

## **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes**

May 20, 2020

9 AM – 12:00 PM

Zoom

### **Call to Order**

3:00 PM

Roll Call of members, including the Landscape Subcommittee

Introduction of new member - Julie Eizenberg of Koning Eizenberg Architecture, recent winner of the Australian Institute of Architects 2019 Gold Medal.

### **Associated Students Bike Shop – Site & Massing**

Alex Ramos and Marisela Marques from Associated Students introduced the project giving a historical background and need for the project. They introduced the architects Alice Kimm and Tyler Johnson of JFAK, who worked with the Capital Development office and the Building Committee to develop the program.

Ten sites were identified by the Campus Planning & Design Office, and reviewed by the Building Committee. Site number four, adjacent to SAASB and Parking lot 15, was ultimately selected. This site appealed to the staff of the AS Bike Shop who were excited to have it closer to a central student engagement area with many activities.

The project has not yet moved to design phase, but building systems considered include both steel and wood structural framing. Heating and natural ventilation are included without cooling. Materials will be simple including concrete, cement board, plaster, and corrugated metal. The interior is visualized as a comfortable workshop environment, with black painted plywood, and sustainable recycled rubber flooring. A shade canopy projection formed by a PV array creates an outside covered workspace.

The cost estimate is on budget at \$22.50 per gross square feet.

Discussion focused on the following topics:

### Adjacency to Parking Lot 15

Concern was expressed that siting the building so close to Lot 15 would constrain circulation in that area. The architect confirmed the project does not disturb parking at Lot 15 and maintains the existing walkway keeping circulation routes open for access to the bike parking area that will remain. The suggestion was made to change the angle of the building or shift it more to the north.

Henning Bohn, Co-Chair, Senate Chair  
Volker Welter, History of Art and Architecture  
Nuha Khoury, History of Art and Architecture  
Dick Hebdige, Art  
Ram Seshadri, Materials & Chemistry  
B.S. Manjunath, Electrical & Computer Engineering  
Dennis Joshy, GSA Student Representative  
Kathryn Foster, AS Student Representative  
Dennis Whelan, Staff Support - Campus Planning and Design

Renee Bahl, Co-Chair, Associate Vice Chancellor  
Annie Chu, Architect - Design Consultant  
Dennis McFadden, Architect- Design Consultant  
Derrick Eichelberger, Landscape Architect- Design Consultant  
Elyse Gonzales, University Art Museum  
Barry Colwell, Housing, Dining & Auxiliary Enterprises  
Donna Coyne, Staff Representative - Admissions  
Jennifer Loftus, Staff Support - Administrative Services

Another suggestion was made to consider a design means or landscape element that would reduce pedestrians crossing Ocean Road rather than using the pedestrian underpass.

It was noted that Parking Lot 15 is regularly at capacity and includes a lot of utility traffic causing concern with bike loading and unloading there. The design should consider this and not add impacts to the lot. The need for vehicular access to the back side of the project could be addressed through additional parking at the west end of the parking area (bike path and ocean rode).

#### Impacts to the Visitor Center

The design does not include sitework in the lawn area north of the site and sought to not disturb this area as the Visitor Center is the primary user of the lawn which can stage 50,000 visitors there annually. The question was posed if the Bike Shop should be one of the first things that visitors see since it is not academic in nature. Concern was shared regarding views of bikes being serviced out front on a very prominent and visible campus site along a primary thoroughfare.

Discussion ensued about the program and the design reinforcing a sense of community and that the students involved in the design felt the most important part besides the workshop is the education/tutorial function promoting self-sufficiency to the clients. They want the public workspace in a prominent location which is the current model in the existing facility but without the infrastructure seen in this design.

The suggestion was made that the project provides an opportunity to activate this space through well considered site design and to not have the design draw attention to itself but to be a connector with the Visitor Center. The architect confirmed they could address these issues and use the lawn as an opportunity for student interaction and co-learning. Design elements such as a community seating area and selfie wall were suggested.

#### Programmatic Relationships to Surrounding Campus Spaces

The comment was made that the pavilion concept of the design reads like an object. The design should consider how this very small building fits in the context of a campus that is much larger and consider design relationships to the site, the parking lot and the surrounding buildings. The suggestion was made to reach out with more connection to the landscape as opposed to being a closed perimeter block and possibly flip the plan to revisit the flow.

The architect responded that the site design is still in the early stages but understands the opportunity for the site and program to establish an outdoor space relationship in the amount of transparency created. Because it's a small building and is not trying to be a large academic building, it does not necessarily have to have a direct relationship to SAASB. Rather, it might incorporate vertical elements, graphics, signage, use of materials, and color in a way that is not as limited because it is not a conventional campus building. By using transparency to its greatest effect, it will connect it to the lawn and street.

### Site Selection

Regarding the site, comments were shared that the site is not central for most of the main academic campus and does not link to any of the main drags for entering or leaving campus with the major flow of traffic (to and from IV).

It was explained that a process was followed to figure out a permanent site for the AS Bike Shop as the siting for the current facility was always understood as temporary, even after 45 years. The current location is operationally too small and poses a potential danger to staff and students. Sites on campus are difficult to identify that won't displace larger building sites on campus. The site selection process included detailed analysis by the architect and Building Committee of several possible locations and included cost considerations, LRDP constraints, underground utilities and underutilized space. Sites were also reviewed by consultants working on the master circulation study. Based on this process the proposed site was identified as the optimal site.

Understanding this, it was noted that although there are issues that still need to be thought through, they could be solved through design. The suggestion was made to use more of the lawn to avoid the building being squeezed into an abandoned bike parking area and to orient it differently to be more welcoming for visitors. Support was shared for its location near Ocean Road and the traffic circle, and through design the project could address access and circulation issues for safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

The committee agreed delaying its recommendation to CPC would not be well received and should instead bring it forward as an item that was discussed with many comments. There was extensive work done looking at different sites and it will just take good people doing good work to make the site work.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

5:00 PM