



CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES – January 31, 2018
Primrose Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 4:00 PM

Attendees:	Chip Andrews	Eric Hawkes	David Hill
	Tim Blair	Ann Goodnight	Doug Morton
	Brian Boothe	Lisa Johnson	Tom Skolnicki
	Gene Bressler	Sumayya Jones-Humienny	
Additional Distribution:	Lauren Joyner	Kate Meurs	Julieta Sherk

Approval of Minutes

The October 25, 2017 meeting minutes were approved.

Project for Review:

1. Plant Science Building, Submittal #151

Site: Centennial Campus Precinct

Designer Name: Flad Architects with Chuck Mummert and Andrew Cherry presenting, and CLH Design with Heather Rhymes presenting

Facilities Project Manager: Mike Kapp with Capital Project Management

- a. This is the first Panel review for the Plant Science Building project.
- b. Project Description: The project will build a new interdisciplinary plant sciences research building on Centennial Campus where researchers from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CAL S) and from across the university can build imaginative and far-reaching multidisciplinary partnerships with scientists from government, industry, and regulatory agencies. The five-level building will be approximately 184,000 gross square feet (GSF) comprised of flexible research labs, office space, partner lab/office suites, support lab space, and flexible conferencing space. The top floor will house Biosafety Levels (BSL) 2 and 3 rooftop greenhouses.
- c. Master Plan Summary: This building will reinforce the western edge of Oval Drive, a Shared Open Space that gives physical definition to this Campus Neighborhood. The setback from the walk on the west side of Oval Drive to the closest building facade will be 30 feet to relate to the proposed BTEC addition at the northwest corner. NC State Style and exterior elements are eclectic and reflect the university’s diverse programs, but consistently have a tripartite organization with a base, middle, and top. This style draws design cues from surrounding architecture in the neighborhood.

Presentation and Panel Discussion:

- a. Lisa Johnson stated that this is the first project with a new forward-thinking, interdisciplinary model, which will have a profound impact on NC State. Over 100 stakeholders, including commodity groups, have participated in determining the project’s vision, goals, and programming. Geoff Bock is the Program Director and Steve Briggs is the Research Launch Director.

- b. Flad described the site as being highly prominent north of the Biomanufacturing Training and Education Center (BTEC) off of Oval Drive. With no back door to the site, services must be tucked in to preserve views from future neighboring buildings. Site infrastructure improvements include a new access road between BTEC and the site.
- c. A new road, south of the building, will connect Partners Way and Oval Drive.
- d. The main entry faces Oval Drive. The hardscaped plaza adjacent to the building edges provide indoor-to-outdoor visual and physical connections. An open lawn area south of the plaza allows for program functions like outdoor events, while the adjacent new connector road can be closed off for demonstrations of large farm equipment and such.
- e. A ramp and universally-accessible sloped plaza provide an accessible path from the Partners Way approach to the main entry. There is a 6'-0" elevation change across the plaza. Site walls are multifunctional by taking up grade and separating vehicle circulation from the event area. Handicapped parking will be by the front entry.
- f. A speed table at the new connector road aligns with steps up to the plaza for a direct pedestrian connection. The service area is depressed on the site's high point to screen vehicles and equipment.
- g. Flad recently received new bus stop information from Transportation. Further dialogue is needed for coordination to determine the exact location of the stops pedestrian connections.
- h. The Site Precedent images are from higher education institutions: the Artists' Backyard and Syme Rainwater Garden are from student-led projects at NC State.
- i. The storm water diagram shows the worst-case scenario to address all storm water on site. Preliminary study indicates that the regional device may handle some quantity off-site and eliminate need for underground detention.
- j. A question arose as to the approach to the building in inclement weather. With the current conditions, the majority of people will either come to the main or secondary covered entry but in the future that may change with additional development: parking may be built on other side of Oval Drive.
- k. The floors plans for each level were reviewed.
- l. The Hearth space is designed to display work on a temporary basis as it is more of a gathering and pass-thru space. There are numerous branding opportunities throughout.
- m. The Seminar Room is flexible space, with 135 seats and two moveable partitions for subdivision into 3 spaces. The pre-function space is part of the interior promenade.
- n. The Cellular and Molecular Imaging Facility (CMIF), a university core facility will
- o. The front-of-house public areas are separated from the secure back-of-house service areas, which have their own separate circulation.
- p. The greenhouses are located on the 5th Floor with the interstitial mechanical space below on the 4th Floor.
- q. The building's materials and massing take cues from its existing context, but use a more forward language with metal and terracotta panels, aluminum panel solar screens, and aluminum storefront, similar to the Talley Student Union. The design expresses duality in its machined and earthy, warm material aesthetic.
- r. The building is not optimally oriented from a solar perspective: it must balance views out and daylighting with solar screening to reduce glare for digital work. Its high-tech spirit uses horizontal stacked aluminum fins, and where frame solar fins are not located, ceramic frit.
- s. The lantern feature above the front porch functions as a landmark for wayfinding across Centennial Campus. Wood or wood-like materials tie the interior to the exterior at the entry and front porch. The tripartite organize is comprised of brick at the base, terracotta and glazing at the middle and glass at the top.
- t. The Panel gave kudos to the dean and the whole team for implementing a highly collaborative open space design. They said the building is dynamic, its massing is nice, the location of the main entry anticipates well future development, and the Lantern is a great feature.
- u. Further discussion ensued regarding color options for the building materials, the solar shading devices, bus stop locations, exterior planting displays and means, universal design for approach, bio-retention areas, site sections, site walls, bike parking, street trees and the overall site plan.

Panel Action:

The Panel recommended the following design directives to be incorporated for review at the March meeting:

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. Consider other color options for the terra-cotta tiles and brick that are less orange. Bring samples to the next Panel review.*
3. *Provide more information on the building shading devices and the solar shade studies that were used to evaluate the design.*
4. *Confirm new bus stop locations coordinate well with pedestrian access to the site and building. Mike Kapp will schedule a meeting for us to review with University Transportation.*
5. *Consider exterior planting displays that provide insight on the research activities within the building. This is a great opportunity for an outdoor learning landscape.*
6. *Take into consideration Universal Design to provide the same means of access for all to the front building entrance. The exterior ramp as designed will only be used by those that can't use the steps*
7. *Assure that the Silva Cells are in locations where they are most successful.*
8. *Further evaluation is needed regarding the bio-retention areas. What is the plan to ensure success in this climate?*
9. *The planting beds should be wider than three feet so plants can be more successful.*
10. *Full site sections are needed to understand the grade and its relation to the building.*
11. *Evaluate the number and locations of the site walls and consider reduction of walls that are not needed to make up grade. Use walls for seating judiciously, avoiding placement along major circulation paths. Reduce the height of the walls, where possible.*
12. *Bike parking location and quantity needs further evaluation.*
13. *New street trees should coordinate with Oval Drive and Partners Way street tree design.*
14. *Provide a larger site plan that includes the surrounding buildings and their entrances.*
15. *Final exterior material selections based on field-erected sample panels will be reviewed and approved by the Office of the University Architect (OUA).*

Information Item:

1. Exterior building Signage Design Update:

- a. The current signage program has been in effect since the 1990's but it has taken years to implement from the previous iteration initiated in the 1960's and 1970's. The Facilities Division is looking to improve the program and use resources more wisely.
- b. The building identification signage will be simplified and easier to read. The signs will no longer included building occupant listings that require frequent updating and the street address will be added to each sign which will assist first responders and visitors.
- c. The parking identification prototype is similar to the parking sign with pictogram info for public pay lots. The number of parking signs types has been reduced from 6 sign types to 2 in order to maintain them more easily.
- d. Implementation of the new signs will be phased over time.

Panel Action:

The Panel recommended discussing with sign shop on how often to clean the signs and raised the question of making the street address number bold and street name regular font.

Status of Projects in Planning

1. The Plant Sciences Building will return for panel review on March 28, 2018.
2. Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority House and Greek Village Infrastructure will have their first review on March 28, 2018 with three more Greek houses to follow.

Next Meeting

Subsequent to this meeting, the February 28, 2018 meeting was canceled due to lack of agenda items. The next meeting is scheduled for April 25, 2018 at 1:30 in the Primrose Hall Conference Room.