

## **NOTES FOR DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD**

**University of California, Santa Cruz**

**Monday March 26, 2018**

**9.30am – 12.00pm**

**PPDO Large Conference Room 151**

**CHAIR: Tito Patri**

DAB Members: Richard Fernau, Louise Mazingo, Tito Patri

### Capstone Development Partners

Bruce McKee – Capstone Partners

Jason Jones – Capstone Partners

Mike Zilis – Walker Macy Landscape Architects

Cameron Hall - Katerra

Alyse Winterscheid – Katerra

Chad Zettle - Katerra

### UC Santa Cruz

Traci Ferdolage – AVC, Physical Planning, Development and Operations

Felix Ang – Campus Architect, PPDO

Jolie Kerns – Interim Campus Planner, PPDO

Adam Shaw – UCSC Project Management Consultant

Shannon Percy – UCSC Project Management Consultant

### Site Context and Landscape Strategy

Walker Macy began with a contextual overview of the project area, describing the surrounding meadow landscape procession through the campus historic district before arriving at the Hagar Drive site. The idea was to conceptually knit the forested vegetation at the campus edge into the housing project by extending the tree vegetation from across Hagar Drive.

Taking cues from past LRDP development ideas and also from existing embankment slopes between 2:1 and 4:1, Capstone felt the grading plan has been modified adequately to address the Board's concerns from the last presentation. The proposed slopes now are flatter and more undulating compared to CALTRANS standards, providing a more dramatic edge condition and suggesting a forested landscape that has been naturally restored from its cattle-grazing history.

Some of the revised landscape design features include accessibility across the entire site; blending in the northern contours and at the same time, greatly reducing the fill on the southern edge to achieve slopes at gradients between 5:1 and 6:1. The palette for the plant material are selected to be native and climate-adaptive.

Within the site, the two central commons have been tightened in scale to intensify their use. The maintenance shed has been tucked down, reducing the severe grading cut that

was last presented. Capstone felt that a lot of work has been done to connect the units to the two central commons. Two exterior renderings were shown: one from the commons looking south and another from a parking row looking up north.

The perspective renderings shown illustrated vegetation of a twenty-year maturity. By comparison, the project's Environmental Impact Report renderings indicate five year-old vegetation.

Attention has also been given to how views open and close in the development. Slides with 'before' and 'after' views down Hagar Drive attempt to illustrate the housing units have been tucked in considerably to maintain views of the bay. The Board disagreed with Capstone that the buildings have been sited appropriately to remain hidden.

### **Architecture and Material Selection**

For the residential buildings, Katerra briefly presented two facade options for the exterior: a vertically continuous black-coated metal panel system extending to the roof alternating with enhanced wood panels; a second option of either cementitious panels or cement plaster system in lieu of the metal panels. Precast deck slabs and metal channel stair stringers are currently explored as structural possibilities. Tipping Engineers are engineers of record for the structural foundation, while Katerra is responsible for the super-structure.

PPDO and the Board jointly noted that the option which alternated contrasting materials that extended from ground to the roofline, read more texturally at a larger scale. This was a critical distinction given that the building exterior will be viewed largely from a distance and was preferable to the simple cementitious form with punched fenestrations.

Compared to the lighter values presented at the last presentation, the material palette presented was revised to earth tones that were more aligned with the Physical Design Framework guidelines. Following comments from the last presentation, Katerra introduced more asymmetry to the plans, each module having a 2-foot offset with a 10-foot separation between the pairs. Clerestory translucent windows have also been added to the bathrooms and exterior storage units are being studied. Katerra will explore further locations for storage areas on the upper level units.

The rooftop photovoltaic panels are currently designed as low-tilt; Katerra is collaborating with Puttnam Infrastructure to configure the arrays and possibly, create roof overhangs. 140 parking spaces are being considered for the residential portion and up to 40 for the childcare facility. A traffic study for the Environmental Impact Report is currently under review, which will inform the Hagar Drive and Coolidge Drive intersection, but more study is needed for a 2nd Coolidge Drive exit.

The Board commented that the site is on a moderate karst hazard zone. Capstone noted that close to 100 borings have been made so far. The building foundation method would

likely comprise of 12” to 18” mat slabs over lime-treated soil with engineered fill. At this time, the geotechnical consultant is studying the general massing and the weight of the doline fill, which may potentially erode the existing geology.

Walker Macy noted the trash enclosure design is being incorporated into the next design review.

### **Comments on Overall Planning Strategy**

The Board felt that the strategy of contour treatments, slope modifications, scale reduction of the interior commons and the drift of trees across the Hagar landscape have made the best of a difficult situation. Even then, the Board reiterated that they were still opposed to the selected site and felt that the campus was “making a big mistake.” They also strongly urged for an analysis of alternative sites.

The Board further questioned whether the plant varieties, while visually pleasing, were child-appropriate as the selection appeared too delicate and possibly even, challenging to maintain over time. At present, Capstone Management Partners are contracted to manage the landscape; details on the custodial and grounds services are being worked out. The Board felt the overall landscape looked very suburban and Capstone agreed it would not be desirable to rely solely on maintenance to protect the landscape. The Board felt the issue of maintenance is a priority.

While Capstone observed that past LRDP plans, including Thomas Church in 1963, had suggested the East Meadow to be considered for development, the Board commented that low-cost housing and the proposed landscaping was programmatically incongruous for the site. The Board accepted that all of the campus resource lands are available options, citing the recent Ranch View Terrace development as an example of how the campus entry has evolved. However, they maintained there are other spaces on campus better suited for student housing and that the East Meadow site would be more suitable for other uses.

The Board advised the team to treat the entire area across Hagar to Jordan Gulch as one single zone. Capstone agreed the landscape design may have been too contained and they will consider letting the landscape reach out further beyond the limit of work. The Board would like the site plan to be brought back for more improvement.

The Board felt the need to reiterate that the enduring quality of the open meadow was well understood by all and underscored that there was a storied sequence into the campus. They emphasized that “we need to start and end our discussion with those points.”

### **Early Education Center**

The Board expressed concern that design for the Early Education Center (EEC) is still pending while the rest of the housing development has already been designed. Capstone clarified that the initial siting of the EEC dictated the planning of the housing development, not the other way around. They assured there will be some latitude to move the EEC around within its boundary limit. Capstone has retained the services of Indigo Architects as designers of the EEC, noting that the principal, John Hammond, had studied with Thomas Church at UC Berkeley.

The EEC will be approximately 13,000 SF and the proposed outdoor space will double that area; the childcare program is expected to serve 140 children and will be available to the families of all staff and faculty on campus, not just the immediate neighborhood. The Board stressed the important relationship between the interior and exterior programs and identified an opportunity for good architecture.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting ended at 12.00pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 16.