

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
&
LANDSCAPE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of Joint Meeting
Aug 12th, 2019
Dempsey Hall, Anthony's Forum

Architectural Commission

X	Renee Cheng, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	AnnMarie Borys, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, College of Build Environments	Voting
X	Linda Jewell	Partner, Freeman & Jewell	Voting
X	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Wienzapfel Associates	Voting
X	Cathy Simon	Design Principal,	Voting
X	John Syvertsen	Chairman, Board of Regents, American Architectural Foundation	Voting
	Vacant	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Mike McCormick	Associate Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

Landscape Advisory Committee

X	Maggi Johnson, Chair	Johnson Southerland, Professional at-large	Voting
X	Jennifer Jones	Carol R. Johnson Associates, Professional at-large	Voting
	Ken Yokum	Department Chair, Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
X	Nancy Rottle	Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
X	Bruce Balick	Professor Emeritus, Astronomy	Voting
	Thaisa Way	Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
X	Howard Nakase	Manager Grounds Management and Building Envelope	Voting
X	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, UW Facilities	Voting
X	Morgan Southall	Student Representative	Voting

Call to Order

The Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, Renee Cheng, called the meeting to order.

Approval of Agenda

The meeting agenda was approved unanimously.

Approval of Past Minutes

The April 26th and July 16th meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Health Sciences Education Building (HSEB)

Requested Action: Review and Comment

Ruth Baleiko, Elizabeth Moggio & Sian Roberts, Miller Hull

Mary Jo Olenick, SLAM Collaborative

Scott Akre & Brian Aske, Lease Crutcher Lewis PM

Julie Knorr & Jeannie Natta, UW Facilities PDG

Jennifer Guthrie & Kara Weaver, GGN

Overview:

The project has evolved due to new funding, which brings the total budget to \$100,623,000. This allows the project scope to expand to include large, medium and small Active Learning Classrooms, several Skills Lab Suites, an Anatomy Lab, and student amenities.

Project

- Includes
 - Freestanding building, with big and small program organization
 - Legible vertical circulation including 4 stories and basement (below grade)
 - High performance envelope
 - Landscape incorporates active learning with outdoor rooms.
 - New streetscape.
- Excludes
 - Hitchcock Bridge aside from stair access points.

Schedule

- Concept Design completion expected in the next few weeks.
- On-boarding trade partners now.

Site and Campus Context

- Expect majority of pedestrian movement coming from T Wing and I Wing.
- HSEB building has great potential to be the welcome to S. Campus
- Topographic grade change of 7 ft. - Pacific at 60', lower level I Wing and J Wing at 53'

Conceptual Development

Design Logic - Working toward a culture of care...the "Ah" feel.

- Transition from the urban scale to the student + patient scale
- Design in sensory moments that stimulate the experiential qualities of the space and instill the concept of providing a Culture of Care to our students, who take this feeling with them into practice.
 - Street – attention to materials and scale of the site from the street level.
 - Site – synch up with building and site, ensure balance and consider existing and future sites in proximity as well
 - Juxtaposition of larger open areas, to smaller tight nooks and pathways.
 - Attention to daylight, and use of materials help to bring a sense of health to patients and students.

4 moments of "Ah" in the site - Moving through spaces allow you to feel the shift in function and space

- North East – feeling of entrance
- North West– feeling of landing and arrival
- South West– moment of choice and decision
- South East – lingering area, a place to gather.

Movement through the landscape is not direct, but offers moments of pause.

- Utilize lower plantings to create thick experience with a meandering path, not necessarily straight.
- Currently working through slope transition studies – hope to have a better idea of this in the fall.

Functional internal spaces -

- Smaller, informal learning spaces facing Pacific Street with larger, flexible learning spaces to the south.
- The experiential section
 - Lowest Level (below grade) – Practice
 - Ground Floor (south entry) – The Buzz
 - 1st Floor (entry from Pacific) – Convene
 - 2nd Floor – Bond
 - 3rd Floor - Engage

Building Envelope Design Criteria – the building skin should:

- Reflect the environment and program
- Set a precedent for performance on S. campus
- Operate at multiple scales
- Convey sensory and textural gradients.
- Express significant opening/program at the heart.

Conceptual Execution of the Skin

- Southeast & north west Elevation – Solid, textural, limited openings.
- Northeast Elevation - Increase transparency.
- Southwest Elevation - Shading and intentional transparency, considering existing buildings aren't as visually interesting.
- Center of the building - Highlights vertical circulation, and creates core/heart of the building.

Experiential Routes

- Need to consider varying audiences and what routes mean to them
 - Ensure there is a campus entry view, and allow visitors an understanding of direction.
- Create the feeling of an active edge and lush streetscape.
- Once in the building heart (floors 2-4) create a feeling of being within the tree canopy.
- Anticipate that I-wing will eventually come down, so in the long term, create views directly toward the water in this space.
- Slope transition – through route
 - Use thick vegetation to invite lingering and a feeling of being welcomed. Soften the view of Hitchcock Bridge.
 - Use devices (furniture, trees, path location) to feel your way through the area.
 - Arrival at the south room, shows off transparent spaces at building core.
 - Shows how to transition from T-Wing to new space. Transparency helps signal through route.
- Lobby expected to function in a varied ways...event space, presentation sessions, and lunch space.
 - Conversations are now starting on how we use CLT Flooring within these spaces.
 - Anticipating more details on this at the next UWAC/ULAC meeting.

Comments

- *Is there consideration for bike space and access routes from the street and the Burke Gilman Trail?*
 - *Will have more on this topic at a future meeting. Quick drop locations and long-term storage needs are both being considered.*
- *No sunlight between these buildings currently. Do you really think people will want to hang out there?*
 - *Shady space will be lush. Will utilize reflective surfaces to enhance light.*
- *Concern over use on the streetscape side of the project. Pacific is a hostile environment, the more landscape space to separate pedestrians is better. Remove or reduce the pull out seems beneficial.*
- *It's a lot of building in such a small space.*
 - *The transparency will help expand this space.*
- *Is the building too small? Should it be larger...will it be dwarfed in the future?*
- *The simplicity in form is appreciated.*
- *Give the outdoor landing space at the northwest corner more prominence, provide a destination.*
- *Allow the ground to come up into the building to create the "Ah" moments both indoors and outdoors.*
- *Are the exterior facades overly specific? Does the experience of the building gets lost on the interior, due to the specificity of the exterior skin? The team should avoid homogeneity that may occur if the same types of spaces are located on each level. Be conscious of how the composition and expression of the building will make it a good neighbor.*
- *Natural light is important in all learning spaces. Ensure that the southern classrooms have access to natural light.*
- *Consider adding two more stories. The building should be bigger. If the building were to expand in height, then it would aid in adding dimension to the landscape.*
- *Consider utilizing the rooftop of the building.*
- *"Diamond in Rough" – what might help create this?*
 - *Develop the roof floor if possible (a green floor)*

- *If a student can “see” the space, they are more likely to go there.*
- *Ensure that spaces for engagement include pockets for study.*
- *Transparency, focus on materials, and ensuring you set the tone for future construction*
- *Should the event spaces move to the top of the building? Allow this to be the destination (gathering, relaxing, and studying).*
- *Appreciate how the transparency of Pacific Street 1st floor encompasses the streetscape and the multimodal feel.*
- *Consider circulation – should there also be east west circulation?*
- *Skin of the building – make it happy. Avoid a dark, foreboding feel.*
- *CLT floors and ceilings. If you can, try to bring that system into the structure. The real economy of the system comes when it’s used throughout as an entire system. This type of building would be a good fit for this system.*
- *Encourage the team to think about how water could be integrated into the design to emphasize topography and add to the “Ahh” experience.*

Foster School: Founders Hall

Requested Action: Review and Comment

Ross Pouley, UWF Project Manager

Kate Westbrook, LMN

Shannon Nichol, GGN

Overview:

The project has shifted from a concrete to heavy timber structure, increasing the budget \$3.1M. Due to additional been depths, the target floor-to-floor height is 13’-6”.

Schedule Impact

- Due to structural changes, an additional 6 weeks has been added to the initial timeline.

Building Section

- The overall height of the building will be slightly taller than Dempsey Hall.
- Consolidated from three entries down to two, which allows for a more open, spacious, and functional lobby space.
- Along Chelan Way, the building is pulled back from current plinth of Makenzie Hall.

Façade Treatment

- The existing Foster School complex provides a binary approach to façade expression with masonry walls with moments of transparency countered with all glass facades.
 - Considering masonry with punched openings for the office block to complement the Foster School complex.
 - Proposing a high level of transparency (not a full curtain wall) for the classroom and public portion of building.

Landscape Driving Concepts

- Emphasize and building upon Denny Hill with its natural topography and informal character of planting.
 - Café terrace was previously too tight, too narrow, too geometric compared to the proposed pathways. Current concept integrates rocky meadow outcroppings that aid in terracing the slope transition between Klickitat Lane and the north terrace, and are inspired from relevant ecological and geological examples. The outcroppings are part of the hill that define the edges of the north terrace, rather than the terrace feeling like a drawer pulled out from the building.
- Embrace and reinforce the woodland connection of mature trees along Chelan Lane.
 - Pathways will continue to allow through travel with a more smooth and graceful experience by pulling away from the base of the building.

Comments

- *Regarding the stair at the southwest corner, preference for the end of the space to be occupied vs. a stair.*
- *The structural organization and use of heavy timber is great.*

- *The geometry in the earlier scheme for the terrace was too tied into the building structure, now it may compete too much with that geometry. Is there opportunity to enlarge the exterior space? On sunny days, the spaces at PACCAR are heavily used, and it could be assumed that this space would be as well. Students appreciate “rooms” which they feel they can be separate from the main. Keep this in mind when creating these outdoor spaces.*
 - *The idea behind it, the contrast with the materials (stones etc.) is good, but the geometric shape needs to continue to be reviewed.*
 - *The concept of the meadow feels very montane, more in character with the San Juan and Indianola land typology than the once forested Denny Yard. Might be better to reference the more mundane lower Puget Sound typology.*
- *Bubble terrace doesn’t feel right. Soften the hard edges, but still utilize the geometry of the building.*
 - *Somewhere in between the harsh edge and the bubble terrace is needed.*
 - *Maintain gracefulness.*
- *Green space along Stevens Way still needs to be considered. Don’t let the addition of 6 parking spaces inhibit creating the green space Stevens deserves.*
- *Applaud the reconfigured entrances now at the corner of the building. Works much better than previously shown.*
- *Can the pre-function space open up to the function space?*

Project Updates

Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, UWF Asset Management

Green Building Standards

UW is currently working hard to establish a stronger focus on Sustainability.

- The Environmental Stewardship Committee has created Green Building Standards to focus on Sustainability. Standards were once very specific, and are now more general, which allows sustainability to be encompassed more broadly. Project guidelines include:
 - All projects must be LEED GOLD
 - Must be 15% more efficient than Seattle Energy Code
 - Must be 50% more efficient than Seattle Water Code.
- The Sustainability office is working on a Climate Action Plan, and is currently identifying the gaps and determining how to best fill them.
- The Campus Utility Plant is still being reimagined, and will likely require external partnerships to make it happen. UW is currently exploring how we can do that, and will bring findings to the Commission over the next few years.

University Architect Search Continues

UW Facilities continues to search for a University Architect. New candidates are currently being interviewed and we are hopeful that by the next Commission meeting we have a candidate hired.

UW Architect Selection Process

Currently we are in the selection process for the joint UWB/Cascadia STEM project. We’ll be utilizing the list provided by the Commission, and working with the selected Builder to make the final selection for the Architect. During the Builder selection, they are asked to include a list of criteria defining how they best work with designers. We anticipate that this will aid in the setup of successful partnerships.

Comments

- *Consider allowing the University to make the initial short list for the builder to review, rather than the first list being created by both Builder and University.*
- *This process will require a major conscious effort to make it work.*
- *Ensure there is equal balance of risk and reward for the builders.*

Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies

The Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies (CAMCET) selection process for a site developer is underway. The project is designated as a P3 development, with a likely site of W27 in the Campus Master Plan, located just

west of the UW police Station and West Campus Utilities Plant. We anticipate reviewing 3-4 developers with proposals, to collaborate with a design team decided upon by UW. We'll ask each team to come with 3-4 potential design teams in mind for our selection.

University District Station Building

The Sound Transit Light Rail U District Station is currently under construction and on target to open in September 2021. The University District Station Building (UDSB) will be a Public-Private Partnership Development above the station, as the University owns the air rights over the U-District Station. We've finalized our selection for the developer and will be bringing this project to the BOR. The UW and Commission will have design approval rights, so we will have full control of the design, as part of the negotiated partnership.

Additional Comments

Hagget is still on our list for replacement, hopefully in the next few years, but after that, we don't anticipate building an additional student housing due to the expansion of private housing towers planned within the greater University District.

Behavioral Health Teaching Hospital

Requested Action: Review and Comment

Ross Pouley, UWF Project Manager

Jeannie Natta, UWF Project Manager

Jaclynn Eckhardt, UWF Account Manager

Marty Francois – Director Design and Construction UWMC

Overview:

The Behavioral Health Teaching Hospital hopes to help address some of the growing mental health concerns present in the State of Washington.

Goals:

- Innovate and integrate long-term behavioral health recovery.
- Create an alternative to long-term civil commitment beds at UW.
- Provide a training site for Behavioral Health.

Scope:

- \$225.5M total Budget.
- Legislative requirements include:
 - Long-term civil commitment beds
 - Geriatric/voluntary psychiatric beds
 - Medical surgery beds
 - 24/7 tele-health consultation

Site Selection

- NW Hospital Medical Center (NWH) will be combined with the UW Medical Center (UWMC) in January 2020. This provided the most logical location to house this new program and facility.
 - This is in the NE area of Seattle
 - Currently looking at either a reconstructed D Wing site or a site which reduces parking in lot H.

Schedule/Budget

- The planning phase is scheduled for approximately half the time normally allotted for a project this size.
- An environmental impact study is already underway, and we are working closely with UWMC and NWH on the process, ahead of their official merge.
- The Design/Builder selection process has already begun, and we anticipate having the Builder in place by late October.
 - Will look to the commission for suggestions on Architects, in addition to what we already have.

Comments

- *What is Northwest Hospital's institutional history and who goes there?*
 - *Was originally a regional hospital – specialized in Child Birth. The process for combining with UWMC started in 2009, with full ownership in place by Jan 2020.*
- *It's a nightmare to find your way around here, be sure you consider thoughtful wayfinding.*
- *Will a new masterplan be considered for this, since you're working off of a 1991 plan?*
 - *Not at this point due to the tight timeline.*
- *Is there a chance to create an overlay of wayfinding, transit etc., which could be pulled together to help sell this project to neighbors and local residents?*
- *Is there leeway in where you spend that \$33million? Could some of it be spent on a new Campus Master Plan? Even an unofficial Master Plan would allow you to more effectively plan for this and future growth.*
- *Do you anticipate this will create some animosity from outside Medical professions, as this is being pushed through quickly? Keep in mind the sensitivity that this project may create.*
- *Healing gardens and views of nature should be incorporated into the design? Establish a sense of health and safety.*

University's Role in U-District Development

Renee Cheng, Chair, Dean UW CBE

UW Employer and Land Owner - What if the UW Acts differently?

- How is the UW Unique?
 - UW vs Commercial Developers
 - Both have, land use rights, are designed to benefit people and need to generate value.
 - Investment horizon is extend far out for UW due to the longevity vs developers with are typically much shorter in term.
 - Social Impact Bonding
 - Investing in programs now that reduce the social cost later on.
- With the explosion of private development around our campus, how does the UW take advantage of that to ensure that what is built enhances the preferred environment around the university without having to invest much capital?
 - Is there something we can do to improve the quality of design
 - Is there something we can do to help improve the retention and attraction of quality faculty and staff
 - Currently approx. 2700 units planned in U-district (more than 5500 beds anticipated)

Comments

- Does the University own land outside of the main campus?
 - Yes, but not in the U-district. We don't have excess capital to be able to tie up in that.
 - Without land ownership, can the UW be a player in shaping this area?
- Cambridge – Vacancy rates near the University tend to be higher as amenities and housing are targeted too high for those who might actually want to live there.
- Plan to reach out to these developers to understand these buildings and help them build community which includes the knowledge of campus.
- Is there more leverage in innovative space vs housing?
 - CAMCET will be a prime example of this and we hope will give us some insight into this exact question.
- Can you package this in such a way that would draw in private or state funding, like NWBHH?
- Leverage how you're helping the developers by not creating additional housing.
- If there is a City design review, is there a University representative sitting on this review board?
 - Not currently. The University Architect would be the likely candidate, and has been in the past.

Population Health Facility Site Tour

The meeting adjourned at 3:30PM