

Design & Construction Services

Design, Facilities & Safety Services

Design Review Committee (DRC)

Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2025

Meeting Location and Time:

ZOOM Meeting

9:00 – 12:00

Committee Members:

Susannah Scott, Co-Chair - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative

Renée Bahl, Co-Chair - Associate Vice Chancellor

Alexander Luckmann - GSA Student Representative

Alice Kimm, Architect - Design Consultant

Andrew Teel - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative

Bill Smith - Senate Appointed Faculty Representative, Chair of the Capital Space Planning Committee

Derrik Eichelberger, Landscape Architect - Design Consultant

Julie Eizenberg, Architect – Design Consultant

Julie Hendricks, Campus Architect, Staff Representative – Design & Construction Services

Richard Wittman – Senate Appointed Faculty Representative

Silvia Perea - University Art Museum

VACANT - AS Student Representative

Staff Support – Ed Schmittgen, Design & Construction Services

Welcome: Co-Chair, Renée Bahl

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

Susannah Scott

Renée Bahl

Alexander Luckmann

Alice Kimm

Andrew Teel

Bill Smith

Derrik Eichelberger

Julie Eizenberg (did not attend the KITP session)

Julie Hendricks

Richard Wittman

Silvia Perea

General Business:

Co-Chair Bahl asked for approval of the minutes from the of December 18, 2024 meeting. Minutes were approved without objection.

Ms. Bahl reviewed the charge and organization of the Design Review Committee (DRC):

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

The DRC is comprised of faculty, students and staff, as well as consulting architects and the Campus Architect. The Committee makes recommendations to the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) and the Chancellor.

Engagement with the DRC:

- Projects over \$10,000,000 are presented to the DRC 3 times:
 - Conceptual Site and Massing Design (also considered by CPC)
 - 50% Schematic Design
 - 95% Schematic Design (also considered by CPC)

At this meeting, the DRC will review the East Campus Student Housing Project, which is in the 95% Schematic Design Phase. This is the 'last stop' for the DRC review of the current UCSB student housing initiative.

Action Items

1. East Campus Student Housing Project – 95% Schematic Design Level Review (Final DRC Review)
2. KITP House – Site Design & Massing Level Review (DRC will see this project two more times)

The CPC will hear the DRC Comments on the East Campus Student Housing Project later this month.

1. East Campus Student Housing Project – 95% Schematic Design Level

Julie Hendricks, Campus Architect, gave a project overview:

- The project will add approximately 1,300 additional beds to the campus that are required to comply with UCSB LRDP. This is the companion project to San Benito and construction will begin approximately 1 year after construction commences on San Benito. This project will demolish 2 existing structures:
 - Santa Rosa Hall
 - Ortega Dining Commons
- The project goal is LEED Platinum and will be compliant with the UCSB Interim Decarbonization Policy. It is an all-electric design.
- Project Timeline:
 - CPC review in both March and April
 - UC Regents in July
 - Then followed by the California Coastal Commission

Ms. Hendricks transitioned the presentation to the Design Team

SOM and Mithun (SOM-M) gave an overview of the Project Design, walking through the 109-slide presentation showing the project's development since the 50% SD in December 2024.

- The location of the project is the site of the Channel Islands Five residence halls on the southern peninsula of campus.
- The project will demolish Ortega dining hall (April 2026) and Santa Rosa Residence Hall (June 2026).
- Bike parking will be distributed with 1,687 new parking spaces added, resulting in a total of 3,062 spaces serving the Channel Islands Five precinct.
- Vehicle parking will be distributed with 203 new parking spaces added for a total of 237 serving the Channel Islands Five precinct.
- The project connects with Campus via North-South alignment with Library Mall and Campus Walk. East-West pedestrian connections consist of a series of rectangular spaces connected diagonally with a curvilinear pathway.

Program Summary:

- 412 Beds: Residence Hall (Santa Rosa Replacement)

- 1,278 Apartment Beds (New Beds)
- Study Lounges
- Catering and Dining

Exterior Expression: Olin Mckenzie, SOM

SOM-M focused on material use and façade development while reviewing the 570,000+ SF program distributed in 7 buildings located in the East campus peninsula. Two new buildings (Buildings 1A and 1B) replace Santa Rosa Hall as 'residence halls'. The remainder of the buildings are 'apartment style' accommodations with supporting amenity space.

- SOM-M reviewed general organizational principles for the project design, including fenestration strategies and primary material appointments.
- Buildings 1A and 1B (the residential halls) were described as cousins, not identical twins, to Buildings 2, 3, 4 and 5.
- The architectural expression is based on an "earth, canopy, sky" motif. The idea is the buildings get visually lighter as they increase in height.
- The podium (plinth)/residential bar relationship was described as human and friendly to pedestrians while adding bulk to the buildings base. The plinth will consist of decorative concrete blocks, including breezeblocks that allow air passage. The blocks introduce a "sublime pattern" of texture and lighting effects giving the ground floor an overall rich, textured effect.
- The material treatment of the residential bars was explored including a corrugated panel system that produces a textured lighting effect as well as an alternate flat panel option that results in a smoother, more modular appearance.
- Regarding the massing of the residential bars, a new idea was introduced which includes voids and breaks in the bar shaped buildings. This offers visual relief, variety and interest.

Outdoor Areas (Architecture): - Sade Borghei, Mithun

- Covered outdoor areas were presented including the terrace level space of Building 3 and an entry portico of Building 2 which were described as a "parenthetical" event that creates an experiential place of entry.
- Building 1 includes the concept of a "Breezeway Gasket", a human scaled passage between building masses that was depicted as welcoming, framing attractive views of the surroundings. Gaskets were depicted as a terra cotta panel with contrasting color.
- Human scaled outdoor areas were presented showing a variety of open spaces and amenity areas such as outdoor dining/study areas and lounge/recreation spaces.
- Wood features are being considered in exterior amenity spaces.
- A screen wall surrounding the outdoor dining area, composed of masonry textured blocks and breezeblocks was reviewed.

Site & Landscape Design: Sarina Govani, TLS Landscape Architects

- Ms. Govani gave a "tour" of exterior spaces emphasizing the pedestrian connections and network of spaces dispersed between the buildings and the pathways through the site. Various renderings emphasized the activities that are envisioned in the spaces and how the spaces relate back to the human scale.
- The curvilinear pathway runs from east to west connecting the overall composition while creating a variety of dynamic and interesting spaces.
- An overview of site paving was presented showing various shades and patterns of concrete as well as stabilized aggregate paving.
- The Landscaping has evolved since December, now expressing a Mexico-Central American theme for Buildings 1A and 1B and an entirely Australian theme for the remainder of the project. No native plants are proposed. This is consistent with the UCSB Landscape Master Plan.

- A tree preservation strategy was reviewed focusing on UCEN Road along with a proposed planting plan for the frontage of the College of Creative Studies.

DRC Q&A:

Site Design Logistics and Circulation:

DRC:

- *Regarding bike paths, are there plans to continue the bike path east and west within the project site?*
 - SOM-M: There is not a strong east-west bike path between the two vertical connectors. We're actually deterring bikes from making that cross connection in and around the three central green spaces.
- *Is there adequate parking? Parking is tight over there now.*
 - SOM-M: Parking is being displaced but reconstituted in many ways by new lots that are introduced along UCEN Rd. It may not be exactly equal. It has been quite a negotiation between all stakeholders.
- *Is wind being studied? Many campus spaces are not really used due to winds, wind tunnel effect.*
 - SOM-M: They will look at the wind impacts on proposed spaces.

Landscaping:

DRC:

- *Can we have a meeting with the Landscape committee (LC)? There are questions about some of the species that were identified on the slides showing the planting palettes. Based on the LC's campus knowledge they can help ensure the best selection of plants, considering color, interest, non-invasive and non-littering species.*
 - SOM-M: Yes. They will arrange a meeting with the Landscape Architect and the LC.
- *What type of grass will be used? Are plants drought tolerant?*
 - SOM-M: Yes, they will use drought tolerant plant species.
- *Paving examples look good, and we appreciate adherence to the geographical planting regions of the UCSB Master Plan.*

Façade Variations/Massing:

DRC:

- *Liked the new option showing the inset stairs that effectively breaks up the massing of the rectangular buildings.*
- *The "sober", institutional nature of the design was discussed at length, particularly residence halls (Buildings 1A and 1B.) Various suggestions were made:*
 - *Introduce a horizontal steel structure as a lintel element at the 'garden wall.*
 - *The base seems disconnected from the upper building as if designed by 2 architects; Consider a more cohesive composition with the upper portion more connect to the ground plane in some way.*
 - *Introduce various colors into the stair towers (similar to San Benito) for variety and interest.*
 - *On the lower CMU wall, make the block pattern more playful and varied so it isn't so rigidly reflecting the structural columns.*
 - *Introduce a second material (on the upper building) to add interest.*
 - *Reconsider the railing material, aside from CMU, to make it visually lighter.*

- *Project the (Orange) colored elements of the stairways outside of the plane of the façade to help with articulation.*
- SOM-M: A discussion around these points followed. Olin Mckenzie, SOM, stated that there is a designer's preference for the façade treatment to respond to the program behind it (repetitive stacked housing) rather than 'painting' on an arbitrary facade that isn't an honest representation of the program. SOM contemplated the suggestions and they discussed the idea of possibly introducing a feature on Building 3 (east side) where the building steps outward. Agreed with the notion of de-emphasizing the structural grid on the podium of Building 3. Agreed that introducing a variety of colors, like San Benito, can be done at the stairs.
- Comment added by Andrew Luckmann via email after the meeting: Regarding the "institutional" or sober look. One of the strongest aspects of the Pereira & Luckman designs from the 1960s is the planarity of roofs and piers. Of course, those are on a totally different scale from this project, but I wonder if an extension of the roof - at least on the inward-facing facades - could contribute to a more playful and human effect. As a Gordon Bunshaft fanatic, I think here also of the former John Hancock building in New Orleans. The horizontal planes there don't "break up" the massing per se - it's a large building, as is East Campus, and I don't think that needs to be hidden - but the planes mediate between the viewer and the mass.

East Campus Housing Meeting Summary by DRC Staff Liaison:

Co-Chair Bahl asked Mr. Schmittgen to recap the meeting's major points as follows:

Bike path and pedestrian connections:

- Discussion about providing an east-west bike connection.

Architectural Diversity:

- Discussion regarding the institutional nature of the design was discussed at length. With many encouraging ideas to be considered, include subtle façade variations, introducing of color and material selection.

Open Space and Landscaping:

- Landscaping has evolved now expressing a Mexico-Central American Theme (Buildings 1A and 1B and 100% Australian theme for the remainder of the project. No native plants are proposed. This is consistent with the UCSB Landscape Master Plan.

Practical Issues:

- Questions regarding a wind tunnel effect, ensuring spaces are pleasant and well used.

Sustainability:

- The project goal is LEED Platinum and will be compliant with the UCSB Interim Decarbonization Policy.

Adjournment East Campus - Action Item 1:

Co-Chair Bahl provided a wrap-up and reminded the committee that we will be in touch regarding upcoming meetings in April, May and June.

The second Action Item was Presented and Reviewed. All DRC members were present except for Julie Eizenberg who recused herself.

2. KITP House – Site Design and Massing:

Co-chair Bahl introduced Project Proponent Lars Bildsten who introduced the project team including ZGF Architects.

ZGF Architects gave an overview of the Project Site Design and Massing, walking through the 26-slide presentation introducing the project, site design and proposed location.

Program Summary: (Heather Alonso, ZGF)

- 16 one-bedroom units
- 14 two-bedroom units
- 3 four-bedroom units
- Total 33 units and 56 beds

Site Design: (Lia Peacock, ZGF)

Ms. Alonso ZGF, reviewed essential aspects of the proposed building on the site.

- The design has two entry points, one at the northeast street intersection and the second at the rear from the parking area.
- The project will feature a "C-shaped" plan that opens to the south and west providing a solar orientation that maximizes daylight and views.
- Site circulation was addressed by showing campus connections, bike paths and bike parking.

Massing: (Lia Peacock, ZGF)

ZGF reviewed site sections and massing diagrams showing the context of the building. Three-dimensional perspective renderings from two vantage points were shown: the corner of El Colegio and Camino Pescadero and a view from the south looking north on Camino Pescadero towards the Munger Residence.

Landscaping Design: (Lia Peacock, ZGF)

At this very preliminary stage ZGF focused on street scape trees and retaining existing oak trees located on El Colegio.

DRC Q&A:

Site Design & Massing:

DRC:

- *Discussion about the privacy and buffer between the courtyard and the guest rooms.*
- *Discussion about parking, is parking adequate?*
- *Suggestion to consider possible terraces on the upper level on the street side.*
 - ZGF – Agreed to develop these ideas before the next meeting.

Architectural Expression:

DRC:

- Discussion about architectural style. How should it relate to the surrounding buildings with a focus on Munger Residence?
 - ZGF – This is under consideration and they will be prepared to discuss at the April meeting.

KITP house Meeting Summary by DRC Staff Liaison:

Co-Chair Bahl asked Mr. Schmittgen to recap the meeting's major points as follows:
All acknowledged that this was very early and appropriate for this initial Site Design and Massing review and the meeting in April will contain more content for feedback.

Site Design & Massing:

- Discussion about the privacy and buffer between the courtyard and the guest rooms.
- Discussion about parking, is the provided parking adequate?
- Suggestion to consider possible terraces on the upper level on the street side.

Architectural Expression:

- Discussion about architectural style. How should it relate to the surrounding buildings with a focus on Munger Residence?

Adjournment KITP House - Action Item 2:

Co-Chair Bahl provided a wrap-up and reminded the committee that we will be in touch regarding upcoming meetings in May and June.