NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – January 26, 2022
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
Additional Distribution:	David Hill	Rich Holly	Mark Weathington
		Tsai Lu Liu	

Approval of Minutes
The September 29 meeting minutes were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Physical Master Plan Progress**
   The Physical Master Plan will be brought to the CDRP at key milestones for review. Multiple engagement sessions have been held across campus for outreach and feedback. SmithGroup will attend the February 22 CDRP meeting in-person to receive direct feedback from panel members. Panel members will recommend approval to the Board of Trustees for their approval at their November meeting. Completion of the Physical Master Plan is slated to occur in December 2022.

   a. Principles, Processes, and Prototypes Approach:
      1) Formulating principles is an iterative process, which receives input, feedback, and observations, that inform each of the six Task Forces principles that then inform the overall Master Plan principles. These principles align with the university's strategic plan and are statements that guide decision-making.
      2) Processes are actionable strategies that align with the principles. Once established, they will determine the "who, what, where, when, and how" of the decision-making framework. All Task Forces will identify processes to roll up into an overall decision-making strategy.
      3) Prototypes are derived from the principles and processes. Prototype elements will be identified by each Task Force for use in the Master Plan's comprehensive prototypes.

   b. Campus and Community Outreach and Input
      1) Outreach and input measures include a website with the ability to input feedback and 14 pop-up events, some targeted for geographic representation with others targeted for

underrepresented groups, garnered participation from 300 attendees. In addition, three open forums were also well attended.
2) From these events, feedback was gathered on what campus means to individuals and dot exercises translated to heat maps for what to preserve or transform around campus.
3) Task Force meetings dove deep into areas of focus and started developing the guiding principles.

c. Initial Observations and Analysis Examples
1) Task Force 1 - Reinforce the Culture and Place of NC State:
    i) The arrival experience to reach our Hallowed Places often does not enhance the quality and character of NC State.
    ii) The mission of “think and do” needs to be put on display.
2) Task Force 2 – Enhance Stewardship of Campus Resources
    i) Integrate design and stewardship goals through strong sustainable design guidelines with the goal of implementing strategies to achieve progress. Sustainability also includes social and economic in addition to physical components.
3) Task Force 3 Elevate the student experience.
    i) North Campus energy dissipates after the academic hours of the day. The focus started on North Campus but broadened to include all of campus.
        (1) The panel questioned whether the heat map indicating where students say they feel unsafe correlates to crime incidents on campus. It does not correlate to crime, but rather to the number of people out and about, as most of the campus is well lit at night. The question to answer is what activities/functions will enliven campus at night?
4) Task Force 4 – Align Facilities with the University Mission
    i) Learning environments need to be flexible and scalable to support a variety of pedagogies.
    ii) Research spaces are not adequate in size or function to support the growing enterprise, as research is growing very rapidly.
5) Task Force 5 – Create a Connected Campus
    i) Some of the most intensely used pedestrian paths on North and Central Campuses are streets and parking.
        (1) The panel asked if there is there a more efficient way to provide parking and free up circulation for pedestrians and service vehicles. Head-in parking is a safety problem. The panel suggested eliminating parking on Cates Avenue first, as most are employee spaces.
        (2) Transportation thinks the parking permit numbers won’t rebound to pre-Covid-19 numbers. The panel asked for consideration of a more thoughtful street grid overlay to allow more appropriate ways to travel through campus, especially for service and emergency vehicle access.
6) Task Force 6 - Identify Infrastructure Needs
    i) The existing, aging building stock is a burden to infrastructure and planning plus energy use.
        (1) This is as much a sustainability issue as it is a focus of this Task Force. To be more specific, the lack of attention to infrastructure planning is a burden because infrastructure must grow before the building inventory can grow. For example, the Integrated Sciences Building is out of thermal capacity; therefore

that building may have to be saddled disproportionately to cover costs to expand the plant. Aging electrical and water main infrastructure are also problematic as no one is inclined to give funds for those costs.

d) Refinement of the draft principles is underway and will be finalized at SmithGroup's visit from February 22 – 24.

Panel Discussion:

1. Do observations surprise anyone? Some panel members responded that where people do not feel safe is surprising and assumed it was because of low light levels but the correlation to feeling unsafe is about the lack of activity after dark in areas of the Brickyard.
2. The most challenging thing for connectivity is going back and forth from North to Centennial Campuses. The distance is not as far as the crow flies, but the pedestrian crossing at Western Blvd. is not only a physical barrier but a safety problem.
3. Opportunities are being reviewed for programmatic and vista connections to landmarks from one precinct to another.

Status of Projects in Planning:

The FY2021-22 Repair and Renovation list has over $100M funding that will be allocated in increments. This year, NC State will receive $10M for designing and executing projects Highlighted projects include:

1. Integrative Sciences Building, located on the former Harrelson Hall site, is in Schematic Design.
2. Ricks Hall 2nd Floor Renovations is an interior renovation only.
3. Page Hall Mechanical & Electrical Upgrade is also an interior renovation only.
4. USDA Agriculture Research Service Building at Lake Wheeler will be a land lease with a new facility.
5. The Dabney, Mann, and 111 Lampe Drive projects include building envelope upgrades.
6. ESports will renovate existing square footage to accommodate teaching, research, and competition functions for gaming.
7. Apiculture Facility at Lake Wheeler will be a new building for bee research.
8. Centennial Campus Plaza is the location for a new art installation.
9. CVM Translational Research Facility is a new research facility funded via an NIH grant.
10. CVM Equine Facility is funded through Advanced Planning only.
11. Anticipate the Physical Master Plan to be reviewed for approval at the October CDRP meeting.

Next Meeting(s)

The next meeting is scheduled for February 23, 2022 from 1:30 – 2:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15.

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – February 23, 2022
Virtual/Talley Student Union Room 5101 Hybrid Meeting
1:30 – 2:30 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	Rich Holly	Mark Weathington
Additional Distribution:	Tsai Lu Liu		

Approval of Minutes

The January 26 meeting minutes were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Physical Master Plan Future Scenarios**
   The NC State Physical Master Plan Team is exploring initial ideas for the future of the campus and presenting early design concepts and big ideas for consideration.

   a) Per the schedule, the SmithGroup design team is now finalizing the Ideate phase and progressing to the Formulate phase.
   b) Outreach included numerous virtual and in-person engagement sessions plus a survey. Findings are on the masterplan.ncsu.edu webpage.
   c) SmithGroup shared a brief overview of the Analysis presentation to help remind CDRP of the previous presentation.
   d) SmithGroup applied and recapped their observation findings with the feedback received to the Task Force themes. This information feeds into Guiding Principles, which will help to guide decision-making.
      i) Task Force 1: Reinforce Culture and Place
         (1) Observation: NC State's Mission of "Think and Do" is not readily visible to the broader campus community and visitors.
      ii) Task Force 2: Steward Campus Resources
         (1) Observation: Integrate design and stewardship goals through strong sustainable design guidelines. The three pillars or dimensions of sustainability address environmental, economic, and social aspects.
            (a) Meg Calkins asked how the impacts of climate change are being addressed. SmithGroup responded it is reflected in Principle #2, falling within the environmental pillar. Lisa Johnson said that more context can be gained by looking at the Guiding Principles memo she shared.
      iii) Task Force 3: Elevate the Campus Experience
         (1) Observation: North Campus energy dissipates after the academic hours of the day.

iv) Task Force 4: Align Facilities with Mission
  (1) Observation: Learning environments need to be flexible and scalable to support a variety of pedagogies.
  (2) Observation: Research spaces are not adequate in size or function to support the growing enterprise

v) Task Force 5: Strengthen Campus Connections: beyond physical to include visual and programmatic needs
  (1) Observation: Some of our most intensely used pedestrian paths on North and Central Campus are streets and parking

vi) Task Force 6: Ensure Infrastructure Reliability
  (1) Observation: The existing (aging) building stock is a burden to infrastructure and planning to serve academic and research and outreach mission

e) Future scenarios are big ideas, opportunities for consideration, and discussion, that would be implemented incrementally over time. Panel discussion specific to future scenarios is shown in *italics* below.

i) North Campus:
  (1) Create a more pedestrian-focused campus and engage Hillsborough Street. Remove roads from the center and serve campus from its perimeter. Open up views and opportunities along the seam with Hillsborough Street. Roads are primarily static parking lots due to the massive student pedestrian flow between classes. Remove curbs and create stormwater control measures (SCMs) to alleviate impervious surfaces' runoff. North-south connections are important, especially on Broughton Dr, as a pedestrian route from Hillsborough Street can link all the way to Centennial Campus.
  (2) Create a polycentric campus with vibrant, mixed-use hubs by understanding what programmatic elements should be included in each neighborhood. This mix could include shared, interdisciplinary collaboration spaces and food/beverage amenities, with each center having its own thematic focus. These thematic areas of interdisciplinary interest within the neighborhoods would primarily focus on enhancing adjacencies.
    (a) The new Integrative Sciences Building (ISB), future renovations to the Erdahl-Cloyd (west) Wing in DH Hill Library, and redevelopment of Bostian and Gardner Halls have the potential to greatly improve the level of engagement and activity on "The Brickyard" (University Plaza) beyond academic hours.
    (b) 250+ parking spaces could be relocated from various locations around North Campus and consolidated at the SAS parking in a deck under housing, academic, and/or research functions to improve the pedestrian experience.
      (i) The panel asked if SmithGroup could describe the concept of a "Campus Center." Is it a building, a space, or a program? SmithGroup responded that they can each be different in nature to celebrate the polycentric campus. These are areas of catalytic convergence that celebrate NC State's culture of interdisciplinary culture.
      (ii) The panel questioned how to better connect the East Arts neighborhood (the area with Gregg Museum, Pullen Arts Center, and the Theatre in the Park). SmithGroup agreed that this needs to be explored in more detail.
      (iii) The panel questioned how the campus would be serviced by reducing vehicle access. SmithGroup responded these paths can accommodate service vehicles as needed but the plan is to remove personal vehicle use except during Housing move-in/out days.

ii) Central Campus
   (1) This student life precinct is tied to North campus with parking lots and roads. Considerations for stronger connections include making Cates a pedestrian-focused path, allowing for housing move-in/move-out days, and relocating about 200+ parking spaces to consolidated parking areas.
   (2) Students' had a great amount of feedback regarding the pedestrian conflict crossing Dan Allen Drive, which could be rerouted to the west of Lee and Sullivan Residence Halls to make Dan Allen Drive more pedestrian-friendly.
      (a) The panel questioned how the previous Housing Master Plan would be integrated into this PMP. Donna McGalliard responded that leadership and pandemic changes require revisiting the recommendations. She noted it is very expensive to wrap housing around parking decks and that Lee and Sullivan Residence Halls are not accessible; therefore, the preference is to demolish them and rebuild on those sites across the railroad tracks from where Dan Allen Deck provides existing parking.
   (3) The Morrill Drive gateway at Western Boulevard is an opportunity to enhance the connection to Centennial Campus with a more engaged and consistent pedestrian experience.
   (4) One option that may be cost-prohibitive for Athletics is to relocate Case Academic Center and its associated dining to the softball field by relocating the softball facilities to Lee Field. This would add more vibrancy to the closed-off portion of Cates Avenue to the east of Morrill Drive.
      (a) The panel questioned if the Miller Recreation Fields could be relocated elsewhere. Lisa Johnson responded that these are undersized amenities that would get even greater use with artificial turf which is in Wellness and Rec long-range plan. Adjacency to Carmichael is important from a student use and management standpoint.

iii) Centennial Campus Precinct
   (1) Expand the character of The Oval outward and encircle the areas with a greenway loop as an amenity with pedestrian connections across Centennial Campus Parkway. The seam between campus and Dorothea Dix Park's future development is an important one. A higher density along the perimeter of Dix Park will help to define the edge while strategically-located open space areas will bridge over to Dix Park providing access and view connections. Open space by Pullen Terrace (formerly called the Kirby/Bilyeu neighborhood) will provide a buffer.
   (2) Relocate the Arboretum to Green Space to enable growth and be more accessible and leverage Farmers' Market visitors.
      (a) Mark Weathington questioned how much space was available. SmithGroup that it would almost double the existing. Lisa Johnson shared that this approach would make it more accessible. Mark said he loves the idea of having it in this location and is curious if there could be some collaboration with Facilities on green infrastructure.
   (3) The demand for student housing at CC is great now and will only increase with the proposed growth for the College of Engineering. More food venues, amenities, and student services will also be needed.

iv) South Campus Precinct
   (1) Redevelopment of the Avent Ferry corridor provides an opportunity to create pedestrian engagement events along Avent Ferry Rd. We may be able to partner with or influence any development at Mission Valley Shopping Center.

v) West Campus Precinct

(1) The new bridge over I-440 at Ligon Street provides a better connection than the demolished one-lane tunnel and presents an opportunity to improve the research enterprise in the area. Historically, this area has been relegated as the "messy" part of campus but is now more visible from the I-440 portion undergoing widening.

vi) West Campus-Central Campus Precinct
(1) Renovate/rebuild mixed-use dev at Athletics stadium/arena east side
(2) Create a campus center at CBC. Showing SHP property acquisition and expansion of academic, research, and pasture land. We cannot expand into the lease line of the University Club but need to remove the pond and replace it with better stormwater control measures instead.

vii) Lake Wheeler and Reedy Creek
(1) Create a campus center south of the USDA building under design/construction.
(a) Tom Skolnicki noted that Reedy Creek should be looked at similarly to Lake Wheeler with its own long-range planning effort involving three colleges and Bandwidth's relocation there to understand how to capitalize on the land there.

f) Panel General Discussion:
i) Meg is excited about the campus committing to net-zero energy and water use and asked what physical things those would require. She noted that many strategies require land-consumptive tactics, such as solar panels over parking lots, and these need to be considered now. SmithGroup offered that renewables could certainly be part of the equation but are typically a multi-phase, multi-year effort. Lisa Johnson noted that one project, the Varsity Dr. Parking Lot expansion, has such infrastructure and is getting ready to bid. We must take the value of land into consideration for various uses. Renewables should be part of the mix but are multi-decade new implementations with centralized district utility plants. Water storage and geothermal measures take a substantial amount of land. (Ball State has the largest geothermal campus application.)

g) Next steps:
i) The next campus visit will be in late April 2022.

Status of Projects in Planning:

Next Meeting(s)
The next meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2022, from 1:30 – 3:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30.

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – April 27, 2022
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 3:00 PM

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

Additional Distribution:

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 22, 2022 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Page Hall Window Replacement**
   Site Location: North Campus
   Designer: McMillan Pazdan Smith
   Designer Representative: Jana Hartenstine

   - Page Hall Envelope Improvements include increasing the thermal performance of the existing wall, roof, window, skylight, and curtain wall assemblies to increase energy efficiency.
   - Insulation will be added to the existing furred-out mass masonry wall cavity space, and existing windows, glazed curtain wall assemblies, and roof skylight will be replaced. In addition, the roof will be replaced with a high albedo reflective roof, and existing compromised sub-grade partial basement walls will be waterproofed and insulated. Replacements are going into existing window openings.
   - The designer reviewed historical photos of original building exterior, as well as the context of buildings in the immediate area, such as the 1911 Building, Park Shops, Withers Hall and Winston Hall.
   - The proposed design recommends thicker mullions at the bottom of the windows to allow a similar pattern to occur between shorter and longer taller windows.
   - The bay on the east façade is not original to the building and the design strategy is to treat this element separately from the other window patterns. The project proposes spandrel glass to replace the metal panels so the bay looks less divided.

Comments:

The panel discussed operable windows benefits on indoor air quality versus the challenge they create with controlling humidity in buildings. Although these windows are not operable, the project is increasing the number of air changes with the new mechanical system to ensure good air quality.

The panel expressed concern that the bay window mullion pattern does not relate to the other windows on the east façade, and that the mullions on the storefront look thin and are not wide enough to conceal the conduit needed for the door openers and other equipment.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Page Hall Window Replacement project subject to the below design directives to be coordinated and finalized by the Office of the University Architect

- Provide alternative design options for the bay window mullion pattern that better align with the proportions of the other windows.
- Ensure the exterior door opener conduit/wiring can be concealed in new mullions and update the design documents with the correct mullion widths.
- Submit final exterior material samples (glazing, mullions, paint, etc.)

2. **Physical Master Plan**
Site Location: All land holdings in Wake County
Designer: SmithGroup
Designer Representatives: Lauren Leighty, Neal Kessler, John Perry

- The NC State Physical Master Plan Team is exploring initial ideas for the future of the campus and presenting early design concepts and big ideas for consideration. While the project is looking at all precincts in Wake County, the focus of today's discussion is the North, Central and Centennial precincts.
- The project is in the Formulate phase. Here to present a series of specific alternatives for key areas of campus. Goal is to gain consensus from the community regarding the direction for the plan scenarios.
- Six guiding principles will be integrated into each of these scenarios and projects going forward.
- The plan proposes some overarching concepts or Big Moves to unify campus.
    - Because of the relationships of the land holdings, a polycentric campus is needed, using Hubs in key locations to foster and focus activity. Hubs can be created in a number of different ways that use programmatic elements to bring people together. Each Hub will have elements associated with Academics, Research and Campus Life.
    - A connected network of Landscape Systems, Paths, and Green Infrastructure can further unify campus.
    - Create a Central Connector between North, Central and Centennial Campuses, from Hillsborough Street to Dix Park. This is envisioned as a multimodal pathway that has

nodes of interest along the way to elevate the human experience and create efficient movement back and forth across campus.
    - Engage Campus Edges. Focus on strategic interfaces and integration with the community at Hillsborough Street, Mission Valley, Dix Park and the Farmers Market.

- Brickyard Hub scenarios: Vibrancy in this area has been lost with removal of classrooms that were in Harrelson Hall and following the transformation of Talley. Idea – Program multiple buildings contribute to a hub.
- Riddick Lot scenarios: Add a residence hall or academic building with a hub focused on Social Sciences and Design. Place the building over a parking structure that accommodates spaces that are displaced from the streets on North Campus, allow the former streets to become pedestrian-focused paths.
- Cates West: Address maintenance concerns of Lee and Sullivan through a carefully phased plan to replace and add new beds in a new configuration that is pulled closer to Dan Allen Drive. Replace Fountain Dining Hall with a new multistory building that incorporates opportunities for collaboration or classroom space. Improve Witherspoon Student Center, adding collaboration space needed in the neighborhood.
- Cates East: Talley, Wellness and Rec, Reynolds have created a great hub right now for campus life with a vibrant urban intersection on three corners. Two alternatives propose ways to strengthen the hub in this location that is focused on campus life.
- Centennial Campus, Oval area: Build on the energy at Hunt Library by creating a hub that focuses on student services, housing, and recreation space.
- Centennial Campus, East of the parkway. Focus density along Blair Drive, adjacent to the Innovation District. Taller buildings could be a landmark viewed from downtown. Open space is proposed at the Spring Hill House, and at the northern and southern ends. Green corridors connect east-west from the west side of the Parkway to the Farmers Market and Dix Park. Create an active pedestrian seam between campus and Dix Park.

Comments:

- Give thought to some of the hub facilities being outdoors/open air
- In the Brickyard Hub, think about maker space in the lower level of a residence hall. Hillsborough Building site has a lot of potential to add to this hub. Also, consider Bostian Hall site for expanded dining.
- At the Riddick site, flip the relationship of the plaza/shared space and the buildings. Also, think about better connections to the space, such as the path between Poe and Page.
- At Cates West, think about how an opening could also happen at the Dining facility. The panel likes the idea of some academic space in the Dining facility, with the thought that classroom space could be study space as well. Think about how service to the dining facility can happen from either the north or the south. If student services need to grow is there a provision to do that here as well? Or should some of it happen on Centennial Campus?

Status of Projects in Planning:

Next Meeting(s)
The next meeting is scheduled for May 25, 2022 from 1:30 – 2:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – May 25, 2022
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 2:30 PM

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April 27, 2022 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **USDA ARS Plant Improvement Facility**
   Site Location: Lake Wheeler Road Field Labs
   Designer: Clark Nexsen
   Designer Representatives: Xander Ellenbogen, Tom Dalton (Clark Nexsen)

   - The project is a collaborative effort between the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service (USDA ARS) and NC State. Relocating several existing facilities and combining them into one improved facility.
   - Located in the agricultural area of the field labs, the site is at the northeast corner of the intersection of Lake Wheeler Road and Inwood Road.
   - The project's intent is to create a more natural, agrarian setting.
   - The driveways and parking are gravel, and walks leading from the parking to the building are concrete.
   - A water storage tank at the north end of the site is to provide fire suppression in addition to other water needs. The base bid for the project includes a small pump house for a well with an equipment storage yard to the east. The bid alternate is for a combined pump house and covered storage building for the farm equipment.
   - Stormwater approach. Drainage from buildings and paving is to a bioretention area on the east side of the site.
   - The one-story facility is comprised of interior spaces organized according to their respective crop in building wings that will be connected by a central outdoor breezeway. The west sides of the wings are offices with views of Lake Wheeler Road. The south end is anchored by a greenhouse/head house.
   - The surrounding agrarian architecture relies on extruded buildings with low sloping gabled roofs.

- The buildings are concrete block for the head house, pump house, and well house with translucent polycarbonate panels for the greenhouse. Box corrugated metal walls and Galvalume standing-seam roofs are proposed for the other buildings/wings.

Comments:

The panel inquired about the color of the glass on the windows, which is clear, as well as whether or not there are columns and downspouts associated with the canopies over the doors. There are columns that also carry the downspouts.

Several issues regarding the layout of the buildings were discussed. The greenhouse orientation is optimal running in a north-south direction, while the remainder of the buildings run east-west. It was also noted that the reason that the buildings are not perfectly perpendicular to Lake Wheeler Road is because the grading becomes pinched at the northeast corner of the site. Rotating the entire complex slightly resolves this issue.

There was discussion regarding the east and west ends of the buildings where the roof line changes to a shed roof condition. The panel expressed concern about the appearance of these and asked about various ways to address the issue. For security reasons, Federal standards do not permit plants between 6 inches and 6 feet above grade adjacent to the buildings. Therefore the panel asked if the roofs could turn down to break down the scale of the tall, blank walls.

The project proposes naturalized areas of tall grasses between the buildings and the streets. The panel expressed concern that these types of landscapes are not always successfully maintained. Lack of proper maintenance training or equipment can result in these landscapes taking more resources to maintain than intended.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the USDA ARS Plant Improvement Facility project subject to the below design directives to be coordinated and finalized by the Office of the University Architect:

- *Roof form and tall blank walls: Study alternate ways to break down the scale of the tall walls at the east and west ends of the bar buildings, including turning down the roofs to form a gable.*
- *Use of grasses: Ensure that staff understands and is trained on how to properly maintain the naturalized areas.*
- *Final exterior materials: Selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*

Next Meeting(s)
There is a meeting on June 15th to review the Centennial Campus Plaza project. The project would fall behind schedule if the review occurs in July; therefore, this special meeting is needed.

The July 27, 2022 meeting will be in-person to review the Integrated Sciences Building.

The meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM.

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – June 15, 2022
Virtual Meeting
12:00 – 1:00 PM

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 25, 2022 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Centennial Campus Plaza**
   Site Location: The Oval, Centennial Campus
   Designer: Design Workshop
   Designer Representatives: Emily McKoy, Benjamin Boyd, Adeline Lerner, Patrick Quigley (Design Workshop) Lauri Tredinnick, Leah Robinson (Affiliated Engineers) Jasmine Denizard (Lynch Mykins) Dan Miller (SEPI)

   - This project constructs a new plaza on the south side of The Oval adjacent to the James B. Hunt Jr. Library on Centennial Campus. The new plaza will be a permanent display of public glass art by Larry Bell. The reflections created by the interaction of light with the glass of the sculpture require a simple and elegant environment surrounding it. The desire of the artist and the Centennial Campus Art Committee is to create a plaza that showcases the reflections and allows viewers to approach the sculpture. The project includes specialized lighting.
   - The introduction of glass art on The Oval will be the largest public art installation for NC State University, and the most significant. This new plaza and art installation will create a focal point on Centennial Campus in a large-scale open space. The plaza will be a multi-use space allowing for events and gatherings. The art will create a new landmark, assist in wayfinding, and strengthen the campus identity.
   - The plan is an orthogonal layout of paths that connect to a square plaza with the art at the center. The use of aggregate paving around the art has two benefits. It will mitigate the impacts of potential skateboard activity around the art, and also plays a role storm water management, allowing water to drain through a binder that makes the pavement permeable and accessible.

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

- The design team is considering details to deter skateboarding at the granite seat wall at the north and companion wall at south.
- The design proposes to lower the mound to the north of the plaza by approximately two feet to improve views to the art and plaza while still maintaining the minimum cover recommended over the existing utilities below grade.
- The plaza is very gently sloped from east to west in what is hoped to be perceived as a flat plane.
- The planting palette is very simple, consisting of native sedges and grasses, and small ornamental trees carefully selected to consider shadows relative to the art, leaf litter, etc.
- The structural design is providing robust connections to the footings that will resist overturning forces, as well as ease of repair to, or replacement of, individual glass panels.
- The lighting concept is indicative of Larry Bell's interest in how light interacts with glass, and is intended to provide illumination that enables exploration of the sculptures at night to attract and orient people throughout the evening. Tree up-lights and lighting under the benches provide light from the "outside in" to the art, creating a visual boundary to define the plaza as a space.

Comments:

The granite seat walls are a nice feature, but they are all out in the sun. It would be good if some of that seating had opportunities for shade.

Pedestrian flow from Hunt Library is important. Discussion on this point confirmed that the walk layout does relate well to the entrance to Hunt Library.

The color of the trees, including autumn color, is important so that their color does not clash with the red and pink colors of the art.

Alternative site wall layouts adjacent to the art showed walls on the west, north and east sides, and another version with a break in the wall on the south edge. The panel's comments were more favorable toward exploring seating along the east and west edges of the plaza, adjacent to trees. The panel also discussed removing the south seat wall would allow circulation to work better when an event is using the lawn to the south.

The panel cautioned that careful thought should be given to where trash and recycling receptacles are located, and consider not putting them in the plaza, encouraging people to take their trash with them when they leave the space.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Centennial Campus Plaza project subject to the below design directives to be coordinated and finalized by the Office of the University Architect:

- *Provide opportunities for shade seating near the art.*
- *Consider the color of the trees, year-round, to make certain they complement the art.*
- *Lower the berm at the north end of the site as much as possible to improve views.*
- *Further evaluate seat wall locations and their relationship to the tent space.*

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
Facilities
Office of the University Architect

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

- *Locate trash receptacles and other site amenities.*
- *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels and reviewed by the Office of the University Architect.*

Next Meeting(s)
The July 27, 2022 meeting will be in-person to review the Integrated Sciences Building.

The meeting adjourned at 12:54 PM.

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
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 (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – July 27, 2022
Winslow Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 3:30 PM

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the June 15, 2022 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. **Integrative Sciences Building** (#170)
   Site Location: North Campus
   Designer: Moseley/ZGF
   Designer Representatives: Bob Cwikla (CPM), Brad Lockwood (Moseley Architects), Kate Mann and Devin Carlson (ZGF), Matt Girard (Michael VanValkenberg Associates)

   - Guiding Principles are about bringing the sciences together at a crossroads on the Brickyard. The Invite campus community to engage with the sciences.
   - Circulation tries to separate conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Public spaces face north to the Brickyard, with a “living room” collaboration zone on the northwest corner. Collaboration space (public component) projects out into the Brickyard. The classroom on the first floor can open up to the Brickyard to support events and engagement. There are classrooms and class labs on the second floor. The third floor includes research labs, faculty and graduate student office space, collaboration space, and a green roof amenity.
   - Accessible routes: the goal is to have them embedded into the campus fabric, and be more than work-a-day routes. The current route from Free Expression Tunnel to the Brickyard is circuitous due to several existing stairs on the primary route.
   - Emergency Services will access the Brickyard via Broughton Drive.
   - Landscape Areas: an accessible route will be created from the Free Expression Tunnel to the Brickyard. The use of natural stone boulders will help define the character of the space. Entry Garden on the south side of the building creates smaller, more intimate areas for gathering that also incorporate expressions of boulders into the space. There will be a new accessible path from Stinson Drive to the south building entrance that provides easy access through the building to the Brickyard. There will be two outdoor classrooms with one partially

covered. The terrace adjacent to the north side of the building adjacent to the porch will provide furniture for outdoor gathering to support dining and collaboration.

- Neighborhood context. Range of buildings from the 1920s to the 1960s. Some points of consistency are the brick buildings with punched window openings, complemented by limestone.
- Façade treatment for the north façade. Double height entry. Datum is carried over the porch at the Classroom. Steps down to a one-story porch at the café for a more intimate experience.
- Family of window details that tie the upper volume together. Penthouse proposes perforated metal panels at the ends to reduce the effect of the volume, with solid panels in the main central portion.
- A model of the building in the Brickyard neighborhood was reviewed.

Comments:

- The bridge from Dabney is abruptly narrowed at the north end. Needs to look intentional. Observe behavior more carefully over the next few months to see how that bridge/entry is used.
- The horizontal element at the top of the two-story volume may read better as another material other than 4-5 courses of brick. Columns on the west façade of floor two don't visibly
- Show more detail about the columns and the lintel elements. They are rather thin. The front face of the columns (at one brick wide) seems very thin.
- Entry element. Pass through of circulation from east to west across the opening needs more study. Explore how to make the openings more interesting. The wood at the entry should be real wood. The wood could have more texture to create more interest and weather well.
- Should the north side have more metal and glass? Will the light brick color read as too light/white on the south and west sides?
- Could space over the café seating be either a second-floor outdoor terrace or a covered porch?
- Is some red brick needed to tie into the neighborhood?

Action:

The panel recommended another review of plans following further study of the following directives:

1. Façade two lowest levels, entry and porch:
   a. The gray brick columns and lintels appear out of proportion, especially the lintels which are too thin. Provide design options along with partially enlarged elevations and sections.
   b. Consider another exterior material option in lieu of the gray brick.
   c. Provide a design option that extends the two-story element across the north face of the building over the exterior café seating.
   d. Use real wood with a textured pattern and/or some depth variations at the building entrances in lieu of linear metal panels with a wood-effect finish.
   e. Remove the brick columns at the second floor west elevation where there are no columns below.

2. Site and Landscape:
   a. Use red-brick elements in the landscape to relate the site design to the existing campus context
   b. Outdoor classrooms need further development. Evaluate size and orientation.
   c. Planters at the brickyard entrance need to respect the Harrelson Hall shape.
   d. The interface of the Dabney Hall bridge with the new ISB site should be more intentional in the way it transitions and needs a stronger visual connection between old and new.
   e. Provide a significant landscape feature at the Stinson terminus.
   f. Consider some deeper planting sections on the green roof and provide options for a reduced occupant load.
   g. Locate trash receptacles and other site amenities.

3. General:
   a. Provide photos of the brick and other exterior materials in full sun.
   b. Consider more glass on the north façade with a hierarchy of mullion depth and patterning for visual interest.
   c. Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.
   d. Provide a design solution for deterring bird collisions with exterior glazing.

2. Translational Research Facility (#176)
Site Location: College of Veterinary Medicine, West Campus
Designer: Wagner Architecture
Designer Representatives: Rob Wagner (Wagner Architecture), Laura Zaytoun (Capital Project Management)

- The building is in the back portion of the college, behind a biosecurity entrance. Supports the Lab Animal Research unit at the college.
- The building works together with Finger Barn #2. Each has the equipment and facilities that the other needs to achieve its mission.
- Aligning the south edge of this new facility with the south edge of Finger Barn #1 while not impacting some significant utilities. Allowing for expansion to the north if future funding is identified to achieve the full program that is envisioned by the college.
- Reviewed the context of surrounding buildings. The Finger barns are windowless due to the need to tightly control the interior environment. Gable slopes match the surrounding buildings.

Comments:

Removal of healthy tree. The tree should be replaced in an area that can be protected. Protect the other existing trees.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Translational Research Facility project subject to the below design directives to be coordinated and finalized by the Office of the University Architect:

1. *Replace the tree that will be removed with another large shade tree.*

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Finance and Administration
Facilities
Office of the University Architect

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

2. *Final exterior material selections will be based on sample panels.*

Projects in Planning:
The Integrative Sciences Building will be back for a second review. The Brickyard Master Plan will be reviewed as a separate project.

Next Meeting(s)
The August meeting will be a virtual meeting and the September meeting is being planned as an in-person meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.