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Dale Cole, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 and called for the approval of the March 5, 2009 meeting minutes and acceptance of the day’s agenda.

Committee action: Motion was made by Darlene Zabowski to approve the March 5, 2009 meeting minutes with the recommended revision to add Brian Davis to the Staff Present list. Motion was seconded by Maggi Johnson. Minutes were unanimously approved as final with the above correction.

Denny Yard Concept Plan
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect, Project Manager
Brice Maryman, SvR Design Company
Reece Cowan, SvR Design Company

Project Phase: Concept Design
Requested Action: Comments

The Denny Yard Concept Plan was funded by CPO in response to President Emmert’s request to improve Denny Yard upon completion of the adjacent construction projects. The study is a two-month effort involving presentations to the University community and committees to solicit feedback. An existing conditions analysis and historic review of the evolution of the yard since the construction of Denny Hall in 1895 was completed and presented prior to developing concept alternatives.

The challenges associated with future renovation of the yard involve universal access, bicycle access and storage, visual connections within and through the yard, aging infrastructure, historically significant trees and the open-ended nature of the outdoor space. The goals established to provide direction for the concept alternatives are to unify and simplify the landscape expression, clarify the circulation hierarchy, acknowledge historic patterns, and embed strategies for sustainability.

Three concepts were presented:
Alternative 1 - Restoring the Front Yard
This concept re-establishes the open space as the front yard of Denny Hall and consists of a formalized axial relationship between the quad and Denny Hall with parallel pathways accentuated by an outer row of trees and inner plant bed of edible plants which extend around the base of Denny Hall. The tree canopy is kept away from Denny Hall to open views of the architecture and allow the building to command the open space. A denser canopy of trees with an under planting of woodland plants are proposed around the 3-sides opposite Denny Hall, visually enclosing the space and providing an edge to the central lawn.

Alternative 1 - Experiencing Denny Yard
This concept is driven by the desire to build upon Denny Yard’s existing character of open sloping terrain, large canopy trees, sunny pockets of lawn and the axial connection between Denny Hall and the quad. The design provides opportunities to linger in a large terrace mid-way in the pathway to Denny, connected to an east-west promenade with a continuous low seatwall notched into the uphill slope. Groundcover plantings reinforce the southern edges of the lawn and provide screening of service areas at Raitt and Savery halls.
Alternative 1 - Performance Cells
This concept is driven by a series of operations rather than specific forms. Cellular modules, selected based on specific existing conditions, may perform a variety of programmatic functions. These functions may include providing habitat, ornamental display gardens, protection zones for mature trees, rain gardens, storm water treatment, campus agriculture or outdoor classrooms. The space between the cells would remain lawn and would serve as secondary circulation and places to gather.

Committee comments:
- The greatest amenity of Denny Yard is that it is not the quad. It is a more informal, quiet, reflective and unprogrammed space. It has been said to be the first arboretum on campus, which is evident in the variety of mature specimen trees said to have been planted by Professor Edmond Meany at the turn of the century.
- Darlene noted the soils in the yard have a good A-horizon and are generally very good due to the long-time turf ground cover.
- There is no perceptible ownership of the yard from the surrounding building occupants, with possible exception of those individuals in Denny Hall who overlook the yard. Planned events typically use the quad rather than the yard.
- The visual connection to and from Denny Hall are important considerations in developing an appropriate redesign of the yard. However, current views of Denny Hall are mostly obscured by the existing tree canopy and reinforcing this with an allee of trees further restricts views, divides the open space and may put too much emphasis on Denny Hall as the destination.
- The topography of the yard is characteristic to the informal quality of the open space. Given the absence of topographic information on the plans, it was difficult to evaluate the full impacts. It was noted that given the change in grade across the lawn, Raitt and Savery Halls do not provide as much of an edge as perceived in plan. Rather it is accomplished in the mature evergreen tree canopy at the southern edge of the yard.
- To context in which Denny Yard sits within the campus landscape was not presented. In developing the final concept, acknowledging how the yard fits into the adjacent quad and Parrington Lawn landscape, as well as the greater campus landscape, should be considered. There are very clearly defined characteristic spaces on campus and this should be its own space.
- The pathway connection between Denny Hall and Parrington Hall should be studied to understand the circulation patterns and formal gesture. Divorcing the connection may be a suitable alternative.
- In general, the committee agreed to the concept of reinforcing Denny Hall as the ‘queen of the hill’ and encouraged opening views of the building, but cautioned against providing too much emphasis on the pathway leading to the building from the quad, potentially dividing the open space. The remainder of the open space should support the informal, meandering quality of the open space, with multiple pathways and a loose canopy of large deciduous trees, contrasting the formal character of the adjacent quad. The ground plane should be kept visually simple, reinforcing the edges where suitable and providing a complementary apron around the base of Denny Hall. Seating and places to gather should be incorporated at the bottom of the stairs to Denny Hall and along pathways as appropriate.

Committee Action: No action required. Informational only. Kristine to follow-up with link to final report.
Ethnic Cultural Center  
*John Wetzel, UW Project Manager*  
*Sam Cameron, Rolluda Architects*  
*Kenichi Nakano, Nakano Associates*  
*Gail Staeger, Nakano Associates*

**Project Phase:** Schematic Design  
**Requested Action:** Schematic Design Approval

The consultant reviewed the building floor plans, sections and elevations of the current proposed design to establish the context for the site design. The site itself is compact with many site constraints. The mature Pin oak trees along Brooklyn provide a defining character to the streetscape, but significantly restrict the buildable area of the site. The daycare center at the rear property line presents unique issues regarding security of children and service access is only possible from the south.

Two site concepts were developed that incorporate many of the same features, but look at selective removal of the Pin oaks. Both concepts remove the outer sidewalk along Brooklyn, thereby extending the width of the plant bed and widen the inner walk toward the building. Decks and sidewalk connections are provided along the back of the building and along the southern edge. A storm water feature is proposed in both concepts, but is visualized in differently for each.

Concept A strongly emphasizes the entrance plaza with a concentric set of stairs mimicking the outer wall of the adjacent lounge. A naturalized storm water feature is incorporated into the landscape south of the entrance, cascading in 3 locations relative to the articulation of the architecture. The 2 southernmost Pin oaks along the curb are proposed for removal, as are the 3 northernmost trees closest to the building.

Concept B relocates the building closer to the sidewalk, enhancing the urban quality of the landscape. The steps from the lounge and storm water feature are more linear in form and incorporate nooks for seating. By relocating the building, the useable area at the back of the building supports a barbeque area for group events. The inner row of Pin oaks is entirely removed and the outer row is retained.

Committee comments:
- Removal of the inner row of trees is appropriate given constraints and potential impacts during construction. The double row of trees is only in this area of Brooklyn and does not continue further south. It also gives the building more presence and creates a useable area that is more conducive to the events the ECC hosts.
- The entry plaza should be adequately scaled to accommodate the expected use as an informal, overflow gathering area and the building entrance should be clearly articulated.
- The storm water feature should be incorporated into the urban context of the street environment, enhancing the interface between the sidewalk and building, without blocking access to the entrance.

*Committee Action: Maggi Johnson made a motion to approve the general layout of Scheme B with the following conditions: Move the building toward Brooklyn, save the outer row of trees, emphasize a generous entrance plaza at the corner, and provide appropriate outdoor terrace/deck at the rear of the building. The Committee would like*
to review the development of the storm water feature and steps/entry plaza at the next meeting. Jon Hooper seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Student Housing
Paul Brown, CPO Director
Mark Cork, Mahlum
Jennifer Guthrie, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol
Ian Horton, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol

Project Phase: Schematic Design
Requested Action: Schematic Design Approval

The Student Housing project is planning to develop four sites in west campus, three for student housing and one for apartments that will house approximately 1,600 students. The project will be constructed in 2 phases with phase one opening in 2011 and phase 2 opening in 2012. The presentation included review of design alternatives for interior courtyards/rooftop terraces and typical streetscape plantings.

The streetscape environment presents many challenges relative to the intensity of pedestrian activity, efficient multimodal transit connections and safety and security of students, balanced with the ability to provide a healthy environment for street trees. Typical improvements include widened sidewalks, new street trees on both sides of the street (as opposed to just the sidewalk adjacent to the new facility), better bus stop facilities with canopies integrated into the building and greater protection around street plantings. The layout of plant beds within the sidewalk are laid out relative to the location of parking spaces to allow ease of access.

The above grade courtyard space for site 33W is visible from the Brooklyn Street and provides spaces for small or larger group gatherings. A combination of plantings, paving materials and trellis elements visually connect the courtyard to the streetscape the café terrace on site 32W. Planters will typically be raised with 30 inches of soil. The courtyard spaces for sites 31W and 35W are internal to the building and provide similar outdoor program. The elm tree on site 32W will serve as a feature element for an open space that will incorporate an accessible ramp to transition the grade from the southern corner of the site to the café terrace.

The site materials will be consistent throughout each site and will consist of concrete for sidewalks with permeable paving between trees, custom benches and lean rails strategically sited to protect plantings, and low maintenance, durable plants. Trees species will accent fall and spring color and have a typical spacing of 30 ft on center. The current design proposes a continuous treeway planter with permeable planting as a surface material and no supplemental irrigation system.

Committee comments:
- Maintenance of plantings along outer edge of rooftop terraces will require fall protection and easy access for grounds staff to bring in tools and remove debris.
- The planting under the existing elm tree should take into consideration the intended use of this area and the potential for pedestrian movement through the space. All plantings should remain low to ensure natural surveillance.
The transition of bicyclists into pedestrians, or the potential conflict of bicyclists with pedestrians as they access bicycle storage areas should be carefully thought through and incorporated into the design with wider sidewalks, on-street bicycle lanes and/or strategically located curb cuts.

The physical connection of the student housing to central campus is critical to ensure the students feel they are part of the greater community and not isolated. Planting both sides of the street is a good effort in this direction, but additional thought should be given to how else this might be achieved, either through materials, site furnishing, or other methods.

Committee Action: Jon Hooper moved to approve schematic design with Committee comments to consider. Bob Edmonds seconded. Vote was to unanimously approve with comments.

HUB Renovation
Jon Lebo, UW Associate Director
Amanda Sturgeon, Perkins + Will
Jennifer Guthrie, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol
Ian Horton, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol

Project Phase: Schematic Design
Requested Action: Schematic Design Approval

The renovation of the HUB is a student-funded project with construction slated to begin October 2010 through December 2012. The project is seeking LEED Platinum and is proposing 100% non-potable irrigation (with the exception of the HUB yard) and a highly functioning landscape. A 20-30,000 gallon cistern will collect rainwater for reuse and is currently being studied to identify capacity requirements and potential concerns. The presentation included a review of the development of the plaza areas surrounding the building and the resolution of various campus systems.

The west plaza off the HUB yard will be expanded and lowered to provide universal access to the facility. The path leading from Allen Library will be widened to better accommodate student booths and centered on the historic facade. Further south, a terrace off the dining services area will provide outdoor seating. The plaza on the north end of the building will incorporate a large amount of bicycle storage for transient use and dedicated storage for the bicycle repair shop immediately adjacent on the interior of the building. The south entrance will feature a larger, covered bus waiting area closer to the building and additional bicycle storage. The eastern edge along Stevens Way features a storm water conveyance system with pedestrian circulation adjacent to the building.

Universal access will be provided on each side of the building. Bicycle parking will double the current capacity and will be located at the north, south and southwest entries. Paving materials will consist of unit pavers at each plaza that will extend the character of the interior flooring outside, concrete sidewalks for high pedestrian traffic areas and asphalt pavement for low volume areas. Many of the large, significant trees around the building will be preserved and include the American Elm, Silk trees, Cork Oak, Dawn Redwoods and European Beech. The understory planting will vary from one side of the building to the other. Adjacent to the HUB yard, a layered approach consisting of a meadow edge filter band, a shrub backdrop band and a bright green foliage band planted adjacent to the building to reflect light back into the
lower levels are proposed. The east side of the building will be planted with primarily a NW native understory. The HUB yard will be used as a construction laydown area and will be restored after construction, which will provide an opportunity to replace the soil profile to improve current drainage issues.

Committee comments:
- The loading dock enlargement removes a significant mature landscape and replaces it with a lot of pavement. Pedestrian safety at the entrances to the loading dock area and views from the UW Club across the street should be carefully considered in the design solution.
- The HUB yard is all about gathering, but the design currently shows very little seating adjacent to and around the yard. In addition, the overlook aspect of the seatwalls at the west entrance will be eliminated in the proposed design. The committee requested the design team study more options for seating in this area.
- The vistas to other parts of campus are very clear in plan, but are not represented vertically. What suggestions can be made for future projects to help reinforce these vistas?
- Limiting everyday vehicle access around the building is desirable, but just a chance in pavement type will not be a successful deterrent. Alternatives should be explored.
- The design resolution of the north entrance requires more study to make it feel more like a portal.
- The project proposes removing a significant amount of trees and the committee is concerned with replacement strategies either on-site or elsewhere on campus.
- The ASLA Sustainable Sites Initiative is looking for pilot projects—this may be a good candidate.

Committee Action: Darlene Zabowski moved to approve with general comments by the Committee taken into consideration. Jennifer Jones seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Campus Signage & Wayfinding
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect, Project Manager
Michael Courtney, Michael Courtney Design

Project Phase: Concept Development
Requested Action: Comments

The University would like to update the site signage and wayfinding on campus and has generated a proposed plan for a family of signs. The family includes vehicular and pedestrian oriented signs that direct visitors from off campus to individual buildings. The plan proposes a similar look and feel for approximately 12 different sign types that would be used in specific locations.

The goals for the signage on campus are as follows:
- Make the signage more welcoming and celebratory
- Make it easier for all people to experience and find their way around the UW campus
- Brand the new signage as distinctive to the UW
- Unify all the signage into one cohesive program
- Develop a new system for the signage and create standards
- Develop additional strategies and concepts to extend these goals:
  - Visitor walk: marked pathways in combination with “money walk”
  - Portals and gateways: mark edges and entrance to the UW with distinctive landmarks
  - The “W”: strategically place “W” for brand recognition and photo opportunities

The proposed concept consists of a very simple and changeable panel system. The size of each sign type may vary slightly, but key features such as a stone base, horizontal accent band and UW logo would remain on each sign. Most wayfinding signs will be placed perpendicular to walkways for ease of access and will have directional or building identification information on one side and a neighborhood map or historic information on the other side. A prototype sign is currently being designed and will be fabricated this fall.

Committee comments:
- There was a lot of concern regarding cluttering the landscape with signage and it was suggested to prioritize pedestrian signage over vehicular wayfinding and to err on the side of less signs where possible.
- The size of the signs and their appearance in the landscape should be carefully considered. A pole-mounted sign may be visually less obtrusive and desirable. Reviewing the prototype will be helpful.
- Lighting for the signage should consider effect on light pollution.

**Committee Action:** No action required. Informational only.

---

**Union Bay Natural Area Management Plan**

*Kern Ewing, Author of the plan*

*Project Phase: Management Plan*

*Requested Action: Comments*

Kern was not available to make this presentation. The committee was provided with a copy of the plan and was requested to provide any follow-up comments to Kristine.

Committee comments:
- In general, the committee thought the plan was excellent and the efforts by Kern and others should be applauded.

**Committee Action:** No action required. Informational only.

---

The meeting adjourned at 4:30

Meeting notes prepared by: Kristine Kenney and Carolann Driver
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