From: UH Manoa - Office of Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Financial and Physical Management

To: Office of Capital Improvements

Att: Bruce Teramoto

Date: June 29, 2009

Subject: Campus Center Expansion – Recreation Building
Design Recommendations Design Advisory Panel Meeting of 6/24/09

Design Advisory Panel Members:
Peter Vincent AIA, Peter Vincent Architects, 808-524-8255
Kiersten Falkner Historic Hawaii Foundation, 523-2900, x24
Juli Walters Landscape architect, Walters, Kimura, Motoda, 941-2520
Steve Meder UHM, 371-7032
Sanford Murata Sanford Murata, Inc., 226-7373
(Clark Llewellyn Dean, UH SoA – (excused due to travel)
Eric Crispin UHM Assistant Vice Chancellor, 956-8018

Recommendations:
Based on a walk-through of the site, examination of the drawings available to date, and on the presentation by the Design Team, the Design Advisory Panel makes the following Comments, Questions and/or Recommendations:

A. General Comments / Recommendations:
1. The building includes some wonderful “Green Building/Energy Conservation/Sustainability” considerations; it is a progressive statement for campus.
2. Building itself is very handsome.
3. Building reflects thoughtful design, however as shown there's too much hardscape, need more “feel of Hawaii”.
4. Project reflects sustainable design but it could be located in “Anywhere USA” - needs to reflect a “Hawaii sense of place” (this does not necessarily mean putting a pitched roof on it, however; instead it should reflect and acknowledge elements of Hawaiian culture, history, and the Manoa/Waikiki Ahupua’a, an ancient Hawaiian land management concept of sharing resources and stewardship from Mountain to the Sea).
5. The group commends and encourages further exploring the “village of buildings” parti as a means of breaking up building massing/bulk.
6. The group has concerns about sun control on E side and potential heat gain
7. Elevations need to be further studied; example: green roof will require thicker section – either decreasing the fenestration or increasing size of parapet; further explore access and maintenance of green roofs.
8. Seating / informal use of space: further explore opportunities for informal seating under shade of trees for example, rather than creating formal, rigid spaces.
9. Need more eye-level perspectives to better get a feel for the building.

B. Landscaping:
1. Design shows too much hard surface; not enough green/landscaping.
2. Formal placement of trees not Hawaiian in feeling; use informal, “looser” forms.
3. Unlike a new campus (such as West Oahu campus), this is an established institution – the mature landscaping is a key element in signaling that point to students, staff, faculty, and to visitors.
4. 24 mature trees area affected by this project; consider the loss of canopy; losing the heart of the campus with the loss of the 80+ year-old Ficus Comosa tree.
5. Need photographic documentation, document and celebrate the history of Ficus Comosa tree within the project.
6. Preserve as many of the existing trees as possible.
7. Preserve the two Ficus trees by the two historic buildings; push stairs back closer to the courtyard.
8. Move exit stairs and storage, preserve 2 additional trees.
9. Project should plan/design “Legacy Park” at existing parking lot between Kaleo and Building 37, as means of mitigating loss of Ficus Comosa and the 24 Heritage trees.
10. Legacy Park will create a much better setting for the new Campus Center and its addition.
11. Legacy Park should reflect a well developed plan to show future splendor on N-S axis on E side of Campus Center courtyard – equal in size and stature to the area being lost North of Campus Center expansion.
12. Need Landscape Architect’s input as soon as possible.
13. Need Arborist to be on board the project as soon as possible to provide direction on logistics of relocation of trees.

C. Specific Detail Questions/Comments/Recommendations
1. Delete planters around the historic buildings. Need more nature, looser, not so hard and controlling; very urban landscape.
2. Exterior building envelope around the Gym building should be operable, “porous”
3. Court surface should allow for humid air and use of street shoes; should be low maintenance. If maple floors are used, building will be sealed off to multi-use functions and/or will have to be constantly air conditioned, which is not desirable.
4. Entire building envelope should be as “open” as possible (while retaining function).
5. Visual impact of large mechanical enclosure on roof needs to be considered and properly designed. That feature will be very visible from Mauka side of campus.

D. Historic Preservation Comments/Questions/Recommendations
1. Remember – as agreed upon, we still need a separate charette on historic buildings
2. Remember commitment to an integrated educational display for historic buildings.
3. Delete plinths around the historic buildings.
4. Agreement was reached to demolish the oldest building (#6) – in return, Design team should make an effort to save the historically significant landscape.
5. Clarify how interior wall and historic building meet; interior view.

Conclusion:

1. DAP Recommendations will be submitted to the Design Team for incorporation and for Campus Facilities Planning Board’s information.
2. Design Team please provide update to the Design Advisory Panel at next stage of design (final Design Development Phase?).