

# Design Review Board Minutes

November 11th, 2014

## Projects Reviewed:

School of Veterinary Medicine Expansion Feasibility Study  
Meat Science & Muscle Biology Building  
Music Performance Facility  
Veterinary Medicine Clinical Skills Laboratory Renovation

## Present:

### Board Members:

Annette Wilkus	Design Review Board
Phil Certain	Design Review Board
Pete Anderson	Design Review Board
Dan Okoli	Design Review Board /FP&M CPD

### Ad Hoc Members

Jonathan McAnulty (Vet Med Feasibility)	Department Chair of Surgical Sciences
Doug Sabatke (Meat Science)	Assistant Dean of Agricultural & Life Sciences

Susan Cook (Music Performance)  
Jeanette Jenson (Music Performance)  
Lynn Maki (Vet Med Clinical Lab)

### Campus Affiliates:

Gary Brown	FP&M CPLA
Bill Elvey	FP&M
Stu LaRose	FP&M CPD
Megan McBride	FP&M CPD
Rob Kennedy	FP&M Transportation Services

### State Affiliate:

Jon Jenson (Vet Med Feasibility)	DFD
Rex Loker (Meat Science)	DFD
Russ Van Gilder (Music Performance)	DFD
Wendy Von Below (Vet Med Clinical Lab)	DFD

### Vet Med Feasibility

#### Design Team:

Ross Pinski	Flad Architects
Rachel Nelan	Flad Architects
Tom Raley	Flad Architects

#### Meat Science Design Team:

Mike Gordon	Potter Lawson
Doug Hursh	Potter Lawson
Bob Mangas	Potter Lawson
John Dreher	Potter Lawson

### Music Performance

#### Design Team:

Doug Moss	Holzman Moss Bottino
Mark Bastian	Strang
Larry Barton	Strang

### Vet Med Clinical Lab Renovation Design

#### Team:

Dan Hale	Strang
Jacob Ziomek	Strang

---

## **School of Veterinary Medicine Expansion Feasibility Study**

### **Project Background:**

This project focuses on expanding the existing main facility northward across Linden Drive into Lot 62 with a separate new building that still provides program connectivity. A total project budget is estimated at \$50,000,000 for the final project build-out. This project proposes to construct an approximately 100,000 GSF building for a new Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital (VMTH) and provide additional space for clinical and basic research. Programmatic connections between the existing main facility and the proposed new facility will need to be studied, particularly for the small animal hospital, as will reuse of existing hospital spaces that move to the new facility.

---

## **School of Veterinary Medicine Expansion Feasibility Study**

### **Presentation:**

1. The project site is located in lot 62 with Observatory Drive to the north, Easterday Lane and Willow Creek on the west, and Linden Drive on the south
2. The existing building is located to the south of lot 62 with the loading area for large animals on the east, the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory building to the south west, a paddock and a small animal mobile MRI scanner that the design team is looking to move into the building (currently there is no large animal MRI scanner) to the south, the loading dock on the south east, and a few landmarks buildings such as the Dairy Barn and the US Dairy Forage Center to the east.
3. The existing Seed Science building, located to the north east, will become the new site for the Meat Science building.
4. The intersection of Observatory Drive and Easterday Lane is significant. The design team is looking at this corner as a signature corner.
5. It is correct to assume that most of the traffic will come in from the west. Most of the traffic down Linden Drive is for the School of Veterinary Medicine.
6. There is a lift station at the corner of Easterday Drive and Linden Drive that is expected to expand by 50% over the next several years. It could grow in size above or below grade and could grow taller and wider. The design team is considering what to do with the station and how to incorporate it into the aesthetic of the design. It could be 12-20 years before anything is upgraded.
7. The loading and receiving area on the east of the existing building will remain mostly untouched.
8. The Campus Master Plan calls out an existing building the size of lot 62 with the closure of Linden Drive at the west end.
9. The existing School of Veterinary Medicine building was completed in 1993 and designed for 12,000 cases per year. Currently the School is serving 20,000 cases and may increase to as many as 30,000 cases. The school is extremely overcrowded.
10. The study looks to expand the clinical and research areas into lot 62. The large animal areas will mostly likely stay in place.
11. The design team is also looking at creating replacement parking for the stalls that will be lost due to the proposed building on lot 62.
12. There is a drive, on axis with the Natatorium and the existing Veterinary School entrance that separates the proposed building from the proposed parking garage.
13. To the west, along Easterday Lane is the proposed new entry to the facility with a drop off/turn around and some short term parking. It is the hope that most of the small animal customers will be able to park in the short term parking lot. Currently there are 20 stalls proposed at the south west and 10 stalls at the north west edge of the building. The School thinks this number will be adequate for the future needs of their customers.
14. There also is another drop off area for the Tomotherapy entrance.

15. A public entrance is located at the south east corner of the proposed building for those who will park in the new ramp. There are some operational issues that still need to be discussed at this entrance. There is a corridor at the south edge of the proposed building and north edge of the existing building that could serve as enhanced ingress to the facility.
16. The emergency facility will be housed in the new building and patients will come in at the west entrance and then directed to where they need to go.
17. The courtyard is proposed as a student and staff area rather than a place for clients to walk their animals.
18. There is a MG&E substation at the south east corner of the proposed ramp that can't move without costing the project several million dollars.
19. The project is proposing a 180 stall parking ramp.
20. The ramp has been discussed in two orientations: one that orients the majority of the parking garage north to south and the other that orients the garage east to west which would allow for more landscaping on the south side of the lot but makes the ramp less efficient.
21. There are a lot of utilities running along Linden Drive under the proposed building. Currently the design team is looking at locating the thermal utilities in a tunnel. Steam, chilled water, storm and sanitary lines would be located outside the tunnel along with duct banks. The design team needs to develop a plan for a utility failure so if a section of pipe needs to be rebuilt someone can get to the area.
22. DFD commented that the State never allows building over utilities. to make repairs the cost would be considerable and the schedule would be prolonged. The state is working with the design team to study the issues further.
23. The design team is not necessarily thinking that the tunnel would be a walkable tunnel
24. The design team has also looked at spanning across Linden Drive with a set of piers and creating a second floor bridge between the buildings; however they believe this would ultimately be more expensive. The design team would prefer to span across the utilities at grade and not build a bridge. The School would also like to avoid a bridge connection. They need the two buildings to be as integrated as possible so staff and patients don't have to travel up and over a bridge every time they need to move between the two buildings.
25. The design team doesn't have the space or budget to relocate the entire small animal hospital into the new building.
26. There are walkable tunnels in other locations around campus; however there is not a proposal for a walkable tunnel in this project.
27. The design team is looking at the floor plans from a conceptual perspective for feasibility purposes.
28. The public functions in the new building are proposed along Easterday Lane with a prominent element at the north west corner which would include waiting rooms. There would be exam rooms along the west, service and surgery rooms further to the east, and internal housing and isolation areas on the far east side of the building.
29. The existing hospital will go largely untouched however there is a small upgrade in the large animal hospital where clinical pathology occurs now. The intent is to leave as much of the infrastructure and partitions in place and develop a long range plan to upgrade the space over time.
30. The design team is not proposing anything new to the second floor of the existing building except the addition of connections to the new building. In the new building, there will be offices for faculty clinicians and researchers along with a lab component. The School is looking to hire 7-10 new researchers over the next several years
31. The second floor clinical pathology area will only be used for samples.
32. The second floor is envisioned as two wings in order to get light into the area. There is a corridor on the south and the design team is looking to add another on the north.

33. The design team is not developing a research vivarium in the new building due to the support space required. This will remain in the existing building and mostly house small animals such as mice.
  34. On the ground floor, the wide connector has both a service side and a public side. The second thinner corridor is designed for movement back and forth. There are the same issues with the utilities under this corridor as well. It was previously discussed that the narrow corridor could have a removable floor for easy access to the utilities. The design team is still studying the options.
  35. It seems difficult to understand that the only thing standing in the way of making this a great building that functions well is the Utilities. The University should consider making a walkable tunnel for the entire block so the project could build into Linden Drive. One issue is that the University does not own the Drive and there is nothing wrong with the utilities. It also wouldn't be as easy as putting everything in one tunnel, some of the utilities would have to be abandoned and rerouted around the block which would cost a lot of money.
  36. Observatory Drive utilities were just replaced as well and a considerable amount of money was spent on upgrades.
  37. The utilities along University Drive would serve the building but the utilities along Linden serve other buildings. There are three main tunnels that serve campus and on peak days it is difficult to enough steam to the hospital.
  38. It is possible to put the thermal utilities in a tunnel and reroute everything else.
  39. It seems that the narrow bridge/walkway should make the most of the space and become wider to hold more functions. The biggest cost seems to be just getting into the area so the space could get wider without any great impacts. If it did get wider it could serve the same function as the wider walkway/bridge
  40. The design team also has to consider how widening the connection would impact fire truck access. The entry would move deeper into the building.
  41. The north south ramp is the most efficient ramp with the primary entry at the south. The design team is a little concerned about the distance between the Schools entry and the ramp.
  42. The design team is looking at a 16 foot floor to floor height which would end up at about 64 feet above grade to the top of the penthouse which is consistent with other buildings in this area.
  43. The parking ramp will have lower floor to floor heights and would end at about 55 feet to the top of the stair tower.
  44. Generally speaking the north setback is in line with the Agricultural Engineering building.
  45. On the west, the building is setback from Willow Creek by about 75 feet.
  46. Both orientations of the ramp are 5 levels but the east west orientations losses one row of parking on each level. In both orientations the ramp meets the minimum number of stalls requested by UW Transportation.
  47. The design team is looking to improve the teaching entry approach and the outdoor spaces in the area by orienting the ramp east/west.
  48. The connector on the east is three stories and the connector on the west is two stories.
  49. The design team has not yet done a shadow study on the courtyard. The DRB would like to know how much of the courtyard is in shade throughout the year.
  50. The large animal entry will remain in the same area. Trucks and trailers will be able to circulate around the building.
  51. Currently lot 62 has 462 stalls and the design team has created a ramp with 500 stalls. This parking would serve all of the parking lost around campus.
  52. The ramp could serve the patients of the Veterinary School that need to come in the east end.
- Ramp

1. New access drive along west with primary entrance on south. Concern that the south is too close to the existing school 60-80 feet

---

## School of Veterinary Medicine Expansion Feasibility Study

### Design Review Board Comments:

1. The DRB is concerned with how the building creates an end to Linden Drive. It is believed that the turn should curve more so that one doesn't feel like they are slamming into the building. The landscape component is important in this area to helping the better define the terminus of Linden.
2. The design team should consider the panicked customer who is bringing a pet in an emergency situation. The entrance and parking needs to be clear. The design team has created a large canopy that defines the entrance as a beacon for those in a panic.
3. The School believes the new entrance will be a huge improvement and staff will be available to help in emergencies and will come out of the building to meet the clients.
4. There is space to walk animals along Willow Creek with waste receptacles and the School has designated spots for those animals hospitalized.
5. If the 2 story connecter moved east there could be more parking but the entrance would also become deeper and maybe too deep.
6. The landscape component is critical and should be handled in a sensitive way.
7. The school pushed hard for the second connector to accommodate circulation of staff, such as the anesthesiologists, who move between the spaces multiple times a day. Shortening the route through and around the building might also impact recruitment and the program needs down the road.
8. Some of the DRB would trade off less space in the ramp for more landscape to the south of the ramp and in front of the Schools Entrance. The East West oriented parking ramp sets up a landscape package which consists of all the space in the area including in front of tomotherapy and in front of the east connector. It all should be thought of one space.
9. Some of the DRB would also like to see north west corner treated in the same manner. They would like to move Easterday Drive to the east to create more of a green corridor along willow creek, as opposed to having the creek, the road, and the landscape three separate spaces. The idea would be to pull Willow Creek into the site to give it a stronger prominence. The challenge with this idea would be to allow enough room for the large animal trucks and trailers to move through the space.
10. The DRB would like to see the how the lift station impacts the entry and blocks the view to the corner. Currently the renderings do not include an image with the lift station.
11. There is an option to create a basement to place the lift station that would be fit out in the future. It seemed to be too difficult to build a basement for a future lift station without knowing the codes, controls, and size. Currently there is no basement in this building and the station upgrade is so far into the future but the advantage would be huge. It's important to think about these issues now so that the building is more functional.
12. The only other option is building in another site but the cost of that might be as expensive and making some of the larger changes being discussed.
13. The lift station could become a sign or used as urban art to define the entrance in a clear way.
14. The lift station could be 20 years out but the design team should have a vision of what this could be in the future.
15. When the design starts that team will have to develop the details that are being discussed now.
16. The intent for the school is to reduce the amount of stuff in the halls in the future building.
17. The School is looking at creating a building with 80,000sqft when other institutions are typically closer to 150,000sqft. With that said, this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> study the School has done and most of the others have failed because of budget, so the school wants to see this move forward with the possibility of another expansion further into the future. A lot of veterinary schools move off campus and they don't want to do that here.
18. The design team may want to think ahead and consider widening the corridors so that they could accommodate the need for the space for future years.

19. The design team is still working through utility studies now.
20. Ideally the existing buildings and new building would touch.
21. Some of the DRB would not like this building become like a hospital in that the building gets thicker and thicker for function alone. Having to walk across the connectors seems to be a benefit the space by pulling in light.
22. The plan has a really good feel as it is proposed.
23. The feasibility study should include the different cost of options and should make sure the plans align with the principles in the master plan. The master plan enhances the sense of place on campus rather than places spaces simply to fulfill functional requirements.
24. Moving forward it will be important to consider the ramp as a 100 year building and not simply based off the cost of some stalls.
25. Transportation Services is taking on the cost of building structured parking in an inefficient way and losing surface parking. They are also losing opportunities to make better ramps.
26. UW Transportation Services would like the options clearly laid out with circulation issues and cost impacts. UW Transportation is not receiving financial support from the University.

---

### **School of Veterinary Medicine Expansion Feasibility Study**

#### **Summary:**

1. The DRB commends the design team for all their efforts on this challenging and “exciting” project. The DRB recognizes the work the design team is putting into finding an appropriate design for this project.
2. The way the building integrates and frames the landscape is important.
3. The design team should look closer at the experience coming down Linden Drive. The Linden Drive turn should be more gradual and the building should address the surrounding landscape like a plaza.
4. Close consideration should be paid to Willow Creek, Easterday Lane, the landscape, and the lift station on the western edge of the building. Right now they seem to be treated as separate elements.
5. The design team should study the connectors and the possibility of thickening them or moving them east in terms of the needs of the school and codes.
6. The design team is encouraged to help FP&M understand the ramifications of each the options being proposed as part of the plan including the parking ramp and the utilities. Campus is building 100 year buildings and so they need to be prepared to make 100 year decisions.
7. Internally FP&M will continue working with the design team but this is the only meeting the project needs to come to the DRB. If any off line discussions are necessary, they can happen offline.

---

### **Meat Science & Muscle Biology Building**

#### **Project Background:**

The \$42,877,000 Meat Science and Muscle Biology Building project will construct a modern teaching, research, and outreach facility with approximately 30,000 ASF to support the meat industry of the State of Wisconsin. The new laboratory will facilitate the development of modern meat processing and research through the inclusion of lab general-purpose benches for biochemical, chemical, and microbial studies, as well as more specialized rooms for microscopy, tissue culture, instrumentation and cold experiments. This project replaces the existing Meat & Muscle Biology building built in three sections in 1930, 1959 and 1969. The project is currently in planning and construction will begin May of 2016 and finish in October of 2018.

---

## **Meat Science & Muscle Biology Building**

### **Presentation:**

1. The Meat Science site is surrounded by the School of Veterinary Medicine to the south west, US Dairy Forage to the south, various barns to the east and recreation fields to the north.
2. Observatory Drive is the main vehicular path in the area and Linden Drive is seen as a secondary, less traveled drive.
3. Typically the area consists of low scale buildings with just a few stories.
4. Many of the buildings are of a contemporary/modern style.
5. There is a drive that cut through the sites at the north east end of the US Dairy Forage building and continues north to the west entrance of DeJope Hall.
6. The design could consider extending the site east and west and taking over the east drive.
7. The current design proposal calls for 55,000-60,000 sqft. It has been determined that there is a program that needs to be placed on the first floor such as the laboratories, the bio safety area, any level two equipment, the meat processing area including its support spaces, and lecture halls that use carcass for demonstrations; all of this program accounts for about 72% of the gross area. Any additional program will need to be placed on the second floor.
8. The project will need four service entry points, some as big as a semi for the inedibles, livestock and poultry, biosafety materials, and a general service entry which is separate from the animal entrance.
9. The entrance for people will most likely be made of glass and contain some prominent identity.
10. Depending on how large the entrance needs to be, the design team is thinking of placing it on the south side of the building. If there is not enough space on the south façade then the design team believes the north is the next best location.
11. In general this building does not want to have a lot of glass.
12. The design team has determined the west side of the building to be the best location for service functions and they are working on minimizing the impacts to site.
13. Typically there are a high percentage of students coming from the School of Veterinary Medicine and the agriculture district.
14. Deliveries tend to come down University Drive.
15. The design team believes the north side of the building has more of a prominent face but they are still looking into the possibility of taking the entire site of the project.
16. The design team would like to see east side of the building act as a link for pedestrians. This may not require a drivable path and might be more of a landscaped element.
17. Current, it is believed that trucks come down Observatory Drive, turn along the west side of the building and exit onto Linden Drive with the majority of traffic coming from the west.
18. It was stated that the City will have a minimum distance between loading areas on a single block.
19. The Meat Science building is expecting animal deliveries three times a week.

---

## **Meat Science & Muscle Biology Building**

### **Design Review Board Comments:**

1. It was stated that the ramp created as part of the Veterinary Feasibility study might impact the Meat site and terminate 20 feet east of the MG&E substation that is located in the south west corner of the site.
2. A new piece of the Meat Science program is the inclusion of co-products (inedible portions of the animals). The existing facility does not currently have any of the functions associated with these products.
3. The existing seeds site is about 175 feet by 170 feet with a 126,000sqft footprint. The meat science program requires two-thirds to three-fourths of site not including the loading docks.
4. The design team is thinking of Linden Drive as the pedestrian corridor and Observatory Drive as the service corridor.
5. The DRB would like the design team to consider the scale of the building and steer away from bland elongated structures.
6. It was discussed that proposed parking ramp to the west might be set back from Linden Drive with a landscaped lawn between the ramp and the street. This setback would be a benefit to the Meat Science project and something they could consider incorporating in their plans; however the design team is not thinking there would be enough room for the green forecourt to continue onto their site.
7. The process flow for the Meat Science building is very important. It's close to a linear process where things need to move from dirty to clean.
8. Having a level two Biosafety lab (BSL2) requires complete separation between the lab and other spaces. The large equipment moving in and out of the lab requires it to be placed on the first floor. There are further discussions surrounding how to bring contaminated animals into the building on crates.
9. The design team is currently working through creating the proper separation for the public spaces and the processing components. Currently the retail store and student spaces are part of the public program.
10. FP&M believes Observatory Drive is more pedestrian than Linden Drive due to the bus route along Observatory Drive. They believe this will become even truer once the connection west along Linden Drive is lost with the addition of the new Veterinary Medicine School.
11. It was noted that the entrance to the Veterinary Medicine School is along Linden Drive.
12. It was also noted that the bike trail crosses Willow Creek and curves around the back of the Veterinary Medicine School.
13. The design team feels like Linden Drive seems more like the center of the agricultural campus and Observatory seems like an edge of campus. The design team would like to see the building have two entrances but the team is not sure this can happen with the required functions of the proposed building.
14. FP&M would like to maximize every opportunity to create student connections through campus but at the same time the design team isn't sure there would be much traffic traveling through lot 62 and the current seeds site especially considering the dairy forage building is a federal building which does not house any academic functions.
15. The DRB would like the design team to think about the schools future needs.
16. Except for the Poultry Research Laboratory there isn't anything between Easterday Lane and Elm Drive that faces north on Observatory Drive.

17. There is a potential for short term parking in the future ramp that could support visitors and vendors for the Meat Science building.
18. Currently the meat store does around \$5,000 worth of business in 4 hours.
19. They also have short courses and a two year master meat crafters program. The school would like to see more short courses develop which would mean a need for more animals and that the store would be open more days a week.
20. Lot 62 currently holds 45 metered stalls that should be replaced as part of the proposed ramp project.
21. The design team stated they are not aware of any future changes to the buildings to the east of the Meat Science site.
22. The design team imagines that the building will be about 50 feet high including the penthouse. This would mean there would be two stories at 15 feet and 13 foot high penthouse.
23. The DRB believes it would be helpful to see bubble diagrams with the building footprint and dimensions of site; however it was stated that these types of drawings are not typically required at the first DRB meeting.
24. The DRB would like the design team to continue to look at the site and the surrounding site constraints. They believe it is important to recognize the scale of the different buildings and develop details accordingly.
25. FP&M would like the design team to use the Poultry Research Laboratory's north edge as the Observatory Drive setback for the proposed Meat Science building. The design team thinks this would equate to roughly a 55 foot setback from the curb.
26. Transportation Services will be looking to replace the parking stalls lost from the Meat Science site including any visitor parking.
27. It was stated that the proposed parking ramp is part of the 2017/2019 budget and construction would potentially begin in 2019.
28. The Meat Science construction is estimated to being in 2018

---

### **Meat Science & Muscle Biology Building**

#### **Summary:**

1. The DRB would like to see options where the Meat Science entry is on both the north and south side of the building with one potentially less prominent than the other.
2. All the functions of the program need to be met and the site impacts should not detract from the programmatic requirements of the building.
3. There should be a different character on Observatory Drive verses Linden Drive.
4. The DRB would like the building to be friendly, engaging, and welcoming.
5. A Draft of the Veterinary Medicine Study should be complete in February for the Meat Science team to preview.

---

## **Music Performance**

### **Project Background:**

The School of Music Performance Facility 30,000 GSF project is a significant component of the University's East Campus Development Plan which calls for the creation of a contemporary and technologically advanced arts and humanities district, consolidated along the University's pedestrian corridor, the East Campus Mall. . The School of Music is currently engaged in fundraising and has received more than \$22.5 million in lead gifts. Programming and pre-design have been completed. It is hoped this \$22,500,000 project will construct 30,000 GSF of new space. Demolition was completed in November 2012 and the project is currently in the 35% design. Construction is anticipated to start July 2015 with occupancy in July 2017. This project is tracking LEED Silver.

---

## **Music Performance**

### **Presentation:**

1. Last met with the DRB in September 23<sup>rd</sup> and have been working towards this meeting.
2. Since the September meeting the design team has met with state, FP&M, and the client a number of times.
3. The design team has also since visited the site and generated some images which are included in the presentation today.
4. The design team has since met with the Urban Design Commission and no issues arose at that meeting.
5. The design team has also with Client since September as part of preliminary design report to discussed different options.
6. There are two design options to discuss at today's meetings.
7. The project had originally intended to complete the design package by December but now, due to continued dialog and depending on the scheme the design team moves forward on, they believe the schedule will shift to January or even early February
8. Design team thinks the 15 foot shift is rather minor but they want the School to be able to weigh in on the changes.
9. The design team has shifted the rehearsal room north 15 feet and moved the stair south and combined the two storage rooms into one room.
10. There is now a vestibule along the west that allows pedestrians to enter the lobby.
11. The path currently in front of the Chazen Museum will be paved and have bike racks. The door at this location has shifted north slightly.
12. The path between the Chazen drop off and the south west corner did not widen, however the situation has greatly improved due to the setback of the building, which now allows for more space on the south side of the building.
13. The Chazen drop off has also remained where it was previously.

### **Impacts to the floor plan:**

14. The changes due to the 15 foot shift are fairly modest in phase one but they become greater in phase II.
15. There is a 300sqft reduction in the size of the lobby and a reduction in the corridor on the west that runs north south from 14' to 12'. The School is ok with these changes.
16. The storage room attached to the rehearsal space has been redesigned from two rooms to one room. The doors into the rehearsal room are also now both located on the east wall.
17. This lobby was already small but losing the 300sqft makes things smaller, however everyone is aware of this. None of these changes truly affect the program.
18. The lobby has always been small and everyone is aware of this.

19. The seating capacity in the auditorium is at about 800 seats.
20. The design team is looking at adding windows to the west stair case. There is a percentage of windows that is allowed by code, between the Chazen Museum and the School of Music. The design team is also looking at opening the north wall of the stair so the space feels larger.

**Phase II:**

21. Due to the 15 foot shift, the overall square footage of phase two has been reduced by 1850 sqft. The biggest change occurs in the reduction of women's toilets on the first floor. The number of toilets in phase one did not change but when phase two opens the number of women's toilets will be reduced from 11 to 7. The design team is still discussing options to get around the reduction. The plans are still above code but for theater purposes the design team would like to have more toilets. There are other toilets on other floors.
22. The concession stand storage, the coat check room, and the catering pantry have been removed as part of the building shift. The design team has been discussing using the corridors in place of these spaces with the School of Music. The concessions would be mobile concessions.
23. There is limited space to move these functions into the basement as part of phase one.
24. Currently the budget for Phase II has not been developed so any additional basement needs could be built into the budget and plans for phase II to cover the needs that the School is losing due to the 15 foot shift.
25. There is a concern that it there is a long circuitous route to the toilets. Even without the 15 foot shift the toilets have been located far from the performance hall seats.
26. There are two unisex restrooms south of the performance hall. The design team doesn't want lines to form at these just because people don't want to walk to the other toilets or because they didn't know about them, so they are still looking at other locations where these rooms might be placed.
27. It would be possible to add a door to the west wall right outside of the west sound and light lock just south of the stairs. The addition of this door would shorten the route to the bathrooms.
28. There is a janitors closet and a mechanical shaft located south of the women's rest room

**Model:**

29. There is a canopy at the both west entrances.
30. The DRB believes the new layout successfully inflects into the courtyard and opens the south west corner. The earlier scheme turned a cold shoulder to the art complex, so the new plan is a great improvement.
31. The design team liked the offset of the building masses in the previous plan that stepped the forms to the north as one moved west along University Avenue.
32. The glass from the south façade seems to transition around the corner better in the shifted scheme rather than the previous scheme.
33. In phase II the stair on the west will extend to the second floor but no higher. There is an entry element near this location so adding glass up to the second level is possible.
34. The DRB think the results of the changes are great.
35. Some of the DRB are concerned about the functional compromises. They believe these compromises could be substantial operationally but they defer to the School for their opinion. The School of Music stated they are ok with the changes.
36. The travel distance to the bathrooms is a user comfort issue, in reality the location is not that far and is not a code issue.
37. The DRB hopes the design team is not yet done trying to solve the issues that have developed from the 15 foot shift. Some solutions might be inconvenient for staff and more convenient for the users, but all the functions would be addressed.
38. DFD is concerned with issues like the restrooms.
39. The DRB believes that the design team will find a location for the toilets.

40. Although there are bathrooms on the balcony floor the design team has noticed most people will go to the lobby to use the bathroom no matter what the count is on the upper levels. The upper level bathroom count has not changed.
41. The School of Music needs to think a bit more about the effects these changes will have operationally. If custodial needs could be met in the basement the School of Music would be happy with the plan.
42. The client is not getting everything they want now but there might be opportunities to gain some of back in other phases. Some things may not end up in the most ideal space and some things may not come back at all.
43. The design team should continue to meet the programmatic needs of the School and the DRB has confidence that the design team will figure these issues out.
44. The DRB thanks the design team for their effort in working through the issues. They believe the original massing worked well as a part of art outside of the current context but now the design seems to be balanced within the campus context and a good interpretation of the Master Plan.
45. The Chazen Representatives are not in the room and the design team would like to have a clear direction from them that they are heading in the right direction. Dan will reach out to the Chazen Museum folks this week and get the design team a response.

**Landscape:**

46. Phase I there is a lot at the north along with a modest lawn.
47. There is seating, pavers, and bike racks at the west side at the end of the Chazen walkway.
48. Along University Avenue there is a softscape planter with a single specimen tree at the south east corner.
49. There are street trees along University that end short of the south east corner to open up the view to the building.
50. There is a bus stop located on the south somewhere amongst the street trees.
51. The building is set back along Lake Street for street trees and some landscape with a planter wall to accommodate a grade change.
52. The east edge planter could be developed and potentially extended to along the entire east wall. The DRB would like to see details of the planter wall and plant choices.
53. There seems to be an opportunity along the west to create a place at the patio area.
54. Some of the DRB think there doesn't need to be green space right against the rehearsal and recital walls.
55. There needs to be a more cohesive look. The west could be more paving as part of a plaza but it would be nice to see what has been planned by the landscape architects for the east side.
56. The architects specifically asked their consultants to hold off until the 15 foot shift had been solved.

---

**Music Performance**

**Summary:**

1. The design team is ok with the direction the project has taken and they believe the building will be a very nice building.
2. FP&M believes that there needs to be a balance in design and that it's not just about an aesthetic piece, the project also needs to consider the context and patterns of movement across the site.
3. The DRB appreciates the amount of work and time the team has put into solving the problems. Not every architect could have met all the challenges presented.
4. The design teams responsiveness is also very much appreciated.

5. The DRB encourages the design team to continue to address the outstanding issues that will resurface in Phase II, so there are solutions for future years when the project is picked up again.
6. Ideally the SE corner would be transparent and the DRB encourages the design team to look at the corner in greater detail. The design team stated the solid wall in the rendering was intentionally presented as a generic piece in order to discuss the direction for potential signage or art. The design team believes the rendered solution is not the right move but they are still developing the corner. To move the sound and light lock would be a substantial challenge. The project team has discussed using spandrel glass at the corner but that was not deemed the best solution as one would still not be able to see through the corner.
7. There is a planting bed that sits along the south east corner but the design team is still looking at options for the landscape.
8. At some point the DRB would like to see the landscape plan completed to the same level as the plans.
9. The design team will resubmit the plans with the landscape included.
10. The DRB would like to meet once more to discuss the landscape. The meeting does not have to happen prior to the design submittal; it just needs to be addressed. The DRB would also like to see the utilities presented with the landscape plan.

---

### **Veterinary Medicine Clinical Skills Laboratory Renovation Project Background:**

This project constructs a new larger clinical skill laboratory to provide space for learning veterinary skills through the use of prosthetic and functional mannequin models. Use of the current laboratory has increased each semester and its space is only one third of what is required to meet the demand. This project remodels the 3,100 GSF storage room currently under the existing solar panels located on the south side of the School of Veterinary Medicine building to create a new clinical skills laboratory. The existing adjacent study area will be enlarged to create more group learning space and a small storage area. The project will remove the existing nonfunctional and leaking solar panels along with associated ductwork and the existing roofing system. Minor structural modifications will be made and a mechanical, electrical, and plumbing system will be provided to support the occupied spaces.

---

### **Veterinary Medicine Clinical Skills Laboratory Renovation Presentation:**

1. The project site is on the south.
2. The main views of the project site will be from Campus Drive and along the bike path that run just south of the building.
3. The Veterinary Diagnostic Lab is located to the south west, there is a trotting field to the south, the Dairy Barn is located to the East and the Dejope residence hall is located to the north.
4. The project is located on the second floor of the School of Veterinary Medicine with about a 4500sqft addition and 2000sqft of renovation on the inside.
5. The solar panels which are original to the 1983 construction are driving the façade. The vet med is looking to remove and improve the aesthetic of exterior and interior views.
6. The design program looks to add three major components; an active learning classroom, a clinical skills lab, both have room darkening elements, and a student study area.
7. There is clear glass at the corners as well as at the center with spandrel on each side. There is also clear glass at the clerestory across the entire façade.
8. The height of new additional wall is around 10 feet to the window head with a 16 foot height to the roof edge at.

9. The form is driven by the sloping roof which terminates at an interior column and then transitions to the flat roof across the rest of the building.
10. There is a sun shade at 8 feet with a clerestory above. The design team is also looking at the potential of a light shelf.
11. The fascia and windows would slightly extend beyond the two bump outs at the southern corners of the building (the design team refers to these as book ends) with doors on each end that would open onto a deck.
12. The sloping roof would not extend beyond the bookends
13. The back wall of brick will match the existing brick on the book ends. The sloped roof will be a bronze standing seam that transition to a flat roof with bronze fascia and glass storefront below.
14. There will be a continuous band of glass at the clerestory with the sunshade below and seven feet of glass that is either reflective blue spandrel or clear glass.
15. The desire is to make all the glass along the façade look like one element.
16. The current building contains bronze metal at the storefronts, sills, eyebrows, and louvers. The design team is trying to treat the building with respect and use the materials that are currently part of the building.

---

### **Veterinary Medicine Clinical Skills Laboratory Renovation Design Review Board Comments:**

1. The DRB thinks the design team is being extremely respectful of the building and maybe even too respectful. The bronze aluminum is so dark and it might be worth it to lighten the area up especially considering the new building that is being studied now.
2. It was suggested that the bronze spandrel could possibly be glass spandrel to lighten the façade.
3. The Tomotherapy project was a clean addition with a large piece of glass and a simple cut out that turned out well.
4. The DRB is questioning if it would be possible to see the active learning screens along the spandrel glass wall on a sunny day. The design team is looking at two level sun shades that would block the light when needed
5. The design team will be building up the floor and routing some of the active classroom wires in through the existing floor drains. They are also looking at thin mats.
6. The design team is not proposing a raised floor. All the tables are hardwired and not very flexible so there really isn't a need for a raised floor.
7. The Veterinary School wants the building to look better than it does now. Lynn stated she has not yet seen anything proposed for the new building. It was commented that the new building is in the feasibility stage so there isn't really any character to pull from.
8. The School wants light but beyond that they have not discussed the aesthetics.
9. The DRB would like to see a lighter material in terms of weight.
10. The design team had previous versions which were heavier.
11. The addition is not so significant that you would not want to depart from the current building materials but there are ways to pull elements and make the design cleaner and lighter.
12. Mimicking the existing side louvers might be another possibility that would be better than the flat brown fascia.
13. FP&M would like the project to look into at the sun angles and the visibility on a sunny day in the rooms.
14. Once changes have been made the proposal should be shared with FP&M and potentially shared with the DRB.