Mike Davidson	Kevin MacNaughton
	Mike Harwood	Randy Ramsey
	Lisa Johnson	Tom Skolnicki

Additional Distribution: Robin Abrams, Brian Boothe, Gayle Lanier and Julieta Sherk

Approval of the Minutes:

The March 27, 2013 meeting minutes were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Bell View Hotel Design Submittal #125

Site: North Campus, at the intersection of Hillsborough Street, Enterprise Street and Maiden Lane, across from the Memorial Bell Tower

Architect: One Group Design

Landscape Architect: Coaly Landscape Architecture

Project Liaison: Ralph Recchie

- a) This is the first Panel review for the Bell View Tower.
- b) The project is a joint venture between 3 groups: Bell View Partners of Raleigh, Bernstein Brothers of Washington DC, and NC State University.
- c) What sets this project apart from others is that it is a lease with a constant option to buy.
- d) The schedule calls for the site plan submittal to the City of Raleigh in June of 2013 with approval by December of 2013. Construction is slated to start in June of 2014 and to complete in August of 2015.
- e) There are several stated goals:
 - i) To have NC State as an active partner
 - ii) To keep the process transparent
 - iii) To select the best brand for the hotel
 - iv) To promote design excellence by challenging the design team to elevate this project above a hotel prototype
 - v) To create active engagement
 - vi) To contribute to the arts
 - vii) To hire the design team best suited for the project.
- f) Aloft Hotels (a franchise whose parent company is Starwood Hotel and Resorts Worldwide) is the brand chosen to “invigorate the guest experience” by responding to the energy of the present and the future while being respectful of past history.
- g) One Design Group is the architecture firm that also owns and manages hotels.
- h) Thomas Sayre is the artist on the design team chosen to incorporate art into the design.
- i) The design challenge of the project is to integrate the culture and history of NC State University as well as the iconic importance of the Bell Tower.
- j) Vehicular drop off is along Hillsborough St. with lower level deck parking accessed from Maiden Lane and upper level deck parking accessed from Enterprise St. This two-level parking deck,

adjacent to the north of the building, accommodates up to 100 cars, including an area for valet parking. The only plantings are street trees to the east, south and west and a thin strip of buffer plants to the north. A wood fence also serves to screen the parking from the north.

- k) The sidewalk, which widens at the building entries, is comprised of 2'x4' scored concrete, interrupted by 10 colored concrete bands representing the 10 colleges. It is bordered by the same brick used on the Hillsborough St. walks.
- l) The 7-story, 83,000 SF 135-room hotel may be entered from Hillsborough Street or from the second level of the parking deck. Retail and meeting space flank the entry vestibule at street level and a terrace accommodates outdoor seating. A grand stair links the street level with a remote reception desk to the main reception area on the 2nd floor. Hotel amenities include: an outdoor pool, a bar/lounge with an outdoor balcony overlooking the Bell Tower, a business center and an exercise room.
- m) The Hillsborough St. entrance massing is recessed and oriented to align with the Bell Tower while the elevator and stairs engage views of the Bell Tower, providing a dynamic interplay.
- n) A two-story "spine" wall, comprised of earth-cast panels, leads guest from the exterior entries to the main reception area. The castings are based on agricultural equipment tire treads and farm implements to reflect NC State's history as a land-grant institution.
- o) The front/south exterior elevation is divided into 3 distinct parts: the brick with punched openings portion to the west, representing the past; the plaster portion at the center, where the main entrances are, representing the present; and the metal panel and glass storefront system portion to the east, representing the future. Yellow and blue short strip cathode lighting is randomly placed along the length of the front façade facing the Bell Tower.
- p) Above the Hillsborough St. entry, a sculpture cast from polished stainless steel hangs, representing a stationary shape of the bell tower carillon reverberation. It will be fixed and lit at night.

q) Discussion:

The Panel commented that the history portion of the building needs further development. The expression of the three time periods needs to be addressed on the north elevation. The sidewalk on the south side of the building needs to be consistent with that of Hillsborough St. and the pedestrian connections across the street should be considered in the detailing. The plant material is too sparse, especially at the parking deck where potted plants could be added.

r) Action:

The Panel recommends a second review by a Panel subcommittee (Mike Davidson, Gene Bressler and Lisa Johnson). The Panel subcommittee will review revised documents and verify that the below CDRP design directives have been addressed.

1. *Incorporate historic brick detailing in the brick façade to create shadow lines and patterns. Use the brick details to provide a tripartite organization: base, middle and top.*
2. *Consider reducing the number of cathode lights so that they don't detract from the art on the south facade.*
3. *Explore creative options for telling the story of the art.*
4. *Consider using glass in lieu of stucco above the entrance on the south elevation. Also consider glass above the north entrance to break up the brick façade. This could be done without altering the number of rooms.*
5. *Resolve conflicts with the street pole lights.*
6. *Look for opportunities to add exterior benches that face out towards the Memorial Bell Tower.*
7. *Keep the Hillsborough Street traditional brick streetscape color palette.*
8. *Consider adding another tree to the landscape plan in the area of the south-facing balcony.*
9. *Final exterior material selections will be based on a review of field-erected sample panels and approved by the Office of the University Architect.*

Subsequent to the May 29th meeting the CDRP subcommittee met on June 10, 2013 and reviewed revised design documents and recommended **approval** subject to incorporation of the following design directives.

- 1. Incorporate cathode lights in the façade design on the metal/glass portion of the building only. Remove the lights from the brick portion of the façade.*
- 2. Keep the Hillsborough Street traditional brick streetscape color palette. Deviation from the traditional paving should be limited to the area in front of the main building entrance on Hillsborough Street.*
- 3. Final exterior material selections will be based on a review of field-erected sample panels and approved by my office.*

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that there are not many upcoming projects in planning and some CDRP meetings may be canceled due to lack of agenda items.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for July 31st from 1:30 – 4:00.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
March 27, 2013
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Gayle Lanier
	Gene Bressler	Jason Low
	Mike Davidson	Kevin MacNaughton
	Mike Harwood	Sumayya Jones-Humienny
	Lisa Johnson	Tom Skolnicki

Additional Distribution: Carolyn Axtman, Tim Blair, Chris Kingston,
Randy Ramsey and Julieta Sherk

Approval of the Minutes:

The January 30, 2013 meeting minutes were approved with one miscellaneous period removed from the first bullet point.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Witherspoon Exterior Improvements Design Submittal #125

Site: Central Precinct, Witherspoon Student Center on Cates Avenue

Architect: Corley Redfoot Architects

Landscape Architect: OBS Landscape Architects

NC State Project Manager: Lynn Swank

- a) This is the first Panel review for Corley Redfoot's design, but the second-round review for the exterior improvement.
- b) Three project goals include:
 - Creating a vestibule on each of the West Dan Allen Drive side entries to buffer the temperature differential between exterior and interior, especially at the prefunction area of the 500-seat auditorium.
 - Improving the appearance of the façade.
 - Staying within the \$500,000 budget.
- c) Three project principles include:
 - Bringing organization to the site plan and the pedestrian experience.
 - Softening the transition between the building and the front lawn and providing more human-scale elements.
 - Developing a connection between the two entries and making the entry on the southwest side visible from the eastern Cates Avenue approach.
- d) The project principles are achieved by:
 - Pulling the path from the Cates Avenue sidewalk away from the building to open up large planting areas and connect the two entries along this horizontal spline.
 - Removing the exterior stair from Cates Avenue to allow the entries to be visible from the eastern Cates Avenue approach.
 - Add an open, brick pier colonnade to provide human scale, rhythm and a stronger visual connection between the two entries.
- e) The plant materials' objectives are to:
 - Soften the blank wall between the entries and provide more of a human scale to the building.

- Separate the stage from the circulation path.
- Eliminate the need for irrigation by planting native and drought-tolerant species.

f) Discussion:

The Panel commented that the unhealthy sycamore and Cates Avenue trees need to be removed and replaced. More shade is needed overall. Movies shown previously on the field will move to Talley's great lawn upon that project's completion. Music events will continue to be held here along with a variety of other activities. Consideration should be given to providing movable tables and chairs, night lighting and drainage of the covered entry roofs.

g) Action:

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

1. *Incorporate larger trees in the landscape design for scale and shade, at the northwest and southwest corners of the building (west side of the new path).*
2. *Illuminate the architectural columns between the two building entrances.*
3. *Provide adequate overhead cover at the new entry vestibules to provide for a comfortable transition between the interior and exterior environment during inclement weather.*
4. *The new northwest vestibule roof will be very visible from the second floor of the building. Provide roof finish alternatives that are aesthetically pleasing.*
5. *Incorporate NC State branding in the design.*
6. *Final material selections will be reviewed and approved by the Office of the University Architect.*

Physical Master Plan Update

T. Skolnicki reported on the outcome of the seven workshops held to gather comments from the campus community and be given further consideration by the task forces. The students-only workshop generated more student participation than the last Master Plan update. Students had numerous positive comments about what was working well and appreciated the opportunity for collaborating and learning about campus. Faculty also participated more this time around. Ten taskforces have been formed and 6 of them have started meeting to date.

L. Johnson and M. Harwood reported on the Centennial Campus and Centennial Biomedical Campus task forces. These meetings have focused on orienting participants to the campuses and concentrating on future development feedback, which includes:

- Implementing more mixed-use activities, amenities and satellite services
- Promoting the notion of a "one Raleigh campus" that is unified by branding
- Identifying future opportunities to incorporate art and landmarks
- Recommending locations for bus transfer stations
- Locating future residential opportunities
- Studying in depth the Spring Hill campus and the area south of Lake Raleigh and

Discussion included the recommendation to coordinate with the City of Raleigh to overlap plans for southwest Raleigh and the Town Center.

The Open Spaces, Campus Edges and Wayfinding, the Transportation and the Sustainability Task Forces have reviewed and digested the comment feedback from the workshops and are currently in the process of summarizing the data.

L. Johnson gave an update on the Yarbrough Drive Realignment Study. Project goals include:

- Separating the pedestrian from vehicular circulation
- Reducing the height of the future pedestrian bridge over Yarbrough Drive
- Providing access through to Pullen Road
- Preserving the parking in the railroad right-of-way, as much as possible

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that there are not many upcoming projects in planning and some CDRP meetings may be canceled due to lack of agenda items.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is May 29th from 2:45 – 4:00.

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW
January 30, 2013
Primrose Hall Conference Room

Attendees:	Robin Abrams	Chris Kingston
	Carolyn Axtman	Gayle Lanier
	Tim Blair	Jason Low
	Gene Bressler	Kevin MacNaughton
	Mike Davidson	Randy Ramsey
	Mike Harwood	Julie Sherk
	Lisa Johnson	Tom Skolnicki

Additional Distribution: Brian Booth, Sumayya Jones-Humienny, Chris Kingston and Julieta Sherk,

Approval of the Minutes:

The July 25, 2012 meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Gregg Museum of Art + Design Submittal #123

Site: North Campus, historic Chancellor's Residence on Hillsborough Street

Architect: The Freelon Group

Landscape Architect: Lappas + Havener

NC State Project Manager: Rachel Patrick

- This is the third. Panel review for this project.
- The goal of this project is to relocate the Gregg Museum to the future Pullen Arts Plaza, thereby becoming the third venue with the existing Pullen Arts Center and the Theater in the Park. The master plan goals are to allow strategic views into the site from Hillsborough Street and Pullen Road, to design an addition that complements the existing residence, and to unify the landscape, which blends campus and park lands. It will also provide a meandering drive with a destination drop-off and parking for the Museum and the Pullen Arts Center.
- The landscaping is being modified to reinforce connections from the building to Pullen Park, Hillsborough St. and the future Arts Plaza.
- The design team shared refinements in response to comments from the Trustees regarding the appropriateness and durability of wood as a primary material for the gallery addition.
 - Eastern White Cedar is being considered for the exterior because of its durability given routine maintenance of staining/sealing every 5 to 7 years.
 - Wood complements the residential scale of the existing residence, and the warm tones of the wood will blend well with the existing brick
 - Wood is the most appropriate material that falls within the project budget
 - Additional detailing has been added on the lower portions of the walls, where more articulation of the wood adds interest and attention to craft.

Discussion:

The Panel commented that because the size of the addition is much larger than the residence, the addition needs a material that allows articulation and detail at a finer scale so that the addition respects the house. The Panel agrees that wood successfully affords these characteristics. The Panel

recommended that additional detailing on the project occur to strengthen the references to the proportions and architectural features of the residence.

Action:

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

1. *Include a contemporary interpretation of the existing cornice line in the design of the building addition.*
2. *Consider subtle opportunities to tie the existing residence and the addition together, such as, replacing the door of the house with the same wood species that will be used on the addition. Exterior art and/or landscape art could be used to transition between the new and old buildings.*
3. *Include more detailed drawings that show the sense of craftsmanship for the next Trustee presentation.*
4. *Final exterior material selections will be based on mock-up panels reviewed and approved by the Office of the University Architect.*

Physical Master Plan Update

Lisa Johnson and Tom Skolnicki reported on the outcome of six workshops held to gather comments from the campus community to consider for study as the charge for studying further by task forces. Highlights from designer focus groups held in 2012 were also shared with the Panel. Lisa Johnson asked for reaction to the comments reviewed.

Discussion:

1. Jason Low asked if there was any consideration to create animated fly-throughs or other augmented reality graphics to convey the intention for forms in future neighborhoods.
2. Tim Blair stated that he has observed that the closing of Dan Allen Drive to through traffic during the day has added to traffic on Gorman Street, creating grid lock across the Wolf Village Way intersection that makes pedestrian and vehicular movement at the intersection feel less safe.
3. Regarding campus gateways, Mike Harwood stated that in addition to the kit of parts (columns, railings, signage and ornamental plantings), there is a need to add trees that “claim” the intersection at gateways along Western Boulevard.
4. Regarding gateways, Tim Blair stated that speed of movement needs to be considered so that gateways are understood clearly at different speeds.
5. In response to a highlight that some surrounding neighborhoods feel unsafe to those on campus, Mike Harwood noted that the lack of doors to campus buildings along these edges may contribute to that perception.

Action:

1. Distribute comments to Physical Master Plan Steering Team

Status of Projects in Planning:

L. Johnson noted that there are not many upcoming projects in planning and some CDRP meetings may be canceled due to lack of agenda items.

Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting is March 27th from 1:30 – 3:30.