Design Review Committee (DRC)
Meeting Agenda
October 5, 2021

Meeting Location and Time:
ZOOM Meeting ID: 858 6406 6353
Passcode: Se1F4tYT
3:00 – 5:00pm PST

Committee Members:

Susannah Scott, Co-Chair – Senate Chair, Professor, Chemical Engineering
Renée Bahl, Co-Chair, Associate Vice Chancellor, Design, Facilities & Safety Services
Dawn Holmes, Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
Dennis McFadden, Design Consultant, Architect & Design Director, Leo A Daly
Derrik Eichelberger, Design Consultant, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studio Landscape Architecture
Jack Johnson, AS Student Representative
Julie Eizenberg, Design Consultant, Architect & Founding Principal, Koning Eizenberg
Julie Hendricks, Staff Representative, Campus Architect & Director, Design & Construction Services
Pedro Craveiro, GSA Student Representative
Silvia Perea, Acting Director, University Art, Design & Architecture Museum
Volker Welter, Senate Appointed Faculty Representative
VACANT, Senate Appointed Faculty Representative

Staff Support – Ed Schmittgen, Associate Director, Design & Construction Services

Welcome and Introductions
1. Roll call – Ed Schmittgen

General Business
1. Purview of DRC – Renée Bahl
2. Review & Approval of Meeting Minutes from Meeting of March 11, 2021 – Renée Bahl

Action Items
1. Munger Hall – 100% Schematic Design Level Review
   Project Proponent: Gene Lucas
   Project Manager: Jennifer Pierce, Design & Construction Services
   Architect of Record: Navy F Banvard, VTBS Architects

Project Updates
1. Associated Students Bike Shop – Julie Hendricks
2. Interactive Learning Pavilion – Julie Hendricks
3. Arnhold Tennis Center – Julie Hendricks
Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
11 March 2021

Committee Members:

Susannah Scott, Co-Chair – Senate Chair, Professor, Chemical Engineering
Renée Bahl, Co-Chair, Associate Vice Chancellor, Design, Facilities & Safety Services
Swati Chattopadhyay, Senate Appointed Faculty Representative, Professor, History of Art and Architecture
Derrik Eichelberger, Design Consultant, Landscape Architect, Arcadia Studio Landscape Architecture
Julie Eizenberg, Design Consultant, Architect & Founding Principal, Koning Eizenberg
Julie Hendricks, Staff Representative, Campus Architect & Director, Design & Construction Services
Jeff Kirkby GSA Student Representative
Dylan Martinez, AS Student Representative
Dennis McFadden, Design Consultant, Architect & Design Director, Leo A Daly
Silvia Perea, Acting Director, University Art, Design & Architecture Museum

Ex-Officio - Dawn Holmes, Chair, Capital and Space Planning Committee, Statistics & Applied Probability
Staff Support/DRC Liaison - Leslie Colasse, Project Manager, Design & Construction Services

Welcome and Introductions
1. Susannah Scott welcomed the committee and attendees.

2. Leslie Colasse conducted Roll Call.
The following individuals listed in bold were present on the ZOOM call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susannah Scott</th>
<th>Julie Hendricks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renée Bahl</td>
<td>Jeff Kirkby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swati Chattopadhyay</td>
<td>Dylan Martinez *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrik Eichelberger</td>
<td>Dennis McFadden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Eizenberg</td>
<td>Silvia Perea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dawn Holmes
Leslie Colasse

*During the course of the meeting, it was noted that Marc Vukcevich had been appointed to the position of AS Student Representative. Mr. Vukcevich was noted as being present.
Action Items

1. AS Bike Shop – 100% Schematic Design Level Review

Mr. Ramos was introduced and he provided a history as to the manner in which the AS Bike Shop project came about. Ms. Kimm of JFAK Architects then addressed the committee with a PowerPoint presentation which recappon the outcome of the May 20, 2020 DRC Meeting, illustrated the manner in which her firm had addressed those items, and further demonstrated the extent to which the project’s design had been developed. The following is a summary of comments and recommendations received from the committee as read aloud and accepted by committee members at the conclusion of discussion on this Item.

The cylindrical nature of the architecture is successful in counter balancing the mass and architectural structure of the SAASB building. The committee would encourage celebrating the dynamic nature of the circle to the greatest degree possible and suggests considering whether the north-south oriented wall on the west side of the project and/or the flat wood finish plywood wall on the east could be altered or reconsidered to better reinforce the nature of the drum.

Careful consideration should be given to circulation around and thru the building and potential conflicts. Substantial discussion took place in regards to both the lounge area and the north-south oriented wall on the west side of the building. The opportunity to possibly swap the locations of the restrooms and lounge were noted as a manner in which one might solve the circulation concerns at the south of the building in order to allow a connection between Lot 15 and the walking path, while still maintaining the lounge and its associated need for privacy. Suggestions were made to potentially treat the n-s wall as more of a landscape element and to provide an entry at the south end of the queuing line. It was noted that the poles which are part of the shade structure help to break down the massing and differentiate this building successfully from SAASB.

Concerns were voiced over some of the proposed plantings and it was recommended that the planting palette be reviewed in greater depth with the Campus Landscape Committee. Specifically, the shade plants should be reconsidered, as well as the plants that are intended to climb onto the trellis. Suggestions were made for continuing the Coral Tree theme in this area of the campus and giving consideration to the species of hedge material used in order to ensure that the hedges will remain healthy and visually successful if pruned hard and/or maintained at a modest height.

It was suggested that graphics be considered for the frieze, in lieu of verbiage. If any language is used on the exterior of the pavilion and associated site elements, it shall be reviewed at a higher level.

Consider reintroducing at least a modest amount of bike parking in the immediate vicinity.
General Business

1. Renée Bahl presented the Meeting Minutes from the last Meeting of May 20, 2020. Inquiry was made as to whether there were any needed changes. No comments were made. Meeting Minutes stand as record.

2. Renée Bahl presented proposed updates to DRC Membership & Administrative Procedures. No comments or concerns were voiced over the proposed changes.

Project Updates

1. Julie Hendricks updated the committee on the status of the Classroom Building. Ms. Hendricks noted that the project had been authorized by Office of the President to bid and, that trade packages received in Fall were effectively on budget after a few were re-bid. A Notice to Proceed was issued in October of 2020. The project was noted as having benefitted from a dry Fall and Winter. The project is currently in Mass Excavation and the bulk of underground utilities are effectively complete with footings and slab work underway. Ms. Hendricks noted that there is a subcommittee working on the furniture selection for the project. At present, the project is on schedule for opening in Spring of 2023.

Ms. Scott noted that the subject had come up on campus as to whether the project will remain named “The Classroom Building”. Ms. Hendricks noted that it will be renamed, but that the final naming decision had yet to be announced.

Ms. Chattopadhyay noted that she had watched the video of the building and that it brought into focus the larger question as to how we design buildings in a manner to support teaching in light of COVID and all that we have learned. Mr. Vukcevich remarked that he, too, had looked at the video. He inquired as to whether the Campus was planning to address some of the comments that were posted on You Tube. Ms. Hendricks noted that many of the comments were related to the bike path and that she is hoping to extract the project from discussions related to the master bike path circulation plan for the campus. Mr. Vukcevich noted that there were further comments posted which were unrelated to the bike path.

2. Julie Hendricks updated the committee on the status of the Arnold Tennis Center. Ms. Hendricks reminded the committee that the Arnhold Tennis Center is a 100% donor funded project. She noted that this project had also benefitted from a dry weather season. She noted that framing is complete, that roofing work has commenced, and that the courts are anticipated to be poured next week. There were no comments or questions from the group.
Agenda

1. 20 May 2020 DRC Meeting
2. Detailed Project Program (DPP)
3. 100% Schematic Design
4. Sustainability, Schedule, Budget
1 20 May 2020 DRC Meeting
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Associated Students Bike Shop (ASBS)

100% Schematic Design, Design Review Committee (DRC) Presentation, 11 March 2021

John Friedman Alice Kimm

Architects JF/ AK
Excerpts from 20 May 2020 Design Review Committee (DRC) Presentation
DRC Recommendations:

1. Ensure that the design does not negatively impact Parking Lot 15 or remove parking spaces.

2. Expand site footprint to include portion of large lawn west of SAASB to create more opportunities for community interaction as well as a positive relationship with visitors to SAASB.

3. Study the relationship of building to landscape, and its impact on the campus.
2 Detailed Project Program (DPP)
Attachment 1

Site Delineation
AS Bike Shop

- Coral Tree Cafe
Sketch view looking southeast with expanded community plaza, outdoor seating, and selfie wall.
DPP Conclusions:

1. Approves new relationship between SAASB and ASBS, including shared outdoor plazas.

2. Ensure that no parking is removed and that Parking Lot 15 is not negatively impacted.

3. During design stages, project must resolve safety and accessibility of ASBS test track.

4. Project must minimize visibility and acoustics from ASBS that are disruptive to SAASB and community.
3 100% Schematic Design
Schematic Design Refined Parameters:

1. Expanded outdoor community space with seating, selfie wall, and plaza areas

2. No outdoor bike racks for working on repairs; all repair work takes place indoors

3. Dedicated outdoor staff area

4. Outdoor queueing area to be incorporated

5. DIY work stations and retail display inside public waiting area; one-way public counter
### Program Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>NSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiting and Queueing (Public Counter) Area</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY Area</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics Shop</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor Room</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Bathroom with Shower</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor’s Closet</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Storage</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric / IDF Room</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net ASF

| Net ASF                                              | 2,671 |

### Gross Building Area

| Gross Building Area                                  | 2,950 |

---

**Legend**

- Main entry
- Service entry
- Bike circulation
- Vehicular circulation
- Pedestrian circulation

**Site and Floor Plan, not to scale**

---
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**Associated Students Bike Shop (ASBS)**

100% Schematic Design, Design Review Committee (DRC) Presentation, 11 March 2021

**John Friedman Alice Kimm Architects (JFAK)**

---

**Parking Lot 15**
Bicycle Race
(music and lyrics by Queen)

Bicycle, bicycle, bicycle
I want to ride my bicycle, bicycle, bicycle
I want to ride my bicycle
I want to ride my bike
I want to ride my bicycle
I want to ride it where I like
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at “frieze”
Freestanding canopy: painted steel
West facade canopy and outdoor staff area canopy: fabric shade panels, steel posts, vinyl-clad foam
Trash enclosure: vinyl-clad chainlink
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at "frieze"
Freestanding canopy: painted steel
West facade canopy and outdoor staff area canopy: fabric shade panels, steel posts, vinyl-clad foam
Trash enclosure: vinyl-clad chainlink
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at “frieze”
Inset bike storage wall: Finish Plywood (FinPly)
Freestanding canopy: painted steel
Test track: painted asphalt (graphic not shown for this presentation)
Freestanding "cafe" furniture
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at “frieze”
West facade canopy and outdoor staff area canopy: fabric shade panels, steel posts, vinyl-clad foam
Selfie wall (this option): Steel with steel letters
Freestanding canopy: painted steel
Freestanding "cafe" furniture
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at “frieze”
West facade canopy and outdoor staff area canopy: fabric shade panels, steel posts, vinyl-clad foam
Trash enclosure: vinyl-clad chainlink

eye-level view to west facade and queueing line
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at "frieze"
West facade canopy and outdoor staff area canopy: fabric shade panels, steel posts, vinyl-clad foam
Inset bike storage wall: Finish Plywood (FinPly)
Freestanding canopy: painted steel
Selfie wall: Steel with steel letters and numbers
Freestanding "cafe" furniture
Building: exterior cement plaster (stucco), painted graphic at "frieze"
Inset bike storage wall: Finish Plywood (FinPly)
Trash enclosure: vinyl-clad chainlink
Test track: painted asphalt (graphic not shown for this presentation)
eye-level interior view from public counter

Shop: Plywood-clad walls with plywood shelves on standards
DIY and retail: Sheet-aluminum-clad pegboard walls
Public counter: Corian
Public counter: Sheet-aluminum-clad vertical surface
Painted exposed ceiling structure (trus-joists or other)
Painted gypsum board with painted or vinyl graphic
Shop: Plywood-clad walls with plywood shelves on standards
DIY and retail: Sheet-aluminum-clad pegboard walls
Workbenches: Plywood on rolling steel frames
Painted exposed ceiling structure (trus-joists or other)
Painted gypsum board with painted or vinyl graphic
Dark rubber mats - removable

eye-level interior view from mechanics shop towards entrance
5  Sustainability, Schedule, Budget
Sustainability Target: LEED-Gold

Schedule:

Design Development through Construction Documents - April through August 2021

Bid and General Contractor Selection - September and October 2021

Construction - October 2021

Approved Project Budget: $4.1M
Design Review Committee
Staff Report
October 5, 2021

Action Item: Munger Hall

Discussion/Action
The Design Review Committee is being requested to review the design for the Munger Hall project and make a recommendation to the Chancellor with any suggested changes.

Staff Recommendation
The project continues with no further reviews required by DRC.

Background
The design for Munger Hall is an innovative approach to on-campus student housing that is based on a vision about improving the quality and efficacy of university housing in general and the student experience. The project aspires to deliver a fulfilling student experience with affordable, safe and secure housing within a mixed-use typology. Peer-to-peer interaction is an essential theme to foster an environment of learning and support while providing necessary resources and amenities to support a comprehensive living experience.

The following are the project’s guiding principles:

1. Create a concept that is efficient, cost effective and would be constructed in a shorter length of time than traditional student housing.
2. Incorporate shared cooking areas which would encourage students to prepare many of their meals ‘at home’ and in collaboration with fellow students.
3. Proving a superior housing alternative that would likely draw students back to campus housing, rather than living in off-campus homes, condominiums and apartments.
4. Through the creation of communal study, recreation and amenity areas, socialization among students is improved.
5. Explore radical innovation and, in particular, industrialized construction (manufactured solutions).

Description of Site, Context & Circulation
Site
Within the project boundary is approximately 13.5 acres of total land which includes the actual building site of approximately 6.0 acres and adjacent roads, open space and a place for the Central Utility Plant (CUP); Munger Hall is generally located on the
The southeast corner of Stadium Road and Mesa Road. The building site is somewhat of a bowl with the west and south sides sloping up to Stadium Road and Lot 30. Within the bowl, the site is relatively flat. The site is currently occupied by several operational units. Parking Lot 31 is also located on the project site and provides a total of 227 parking spaces.

**Context**
The site is within a unique setting and is located on the northern edge of the campus. Harder Stadium is to the west, Caesar Uyesaka Stadium is to the south, the Community Hazardous Waste Collection Center is to the east and the Public Safety Building, Goleta Slough and the Santa Barbara Airport are found to the north. None of the adjacent uses provide a traditional context for the design of an urban building. Without a defining context, the building design responds primarily to its programmatic requirements.

**Circulation**
The university’s traffic engineer has studied, and continues to study, the overall project circulation pattern and connections to the main campus. These studies have been focused upon pedestrian and bicycle routes since Munger Hall is not providing automobile parking. The studies also include consideration of transit, pick-up/drop-off spaces and commercial loading zones on the site.

**Pedestrian**
Munger Hall has two main entries, one each on the north and south sides. New pedestrian paths in the form of paved sidewalks would be located adjacent to the building on all sides. The pedestrian connection to campus has been identified as going primarily through the south entry and in response to that, an elevated grand staircase (20’ wide) and ADA ramp is provided for pedestrian access between the building and Parking Lot 30. From the top of the stairs and ramp, pedestrians would continue southward, along the edge of Lot 30, connecting with the east-west pathway linking El Colegio Road and Ocean Road, ultimately giving direct access to the main campus. An additional pathway is anticipated east of the building, running north-south from Mesa Road alongside the tennis courts, Rec Center and athletic fields. This route will similarly connect with the pathway between El Colegio Road and Ocean Road.

**Bicycles**
A significant connection to campus will rely upon bicycles. The project provides more than 3,000 bicycle parking spaces in two areas. One is at the northern end of Lot 30 (1,000 spaces) and the other is in an area adjacent to Mesa Road just east of the building (2,000 spaces). Bicycle users parking in both areas will connect with the main campus via the pathways used for pedestrian access. Those paths will have clearly defined pedestrian and bicycle lanes. The university’s traffic engineer is also studying a possible third connection, this one only for bicycles that would be routed from the northeast bike parking area along Mesa Road then alongside the northern edge of the Rec Center meeting up with Ocean Road.
Transit
The final component in the overall student circulation plan includes two new transit stops, located within the project boundary, one each on the north and south sides of Mesa Road.

Vehicles
Vehicle access through the project site, including emergency vehicle access, would be along a driveway located adjacent to the east and south of the building. The access drive would connect to Mesa Road at the northeast corner of the project site, and Stadium Road at the southwest corner of the site. A truck access and loading zone for deliveries to the on-site market and food service facilities would be located adjacent to the market on the northeast corner of the building. Additional loading spaces can be found adjacent to the northwest corner of the building, intended for custodial deliveries and building supplies. Between the building and Mesa Road, a pick-up and drop-off zone provides short term spaces for Uber, Lyft, Door Dash and similar services.

Access to the Central Utility Plant would be from Parking Lot 17, which is adjacent to the Environmental Health and Safety Building.

Description of Proposed Project, Massing, Design & Landscape Design
Building Typology
Munger Hall is an eleven-story mixed-use building that will provide up to 4,536 beds for UCSB undergraduate students and eight one-bedroom staff apartments. In addition to the residences, Munger Hall will provide a variety of retail, service, academic and amenity uses including a market, bakery, dining facility, fitness center, staff offices, counseling offices, a recreation room and several reading and study areas. These accessory uses and building systems (mechanical and electrical,) are found on the first and eleventh floors while the residences are located on floors two through ten. The building has approximately 1.68 million gross square feet of floor area devoted to the mix of uses. A Central Utility Plant (CUP) will be located within the project boundary to the southeast of the main building, providing chilled water to serve Munger Hall and other Main Campus buildings.

Massing
The building massing is informed by the House and Suite concept, along with the critical mass needed to support abundant accessory and amenity use goals. With primarily common uses and building services on the first floor, the typical residential floor (found on the second through tenth stories,) is comprised of eight Houses, each with sixty-three students. There are four Houses on either side of a generous central building corridor. Within each House there are eight Suites and a large shared ‘Convivial’ Kitchen, Game Room and an expansive Great Room. Each suite will provide eight private, single occupancy bedrooms, two unisex restrooms each with a shower, and a central study area that is large enough for group activities including studying, socializing or dining. The eleventh floor is devoted to the concept of ‘Our Town in the Sky.’ It includes the balance of accessory and amenity uses, each provided with extra tall ceilings to have large spaces that are acoustically comfortable. These uses encircle a large central courtyard that is landscaped, paved and furnished for maximum student enjoyment.
The courtyard is covered by an arched metal and ETFE (Ethylene TetraFluoroEthylene) canopy that rises above the roof level. ETFE is an ultra-lightweight and highly transparent synthetic material that effectively acts as a skylight. This will allow natural sunlight to flood the courtyard.

Design
The architectural character of the building is based upon the vernacular of both academic and civic architectural examples, along with themes found among the many buildings on the Santa Barbara campus. The grand scale of the building will be treated in a classical motif with a clearly delineated base with common areas, a middle section containing the student housing and a top that is dedicated to the ‘Our Town in the Sky’ component. Facades will express the strength of structural concrete panels and these will have a mixture of textured and smooth finishes. Architectural order, organization and interest are provided by recessed reveals, window patterns, metal railings, precast concrete and other metal architectural details (such as trellises) and color. The design utilizes a combination of hopper and awning window styles.

Landscape Design
The landscape design concept for the ground level intends to convey a seamless transition to the surrounding undisturbed environment and provides the impression of minimal impact to the site. The organic arrangement of trees and shrubs adjacent to the perimeter road mimics the natural setting on the south and east sides of the site. Vertical, evergreen trees and a foundation planting of shrubs at the base of the building provides human-scale relief of the structure. Broad canopy trees within the South Plaza/Veranda provide shade for the outdoor seating areas. The proposed trees and shrubs are compatible with the existing surrounding campus landscape and are California-adaptive, low water consumptive varieties suitable for this setting. Hardscape materials at the South Plaza and Front Building Entry are to be enhanced with linear precast concrete pavers in warm gray tones. The remainder of the site paving is natural gray concrete with a medium sand finish and score lines.

Materials & Sustainability
Materials
The foundation will be of end-bearing caissons/piles, pile caps and grade beams with a structural concrete slab-on-grade poured in place. Above the foundation, the first ten floors of the project are constructed of structural pre-cast concrete used for both floor and wall systems and columns. The overall structural approach is a shear wall building; all structural walls are also shear walls. The eleventh floor is constructed of moment-resisting steel frame with Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete (GFRC) facades.

Sustainability
The project will be LEED Gold certified, targeting all possible areas to maximize opportunities. Minimizing the carbon footprint is another stated goal. This is achieved in large part by eliminating all residential gas fired equipment for heating of domestic hot water required for the building. In lieu of gas fired boilers, hot water is generated with electric heat pump chillers.
Consistency with Existing Plans and Regulatory Documents
The primary regulatory document is the campus’ Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), published in 2010. The plan calls for an additional 5,000 beds of student housing to address a shortage of on-campus alternatives.

Schedule
Munger Hall is currently in the Entitlement process and is anticipating Regental approval and certification of the EIR in May 2022 and California Coastal Commission (CCC) approval in June 2022. Construction would commence upon approval by the CCC. Completion/occupancy is scheduled to coincide with the Fall Quarter of 2025.

Budget
The project budget is in the range of $1.5 billion.

Project Proponent
Gene Lucas
Charlie’s Vision
Charlie’s Vision

• Transformational prototype for student housing.
  • Create an on campus student housing experience that promotes student interaction and encourages the development of close-knit, supportive student communities that help students live their best college experience. Student housing must offer much more than a safe, comfortable space. Student housing must also support a wide range of social and emotional needs, helping students get the most from their college experience and enable students to transition to their adult lives.

• Propinquities (nearness in place) helpful to constructive interactive between students, while the bedroom may be “just good enough”, the entirety of experience makes its exceptional – “our town in the sky”

• ‘House and suite” system enhances student experience (co-living) building relationships for future
  • Among suite mates
  • Among house mates
  • Among floor mates
  • Among building mates

• Amenity mix (specifically around food and preparation) reduces living costs (proximity of resources and ability to be self sufficient) and provides an enhanced student experience – again, promoting of student interaction and relationship building. In house resources promote self sufficiency.

• Increase density of students housed per acre (better use resources)
  • However, should be regarded as exemplar

• Cost per student housed should be reduced:
  • Square Footage / student much reduced
  • Less expensive off site inputs
  • Large footprint building, maximize potential for standardization and repetition
  • Maximize off site inputs to improve schedule
  • Incremental add of less cost space within large common areas
Vision Statement

To deliver a fulfilling university experience with affordable, transformational, safe and secure, high density, co-living, student housing within a mixed use format, designed to promote community; encourage peer to peer interaction, engagement and relationship building; foster an environment of learning and support; and provide necessary resources and amenities to support 24/7 on campus living experience.
CURRENT DFSS AND TPS SITE

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
Future design for the pedestrian refuge islands/medians will be needed to address pedestrian safety concerns at crossings.

Proposed bike roundabout
Proposed upgrading of bike roundabout

May need to perform an LOS analysis to understand impacts associated with exclusive bike/ped phase.

Proposed Bike Parking
Area: 0.31 acres
Approx. 1,000 bike parking

23' Wide Proposed Facility: 16' two-way bike path, 5' sidewalk, and 2' buffer

Previous parking capacity - 368
New parking capacity - 264

Analysis by Fehr & Peers
Proposed Bike Parking
Area: 0.6 acres
Approx. 2,000 bike parking

Proposed Facility
Preferred
Constrained

Vertical Grade Challenges

10' wide from wall to edge of path
14' wide from wall to the downslope

Vegetation and downward slope towards the baseball field

Proposed bike roundabout may require removing one volleyball court

Analysis by Fehr & Peers
Proposed Bike Facility on MESA ROAD

- **Potential Class IV Facility between North Bike Parking and Rec Center**
- **Planned tree removal and replanting**
- **May need to relocate the above-ground utilities**
- **Proposed Bike Parking: 0.07 acres**
- **Approx. 233 bike parking**
- **Potential increase in bike parking supply due to tree replanting**
- **Proposed Class I Facility from Rec Center**
- **Potential improvements to separate bike parking area from bike path**
- **Existing Bike Parking: 0.07 acres**
- **Approx. 233 bike parking**
- **Potential improvements for connection to existing undercrossing**

Analysis by Fehr & Peers
Proposed Pedestrian and Bike Facility on STADIUM ROAD

23' Wide Proposed Facility: 16' two-way bike path, 5' sidewalk, and 2' buffer

Proposed Pedestrian and Bike Facility on REC CENTER PATH

Preferred - 19' wide proposed facility: 12' two-way bike path, 5' sidewalk, and 2' buffer

Constrained - 12' wide proposed facility: 8' two-way bike path and 4' sidewalk

Proposed Bike Facility on MESA ROAD

Potential Class IV Facility between North Bike Parking and Rec Center

Proposed Class I Facility from Rec Center

Analysis by Fehr & Peers
UCSB STUDENT HOUSING
SEPTEMBER 14, 2021

CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN - GROUND LEVEL

MAIN ENTRY
- linear pavers
- connection to crosswalk and bike parking

BUILDING ENTRY
- linear pavers
- rideshare loading area

SOUTH PLAZA
- outdoor seating area
- dining
- study space

- pet relief area typ.
- private patios
- enhanced concrete paving
- loading/trash
- grasscrete maintenance access pathway
- outdoor showers
- surfboard rack storage
- pet relief area typ.
- bike parking lot
- private patios
BEDROOM CLUSTER

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
STUDY

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
TYPICAL PRIVATE BEDROOM

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
11TH FLOOR PLAN “OUR TOWN IN THE SKY”

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
“OUR TOWN IN THE SKY” - RECREATION ROOM

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
"OUR TOWN IN THE SKY" - COURTYARD

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
**BOTANICA**
- modern organic forms
- lush planting
- study pods
- wood deck
- shade trees
- bench seating
- green wall on elevator core - 4 sides

**LAWN AREA**
- great lawn
- festival lights
- bench seating
- movie night

**TERRACE**
- seating terrace
- palm planting

**the PUB**
- outdoor bar seating
- festival lights
- shade trees

**the QUAD**
- shade tree grid
- iconic seating platforms

**EXERCISE**
- crossfit lawn

**COFFEE BAR**
- sit up work table
- specimen tree
- lush planting

**OUR TOWN IN THE SKY**

SEPTEMBER 14, 2021

CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN - 11th FLOOR COURTYARD
BUILDING EAST ELEVATION - (WEST ELEVATION SIMILAR)

MUNGER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
Prefabircation Techniques
“Maximize off site inputs.”
Prefabrication Scope

- Precast superstructure including building façade, fully glazed
- GFRG Panelized Ceiling
- Repetition within Suite
  - Volumetric pods
  - Prefabricated multidisciplinary assemblies
    - Gallery
    - Study
- Amenity level structural steel, prefabricated framed system
- GFRC prefabricated façade
- ETFE skylight and steel roof system
- Kitting (delivery of materials, components and assemblies, strategically placed during building erection, to minimize future material movements and improve productivity)
80% delivered by five companies.

Prefab Eco System