Design Review Committee (DRC) Meeting Agenda
January 18, 2024

Meeting Location and Time:
ZOOM
Meeting ID: 833 6972 1842
Passcode: 898212
10:30am – 1:30pm PST

Committee Members:
- Susannah Scott, Co-Chair - Senate Chair
- Renée Bahl, Co-Chair - Associate Vice Chancellor
- Alice Kim, Architect - Design Consultant
- Annjulie Vester - GSA Student Representative
- Derrick Eichelberger, Landscape Architect - Design Consultant
- Julie Eizenberg, Architect - Design Consultant
- Julie Hendricks, Campus Architect, Staff Representative - Design & Construction Services
- Lisa Jacobson - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
- Matthew Begley - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
- Richard Wittman - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
- Silvia Perea - University Art Museum
- Victor Soto - AS Student Representative
- Staff Support – Ed Schmittgen, Design & Construction Services

Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)
- Roll call – Ed Schmittgen

General Business (10 minutes)
- Purpose of DRC – Renée Bahl
- Review & Approval of Meeting Minutes from Meeting of April 12, 2023 – Renée Bahl

Project Updates – Julie Hendricks (10 minutes)
- Associated Students Bike Shop
- Interactive Learning Pavilion

Action Items
- San Benito Student Housing Project - Site & Massing Level Review
  - Project Proponents:
    - Willie Brown – Associate Vice Chancellor, Housing, Dining & Auxiliary Enterprises
    - Gene Lucas – Professor Emeritus
  - Presentation (45 minutes)
    - Introduction: Josh Rohmer – Director, Capital & Physical Planning
    - Architect:
      - Carrie Byles – Partner in Charge, SOM
      - Olin McKenzie – Design Partner, SOM
      - Sade Borghei – Principal, Mithun
      - Tom Leader - Landscape Architect, TLS Landscape Architecture
  - Discussion (60 minutes)
  - Closing Summary – Ed Schmittgen (5 minutes)
Meeting Location and Time:
ZOOM Meeting
1:00 – 3:00pm PST

Committee Members:

Susannah Scott, Co-Chair – Academic Senate Chair
Renée Bahl, Co-Chair - Associate Vice Chancellor
Alice Kim, Architect - Design Consultant
Annjulie Vester - GSA Student Representative (Eugene Riordan Jr. attended)
Derrik Eichelberger, Landscape Architect - Design Consultant
Joseph Sable - AS Student Representative
Julie Eizenberg, Architect – Design Consultant
Julie Hendricks, Campus Architect, Staff Representative – Design & Construction Services
Lisa Jacobson - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
Matthew Begley – Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
Richard Wittman – Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
Silvia Perea - University Art Museum

Staff Support – Ed Schmittgen, Design & Construction Services

Welcome: Co-Chair, Renée Bahl

Ed Schmittgen – conducted roll call, those below were in attendance.

1. Susannah Scott
2. Renée Bahl
3. Alice Kim
4. Eugene Riordan Jr. (for Annjulie Vester)
5. Derrik Eichelberger
6. Julie Eizenberg
7. Julie Hendricks
8. Lisa Jacobson
9. Matthew Begley
10. Richard Wittman
11. Silvia Perea
General Business:

Co-Chair Renée Bahl gave an overview of the charge of the Design Review Committee.

In summary, the Design Review Committee is a recommending body focusing primarily on the exterior features and aesthetics; siting and contextual relationship with adjacent buildings; circulation including pedestrians, bikes and vehicles; landscape design, and other environmental matters.

Meeting Minutes from the DRC Meeting of October 5, 2021 were approved.

Action Items:

Eddleman Quantum Institute – Site & Massing Level Review
Project Proponent: Joe Incandela, Vice Chancellor for Research
Architect: David King, Sr. Vice President, SmithGroup

Mr. Rohmer gave a brief overview of the project stating that project planning funds were provided by a donor and resulted in the production of a DPP document which is the basis for this Site and Massing DRC Meeting. Mr. Rohmer expressed the UCSB goals to obtain approval from the UC Regents in July 2023 with funding for design in August 2023.

Mr. Rohmer introduced project proponent, Vice Chancellor Joe Incandela.

Dr. Incandela introduced the project team, including the faculty and staff involved during the planning. Dr. Incandela elaborated on the donor’s vision to advance quantum science and technology through his gift to UCSB. Through a mutual vision with the donor a mission statement was developed around building high quality laboratory space suitable for quantum science.

Vice Chancellor Incandela introduced Smith Group lead designer David King. Mr. King reiterated the mission statement and elaborated on the opportunity presented by the site, which is located at the intersection of the Campus Green and Science Walk.

Mr. King walked the committee through the site plan, building massing and various perspective renderings that presented how the building concept fits into the context of the adjacent green space, pedestrian circulation paths, as well as the surrounding architecture.

The building massing is based on a curvilinear parti consisting of two forms: a larger circular form and a smaller elliptical form, connected by a gallery. Spaces around the circle consist of offices and support space. A significant below-grade laboratory level extends beneath the Campus Green to the north.

The primary circular form provides opportunities for views approximately 270 degrees around the building. The prominent terraces to the south-west capture views to the ocean.
Site and Massing – DRC Comments:

The project was largely well received as “beautiful” and “Interesting”.

Comments regarding Siting:

While the project was generally well received comments were made regarding effective sun control, particularly on the curvilinear glass façade. The design concept depicted “fins” intended to provide relief from the sun. This feature will be further explored to ensure effectiveness.

The conversation evolved to consider the type of glass used and energy conservation: Would the building end up with glass that is more reflective, i.e., less transparent and inviting? High-performance clear glass should be considered to minimize heat gain. Another option includes an operable shading system that can be incorporated on the interior or perhaps the exterior.

While views to the exterior are generally desirable a DRC member challenged the designers by saying emphasis on views does not always result in the best spaces socially. The two south-facing terraces were called out for consideration.

A conversation ensued about specific site constraints and the adverse effects of the site. For example, the high-water table was identified as a potential hurdle/deterrent. Also, a question about the ramifications if we cannot go below grade with the labs due to the water table. The primary driver for putting labs below grade was to mitigate (eliminate) impacts of vibration on sensitive lab equipment. While vibration tolerant labs above grade are possible, they are likely more expensive due to robust structure required to dampen vibration.

A comment was made supporting a goal of the project to preserve the green space for recreational space for the campus community.

A concern was expressed regarding skylights in the Campus Green relative to corrosion when being exposed to recycled irrigation water, which contains corrosive chlorides, as well as the damage that the grounds equipment could inflict upon said skylights.

A question about bringing light into the lower level labs: can we explore opportunities to make the lower level more inviting? A reference to the Obama Library’s lower level was made specific to providing a ‘respite’ from the relentless framework of the labs below.

There was discussion/curiosity regarding the N/S and E/W pedestrian movement. The N/S was deemed livelier than the E/W (Campus Green). Perhaps the building can better engage the pedestrian activity to the west? A challenge to the design team was to emphasize the connection of program space to the surrounding campus.

A comment was made about bike parking and the opportunity it creates: people linger around bike areas. Does this create an opportunity for an exterior social space? Or perhaps a second front door? Does the building have a front and a back?
Comments regarding Massing:

A DRC member commented that while the curvilinear massing was effective at expressing congeniality from the exterior, it did not translate as well to the interior. Can the interior evolve to better express the concept of collaboration?

One comment expressed ambivalence about the “circle”, i.e., curvilinear form, does it have a “freshness of spirit”? While the form is different (atypical at UCSB), a different form is not always the “best it can be”.

While the two-part curvilinear form gestures at fluidity and is interesting and inviting, perhaps consideration can be given to one larger form vs. two separate forms. Would one larger (curvilinear) form better address the Campus Green? A question was presented “how is a curvilinear form congenial?” (compared to other forms), is this “rhetorical”? Also, a question: was the large circle “a bit too large” as it very closely abuts the sidewalk on the north side?

A question regarding whether the ‘little egg’ (the smaller ellipse form housing the conference room/kitchen and board room) was sympathetic to “baby Broida”; a DRC member encouraged the architect to focus on the dialogue between baby Broida and the little egg. For example, if the ‘little egg’ was rotated to the south, would this increase the opportunity for a collaborative, interdisciplinary courtyard between baby Broida and Eddleman?

Faculty office sizes were presented as equal in square footage. A DRC member questioned if equal size makes them equal. Perhaps this feature is over-emphasized and de-emphasizing this may open up other opportunities, e.g., with massing and fenestration.

Adjournment:

Ms. Bahl asked Mr. Schmittgen to recap the meeting’s major points, for the purpose of incorporating them into the CPC Agenda to be held on April 25, 2023. No comments were made in response.

Project Updates:

After the meeting, Ms. Bahl sent out a project update email to the DRC which included updates on the AS Bike Shop and the Interactive Learning Pavilion.
Action Item
Design Review Committee
January 18, 2024
Staff Report
Project:  San Benito Student Housing

Discussion/Action
Campus has requested that the Design Review Committee (DRC) review the site design and massing for the San Benito Student Housing project and make a recommendation with commentary on any suggested revisions to the Chancellor to proceed with Schematic Design.

Staff Recommendation
The Campus Architect recommends approval of the project site design and building massing so the project can continue into the Schematic Design phase.

Description
The San Benito Student Housing Project will provide approximately 2,250 student beds to the UCSB Main Campus to meet the residential need of the campus for 3,500 new beds outlined in the University's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The Design will comply with the University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices and plans to achieve a LEED Platinum rating.

The project will be located on the current Facilities Management Site (FM Site). The program totals approximately 500,000 Assignable Square Feet (ASF), and 700,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF). It will support the campus with living quarters, community and residential amenities, retail and dining, and building support. Unit typologies include studios, 2-bedroom apartments with 2 beds and 1 bath and 4-bedroom apartments with 8 beds and 2 baths. The Campus plans occupancy for the Fall quarter of 2027.

Background
In 2006, UCSB prepared a Campus Housing Study (Study) that established a vision for residential development to address the need for affordable housing for students. This is foundational for the 2010 UCSB Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which plans for the physical development of the campus to accommodate the expansion of enrollment that now exceeds 25,000 students. San Benito Student Housing will provide a new neighborhood of undergraduate student housing on the Main Campus. This will offer a four-year residential experience that supports a vibrant campus community.

UCSB’s current Facilities Management complex (FM Site) is a collection of single-story industrial buildings at the intersection of Mesa Road and Stadium Road. The southern
and eastern margins of the site are habitat for native plants and wildlife. These areas have been designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) in the campus' LRDP and have specific requirements for development setbacks and restoration that must be integrated into the site and building design.

**Site**
The San Benito project site occupies a manmade semicircular depression with steeply sloping sides around the southern edge that reach a height of approximately +20' and taper to zero along the northern edge. The roughly 5-acre site is bounded by Mesa Road on the north, Stadium Road on the west, and wooded slopes on the south and east. Adjacent buildings and structures include the Public Safety Building to the north, Harder Stadium to the west, Parking Lot 30 and Uyesaka Baseball Stadium to the south, and the Environmental Health & Safety Building to the east.

The Project Site is depicted in the illustrations to follow:
Site Design
The proposed San Benito Student Housing project will transform what is currently a quiet northwestern border of the campus into an exciting neighborhood for resident students with an active and welcoming environment that is inspired by the native landscape.

On the western boundary of the site, Stadium Road will provide a principal linkage that connects the development to numerous uses and pathways including Ocean Road, El Colegio Road, and Parking Lot 30.

On the southern and eastern boundary, a sloping topography includes native plants and habitat that serve as an inspiration for an integrated landscape and stormwater solution. It will incorporate a native plant palette and utilize rain-gardens with native plant materials to treat stormwater through natural processes before releasing to the Goleta Slough.

To the south, Parking Lot 30 will provide an entry to San Benito that will activate student amenities with a sequence of spaces that will meet the need for deliveries, ride-share drop off and parking as well as episodic uses like student move-in / move-outs. Lot 30 accommodates vehicular and bike parking.
Site and Massing Design

The project proposes a massing and site design in accordance with the planning framework in Section C of the 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP): The campus academic disciplines and activities be arranged together in a coherent and logical system of open spaces and circulation. Pedestrian circulation should be well connected to destinations.

The currently proposed complex consists of 6-8 story buildings separated by linear garden courts. The massing is organized into rows of irregular articulated bar-buildings that emphasize compelling views, creating a rich, connective framework of exterior spaces of varying scales and uses.

The east-west orientation of the buildings optimizes daylighting and passive ventilation while providing expansive views of the mountains to the north. The western ends of the residential bars rest upon a 2-story plinth of student and public serving amenity programs creating an active frontage along Stadium Road that extends inward to form a pedestrian promenade at the heart of the complex.
The gently stepping terraces of the promenade form a series of linked gathering spaces oriented towards the San Ynez Mountains and provide principal access to the heart of the complex and a connection to the natural beauty of the Santa Barbara region. The promenade links to the linear courts between the residential buildings to create a rich connective framework.

Back-of-house programs of service, loading and Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing (MEP) spaces, occupy the lower level of the plinth. A service loop has been woven through the lower level of the plinth and the eastern garden courts to support both trash collection and emergency vehicle access. A limited number of student amenities like study rooms and recreation spaces are also integrated into the lower plinth and face onto the eastern garden courts.

Vehicular access from Mesa road will be limited to service and delivery vehicles entering the loading dock along the north frontage of the project site. The north end of the promenade will be significantly elevated above the road to prevent direct pedestrian access and to also create a promontory of the slough and the mountains to the north. Screened and covered bike parking will form the southern edge.
A color-coded stacking diagram and diagrammatic sections are provided below to indicate residential, community, retail and dining, support, and connector space allocations:
Materials
Site design and material selection shall be durable and complementary to the building the interior spaces, and the surrounding campus. The building envelop will be durable and water-resistant. Site furnishings such as benches, trash receptacles, and bike racks shall also be complementary to the campus and will be located at key areas identified on the plans. Plant selection will be chosen to perform well and require the least amount of ongoing maintenance.

Conceptual renderings of the project:
Consistency with Existing Plans and Regulatory Documents
The design will include sustainable and environmentally responsible features to the greatest extent possible to meet CALGreen Code requirements and LEED design credits. The hardscape will be compliant with ADA standards for accessible design, Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (AB1881), and other regulatory requirements that apply to this site. Landscaping improvements associated with storm water retention requirements.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) will be prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the preparation of an Initial Study is underway to determine potential areas of impact to be analyzed in the MND. Energy Design for this project will target LEED Platinum, UCSB 2025 carbon neutrality and CALGreen initiatives.

Consultation
The Building Committee for the San Benito Student Housing project has reviewed and endorses the site and massing design. The Campus Planning Committee will review the project on January 30, 2024 with all DRC comments. The project will return again to the Design Review Committee for 50% and 100% Schematic Design reviews.

Project Proponents
Willie Brown, Associate Vice Chancellor, Housing, Dining & Auxiliary Enterprises
Gene Lucas, Professor Emeritus
Agenda

1. Introductions 2 min
2. Project Vision 3 min
3. Campus Integration 10 min
4. Site Design and Massing 10 min
5. Amenities / Student Life 10 min
6. Site Experience 10 min
7. Recap 5 min
8. Discussion 60 min
Introductions
Our Team
SOM+Mithun+TLS

Carrie Byles
Partner in Charge, SOM

Olin McKenzie
Design Partner, SOM

Sade Borghei
Principal, Mithun

Tom Leader
Landscape Architect, TLS
Our Team
Subconsultants

SOM + MITHŪN

SOM Structural
MGAC Cost Estimating
Introba IT/Low Voltage/Security

KPFF Civil

Glumac MEP/FP

TLS Landscape

Baker Group Food Service

Fehr & Peers Traffic

Wōden Code / Life Safety

Additional Subconsultants to be added in later phases:

Acoustics (Newson Brown) Lighting (HLB) Graphics & Wayfinding (SOM)
Create a **project** that evokes the **values** and **ambitions** of UCSB
Provide **choice** for social, study, and creativity

With **amenities** that **build community**
Extend nature into social spaces
Create an inclusive and safe environment
Community at multiple scales
Provide choice for social, study, creativity
Design for affordability
Consider life cycle and maintenance cost
Wellness and sustainability
Flexible and adaptable spaces
Access to technology

1. Create a New Beacon for UCSB
2. Define the Site Edges
3. Strengthen Campus Connectivity
4. Create a Welcoming Sense of Arrival
5. Ensure Universal Access
6. Build Community
7. Enhance Site Ecosystems
8. Celebrate the Views
9. Leverage Passive Sustainable Strategies
10. Establish Efficient Service Circulation
11. Optimize Density & Placemaking
12. Design for Cost Effectiveness

Add **warmth** with **natural materials**, and **celebrate** **natural light**
1. Create a New Beacon for UCSB
2. Define the Site Edges
3. Strengthen Campus Connectivity
4. Create a Welcoming Sense of Arrival
5. Ensure Universal Access
6. Build Community
7. Enhance Site Ecosystems
8. Celebrate the Views
9. Leverage Passive Sustainable Strategies
10. Establish Efficient Service Circulation
11. Optimize Density & Placemaking
12. Design for Cost Effectiveness

Connect to the Campus
UCSB SAN BENITO STUDENT HOUSING
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- Create an inclusive and safe environment
- Community at multiple scales
- Provide choice for social, study, creativity
- Design for affordability
- Consider life cycle and maintenance cost
- Wellness and sustainability
- Flexible and adaptable spaces
- Access to technology

1. Create a New Beacon for UCSB
2. Define the Site Edges
3. Strengthen Campus Connectivity
4. Create a Welcoming Sense of Arrival
5. Ensure Universal Access
6. Build Community
7. Enhance Site Ecosystems
8. Celebrate the Views
9. Leverage Passive Sustainable Strategies
10. Establish Efficient Service Circulation
11. Optimize Density & Placemaking
12. Design for Cost Effectiveness

Make buildings that breathe
Design hospitable and affordable dwellings units
Create an inclusive and safe environment
● Community at multiple scales
● Provide choice for social, study, creativity
● Design for affordability
● Consider life cycle and maintenance cost
● Wellness and sustainability
● Flexible and adaptable spaces
● Access to technology

1. Create a New Beacon for UCSB
2. Define the Site Edges
3. Strengthen Campus Connectivity
4. Create a Welcoming Sense of Arrival
5. Ensure Universal Access
6. Build Community
7. Enhance Site Ecosystems
8. Celebrate the Views
9. Leverage Passive Sustainable Strategies
10. Establish Efficient Service Circulation
11. Optimize Density & Placemaking
12. Design for Cost Effectiveness

Provide easy access to resources
Form neighborhoods in the sky
Create places of respite

Allow for informal outdoor community hubs
Encourage **wellness** activities

With spaces that are **flexible** and **adaptable**
Campus Integration
Site History
The Goleta Slough
Site History
Excavation and Fill

1941
FM Site (not excavated)

1944
FM Site (excavated)
Create a New Neighborhood on Main Campus
Campus Plan (2003)

An Open Grid of Vistas

Open Space Framework
The Site Edges

Protect from vehicular traffic on Mesa Rd

Respect ESHA boundary

Activate Stadium Rd
SAN BENITO STUDENT HOUSING

Connect to the Campus
Vehicular & Bike Routes

- ½ MILE 5-MINUTE WALK 2-MINUTE BIKE
- ¾ MILE 15-MINUTE WALK 8-MINUTE BIKE
- ¼ MILE 5-MINUTE WALK 2-MINUTE BIKE
- ½ MILE 5-MINUTE WALK 2-MINUTE BIKE

PRIMARY VEHICULAR ROAD
PRIMARY BIKE PATH
PROPOSED BIKE PATH
Connect to the Campus
Transit Routes

- ¾ MILE: 15-MINUTE WALK, 8-MINUTE BIKE
- ½ MILE: 5-MINUTE WALK, 2-MINUTE BIKE
- ¼ MILE: 5-MINUTE WALK, 2-MINUTE BIKE
Improve Connections to the Site

- **San Benito Student Housing**: North Stadium Road Improvements (33,000 SF)
- **Stadium Road to El Colegio Improvements**: 42,000 SF
- **Lot 30 Improvements**: 100,000 SF
- **Service Road Extension and Site Improvements**: 35,000 SF
- **Storke Field Ped & Bike Extension**: .38 Miles of Path
- **Stadium Road to El Colegio Improvements**: .38 Miles of Path
- **Rec Center Ped Connection**
- **Southern Ped & Bike Extension**: .25 Miles of Path
- **El Colegio Pedestrian Connector**
Improve Connections to the Site

- Pedestrian Walk
- Vehicular Drop-Off
- Bike Lanes
- Vehicular Parking
- Bike Parking
Environmentally Sensitive Areas

South Wetland ESHA

Storke ESHA

Eucalyptus Grove
South Wetland ESHA
ESHA Zones

**ESHA Influence Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centromadia parryi, ssp.</td>
<td>Southern tarplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthamia occidentalis</td>
<td>Western goldenrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouteloua gracilis</td>
<td>Blue grama grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilleja exserta</td>
<td>Purple owl’s clover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junco patens</td>
<td>Common rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echscholtzia californica</td>
<td>California poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mow grass</td>
<td>No mow grass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Plants at ESHA and Upland Buffer to Remain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carduus pycnocephalus</td>
<td>Italian thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus echioides</td>
<td>Browly Ox-longue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassica nigra</td>
<td>Upland mustard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygoma monspeliensis</td>
<td>Rabbitfoot grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicodendron pubescens</td>
<td>Poison oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus inermis</td>
<td>Bromus grass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy: Transition between ESHA and neighboring residential gardens, the area serves students for both recreational and educational purposes, while offering valuable resources for local birds and pollinators.

(E) Oak tree groves

(E) ESHA Shrubs and grasses
Seismic Conditions

WESTERN MORE RANCH FAULT

50'

MESA ROAD

50'

EAST FAULT

STADIUM ROAD
Campus Context

Shaded Walkways  Outdoor Pocket Spaces  Scenic Views  Integration of Nature
Design Elements

Arcades

Courtyards

Plinths

Paseos
Site Design & Massing
Project Drivers

Integrated Community

Student Success

Institutional Identity
Creating Home at Every Scale

INDIVIDUAL
- 1
- 3-8

BLOCK
- 25-75

FM + EAST CAMPUS SITES
- 3,500+

UCSB GAUCHOS
- 25,000+

CITIZEN
- 7.7B+
Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Name</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Total ASF</th>
<th>Gross Factor/Efficiency</th>
<th>Total GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>443,265</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>555,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Floor Amenities</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>161,500</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>211,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / Building Amenities</td>
<td>27,860</td>
<td>83,580</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>341,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail &amp; Dining</td>
<td>14,805</td>
<td>44,450</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>24,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM SUMMARY</td>
<td>504,830</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>669,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visual Program
Site Capacity

Ground Floor Program

Typical Upper Floor Program
Design Process

Courtyards
Bars
Collection
Intersection
Design Process

- Courtyards
- Bars
- Collection
- Intersection
Design Process

Courtyards
Bars
Collection
Intersection
Design Process

Courtyards

Bars

Collection

Intersection
Wind Analysis
Bars Scheme

The buildings in this scheme are strategically oriented to channel the breeze from the SW into the site. Additionally, the variation in building massing along the pathway enhances airflow within buildings. This design approach promotes better natural ventilation in the buildings and improves the thermal comfort of outdoor spaces, particularly during the warmer months of the year.

No areas with extreme wind speed are observed under the prevailing wind conditions.

The context building extending against the prevailing wind, creating a calm wind condition in the space behind.

The building’s setback creates an opening through which breeze is directed into the courtyard.

The variation in massing distance along the pathway enhances airflow within the buildings.

More wind protection is observed in this area.

Within Wind Comfortable Range
Beneficial For Thermal Comfort
Average Direct Sunlight Hours per Year
Bars Scheme

AVERAGE ~ 1500 HOURS PER YEAR OF DIRECT SUN IN COURTYARDS
Massing Evolution Diagrams
Program Stacking Diagram
Program Stacking Diagram
Stadium Road Level
Program Stacking Diagram
Mesa Road Level
East/West Sections
North/South Sections
Student Life / Amenities
Student Life & Amenities

Retail Dining  Flexible Spaces  Study Lounges  Social Areas  Wellness Rooms  Student Services
Program Adjacencies
Amenity Program Distribution

UCSB SAN BENITO STUDENT HOUSING
SKIDMORE, OWINGS & MERRILL | MITHUN
Dining Precedent and Distributed Dining Diagram
Typical Unit Plans

8-Bed
4-Bedroom Apartment
1450 SF

2-Bed
2-Bedroom Apartment
615 SF

1-Bed
Studio Apartment
273 SF
Typical Residential Floor Plan

Unit and Bed Counts:

- 4-Bedroom: 7 Units, 56 Beds (90%)
- 2-Bedroom: 2 Units, 4 Beds (5%)
- Studio: 2 Units, 2 Beds (5%)

62 Beds / Floor
Typical Residential Floor Plan

Unit and Bed Counts:

- 4-Bedroom: 7 Units, 56 Beds (90%)
- 2-Bedroom: 2 Units, 4 Beds (5%)
- Studio: 2 Units, 2 Beds (5%)

62 Beds / Floor
Typical Residential Building Plans

- Top Floor: 28 Beds
- Typical Upper Floor: 62 Beds per floor
- Third Floor - Grade at Stadium Rd: 53 Beds
- Second Floor: 50 Beds
  - (1) Assistant Residential Director
- Ground Floor - Grade at Mesa Rd: 49 Beds
  - (1) Residential Director

Legend:
- 4-Bedroom Apartment (8 Beds)
- 2-Bedroom Apartment (2 Beds)
- Studio Apartment (1 Bed)
- Resident Director / Assist. Res. Director Apartment
- Laundry
- Back of House - Electrical / IT / Custodial / Trash
On-Site Circulation - Stadium Road Level

Vehicular
On-Site Circulation - Stadium Road Level
Pedestrian
The Connector
On-Site Circulation - Mesa Road Level
Vehicular
On-Site Circulation - Mesa Road Level
Pedestrian
Courtyards and Portals
Site Experience
Landscape Concept
Landscape Concept

OUTDOOR GATHERING AREA

RESIDENTIAL GARDEN

CENTRAL PLAZA
Stadium Road at End of Pedestrian Path
Stadium Road Towards Courtyard
Site Entry From Lot 30
Connector Looking North
Connector View From Courtyard
Aerial View From SW
Aerial View From N
From Mesa Road Looking East
Site Entry From Lot 30
Connector Looking North
Aerial View From SW