

# NEW ACADEMIC CENTER CORE GROUP MEETING NOTES SCHEMATIC DESIGN MEETING #2



## MEETING NOTES

DATE **06/30/2011** TIME **11:00 am– 12:45 pm**

PROJECT  
**College of Marin  
New Academic Center**

PROJECT NUMBER  
**10010.00**

LOCATION  
**College of Marin  
Swinerton Conference Room**

ISSUE DATE  
**07/05/2011**

NOTES BY  
**Alan Butler**

PARTICIPANTS  
**Alan Butler (TLCD)  
John Fung (MCA)  
Christian Wopperer (MCA)**

**Laura McCarty (COM)  
Debra Mathau (SMC)  
Don Flowers (COM)  
Leigh Sata (SMC)  
David Snyder (COM)  
Raemon Bergstrom-Wood  
(COM student)  
Sara McKinnon (COM)**

**Anne Peterson (Community Rep)  
Len Pullan (Community Rep)**

### Summary

The objective of the meeting was for the design team to present the progress of the Schematic Design concept to the Core Group. Dean Snyder arrived late due to a scheduling conflict, but was given a summary of the presentation after the formal meeting.

### PRESENTATION

John and Christian presented updated plan development for the project:

1. Review of guiding concepts
  - a. Strong connection to original master plan
  - b. Focuses on views down central axis toward Mt. Tamalpais
  - c. Creates internal court similar in concept to original master plan
2. Showed existing views from College Ave. And Sir Francis Drake Boulevard
3. Showed new 3-D views
  - a. From Sir Francis Drake: Laura asked if we could have two versions of this view, one showing existing Harlan Center and then the new buildings, both from Circle Drive
  - b. View from SFD and College Ave: Laura stated street cannot be clearly seen and that setbacks and landscaping should be shown in this view
  - c. View to Fusselman Hall from intersection
  - d. View down College Ave. showing relative scale of commercial buildings
  - e. Site section looking South: Len asked if atrium would be covered and John affirmed that it would
  - f. Site section looking North: Len had concern about tree roots, John stated that it was not currently conceived to move retaining walls west of current location because of damage to root systems. Ann noted that Fine and Performing Arts needed to be shown more prominently. Don said that we should have more photo imagery in final images- more realistic. Ann was concerned about "square box look" of large classroom wing and massing diagrams in general and said we would be better off not using sketches and some of the views in final presentation. She much preferred the live drive around with the live 3-D model.
  - g. Showed live 3-D model
    - i. Showed a study which demonstrated how pitched roofs would have an adverse effect on the overall scale of the building and campus.

111 SANTA ROSA AVENUE, #300  
SANTA ROSA, CA 95404  
TEL 707.525.5600  
FAX 707.525.5616

[WWW.TLCD.COM](http://WWW.TLCD.COM)

Laura agreed that the siting is so horizontal that the pitched roofs wreck the feeling of the building massing.

- ii. Showed new buildings on College Ave. relative to existing. The new are actually lower than existing. Laura: boxes for massing need to show more transparency. John said we might also show how wall from competition entry was eliminated and how canopies are lower. Laura asked "What are the major features of the design? What makes it?" John replied that the design showcases the campus with multiple entries and views into the camps. Len asked what the potential or intent was for the corner treatment. John replied that the redwoods were a dominant feature that would stay. Len asked if the redwoods could be thinned. A discussion ensued about the arborist's findings and tree removal in general on the site. Ann noted that we have to accept the removal of some trees. Alan asked if the rain garden concept for the corner was still being considered and Ann asked about the nature of a sign at the corner. John said both are under study. All seemed to agree that an electronic sign was not appropriate
- h. Ann noted that the issue of arches and tile roofs keeps coming up in public discussions and must be addressed. She added that you can't go backwards but must explain the issue.
- i. Don asked what goes on the roofs and said hopefully nothing.
- j. Len noted that canopies need to provide rain protection.
- k. Len and Sara noted community concern about the buildings being too bright. Don replied that one of the most inviting features of the project was the inviting quality of the light building reaching out to the community. John noted that most of the light would be on the commercial frontage at College Ave.

DATE

**06/30/2011**

PAGE

**2 of 3**

## **JULY 12 COMMUNITY MEETING**

1. Laura stated that it was important to have Mark take the community through the original Masterplan and its evolution.
2. Ann said we should not show pitched roofs option in community presentation
3. Len said he liked treatment of the canopy at the Oakland Museum and should work on strong architectural treatment and detailing of the canopy.
4. John discussed trying to make the building masses more transparent without specifying specific window or glazing locations at this point in the design.
5. Len noted that a sense of place and sense of entry was very important and stressed that the entry should be marked prominently.

6. Laura asked what was important to students. Raemonnd replied that it was the entrances. Sara said it was places to study and gather particularly the courtyard.
7. Len asked about the impact and status of geothermal on the building design. Debra said the study is not yet complete but that 85% of the needed capacity appears to be there. Alan noted that use of geothermal systems could reduce need for as much building space for HVAC and exterior structures such a cooling towers. Len stated that it would be important to be ready to answer questions about geothermal systems and photovoltaics on the roof. Debra noted that the photovoltaics were not in the budget and were not the most cost effective spending per budget dollar.
8. Sara said it would be nice to show how the new related to Olney Hall at the south steps from College Ave.
9. Laura asked what is important to the faculty? Sara said:
  - a. Mostly what's inside
  - b. Covered entry
  - c. Do you have windows looking toward Mt. Tam? Not considered in prior buildings.
  - d. Leigh asked if the courtyard could be configured for an amphitheater or teaching space.
10. The Core Group generally felt that the 3-D images were more effective than the 2-D images.
11. Laura asked "where is the front door?"
12. Len again stressed the importance of detailing the canopy and suggested glazing some of the sides of the canopy walkway.
13. Ann and Leigh noted that is important to show the story and history of the design solution and the notion that the design was all about "leaving the campus better than it was before".

DATE

**06/30/2011**

PAGE

**3 of 3**

These meeting notes will be added to the official project record. Please forward comments or corrections to TLCD Architecture within one week of issue date.