

CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of October 17, 2019 Meeting

PRESENT

Manu Agni
Adrian Borsa
Tara Cameron
Jorge Cortes
Tal Golan
Ken Hall (co-chair)
John Hughes
Elizabeth Owen
Keith Pezzoli (co-chair)
Marlene Shaver

ABSENT

Jeff Kaplan
Susan Narucki
Frank Silva
Rand Steiger
David Traver
Cristiana Winter
Petia Yanchulova

CAMPUS PLANNING STAFF

Robert Clossin
Ginger Stout

GUESTS/CONSULTANTS

Nicole Cheng, Capital Program Management
Brian Garrett, LandLab
Joel King, Design and Development Services
Steve Jackson, Facilities Management
Matthew McCreary, Campus Planning
Eric Naslund, Studio E
Todd Pitman, Campus Planning
Ji Song, Nanoengineering
Yvette Yu, Mascari Warner Dinh Architects

BUSINESS ITEM: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The minutes from the September 19th, 2019 meeting were unanimously approved without further comment.

BUSINESS ITEM: C/CPC OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

Robert Clossin began the meeting by reviewing the role of the Campus/Community Planning Committee, whose primary focus is on the physical development of the campus, mainly at La Jolla, but additionally Hillcrest projects, Elliot Field Station, and the relationships with the surrounding community. For example University City is currently updating their community plan which will be of interest to the campus. C/CPC is as an advisory committee to Vice Chancellor Resource Management and Planning and to the Chancellor. Committees are a way of socializing what is going on around campus and Clossin encouraged the members to take the information

shared back to their VC areas. Related committees include the Open Space Committee which oversees any project with a large landscape or public realm component, and the Marine Sciences Physical Planning Committee which oversees all Scripps projects, both of which are subcommittees to C/CPC. C/CPC reviews projects and provides comments to the Design Review Board, which is the Campus Architect led committee that advises the Chancellor on design guidelines of building projects. Additionally, Planning Advisory Committees are created to guide neighborhood plans, and soon an update to the Health Sciences (School of Pharmacy/School of Medicine) Neighborhood plan will be underway. Building Advisory Committees are formed of potential building users, administration, and project architects, who work together to focus on individual projects.

The Physical Planning Framework follows the goals of the Campus Strategic Plan and other campus plans. The Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) identifies the outer envelope of development for the campus and identifies the land use plan. The 1989 Master Planning Study has five foundational master planning principles, including University Center, Open Space Preserve, Academic Corridors, Connections, and Neighborhoods. Planning Studies are specific to different areas of campus and they provide the guidelines to the project architects.

C/CPC oversees several project types, including: business items, which are project updates; site evaluations, which identify and confirm the project site, and these come as both information and action items; and schematic design, which is where C/CPC provides comments that are shared with the Design Review Board. Planning studies are also reviewed by C/CPC.

Clossin provided a summary of projects that were presented to C/CPC last academic year, which included the Sustainable Building Policy, Public Realm Improvements, Hillcrest 2019 LRDP, Pepper Canyon West Housing Site Evaluation, and Voigt East Parking Structure, among many others.

COMMENT TO DRB: MANDEVILLE ART GALLERY RENOVATION (STUDIO E ARCHITECTS)

Brad Phipps introduced the project as aligning with the transformation of Ridge Walk. Mandeville Art Gallery (MAG) was built with Mandeville Center in 1974. The Ridge Walk project begins construction next summer and will revitalize planned pedestrian node at this location, which presents an ideal time to redevelop the MAG. The existing conditions along Ridge Walk are such that stormwater enters the site. The renovation will address the stormwater, revise all interior finishes, upgrade the mechanical system, and update the adjacent restrooms.

Phipps introduced Eric Naslund from Studio E Architects who presented the project. The art gallery is situated at the far west end of Mandeville Center, and this location is proposed as the terminus of an east/west art spine beginning at the Light Rail Trolley station. Media mesh is proposed at three locations along this spine, to act as attractors to the art walk. The guiding principles of the effort are as follows:

1. Making larger connections to campus; improve the Ridge Walk experience.
2. Create a transition space outside the MAG that would act as a pre-function space, or a 'front porch'.
3. Improve the 'placemaking' area outside of the MAG, which could be utilized during times with no official events.
4. Create flexible space that is useful at all times.

The site is visible from both the north and south, and with future improvements to Sun God Lawn, this area will be visible from the east as well.

The existing Mandeville building is an east/west concrete plinth. The sculpture classroom patio space is above the MAG, and will be partially shaded by the project. Shade trees currently protect the work deck.

Media mesh is made of stainless steel ribbons with LED lights woven through that can be coordinated to show still or moving imagery. Interactive apps can be used by people nearby to display art or messages on the mesh. During daylight hours, the mesh will appear as netting and only at night will messages or art display. The stainless steel mesh has held up well in other marine environments. The posts and mesh of this project will be situated along the outside of the building, and not actually be attached to the historic building.

Arts and Humanities operates and currently holds shows in the space. Marlene Shaver inquired if the Stuart Art Collection has been notified and communicated with about this project. The project has been shared with the EVC's office and Joel King explained the potential move towards an overarching look at and a strategy towards providing art on campus. King indicated discussions about creating a leadership position specific to campus art may be created under the EVC's area. Tara Cameron has received requests from other campus entities regarding outdoor art and agrees the exterior art policy should be updated in partnership with the Stuart Art Collection.

Tal Golan expressed concern about adding lights and metal on the wood and concrete building, and questioned if stakeholders in the art department were aware of this project. Nasland said the project has been presented to the art department. John Hughes mentioned he's been a part of this committee and has seen the progression of Ridge Walk project and sees this MAG project as a logical next step to creating the node along the walk. Keith Pezzoli is glad to see art incorporated into the campus fabric and questioned if the users of the space have been involved in the redevelopment.

The other two locations for media mesh art are at the LRT and at Triton Pavilion. This east/west space can be used as an arts and culture corridor. Ken Hall questioned who would own the content of the media mesh and what the material of the support posts would be constructed of. Nasland explained the mesh material needs to be tensioned and electrified, and it will be supported on stainless steel posts. Viewing of the content is best seen from 30 feet or more due to pixilation of the LED's at closer range, and anything that can be viewed on a screen can be viewed on the mesh. Hall inquired if advertising would be displayed here, and King explained the university has strict advertising rules. Each of the three mesh locations could be updated locally, but may have one content manager for all.

Pezzoli inquired about the sustainability features and life cycle analysis of the project. Naslund explained they are pursuing LEED certification, the HVAC will be upgraded within the interior, and the incandescent bulbs will be replaced with LED's, which will offer a dramatic reduction in energy usage. Elizabeth Owen appreciated the idea of creating a destination and using placemaking as a core element of the project, but failed to see how this particular project will help create those. King explained the Ridge Walk improvements will revitalize the entire plaza and seating, solar charging stations, and shade will lend to placemaking at this location. This project would also address ADA access to the MAG. Vandalism is not a huge concern due to access to the mesh only available from within the sculpture classroom.

The Committee discussed security at the gallery and the potential for broader campus events to be held at this location. Maintenance of the mesh and the LED's should be considered. The Committee's overall comments to be forwarded to the DRB include:

- Consider the activation of the space during non-event times and how the project contributes to placemaking at this location
- Consider the ease of maintenance and the sustainability aspect of the mesh and the LED's
- Consider the effect of the wrap on the architectural integrity of this historic building

Additionally, the Committee recommends follow up with the Stuart Art Collection with any implementation of outdoor public art.

COMMENT TO DRB: CHILLER PLANT EXPANSION CONCEPT REVIEW (MASCARI, WARNER, AND DIHN; LandLab)

Matthew McCreary introduced the project and informed the Committee that this is the second time the project has been presented to C/CPC. Several locations for a new chiller plant have been studied and expanding at this location is most feasible. One of the conditions of site approval for this project for C/CPC was to return to present the concept and share a potential layout. The project is still early in the design process.

Joe Mascari showed an overview of the project massing and reminded the Committee that these are not final renderings. The existing Chiller Plant colors blend in with the grove when viewed from the west, and is visible from Scholars Drive South and Gilman Drive. A significant grade change exists between the project site and Galbraith Hall, and the project takes advantage of that slope which will help buffer the sound and visual impacts. The project is attempting to avoid any impacts to the La Jolla Project sphere of influence. The proposed site is directly west of the existing Central Utilities Plant (CUP) which benefits the project due to the need to align the utilities at the same elevation.

Brian Garrett described the plan to preserve as much of the Historic Grove as possible and also maintain vehicular access to Galbraith Hall. The existing trees have been accounted for and mapped. Ken Hall asked for an explanation of the limit of work and the proposed site boundaries. The proposed site includes the existing CUP, but no work is anticipated within the existing location, save for some potential underground connections per Nicole Cheng.

The access road shown routed behind the new site needs to remain due to the utilities in this location. Moving utilities increases the cost of the project and the design team is working to avoid having to do this. A gate arm could potentially be installed on the east to allow limited access into the new Chiller Plant and minimal fencing will be required due to the slope for security reasons. Mascari shared that the existing pedestrian path is heavily used and the design attempts to maintain it. Garrett showed the potential Historic Grove trees that may need to be removed. Keith Pezzoli inquired if thoughts around climate change are helping guide the hydromodification at the site. The aim of treating the stormwater is to incorporate planters and swales on site, and discharge the rest of the water to connect with the rest of campus. The service yard pavement would be permeable to help treat stormwater on site.

The design includes a curved top of the building to mimic the change in topography, but the materiality of the building has not yet been determined. Potential exists to mask the tank and the background buildings to

mitigate the views from Scholars Drive South. John Hughes pointed out that at the previous presentation, one of the comments was how visible the new plant would be and it seems that per the presentation and visuals of the existing site it is far less visible than previously thought. Options are being explored for the Revelle Provost Office building since it would have to be removed from the site.

Ken Hall suggested that it would be helpful for the Committee to see the tree heights in relation to the tank height. The individual trees have not yet been modeled, but the tank is proposed to be fairly well ensconced within the trees. The tank will add 2-3,000 tons of capacity to the existing 15,000 tons, and the new equipment would be more efficient. With the equipment being placed underground and within the hillside helps increase the efficiency. No parking will be onsite. During construction access to York Lane would remain open and function with one lane utilizing flagmen since traffic will need to access Galbraith Hall and the CUP.

Tal inquired where in the Committee timeline this project falls, and Cheng explained this project will return for concept after DRB, and then back again for schematic design. Adrian Borsa appreciated the transparent process for this project.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ginger Stout". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ginger Stout
Associate Planner