

**Design Review Committee (DRC)**

**Meeting Minutes**

April 12, 2023

**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

Anj Julie Vester - GSA Student Representative (Eugene Riordan Jr. attended)

Derrick 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 Anj Julie Vester)
5. Derrick 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.