



CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES – March 31, 2021
Primrose Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 4:00 PM

Attendees:	Chip Andrews Imran Aukhil Meg Calkins Bill Davis Patrick Deaton	Christopher Galik David Hill Rich Holly Lisa Johnson Sumayya Jones-Humienny	Tsai Lu Liu Donna McGalliard Doug Morton Ed Stack Tom Skolnicki Mark Weathington
Additional Distribution:	N/A		

General Business

L. Johnson stated that the Office of the University Architect is in the process of updating the Physical Master Plan (PMP) and the panel will meet more frequently in fall. She introduced the new panel members: Christopher Galik; Rich Holly; Tsai Lu Liu; and Mark Weathington.

Approval of Minutes

The July meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Integrative Sciences Building Site Selection, Submittal #170

Site: North Campus Precinct

Designer Names: Moseley Architects, with Brad Lockwood and Suzanne McDade; ZGF Architects, with Jerry Foster, Tim Williams, Toby Hasselgren, Juan Porta; and Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) Landscape Architects, with Chris Matthews, Matt Girard

Facilities Project Manager: Bob Cwikla

- a. **Review:** This is the first Panel review for the project.
- b. **Project Description:** The Integrative Sciences Building will further the university’s mission by providing much-needed STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) teaching and research space. It will be a catalyst for transforming the sciences at NC State. Embracing new models for sciences teaching and research, it will integrate STEM education with the grand challenges of society, inspiring new, interdisciplinary approaches to the sciences. The 145,000 GSF building will have a molecular sciences of life focus and will include classrooms, teaching labs, research labs, research core facilities, collaboration/study space, and office space.

The \$160M budget is split funded with half from state appropriations and the other half from university gifts. \$70M has been allocated to begin the design process. A high-level

visioning study was performed prior to site selection. Programming efforts will focus on chemistry, biochemistry, and interdisciplinary sciences with approximately 30% of the assignable square footage allotted to teaching and 45% to research. The Executive panel is comprised of the Chancellor and four deans who will provide oversight. The Executive and Advisory panels have approved the site. This review is for site approval only – the panel will review the project at least two more times for the building design.

c. Master Plan Summary: The site, located in the heart of north campus, presents an opportunity for the building to act as a Landmark celebrating the sciences and enhancing the university's identity and brand. The building design will promote creativity and collaboration and will showcase and celebrate the sciences ("Sciences on Display"). Adjacent to the "Brickyard" one of the university's nine Hallowed Places, great care will be given strengthen this iconic site.

d. Presentation

- i. The vision statement declares this interdisciplinary sciences building acts as a catalyst to transform the sciences at a crossroads for campus connectivity with a flexible model through collaboration, discovery, and transfer of knowledge while celebrating "sciences on display".
- ii. The 2014 Physical Master Plan identified the Harrelson site for a new Science Building, but the team assessed seven sites and went through a pros-and-cons process of elimination. They recommended the Harrelson site based on the Campus Capacity and Assessment Study's five guiding principles and how it relates to the Brickyard, a Hallowed Place.
- iii. The site analysis started with an historic analysis of the Brickyard design with the landscape as the connective tissue that ties the buildings and hardscaping together. Bill Bell's original design had a modernist romanticism for a garden-like quality that complemented the buildings. Since then, the Brickyard has become overgrown and evolved into a series of different connected quadrangles that provide strong east-west circulation. These spaces are a mix of character with some as iconic, front-of-house and others as service-related.
- iv. Site opportunities include: an iconic location at the intersection of two All-Campus paths; preservation of the Brickyard expression to Hillsborough St.; improving its identity by filtering Cox-Dabney; improvements to existing buildings, servicing to Polk and Cox-Dabney, Brickyard accessibility, and storm water management; programmatic adjacencies to other STEM buildings; adjacencies to utilities; limited impact to this Hallowed Place; and activating the Brickyard.
- v. Site challenges include: separating the pedestrian flow from service vehicle traffic at Polk, Bureau of Mines and Cox-Dabney.

e. Panel Discussion:

- i. Dick Bell's original design anticipated fewer cars in the center of campus.
- ii. The building has potential to be more porous to accommodate the pedestrian crossroads flow at the first floor. The Brickyard needs more attention regarding storm water management.
- iii. The design team has performed shading studies on the Brickyard. From a microclimate perspective, the building height may need to be reduced or stepped

- back as it rises to minimize shading on the brickyard. Programming is next on the project's development. The team will determine massing when building design starts.
- iv. Regarding a future visual or physical connection between the Brickyard and the Talley area, a future accessible bridge will start at grade on north campus adjacent to Broughton Hall and connect to the fourth floor of Talley at the exterior elevator tower. This will become a transformative connector when the railroad expands its light rail and the coliseum tunnel is no longer accessible. The new bridge and the underpass at the Free Expression Tunnel will complement each other.
 - v. The sustainability design team will investigate daylighting, lower carbon, and healthy building strategies as part of the goal to achieve LEED Silver at a minimum. Its north-south orientation will allow for a lot of transparency facing the Brickyard. Storm water in the Brickyard that flows south to Rocky Branch Creek will need better management starting with permeable pavers and a holistic view to integrate best practices beyond its boundaries for future improvements.

f. Panel Action: The Panel approved recommending site to BPC of BOT the project with the following design directives to be incorporated:

- i) *The Panel appreciates the level of detail that went into evaluating multiple sites and recommends approval of the old Harrelson Hall site for this project.*

2. Mann Hall Façade Renovation Structural Repairs/Window Replacements, Submittal #170

Site: North Campus Precinct

Designer Names: SKA Engineers, with Scott Singleton, and Walter Robbs Callahan & Pierce Architects (WR), with Matt Messick.

Facilities Project Manager: Melanie Butler

- a. **Review:** This is the first Panel review for the project.
- b. **Project Description:** This project includes repair of the deteriorated concrete structural columns of Mann Hall in order to extend the life of the building. In addition, all the exterior windows in the building will be replaced and envelope repairs, including masonry and roof repairs, will be performed to resolve water intrusion concerns. Mann Hall is an existing 4-story building constructed in 1963 with 79,722 gross square feet. The structure is concrete cast-in-place columns with a cast-in-place beam-joist system. The building was recently vacated by the College of Engineering Civil, Environmental, and Structural Engineering Department's move to the new Fitts-Woolard Hall. Repairs can be done when the building is vacant.
- c. **Master Plan Summary:** Design harmony – architecture arising from the study of and response to the neighborhood context resulting in strong visual unity. Design elements, materials and features will be sympathetic to the neighborhood context.
- d. **Presentation and Panel Discussion:**
 - i. To comply with the Physical Master Plan design harmony guideline, the design is sensitive to the context of the existing buildings in the neighborhood that are bookended by Cox and Dabney to the west and SAS to the east.

- ii. Two architectural precedents are the Polk addition and SAS Hall for material selection. WR performed a series of studies and propose metal bands to cover the concrete columns and break up the mundane repetitive window pattern. They also help to emphasize the Stinson Drive entrance. Adding a canopy further visually enhances the entrance and provides protection from inclement weather.
 - iii. The existing switchback handicap accessible ramp is not in the project scope and will remain as is, but the panel noted that the ramp and rails could be improved for a more universal, appropriate, and welcoming design when future funding allows.
 - iv. The proposed brick base replaces the problematic concrete band to address water intrusion with a material more in keeping with the architectural concepts.
 - v. The proposed curtain wall projects beyond the existing face of the columns. The entry columns will be wrapped with metal. The horizontal bands have the potential for metal panel infills to reflect more recent adjacent designs, budget allowing.
 - vi. At the south, rear façade, the high-bay portion will also have metal-wrapped columns and replacement of the windows and doors. This elevation shows the lowest horizontal mullion correctly, but it differs somewhat from the front pattern.
 - vii. The proposed design provides a top parapet and coping for the curtain wall and it will flash into the existing roof that will only receive patching. The top of the columns will be closed/encapsulated and tied to the new closure for the top of the curtain walls. This solution will be more durable as it brings the columns inside the building.
 - viii. The design is taking passive corrosion resistant measures with a cathodic protection system as well.
 - ix. The panel noted the new front entrance canopy should not exacerbate the existing dark recessed condition. The materials could be lighter and use more glass or metal that is perforated.
 - x. The panel asked whether the front storefront could be pushed out to partially enclose the covered area. Currently this amount of work is neither in the scope nor in the budget.
 - xi. Discussions ensued regarding the timing of the last roof renovation and whether the roof should be replaced while major upgrades are underway. The roof is 20 years old and the warranty has expired. Observations show that it is generally in good condition and with patching it can last another 10 years. Given the limited budget, this approach makes sense as a modified bitumen roof can last 30 years.
- d. Panel Action:** The Panel requested the project return for review at a future meeting with the following design directives to be incorporated:
- i) *Provide details that show how the new façade terminates at the parapet.*
 - ii) *Further study of the entry canopy is needed to ensure that the proposed canopy is not exacerbating the existing dark recessed building entrance. Consider a new exterior soffit and lighting as well as other canopy material options such as glass.*
 - iii) *While renovations of the building entry stair and ramp are not in the scope of this project, it would be helpful to understand possible improvement options and how they may impact the design of the canopy.*
 - iv) *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

1. The Integrated Sciences Building will return at least 2 more times in design development.
2. The USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) \$30M building at Lake Wheeler is currently in schematic design and will come for panel review when it is further developed.
3. The Physical Master Plan is starting and will involve numerous campus stakeholder meetings.

Status of Projects in Construction

1. The panel will look at the impact it has made on recently completed projects, such as Fitts-Woolard Hall, the Academic Success Center at DH Hill Library, the Bureau of Mines Renovation and the Memorial Belltower Restoration and plinth accessibility improvements. Some projects will be reviewed in person, as time and Covid restrictions allow.

Next Meeting

The April meeting was canceled due to a lack of agenda items. The next meeting will be May 26, 2021 at 1:30 via Zoom.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES – May 26, 2021
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 3:00 PM**

Attendees:	Chip Andrews	David Hill	Donna McGalliard
	Imran Aukhil	Rich Holly	Doug Morton
	Meg Calkins	Lisa Johnson	Ed Stack
	Bill Davis	Sumayya Jones-Humienny	Mark Weathington
	Patrick Deaton	Tsai Lu Liu	

Additional Distribution:	Christopher Galik	Tom Skolnicki

General Business
N/A

Approval of Minutes
The March meeting minutes were approved.

Projects for Review:

1. Varsity Dr. Parking Lot Expansion, Submittal #164

Site: South Campus Precinct

Capital Project Management (CPM) Project Manager: Melanie Butler

Transportation Director: Than Austin

Designers: Civil Engineering - Kevin Barnes with Draper Aden Associates; Landscape Architecture - Robert Pratt with Surface 678

- a) **Project Description:** The parking lot expansion will provide approximately 400 additional parking spaces to the South Campus Precinct within an existing commuter parking lot with existing Wolfline bus stops and shelters. Associated infrastructure includes the use of low impact development (LID) storm water methods, possible permeable paver areas, future solar panel structures, additional bus shelters, security stanchions, site lighting, sidewalks and driveway entrance. The project is scheduled to be completed in March 2023.

The Varsity Drive Parking Lot Expansion will provide additional parking to replace a portion of the inventory lost when the Coliseum Parking Deck is demolished since it is near the end of useful life. Associated project infrastructure includes storm water, security stanchions, site lighting, sidewalks

and driveway entrance. The project will demolish field storage structures as a part of the site demolition.

- b) Master Plan Summary:** The site selection for this project was approved by the CDRP (October 2019) and the Trustees Buildings & Property Committee (November 2019). This project will improve vehicular and pedestrian connections with a focus on an enhanced streetscape along Varsity drive as well as creating welcoming transit stops.
- c) Presentation:** This is the Panel's first review of the project.
- i) The South Campus precinct historically was the area for "messy" research support functions, but once the university gained the Centennial Campus precinct, it became a connector. Clean-up implementation is ongoing with demolition of several poultry buildings (#632, 633, 636, and 637) and Greenhouse UFL (#641). The Don Ellis Building (#133), Aqua Demo Building UFL (#640), and Storage Shed #2 (#242D) will remain on site.
 - ii) Current pedestrian circulation consists of a series of sidewalks and bus stops that collect from the adjacent parking lots and Varsity Drive. The proposed design considers the hierarchy of the vehicular and pedestrian circulation and their connections.
 - iii) Proposed points of vehicular primary circulation access are from Gorman Street to the west, Marcom Street to the south, and Varsity Drive to the southeast with three adjacent bus stops. Secondary vehicular access is potentially aligned with Fraternity Court's and Greek Village Drive's new entries. A central circulation spine curves to align with Gorman at the intersection of Greenleaf Street and with Greek Village Drive's new entry at Varsity Drive.
 - iv) The secondary pedestrian circulation runs north-south and collects at intersections with east-west primary circulation leading to the bus stops and covered bike racks. A new bus shelter is proposed at the southeast corner.
 - v) A series of crosswalks with pedestrian tables run east-west as traffic-calming measures to deter vehicles from passing through.
 - vi) The topography high point is at the northeast corner with the low point at the southwest corner where the proposed stormwater measure is located. Stormwater will collect on the parking lot surface in a series of north-south swales with curb cuts into these vegetated areas to save on the need for additional stormwater infrastructure. Permeable pavers will be placed in the parking stalls where reduced traffic load leads to their increased longevity.
 - vii) Shade trees are introduced throughout the parking area and along the central spine. Masses of grasses will be planted along with other vegetation in the swales.
 - viii) Solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays are also proposed as shade canopies; however, due to budget limitations and escalating construction costs, design and implementation may be a phase two solution. It makes fiscal sense to install the electrical infrastructure as part of phase one.
 - ix) The project was delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic causing severe Transportation revenue loss.
- d) Panel Discussion:**
- i. The proposed parking count is currently at 410 and its purpose will continue as parking permitted for commuter students.
 - ii. Handicap accessible parking spaces need to be placed near the bus stops.
 - iii. Long-term permeable pavers' maintenance versus normal asphalt paving requires routine sweeping of the lot and periodic additional sweeping of the parking spaces. The use of permeable pavers are becoming more prevalent with a better understanding of best practices for

- maintenance. These permeable pavers will have an underdrain system to promote conveyance filtration before draining to the wetlands.
- iv. Although the proposed use of PV is very beneficial, further study is needed for the optimum orientation of the panels. Flat solar panel studies at Fitts-Woolard Hall showed the roughly same efficiency as those tilted at the ideal 36 degree southern orientation. The downside is the drip line falls on cars unless it is channeled elsewhere.
 - v. More shade trees are needed to reduce solar heat gain, especially if PV panels are not implemented immediately.
 - vi. Regarding the safety concern about connecting the existing parking lot to the new, the east lot is under further study with two connections, but it helps that the bay organization matches the existing for directional flow. The northeast connection may be future one.
 - vii. A scooter and e-bike system was contracted with Lime, but Lime pulled the bikes out. They will be introducing new e-bikes in the fall that are dock-less.
 - viii. Citrix stations may be strategically located after studying e-bike implementation.
 - ix. The parking lot lighting and emergency stanchion call station design is forthcoming.

e) Panel Action:

The panel approved the site and site design and requested that the following directives be incorporated:

- i. Incorporate more shade trees in the landscape design to reduce the heat island effect until the solar shade structures can be realized.*
- ii. Provide accessible parking near bus stops.*
- iii. Provide university standard security stanchions and lighting.*
- iv. Final exterior material selections will be reviewed and approved by the Office of the University Architect.*

2. Mann Hall Façade Renovation Structural Repairs/Window Replacements , Submittal #171

Site: North Campus Precinct

Capital Project Management (CPM) Project Manager: Melanie Butler

Designers: Engineering – Scott Singleton with SKA Consulting; Architectural – Matt Messick with Walter Robbs

- a) **Project Description:** This project includes repair of the deteriorated concrete structural columns of Mann Hall in order to extend the life of the building. In addition, all the exterior windows in the building will be replaced and envelope repairs, including masonry and roof repairs, will be performed to resolve water intrusion concerns. Mann Hall is an existing 4-story building constructed in 1963 with 79,722 gross square feet. The structure is concrete cast-in-place columns with a cast-in-place beam-joist system. The building was recently vacated by Civil, Environmental, and Structural Engineering's move to the new Fitts-Woolard Hall.
- b) **Master Plan Summary:** Design harmony is architecture arising from the study of and response to the neighborhood context resulting in strong visual unity. Design elements, materials and features will be sympathetic to the neighborhood context.
- c) **Presentation:**
This is the panel's second review of the project.

- i. The primary focus is to repair the building envelope. The roof will be patched to provide another 10 years of service life.
- d) **Panel Discussion:** Previous review comments are below in italics with responses in regular font.
- i. *Provide details that show how the new façade terminates at the parapet.* A two-foot high parapet is now aligned and flush with the metal panel face of the parapet versus the previous recessed condition at the curtain wall. The flashing seam details two sections with drip edges as the best practice is to limit height to 9.5 inches. This will produce a desirable shadow line. The flashing at the corner condition will be a one-piece factory-welded corner piece. The sections are 10-12' long with joints being offset; however, the joints need to be intentional and align with the architectural rhythm.
 - ii. *Further study of the entry canopy is needed to ensure that the proposed canopy is not exacerbating the existing dark recessed building entrance. Consider a new exterior soffit and lighting as well as other canopy material options such as glass.* The vertical slanted-blade canopy structure will be top supported to provide more daylighting and a lighter structure. The concrete columns will be wrapped in new metal panels to tie the façade together. An add alternate will replace entry storefront if budget/bid pricing allow. The hand rails at the front entry steps have a streamlined, low profile.
 - iii. *While renovations of the building entry stair and ramp are not in the scope of this project, it would be helpful to understand possible improvement options and how they may impact the design of the canopy.* The proposed brick base breaks at stairs on west and east sides. The switchback ramp takes too much run length. The proposed straight run ramp has horizontal cable rails between vertical aluminum supports; however, the ramp design and construction are not in the project scope but may be implemented in the future.
- e) **Panel Action:**
The panel approved the site and site design and requested that the following directives be incorporated:
- i. *The vertical seams in the new metal fascia should be detailed to align with other vertical façade elements such as the joint between the brick panels and the window wall system.*
 - ii. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*
- f) **Status of Projects in Planning:**
Upcoming projects include:
- i. USDA Agriculture Research Service (ARS) Building at Lake Wheeler Field Labs. This is a land lease project in which USDA-ARS will construct a building on university property to house USDA personnel that are currently in university buildings.
 - ii. The Physical Master Plan is now underway with the design team touring campus. The Panel will review its progress at regular intervals.

Next Meeting(s)

There is no June meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for July 28, 2021 from 1:30 – 3:00 PM via Zoom.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35.



CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES – September 29, 2021
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Attendees: Meg Calkins Tim Humphrey Donna McGalliard
Bill Davis Lisa Johnson Doug Morton
Patrick Deaton Sumayya Jones-Humienny Ed Stack
Christopher Galik Alicia Knight Tom Skolnicki
David Hill Tsai Lu Liu Mark Weathington

Additional Distribution: Rich Holly

General Business

Introductions were made for new members Board of Trustee (BOT) Member Tim Humphrey and University Real Estate and Development Director Alicia Knight.

The charge, which is posted at the website, is 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. The role of CDRP members has been updated to reflect an increase in its scope of responsibility that includes peer review of the physical master plan and master plan updates.

Project updates include:
N/A

Approval of Minutes

The May 2021 meeting minutes were approved with the revision of the panel actions for Mann Hall Façade Renovation to reflect the May, not March, 2021 meeting.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Physical Master Plan (PMP) Kick-Off**, Submittal # N/A
Site: Five Campus Precincts plus Lake Wheeler and Reedy Creek outlying areas
Design Team: SmithGroup, with Neal Kessler, Lead Campus Planner, and Lauren Leighty, Project Manager
Office of the University Architect Project Manager: Tom Skolnicki
Project Description: Review the new PMP progress to date, specifically the Kickoff activities that started the week of 9/13. The last new PMP was in 2000 with updates in 2007 and 2014.

Presentation:

This is the panel's first review of the PMP.

1. Purpose: Introduction of the NC State Physical Master Plan project, the role of the Campus Design Review Panel within this effort, and discussion around key emerging themes heard during the recent Campus Kickoff visit.
 - a) Overview of the process and decision-making structure
The PMP:
 - i) includes all land holdings within Wake County, including field labs.
 - ii) takes a holistic approach to fold in new the Strategic Plan, past studies, and a wide cross-section of stakeholder feedback.
 - iii) has only one version, per Charlie Maimone: other studies feed into this PMP.
 - iv) is an inclusionary process with a dedicated website and a “MapMyWolfpack” mapping tool.
 - v) Will interface with the CDRP five times at key milestones
 - vi) is an 18-month process with six iterative phases: Discover; Interpret; Ideate; Formulate; Refine; and Resolve.
 - vii) will become a living document with phasing and cost modeling and require BOT approval before posting on the website.
2. Overview of Task Force (TF) Approach
 - a) Six Task Force are uniquely organized by themes, versus topics, with more cross-pollination among diverse cross-sections:
 - i) *Reinforce the Culture and Place of NC State* focuses on what makes us unique. Discussion initially focused on legacy spaces (Belltower, Lake Raleigh, etc.) but evolved into how we become a more inclusionary campus (Strategic Plan Goal 4).
 - ii) *Enhance Stewardship of Campus Resources* thinks through a more holistic lens (land, infrastructure, buildings, people, etc.) regarding sustainability and resiliency.
 - iii) *Elevate the Student Experience* views holistically how the overall student experience impacts student success, retention, and graduation and assesses the “Haves” and “Have-nots” regarding access to amenities and facilities.
 - iv) *Align Facilities with University Mission* looks at how we provide R1 institutional teaching, learning and research and interdisciplinary activities.
 - v) *Create a Connected Campus* seeks to identify and eliminate barriers, not just for mobility, but for visibility, social fabric, programs, etc.
 - vi) *Identify Infrastructure Needs* looks at how to continue to support and create more resiliency and better tell the story of how important infrastructure needs are and to prioritize them for an investment strategy.
 - b) Each TF will review multiple planning components. More involvement is being planned between key milestones.
3. Emerging Themes Discussion: Discuss top opportunities and concerns within each campus precinct.
 - a) Cognitive mapping and feedback exercises took place during multiple meetings, open forums, and pop-up engagement sessions.
 - b) Lack of connectivity was a major theme among all sessions, with barriers such as the railroad, Western Blvd, and I-440, etc.
 - c) For nomenclature clarity, main campus is composed of North, Central, South, West, and Centennial Campus Precincts. The Outlying Areas include Lake Wheeler and Reedy Creek.

- d) *North Campus*: Students love and value the open spaces. Stinson Dr. at class changes is extremely crowded with pedestrians. There are opportunities to rethink its scale and use. Great movement occurs in the east-west direction, but north-south movement is less successful. The university turned its back toward Hillsborough St., but there are also opportunities to make that edge more visible, engaging and porous.
- i) Other discussion from the panel:
- (a) Generally, the panel members agree with these assessments. Driving is easier than walking. Sustainability is part of PMP TF2 with Allen Boyette, Senior Director of Energy Systems, chairing and participation from Carla Davis, Director of the Sustainability Office.
- (b) With regards to connections the community pertaining to Hillsborough Street, the NW area housing developments, most are easy for pedestrians and cyclists; however, Pullen Park and Pullen Rd. are more difficult. Regarding to the university campus precincts, safe and easy access to Centennial Campus is lacking. Centennial Biomedical Campus staff and students need good access to other parts of campus and to retail and the NC Museum of Art. The overall visitor experience is also lacking, especially from the west approach and the Coliseum Deck, in arrival moments and navigating from there to destination points. The Free Expression Tunnel is iconic and accessible, but other tunnels are barriers and unpleasant. Talley is designed to accept a 4th floor bridge that lands at Broughton grade for a pleasant and accessible path across the railroad. The only connection from Administrative Services III Building to north campus is under a bridge at Dan Allen Dr. – could there be better N-S connections further west?
- e) *Central Campus*: It does not have as many open green spaces as North. Everyone loves the Talley, Reynolds, and Carmichael renovations as student-focused places, and by comparison, those areas that haven't been renovated compare poorly, like Cates Avenue, which needs further implementation of the Cates Avenue MP Study. There are very few complaints about residence halls due to programming overcoming facilities that may lack amenities. Students mention dining quality and availability, as they want more of everything. DH Hill Renovations are very successful and students love to study there.
- i) The energy level subsides further west along Cates Ave. to Dan Allen Dr. where Rocky Branch is also a hidden natural feature that could be better optimized adjacent to Athletics and Wellness and Recreation outdoor fields.
- ii) The Food Lion and adjacent area along Western Blvd. access and safety in are concerns. The two tunnels east of the Free Expression Tunnel are dark and not accessible – we need to celebrate those connections. Retail needs to be more vibrant along Hillsborough St., especially during summers.
- iii) The Strategic Plan is well-thought through, but we need more interdisciplinary scholarship and research as part of the PMP to provide spaces that solve complex problems. The Integrative Sciences Building (ISB) is the embodiment of that idea. Collaborative space nodes could be designed to connect different parts of campus.

- f) *Centennial Campus*: The lack of connectivity and amenities (student center, more dining options, and recreation facilities) are major complaints. The development of the 32-acre Innovation District will provide opportunities in partnership with Lincoln-Harris and Goldman Sachs. The Greenway Trails and Lake Raleigh should be more visible and celebrated. The Dorothea Dix Park planner would love to see density at our edge of Centennial East (formerly called "Spring Hill") to enliven the Park and add to amenities of nearby Centennial Campus. The JC Raulston Arboretum would like an arboretum presence on Centennial Campus too: it is currently a hidden gem at its Beryl Rd. location. Centennial Parkway, constructed in the 1980's, is another wide barrier. Students make Hunt Library a destination for studying, especially for their study/breakout rooms. These put learning and research on display for the "think and do" aspects of the university. Balancing all of the above is difficult because they are all competing for space.
 - i) Wolf Ridge is the first residence hall to fill up followed by Avent Ferry because of proximity for College of Engineering (COE) students, even though they don't feel like they are on main campus. Avent Ferry Road is particularly disconnected, physically and programmatically.
 - g) *South Campus*: Greek Village is improving the area, but questions remain regarding use/purpose of the Joyner Visitor Center now that the visitor function has moved to Talley. How do we influence better use and connection to land we do not own at Avent Ferry and across Western Blvd.?
 - h) *West Campus*: The College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) on the Centennial Biomedical Campus (CBC) has need of additional land for pastures and facilities. They do not have a front door on Blue Ridge Rd. Better connections across Blue Ridge Rd. are needed to new development. They feel isolated with a tenuous bus connection and no greenway trail connection to the rest of campus.
 - i) Questions pertain to long-term plans for the Short Course Golf Facility and the University Club. The JC Raulston Arboretum is far away and hidden. The West Research Annex has horticulture field labs that are messy and in poor condition.
 - ii) The game day experience at Carter-Finley and PNC Arena is disconnected for students and unsafe to walk along Hillsborough St. Blue Ridge terminates at the State Highway Patrol property. We should create a narrative for need of that property for CVM for office space and educational opportunities. The Arboretum is also growing rapidly.
 - i) *Lake Wheeler and Reedy Creek*: We will review these outlying areas at a future meeting.
 - j) *Next Meeting*: the date is to be determined for review of Alternative Scenarios in early 2022.
- 4.

Panel Discussion:

See above for discussion pertaining to each precinct.

Panel Action:

There is no panel action needed at this time.

Status of Projects in Planning: N/A

Status of Projects in Construction: N/A

Next Meeting(s)

The next meeting is scheduled for October 27, 2021 from 1:30 – 3:00 PM via Zoom.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.