

**CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of April 19, 2018 Meeting**

**Present**

Kim Carnot  
Ramona Ferreira  
Tara Cameron, Co-Chair  
Ken Hall  
Sophia Hirakis  
John Hughes  
Russ King  
Shirley Meng (Co-Chair)  
Keith Pezzoli  
Frank Silva  
Marlene Shaver  
Joel Watson  
Cristy Winter

**Absent**

Matthew Arrollado  
Adrian Borsa  
Neal Devraj  
Lesly Figueroa  
Charles Sprenger  
Rand Steiger  
Tal Golan  
David Traver

**Campus Planning Staff**

Robert Clossin  
Todd Pitman  
Alison Buckley  
Ginger Stout

**Guests/Consultants**

Fred Besancon, Spurlock Landscape Architects  
Peter Zheng, Capital Program Management  
Joel King, Capital Program Management  
Ken Powelson, EHDD Architecture  
Adrienne Gallo, Capital Planning  
Jennifer Mora, Capital Planning  
Tom Chessum, CO Architects  
Mark Minieri, Capital Program Management  
Ryan Bussard, Perkins & Will  
Ricardo Rabines, Safdie Rabines Architects  
Mark Rowland, Capital Program Management  
Kyle Fiddelke, Office of James Burnett  
Laura McCarty, Capital Program Management  
Scott Shell, EHDD

**Business Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes**

The minutes from March 15, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously.

**Action Item: East Campus Neighborhood Planning Study**

The East Campus Neighborhood Planning Study (NPS) was presented for endorsement. The study area is on East Campus and bound by Voigt Drive to the north, Regents Road to the east, I-5 to the west, and Mesa Housing on

the south. The site is confined with limited access from the edges, save for from the north and east, and the Gilman Bridge once it is completed. The proposed plan will include space for 2.3 million GSF with a mix of research, clinical, and educational buildings. Additionally, intergenerational housing, a hotel, and meeting facilities may be incorporated. Providing patient/family access is paramount as their arrival requires additional navigational signage and circulation considerations. Amenities in the area are lacking and will be included in the planning study. Maintaining the West Campus character on East Campus will be considered while also incorporating spaces for respite. Connectivity with the rest of campus is imperative and Regents Road acts as a common connector to access Jacobs Medical Center.

The creation of a 'Medical Center Loop' circulation roadway around the internal buildings will allow vehicular circulation to flow through the site from Regents Road to Gilman Drive. The goal is to create an easily identifiable pathway from Regents Road to the center of the medical campus to better facilitate the patient experience. Expansions to Health Sciences Walk will allow connections to the East Campus LRT station and to the Science Research Park and hotel center. Bicycle pathways will be separated from pedestrian pathways when available.

Fred Besancon presented the landscape concept for the NPS. The campus is situated on mesas and surrounded by canyons, which will be preserved as a viewing area. Key strategies of the plan are incorporating the canyon feel with smaller scale contemplative areas and therapy spaces; outdoor non-programmed spaces could be designed around each building; creation of a landscaped visual path for vehicles entering the site to easily identify their destination; and creation of a transitional space between the hospital zone and the surrounding neighborhood.

Tom Chessum from CO Architects discussed development capacity of the various parcels of the study area. He mentioned the idea of protecting the central area for exclusively healthcare use, and using the outer edges for more public spaces such as housing and hotels. Access via automobiles is key for each parcel for patient pick-up and drop-off. Buildings will be accessible via underground parking. Chessum presented a table showing parking stalls by location. While parking needs would be studied as individual projects are implemented the Plan identifies that parking will be provided for approximately 5,400 total cars, plus an additional 1,200 spaces for the Science Research Park. Sophia Hirkakis inquired as to how many total parking stalls will be available, which is a total of 6,600. Hirkakis asked what the construction start date is and Robert Clossin mentioned this study is a future plan and capacity analysis, not a particular project. The NPS was endorsed unanimously.

### **Comment to Design Review Board: Design and innovation Building – Concept Design**

The Design and Innovation Building (DIB) concept design project team was introduced by Laura McCarty. Ricardo Rabines from Safdie Rabines Architects presented the overall concept showing the flythrough of the project site. Scott Shell from EHDD discussed the project goals and criteria. The project site is located just south of the SME building and west of the future LRT station in Pepper Canyon. The site is heavily constrained due to proximity to LRT station, SME building, Visual Arts Building, and Pepper Canyon which only allows the future building to run north/south. Fire vehicle turnarounds are considered for the north and south side of the building. The four story building may have public spaces, restaurants, event spaces, studio classrooms, and indoor/outdoor seating. The second floor could house the Makers Lab and Fabrication Lab. The third and fourth floors will be less public areas, and might consist of meeting rooms and project rooms. The LRT elevator will open up to the outdoor restaurant space, and the outdoor stairs could bring visitors to view the makers lab and to a grab-and-go food vendor with additional outdoor seating. The restaurant and studio spaces have the ability to spill out into the outside space, and upper floors could have porches that allow LRT visitors to view the life within the building.

Kyle Fiddelke from OJB presented the landscape concepts surrounding the DIB. A bridge concept leading from the building to the grassy hump is part of a larger concept that originated when the SME building was completed. The northern section of Pepper Canyon will be filled with reclaimed soil and will assist in the redevelopment of Rupertus Lane/Rupertus Walk into a major pedestrian entrance to the campus from the LRT station. The concept of swings hanging from the LRT station is being considered as both a Stuart Collection art installation and a form of recreation. The amphitheater (aka Pepper Bowl) has evolved from a small informal setting to an approximately 1,000 seat theater with a green space at the top for overflow seating for formal events. A building with restrooms and equipment storage is also being considered. The plaza surrounding the DIB could contain a drop off area for patrons to the LRT, a café terrace area, and further public realm improvements. Lyman Lane could potentially be repurposed into a walking path to allow people through the site.

Todd Pitman shared with the committee the comments brought forward from the Open Space Committee (OSC), which included keeping in mind the area is a Campus space, and how it can function for more informal, non-programmed events; which may be the majority of the time. He specifically noted that informal recreation should be considered in the design. Sophia Hirkakis asked about shaded areas, and Fiddelke shared they were considering removable sails over the amphitheater. Hirkakis inquired about ADA access and Fiddelke answered that ADA access is already available at the top and bottom of the amphitheater, but will consider how to make it accessible in the center. Marlene Shaver inquired how the amphitheater has grown in size, and Fiddelke mentioned the user group needs have changed which affects the site. Joel King asked of the team to keep in mind the idea of creating a functional, usable space, including back of the house needs, green room, utilities, storage, etc. Kim Carnot shared that since this is a recreational space, keep the furnishings softer and more organic in feel and less concrete. She suggested the use of wooden benches. Russ King asked how delivery trucks would access the site. Fiddelke explained the pathway on the western side could be pedestrian most of the time, and could be closed off to allow truck access. King offered that a semi-truck can fit through near the Visual Arts Building. John Hughes asked if the coordinator for event spaces has been contacted and Clossin mentioned Campus Events personnel are joining the discussions surrounding the space. Keith Pezzoli asked if the rooftops would be used for rainwater harvesting and Scott Shell from EHDD mentioned that nothing is programmed but the mechanical equipment for the building will be on the rooftop. Fiddelke offered that stormwater will be addressed on site, as per University guidelines. Shell mentioned EHDD needs to be made aware of priorities surrounding campus solar requirements. Hirkakis asked for clarification on vehicle drop-off areas and King replied it's expected to be on the west side of Lyman Lane. Clossin commented that special attention needs to be paid to the drop-off area, considering bicycles, pedestrians, and people exiting the LRT. Ken Hall suggested considering the acoustics of the surrounding buildings and housing areas when designing the amphitheater. Pitman reminded the team and committee the importance of considering the space and design during non-programmed times for informal activities.

The following comments would be forwarded to the Design Review Board:

- The Committee recommended that more spaces be provided that could accommodate informal recreation and other passive uses.
- ADA access to the center of the amphitheater should be provided and ADA parking should be proximate.
- The Committee recommended the amphitheater maintain a softer more organic feel that incorporates natural materials like wooden benches.
- The Committee commented on the need for separation of large delivery trucks and pedestrian paths to ensure safety specifically during events. It appears that the circulation of trucks and pedestrians is duplicious.

- The Committee asked that special attention be paid to the acoustics of the space and how the surrounding housing and buildings may be affected during performances.

### **Comment to Design Review Board: Franklin Antonio Hall – Concept Design**

Mark Rowland introduced the team working on the concept design for Franklin Antonio Hall (FAH), formerly called the Engineering Interdisciplinary Building. The project is located on parking lot P502 in Warren College. The entire site is 2.84 acres and the project site is 2.34 acres, and all construction will remain within the confines of the existing curb. The program of FAH is approximately 200,000 SF, 4 stories up, and 1 below. Classrooms, a large auditorium, a café, and laboratories for collaboration, or ‘Collaboratories’, will round out the building uses. The project will strive for LEED platinum certification. Ryan Bussard presented the building concept. The site is constrained on all sides, by Voigt Drive to the south and by Ecological Reserve and canyons on the other three sides. Views into the canyon and back onto the campus are part of the design being considered. FAH will be the new view from Genesee Avenue and I-5 that is currently a view to Geisel Library. The team is proposing two buildings running mainly north/south separated by an atrium, creating a grand entrance into the space from the Atkinson Hall tunnel across Voigt Drive. Pedestrian routing and connections to the site include a tabletop crossing, metered for pedestrians, on Voigt Drive from the Atkinson Hall tunnel. Shading of the outdoor spaces will be considered so as not to obstruct views from within FAH, or views from other parts of campus. The Committee inquired about alternative parking and if it will be available before lot P502 goes offline. Crossin responded that is still the plan however the campus is still working with Coastal Commission staff. Russ King brought up that Warren Canyon View dining is scheduled to be remodeled and connections should be considered, as that is the closest available dining facility. Fiddelke explained the campus meander will follow the canyon edge, and might be multi-functional as the fire lane as well. Existing bicycle paths along Voigt can be utilized as access to the site. The pedestrian connection across Voigt Drive is proposed as a tabletop crossing with pedestrian metering for safety. Beyond the north side of the atrium is proposed to be an outdoor event space with a promontory and shade structure. The desire to maintain a canyon feel with native plants was discussed for the open space around the building. Strict guidelines lay the framework for acceptable plantings due to brush management requirements. A committee member asked about considering a pathway through the center of the building from east to west, but was ruled out due to topography changes.

The OSC committee comments were presented to the Committee by Pitman. They suggested that the project team consider stormwater runoff, metering for pedestrians and bikes across Voigt, material of the fire lane for ease of maintenance and ADA parking from Voigt Drive. The Committee would like to see more organic materials used for the campus meander and furnishings surrounding the site. An area for food trucks could be considered and an area for drop-off/pick-up from vehicles. Joel Watson inquired as to what this building is projecting to people driving by, both along Voigt and from Genesee/I-5 and wants the team to consider how this site can represent the University’s image. Watson also asked the team to consider how this building relates to surrounding buildings. Currently, there is not consistency between buildings, and each building has a different program and feel, per Bussard. Hirakis asked about the primary use of FAH, which will be research and some classrooms. Hirakis mentioned it would be good to have outdoor seating available with views towards Geisel Library. Bussard responded that the promontory on the west side will have great views of Geisel. Russ King thought a small coffee and sandwich cart could benefit the area, and that thoughts about how trash will be collected needs to be considered. A restaurant/café is being programmed in the project. Cristy Winter wanted the team to consider how many students might be crossing the tabletop or waiting outside of classrooms during the 10 minute passing period, and to consider enough waiting spaces. Bussard offered that classrooms will be distributed from the south end to the north end to more evenly distribute the load.

The following comments would be forwarded to the Design Review Board:

- The Committee asked that the connectivity to Canyon View dining area in Warren College be considered as it is the closest place to buy food and is in the process of being remodeled.
- The Committee asked that pedestrian and bicycle metering along the tabletop crossing on Voigt Drive be considered.
- The Committee noted the view from I-5 and Genesee Avenue, both of this building and the proposed shade structure at the north end of the site. How can this development best represent the University? The project team should consider how this building will be viewed from the surrounding buildings.

### **Comment to Design Review Board: Price Center West Renovation – Schematic Design**

Peter Zheng provided the background behind the Price Center (PC) West Renovation project. Approximately 14,000 sf of interior and exterior space on the north side of Price Center West, in what is currently Round Table Pizza, is being redesigned. The current tenant's lease is up in June and a complete refresh of the space is envisioned, including the outdoor patio area and public realm improvements to the Price Center entrance.

Neil Hadley from LandLab discussed the landscape portion of the presentation and began discussing the pedestrian and bicycle connections to the site. Hadley mentioned relocating the existing bike racks along the PC entrance pathway, which are heavily used, to the decomposed granite area near the ATM's is being explored. Russ King said to consider offering bike share parking in addition to bicycle racks. Hadley also discussed the dividing line and differences between the two types of public space, one within the ABC barrier and one outside of the barrier. The entire site is envisioned to offer open and inviting views.

Garrick Oliver from OBR Architecture presented the idea of opening up the space to provide views from the pathway near Starbucks to the furthest recessed areas of the outdoor patio. Oliver mentioned keeping the space functional yet creating a campus destination space. The seating 'neighborhoods' would offer unique seating options for various user types, either individuals or for various sized groups to sit together. A section drawing showing potential bleacher seating along the back wall where a vegetated buffer separates the space from the pathway between Geisel Library and Price Center Loop was shown. The design intentionally excludes power outlets in the seating areas to not create another campus 'study space'. The building creates shade on the outdoor space during most of the year, so parts of the seating area were left unshaded by either trees or the paper airplane shade structure.

Hirakis inquired if the pathway to the north of the site was ADA compliant and Oliver verified it is an ADA approved pathway. Clossin reminded the committee of its previous concern during concept design regarding maintaining the visual buffer through vegetated screening of the site. A discussion ensued regarding the vegetated screening berm and Oliver clarified that only the eastern end of the berm is being removed. Joel Watson inquired if the Eucalyptus trees on the west side would be removed and commented they should remain to maintain connections to the grove on the eastern side of Geisel.

Pitman brought up the Open Space Committee and the prior C/CPC comments regarding maintaining a distinct separation between the tenant's outdoor space and the Campus public space. The current design appears as tenant space. Joel Watson asked if the vendor patio space had been enlarged in size and Oliver responded that it is larger. The committee further discussed maintaining a visual separation between the enclosed outdoor patio and the public area. John Hughes offered that people tend to have the misconception that the area surrounding the tenant counter belongs to the tenant, when actually everything beyond the tenant counter is public space. Watson mentioned the boundary should be reexamine between the 2 areas and inquired if the "paper airplane" shade structure is visible from the pathway. He further explained if the plane structure is visible from beyond

the site itself that will further reinforce the idea that the 'public' area is part of the tenant space. Watson suggested that the Eucalyptus Trees and existing vegetation along the north edge of the site should remain in place. The plantings relate to the grove across the walk north of the site and provide a unifying landscape feature to the public walk.

Oliver was asked by the committee to show the view looking to the west of the space from the pathway and Clossin commented that view helps define the delineation of the public space better. Hirakis commented on ensuring the fire pit was not situated too close to the trees and also mentioned group seating for large groups should be considered.

**Business Item (Continued): Pepper Canyon Neighborhood Planning Study and 7<sup>th</sup> College Neighborhood Planning Study**

Clossin and Pitman presented background on the Neighborhood Planning Study's (NPS) for both Pepper Canyon and 7<sup>th</sup> College that are just beginning. Pitman presented the boundaries of the 7<sup>th</sup> College NPS as well as the anticipated boundary for the future DPP. Considerations in the study are the Stuart Art pieces, retail components, and connections to both the Theatre District and Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Clossin shared the 63 acre boundary for the Pepper Canyon NPS. The project site will be the existing 'Camp Snoopy' Sixth College housing area. The team for Pepper Canyon NPS was prepping to determine a design firm in the near future.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ginger Stout  
Associate Planner

