



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – January 25, 2023
Winslow Hall Conference Room
2:30 – 4:00 PM**

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the November 30, 2022 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Physical Master Plan

Site Location:

Designer: SmithGroup

Designer Representatives: Neal Kessler, Lauren Leighty, John Perry

Presentation and comments (*comments in italics*):

- As part of the final “Resolve” phase, the team is working on final recommendations for the report and its various components.
- The Project Development Process has evolved since the last meeting. The process grew from the work of the Task Forces to ensure that strategic capital projects are developed through a process that is collaborative, ensures the right stakeholders are involved, is transparent, and is grounded in the plan’s Guiding Principles.
 - *Comment: How will the decision making process fit into the existing processes that the Trustees are involved in?*
- Credentialing – NC State envisions the Physical Master Plan be a living document used by the campus community. Credentialing is a way to ensure that people understand how they fit into the plan.
 - *Comment: Credentialing might not be the right term. A term that is more inviting could encourage more people to want to understand the plan.*

- North and Central Plan - Cates West project has been refined to ensure that the vision for Housing and Dining works with the vision for Baseball and Softball as well.
 - *Comment: What is the consideration for a rail station on campus?*

- Neighborhood Hubs – Refined scenarios were presented for consideration.
 - Cates West – Cates West project has been refined to ensure that the vision for Housing and Dining works with the vision for Baseball and Softball as well.
 - Comments:*
 - *It is appreciated that the Cates West plan breaks the total amount of housing down into smaller communities.*
 - *Consider adding music, performance, and cultural functions to this neighborhood hub mix.*
 - *Given that the buildings on the west side of Dan Allen Drive cannot be pulled closer to the street due to several utilities in the corridor, it will be important to set the vision for how plazas and landscapes can add activity to the new buildings on the west side of Dan Allen Drive.*
 - Brickyard – The goal is to reinvigorate this important open space with activities to bring people together.
 - Riddick – The diagram has been updated to show the possibility of a future building in addition to the pavilion structure.
 - Cates East – The placeholder building on the southeast corner of the Cates and Morrill intersection shows a gesture to allow a view to Reynolds Coliseum, one of our Hallowed Places.
 - Centennial Campus – Refinement of the South Oval area shows a concept to address growth in academics and student services.
 - *Comment: Be careful not to load too much parking along the eastern side of The Oval. Be cognizant of the experience along Initiative Way, and of the views from Centennial Parkway*
 - West Campus – Detail plans for Veterinary Medicine, West Research Annex were shared and received favorably.
 - Reedy Creek – The refined plan for the hub was received favorably.
 - Lake Wheeler – The agricultural research on display concept suggests bringing some research activities more forward so the public can access and understand the research and its importance. The vision includes a market venue for agricultural products to add to the creamery/education center venue.

- Connectivity
 - Priorities for improving the connections within and between areas of campus were presented, showing refinements based on comments received. The areas highlighted were Stinson Drive, Broughton Drive, Morrill Drive, Western Boulevard, and Pullen Road.
 - Western Boulevard – The emphasis of this concept is on pedestrians, rather than on moving people via their cars or via transit buses. Therefore the plan focuses on comfortable, safe at-grade street crossings rather than tunnels under the road.



- Prototypes – The range of prototypes that will be developed was presented. They will be at levels that address neighborhood, building, and room scales.

Projects in Planning:

Wrapping up the PMP is the focus in the next few months. The Equine Hospital will be coming to this committee for the site selection. Projects coming back to the panel: The Centennial Services Center project will be coming back for the building design, and the Apiculture Facility.

Next Meeting(s)

The March 2023 meeting will continue the review of the Physical Master Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – March 29, 2023
1911 Building, Room 129
1:30 – 3:00 PM**

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 29, 2023 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

- Physical Master Plan
Site Location:
Designer: SmithGroup
Designer Representatives: Neal Kessler, Lauren Leighty, John Perry

Presentation and comments (*comments in italics*):

- Showcasing one section of the plan today. The full report will be presented in May 2023.
- The document will be “digital first” and will have many links that allow readers to move through the document quickly, and connect to greater detail by following specific links.
 - *Comment: Because of its importance in connecting campus, the All Campus Path that would connect Central and Centennial through the Mission Valley property may warrant having a specific mobility project identifier.*
- Each chapter opens with a vision for that precinct that includes precinct goals.
- Systems diagrams include Proposed Development, Pedestrian and Open Space Framework, Vehicular Mobility, Neighborhood Hubs
 - *Comment: It seems the new parking deck should appear on the Vehicular Mobility plan.*
- More detailed scenario plans are presented so that they cover a precinct geographically. These scenario plans include land use diagrams for uses on the first floor of buildings in that

- area, and detailed narrative to describe the vision and goals for new buildings and major building renovations in those geographic areas.
- Perspective renderings will have call outs that point to various prototypes or systems that can be used to address MP goals. Clicking on those goals will link the reader with more detailed information about that specific system.
 - *The perspective images are very helpful to envision the character of the spaces.*
 - Areas discussed were Hillsborough Street, University Plaza, Stinson East, Cates Avenue, Cates West, Cates East, the Environmental Sciences Hub, and Western Boulevard.
 - *In the Cates West area, are the buildings the correct height if we are only adding 200-300 beds more than exist in the neighborhood?*
 - *Will the Sustainable strategies include credits for embodying carbon in trees or grasses?*
 - *This idea of a fairly small intervention at the Environmental Sciences Hub can be applied to other historic neighborhoods on campus where common space was not a consideration when they were designed. Consider adding this type of building as a prototype.*
 - *How will mobility patterns change over time and how will that affect the systems and facilities that are needed? Where are drop off points that are most needed for ride sharing, etc?*
 - The team recommends adding The Oval as a Hallowed Place. Hallowed Places have accrued special meaning over time to generations. Survey results indicated that it has become a favorite location on campus for many students and others.
 - *Hunt Library may also be moving to become a Hallowed Place in the future.*
 - *Is The Oval a place that has special meaning to everyone, or is it for the College of Engineering?*
 - *Students whose coursework has them on Centennial Campus identify strongly with The Oval. It is their place to relax and gain perspective and holds special meaning for them.*
 - *Is the definition of "Hallowed Places" correct?*
 - *Should the boundaries of the Hallowed Places be clarified?*
 - Prototypes – The range of prototypes that will be developed was presented. They will be at levels that address neighborhood, building, and room scales.

Next Meeting(s)

The next meeting is scheduled for April 26, 2023 from 1:30 to 3:00 PM and will be a review of the The Brickyard Master Plan, and Baseball Renovation and Addition.

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 PM.



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – April 26, 2023
Winslow Hall Conference Room
1:30 – 3:00 PM**

Attendees:	Meg Calkins	Lisa Johnson	Donna McGalliard
	Bob Cwikla	Sumayya Jones-Humienny	Doug Morton
	Patrick Deaton	Alicia Knight	Tom Skolnicki
	McKenzy Heavlin	Archie Luce	Mark Weathington
	David Hill		
Additional	Bill Davis	Christopher Galik	Tsai Lu Liu
Distribution:	Erik Dixon	Rich Holly	

Approval of Minute

The minutes of the March 29, 2023 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Baseball Renovation and Addition

Site Location: Doak Field, Central Campus

Designer: Ewing Cole

Designer Representatives: George Bushey, Phillip Smith, Joel Dabrowski

Presentation:

- The project is an opportunity to look at team performance spaces and fan amenities, using comparable facilities in the NCAA as benchmarks.
- For the student athletes, the goal is to create a world class player/performance center with a new indoor pitching and hitting laboratory, and team lounge/locker room.
- Fan amenities on left field side include new seating options, concessions, restrooms, and a new student gate.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Baseball Renovation and Addition project subject to the following design directives to be coordinated and finalized by Campus Planning.

1. *Consider an architectural wayfinding element at the top of the new entrance stairs in lieu of signage.*
2. *New entrance security gates and fencing need more development. Verify that there is no opportunity to climb around the gate when it is closed.*
3. *Provide a map that shows the parking impact at the new student gate. Clarify the extents and width of the new walkway along this edge. Coordination is needed with Transportation on lost parking spaces.*
4. *The street trees need more root growth space to be successful.*

5. *Consider the ramifications of locating restrooms above a server room.*
6. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.*

2. **Brickyard Restoration and Master Plan**

Site Location: University Plaza, North Campus

Designer: Moseley Architects/ZGF Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, VHB

Designer Representatives: Matt Girard, Matthew McConnell, John Stronach

Presentation:

- Proposal to reconcile the abrupt straight line stops at the east and west ends of the space
- Much of the existing space has grades and cross slopes that exceed maximum slopes per the Americans with Disabilities Act. The plan presents a strategy to address accessibility by regrading the majority of the paved areas.
- Paving Patterns: Large pattern to fill large paved area. Small pattern. Pattern at slopes will get further analysis to make the
- Brick standards: Pine Hall for full range red, Interstate (non-permeable) white brick for accent bands. The team is looking at a custom sized white brick to match with the spacing of the permeable red brick.
- A new planter at Hill Library restore the historic condition of a planted area between buildings and the paved plaza.

Comments:

- This is a wonderful and thoughtful proposal. The panel particularly likes the idea of recreating a curved planter on the south side of Hill Library.
- The plaza is a place to sit and watch people. Is there a possibility for additional seat walls?
- There could be more small places that encourage serendipitous interaction. Look for opportunities to create those places here.
- It is unclear how the realignment of Broughton Drive path impacts some existing features.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Brickyard Restoration and Master Plan project subject to the following design directives to be coordinated and finalized by Campus Planning.

1. *More study is needed on the exact realignment of Broughton Drive. Provide a new design map overlay on the existing map. Does the realignment affect the Strolling Professor Art?*
2. *Plant selections for the new planter adjacent to Hill Library should not obscure the building's main entrance or the path to the entrance.*
3. *Provide a variety of Brickyard seating options. Consider seat walls on the north and south edges and moveable seating under the trees on the east and west sides.*
4. *Consider opportunities for smaller destinations.*
5. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.*

Next Meeting(s)

The next meeting is scheduled for May 31, 2023 from 1:30 to 3:30 PM and will be a final review of the Physical Master Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 3:03 PM.



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – May 31, 2023
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 3:00 PM**

Attendees:	Meg Calkins	David Hill	Tsai Lu Liu
	Bill Davis	Rich Holly	Donna McGalliard
	Patrick Deaton	Lisa Johnson	Doug Morton
	Erik Dixon	Sumayya Jones-Humienny	Tom Skolnicki
	Christopher Galik	Alicia Knight	Mark Weathington
Additional	Melissa Diamond		
Distribution:	McKenzy Heavlin		

Approval of Minutes

Lisa Johnson opened the meeting by thanking departing members McKenzy Heavlin, Rich Holly, and Tsai Lu Liu for their service on the panel. The minutes of the April 26, 2023 meeting were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. Physical Master Plan

Site Location: University land holdings in Wake County.
Designer: SmithGroup
Designer Representatives: Neal Kessler, Lauren Leighty, John Perry

Presentation:

- Neal Kessler discussed the organization of the overall document and how users will be able to navigate via links. Backup data and reports will be linked via an appendix.
- The Executive Summary is meant to provide people with a quick understanding of the big ideas and recommendations.
- The Precinct Plans document the various frameworks that will guide planning and design in each respective precinct.
- The Design Guidelines build on much of the work that was done in the 2014 PMP Update. All were reviewed, validated, and amended as needed to determine those that have come forward into this new plan. The biggest addition is the Prototypes that appear throughout the guidelines section.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Physical Master Plan project subject to the following design directives to be coordinated and finalized by Campus Planning.

1. *Clarify the nomenclature of the process. Capital or Campus Planning Process is one process, with a Planning component, and an Execution component.*

2. *Emphasize the importance of the Orientation piece in making stakeholders more comfortable with providing their valuable input when they participate in campus planning or development efforts.*
3. *Clarify what is meant by resilient material choices. The design team clarified that the intent is to describe stable, permeable, accessible pavement materials. Define this term or use more descriptive language.*
4. *Need to strengthen the commitment to district energy language and the importance of it to making campus successful, while acknowledging that it comes at a cost. Describe the changing face of energy and how that folds into the overall strategy.*
5. *Where do we talk about what NC State is about? Articulate the incredibly complex interaction between the land grant mission, research enterprise, academics, and extension. The PMP supports the university's mission in these endeavors.*

2. Apiculture Facility

Site Location: Lake Wheeler Road Field Lab

Designer: Biloba Architecture

Designer Representatives: Erin Patrick, Ian Patrick, Alex Del Orbe.

Presentation:

- The challenge for this project is to design this facility in the context of the existing architecture at the Field Lab site, while elevating the presence of this building since it is a building where the public will be welcomed for various programs.

Comments:

- There does not appear to be any screening of the dumpster/composting area from Inwood Road.
- The perennial planting concept shown will provide pollen for a short period of time each year. The plan should provide the bees with plants that will provide pollen for bees on a year-round basis.
- What is the roofing material on the roof with the shallow slope? It is a standing seam, at a 2:12 slope which is allowable.
- If the budget does not allow this design, can the tall gable be lowered
- Where are the mechanical units (HVAC) located outside? They may need to be located away from the screened porch.
- Simplify/reduce the use of fins. Fins on windows will detract from the lovely views inside, especially in office areas.
- The red wall panels work better when they fold down from the roof, but where the roof overhangs, the reason for the red wall is less clear.
- Can parking and the walkway slide north slightly? Having a little more breathing room between the walk and the building would be nice to improve the arrival experience.

Action:

The panel recommended **approval** of the Apiculture Facility project subject to the following design directives to be coordinated and finalized by Campus Planning.

1. *Provide screening for the trash dumpsters and recycling bins and adequate trash truck turn-around.*
2. *Verify that the location of the exterior mechanical equipment will not interfere with the outdoor teaching and viewing porch from a noise perspective.*
3. *Remove exterior window fins from the office space windows to allow better views.*
4. *Provide more separation between the parking and the front entrance.*
5. *The red exterior wall panels work better where the roof folds down to the wall. Look at other options where there is a roof overhang. In this situation, it may be better to change the exterior wall to white metal wall panels.*
6. *Consider using the punched window openings everywhere except the main entrance and multi-purpose room walls on the north elevation.*
7. *Consider using on-campus faculty expertise in the design of the pollinator gardens. Suggest including Danesha Seth Carley and Anne Spafford.*
8. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.*

Next Meeting(s)

The August 30, 2023, meeting was canceled due to a lack of agenda items. The next meeting is on September 27, 2023, from 1:30 to 3:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.



**CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (CDRP)
MEETING MINUTES – September 27, 2023
Virtual Meeting
1:30 – 3:00 PM**

- | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Attendees: | Maria Bellalta | Christopher Galik | Donna McGalliard |
| | Meg Calkins | David Hill | Doug Morton |
| | Bill Davis | Lisa Johnson | David Powers |
| | Patrick Deaton | Sumayya Jones-Humienny | Mark Weatherington |
| | Erik Dixon | | |
| Additional | Bosa Grgurevic | Alicia Knight | |
| Distribution: | Tom Skolnicki | | |

Introductions and Review of Panel Charge

New members Maria Bellalta and David Powers were introduced.

L. Johnson reviewed the CDRP charge, which is to serve in an advisory role to the Trustees Buildings and Property Committee. It reviews and recommends approval of campus design projects that have an aesthetic impact on the physical campus. The Panel reviews the designs of exterior campus spaces, buildings, and other exterior structures to ensure alignment with the Physical Master Plan. A recommendation for design approval is required prior to a project being placed on the Buildings and Property Committee agenda for review and final approval.

Approval of Minutes

The May 31, 2023, meeting minutes were approved.

Project(s) for Review:

1. 4H and FFA Building - CALS Extension Building

Site Location: West Campus
Designer: Innovative Design, Inc.
Designer Representatives: Lou Gerics
Submittal # 183

Presentation

- a. This project constructs an 8,000-square-foot new NC State Extension Facility to house the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences extension units: 4-H and Future Farmers of America (FFA). The new facility provides office and office support space designed for flexibility of use. This building replaces space in two buildings that were demolished with the I-440 Widening project. This facility will be located near another CALS extension building on Beryl Road.

- b. The building should be efficient, flexible, cost-effective, and consider an industrial design on this remote part of campus. The design should provide opportunities for repurposing to another use in the future.
- c. Funding comes from the compensation for the taking of NC State land for the I-440 Widening project.
- d. The new building shares the existing parking lot for the existing 4101 Beryl Road building.
- e. Additional accessible parking will be added with new equipment placed to the northeast of the new building.
- f. The existing bioretention stormwater control measure (SCM) will be displaced by the new building, so new stormwater piping will run to a new SCM farther south with the addition of more landscaping.
- g. The building program includes office, meeting, and co-working spaces.
- h. Building materials include a smooth, flashed red brick base, flush metal wall panels with wide reveals, a standing seam metal roof, naturally anodized aluminum windows, and polycarbonate acrylic entrance canopies.
- i. The building will be ready to receive photovoltaic (PV) panels and Facilities will apply for grant funding to purchase and install the PV panels.

Comments/Discussion:

- a. A lighter metal wall panel color than shown in the renderings is preferred.
- b. The outdoor condensing units need landscape screening.
- c. Since there are no sound amelioration walls for highway traffic, the patio needs to shift from the east side to the west side of the building. The patio design needs further development and separation from the building to allow for foundation plantings.
- d. The sidewalk on the east side needs to connect to the other sidewalk on the north side.
- e. Recommend using the new bioretention SCM area as a teaching tool/demonstration garden for the building occupants. The Arboretum is interested in partnering with the CALS/Facilities to maintain and use this feature for display. 4H already uses the Arboretum for their meetings.
- f. Additional measures that require project funding, like creating seating mounds or additional landscape in the existing parking lot, are beyond the scope and budget of this project.
- g. Provide shade landscaping on the south side of the building to limit exposure and heat gain.
- h. The building does not address specific 4H / FFA characteristics as it is budget-driven and designed to be repurposed for other functions in the future, like storage.
- i. Adjust the parking improvements to align the southern parking island with the northern main entry door.
- j. This area is in an electric vehicle (EV) charging desert. Consider providing infrastructure in the parking lot to provide for charging stations. This request requires discussion with University Transportation.
- k. Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.

Action:

The Panel recommended approval of the 4H and FFA Building project subject to the following design directives to be coordinated and finalized by Campus Planning.

1. *Provide landscape screening for the exterior condensing units.*

2. *Shift the patio to the west side of the building to allow for the building to buffer the I-440 noise and provide foundation plantings between the building and the patio.*
3. *Consider using the new bioretention SCM as a teaching tool/demonstration garden for the building occupants. The Arboretum is interested in partnering with the CALS/Facilities to maintain and use this feature for display.*
4. *Provide lower-height deciduous tree shading to limit heat gain for the southern exposure windows and not interfere with future rooftop solar panels.*
5. *Align the southern parking island with the northern main entrance.*
6. *Provide the infrastructure for future electric vehicle charging stations. Requires coordination with University Transportation.*
7. *Final exterior material selections will be based on field-erected sample panels.*

2. Physical Master Plan – Campus Development Process and Orientation

- a. Users must download the pdf file of the Physical Master Plan (PMP), approved by the Board of Trustees in June, from the [website](#) to obtain full navigation maneuverability.
- b. The Committee is comprised of the Provost, the VC for Research and Innovation, and the VC for Finance and Administration. They will ensure projects over \$4M or those with high impact to the campus align with the PMP, strategic initiatives, and campus needs in aggregation.
- c. The Committee has approved the charges for the advisory Campus Planning and Project Execution Subcommittees.
- d. The Facilities Division is developing Level I and II orientation courses in Reporter for stakeholders wishing to submit requests to respond to the call for needs. Development of Level I orientation is slated to be completed by the end of October. Level I provides an overview, whereas Level II delves into greater detail.
- e. The courses are the first step in the Campus Development process and are prerequisites to submitting needs.
- f. CDRP members are encouraged to take these courses.

Projects in Planning:

- Dabney Hall Renovation
- College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) Equine Hospital Addition and Renovation
- 111 Lampe Drive Renovation
- Scott, Kilgore, Thomas Hall HVAC Renovation
- Mann Hall Renovation
- Small Ruminants & Metabolism Unit Relocation

Next Meeting(s)

The next meeting is scheduled for October 25, 2023.

The meeting adjourned at 2:17 PM.