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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:20 AM – 9:25 AM</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Focus of Study, Process and Participants, Team Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25 AM – 9:40 AM</td>
<td>The Process</td>
<td>Understanding the Needs, Confirming the Space Program, Expanding the Boundaries, Building Analysis, Site Evaluation, Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 AM – 10:00 AM</td>
<td>The Results</td>
<td>A Framework for Moving Forward, Recommendations for North Campus, Phasing, Future Building Projects, Future Precinct Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM – 10:20 AM</td>
<td>Q &amp; A/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Recap – Answering Five Key Questions (at the 500 foot level)

1. **What will be required to renovate existing buildings?** Quickly and broadly evaluate the physical properties of the buildings and their site (integrating work of engineers/consultants). Test various levels of renovation options: A: Ongoing Maintenance, B: Maintenance + Living Improvements., C: Maintenance, Living Improvements. + Life Safety, D: 100% Code Compliance.

2. **What are the programmatic needs in creating a living/learning environment?** Work w/Housing and Food Services to develop/quantify programmatic needs.

3. **What are the qualitative and quantitative differences associated with renovation vs. new construction in terms of?**
   - a. ability to meet program requirements
   - b. quality of environment for students that results
   - c. magnitude of financial investments
   - d. phasing and ability to retain bed count/ income stream during construction
4. How can we maximize opportunities to enhance community interface and reinforce sense of a North Campus Residential Village within context of overall campus? Identify the planning, architectural and landscape elements that make the North Campus a special place. Identify strategies for their preservation and enhancement to strengthen the student environment as new buildings and activities are introduced.

5. Can the successful housing prototype of 5/2 recently built on the West Campus be accommodated on the North Campus? Test HFS’s proven prototypes for new housing construction on the site, taking into consideration the site’s topography, City’s building codes, grading regulations and fire/life safety standards.
Overview

The Focus of the Study

Added to These Initial Questions Were:

1. **Should the planning boundaries be expanded to include the entirety of the North Campus so that when the overall project is implemented, this last remaining area of the UW campus will be complete? If so, what should the boundaries be?**

2. **What strategies can we develop that will help HFS and the University establish a framework for development such that each incremental improvement contributes toward achieving a long-term vision for the North Campus?**

3. **What landscape/open space improvements can be implemented that will help to visually and socially "knit together the various new and existing buildings of the North Campus to create a student focused precinct of living learning?**

What improvements can enhance the visual and pedestrian connectivity between the North Campus, parking to the east and the academic core to the west?
Overview

The Focus of the Study

4. How can the image and identity of the University of Washington be better established along its northern and eastern “edges”? Along 45th Street?

5. What are the long-term opportunities for buildings/sites in the North Campus that aren’t currently a part of the student living/learning precinct such as the laboratories to the east? Lewis Hall?
# The Process and the Participants

## A Series of Workshops with the Steering Committee

### PARTICIPANTS

#### Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Lebo</td>
<td>CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Stahlecker</td>
<td>CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR Fulton</td>
<td>HFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Garia</td>
<td>HFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Lodin</td>
<td>HFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Schreiber</td>
<td>HFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Barnes</td>
<td>OPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsey Cameron</td>
<td>OPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Kenny</td>
<td>OPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Ferris</td>
<td>Spectrum/Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reviews by:

- Kirk Pawlowski: CPO, Student, Student

### Consultant Team

- Pfeiffer Partners Architects: Planners/Architects
- Swift Company: Landscape
- Rushing Engineers: MEP
- Coughlin Porter Lundeen: Structural

---

### WORKSHOPS and Follow-Up GoTo Meetings

- **Kick-off Meeting:** Understanding the Needs
- **Workshop One:** Options and Opportunities
- **Workshop Two:** Concepts for New Construction and Renovation
- **Workshop Three:** Establishing the Master Plan Framework

---

**UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON**

**North Campus Student Housing Study**
1. Develop a plan that doesn’t rely on other “lateral moves” (laboratory site, etc.) for implementation

2. Don’t limit ourselves yet, good time on campus to be more expansive, think of partnerships

3. Ensure that all North Campus residence halls feel like they are part of the North Campus environment – from Hansee Hall to McMahon Hall

4. “Grow” Denny Field to become a feature of the North Campus – uniting the community rather than dividing it as it currently does

5. Be sensitive to the siting and massing of Intellectual House and Lewis Hall
6. Use Denny Field and Lewis Hall Area as “Transition” from Olmsted/Academic Quad to North Campus

7. Retain mature landscape of North Campus but “thin up”, use to frame views

8. Establish better connectivity between lower site and Whitman Court

9. Be sure to address infrastructure issues

10. See Master Plan as a dynamic document – important to define where we start and the early steps but future steps will no doubt change
North Campus to provide:

- 2700 – 3000 beds by 2020 (West Campus – 5400 beds)
- 60% of housing units to support Freshmen/Sophomore Living/Learning Communities – take advantage of proximity to academic programs in campus core
- 30% housing units for Juniors/Seniors
- 10% units as singles for maximum flexibility – place in specific buildings
- Units for visiting lecturers, faculty and staff, supporting living/learning community
- Resident advisor/resident student ratio 1:40 to 1:50
- Ability to grow from North Campus to West Campus
- Unit types for special need students – support accessibility and gender neutral choices
Residence Hall Program

- Staff units 27,740 nsf
- Freshmen/sophomore beds/baths 255,600 nsf
- Junior/senior beds/baths 178,400 nsf
- Floor community (per floor) +/-2,000 nsf

Total approximate NSF 563,740
Residence Hall Program

- Staff units: 27,740 nsf
- Freshmen/sophomore beds/baths: 255,600 nsf
- Junior/senior beds/baths: 178,400 nsf
- Floor community (per floor): +/-2,000 nsf
- Community spaces (per bldg.): 11,800 nsf

Total approximate NSF: 622,700
(assuming 5 bldgs.)
Key to the North Campus - a Dining Program that includes:

- Major food court – “all you can eat”
- Two late night options – café (burgers, bagels)
- Conference center with small warming kitchen
- An express mart

Catering/commissary center (22,000 nsf production area + sales)

Total approximate NSF = 63,000

Additional Regional Amenities

- Meeting rooms/classrooms
- Learning resource center
- Multi-purpose room with 200 seats (meetings, banquets, concerts, dances, lectures)
- Student Government center
- Flexible, small study rooms
- Fitness center
- Gaming center
- Regional storage

Total approximate NSF = 29,000
The Process

Expanding the Study Area – Initial Boundaries of HFS

North Campus Student Housing Study
Introduction – The Project Team

University Village

The Process

Expanding the Study Area – Boundaries of North Campus Housing Precinct

Memorial Way/Observatory

Klick-a-Tat Way

NE 45th Street

Steven’s Way/Lewis Hall

UW Entry – Pend Oreille Drive
SMC Title 22 – Building and Construction Codes

- IBC International Building Code, 2009
- IEBC International Existing Building Code, 2009
- IRC International Residential Code, 2009
- Grading Code: SMC 22.170
- Housing Code: SMC 22.200
- NEC National Electrical Code, 2008
- IMC International Mechanical Code, 2009
- IFG International Fuel Gas Code 2009
- Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code: SMC 22.450.010
- IFC International Fire Code 2009
- Energy Code: SMC 22.700
- Stormwater Code: SMC 22.800
- Permitting: SMC 22.900
- Miscellaneous: SMC 22.920 Energy Use Benchmarking
Building Summary:
- 4 wings, 3-4 floors each
- Primarily singles, 3- and 4-person suites (only a few of these)
- Total number of beds: 336

Attributes:
- Tudor architecture, visually stunning
- High level of detail & finishes
- Indoor and outdoor common areas
- Large, well appointed public rooms on ground floor
- Consider residence hall for “recluses”, students who desire quiet, more studious environment w/ 24 hour quiet hall
- Portion of attic area converted temporarily to student beds

Issues:
- Somewhat “adhoc” street presence on 45th, including public visibility to loading and service area
- Building and rooms not accessible
- Insufficient and poorly located electrical outlets in rooms
- Fire sprinkler routing is poor
- Poor hallway lighting

Recommendations
Building to be saved with limited if any renovation
Improving accessibility when funds are available
Screen service and loading when funds are available
Building Summary:
- 2 wings, 8 floors each
- International community on 3rd–4th floor
- Business community on 5th-6th floor
- SAFE community on 8th floor
- Total number of beds: 814

Attributes:
- Laundry on each floor
- Lounge on each floor
- Views
- Infill opportunities

Issues:
- Common lounges located at far end of floors, double height not particularly visible or easily accessible
- Doesn’t provide type of living/learning environment envisioned by HFS in future to remain competitive
- Windows in poor condition
- Mechanical systems and plumbing fixtures need replacing
- Limited technology available in student rooms
- Meets the definition of Substantial Alteration 2, triggering extensive and expensive code and life safety upgrades
  - Seismic (shear walls/lateral)
  - Fire/life safety
  - Egress
- Won’t trigger high rise improvements given fire truck access

Recommendations
Demolish building, use site for new construction
Issues:
- Small lounges
- Awkward room configuration
- MEP systems and plumbing fixtures need replacement
- Exterior windows require replacement
- Concrete corridor walls make renovation/reconfiguration of hallways expensive
- Costly to meet energy code/sustainability goals
- Renovation would trigger Substantial Alteration 2 improvements that are extensive/expensive
  - High rise building code requirements
  - Seismic (shear/lateral)
  - Fire/life safety
  - Egress

Recommendations
Demolish building, build new

Building Summary:
- 2 wings, 8 floors each
- International community on 3\textsuperscript{rd}–4\textsuperscript{th} floor
- Business community on 5\textsuperscript{th}–6\textsuperscript{th} floor
- SAFE community on 8\textsuperscript{th} floor
- Total number of beds: 814

Attributes:
- Laundry on each floor
- Lounge on each floor
- Views
- Infill opportunities
The Process

Building Analysis - McMahon Hall 1965

Building Summary:
- 2 wings, 11 floors each
- Singles, doubles & 4-person suites
- Arts community on 3rd floor
- Honors community on 4th floor
- Total number of beds: 1043

Attributes:
- Suite configuration
- Views
- Laundry on each floor
- Provides many more beds on site than what could be achieved today
- Large dining hall, recently renovated

Issues:
- Lack of community/shared spaces on floors
- Designed as upper class housing but used for first year students
- Suites are introverted
- Balconies are a challenge for HFS
- Concrete corridor walls – costly to reconfigure
- Requires upgraded building systems and window replacements to meet energy code/sustainability goals vs. $$$
- Will require extensive renovation as per Substantial Alteration definition 2, triggering the following:
  - High rise buildings
  - Seismic (shear/lateral)
  - Fire/life safety
  - Egress

Recommendations
Because of the significant number of beds (+1,000) and existing, large dining hall, recommend retain and renovate.
The Process

Building Analysis Summary Recommendations

Recommended for Demolition
- McCarty Hall
- Haggett Hall

Recommended for Renovation
- Hansee Hall

Recommended for Little or Modest Improvements
- McMahon Hall

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Site Evaluation – Two Primary Criteria: Building Typology and Site Topography

Building Typology of 5 over 2

Current Building Pads
North Campus Student Housing Study

PFEIFFER PARTNERS

Site Evaluation

The Process: Technical Drivers of the Plan

Building Typology of 5 over 2

Steep Slopes

Fire Access

Current Building Pads

Significant Trees and Groves

Existing Utilities

Adjacent Buildings—New and Proposed
Fire Requirements:

26'-0" wide Fire Lane is required on Whitman Court (west side) and on the lower side (east side) of the buildings.
Site Evaluation – Proposed Building Typology _ 5 over 2

The Process

Five Floors Wood Frame

Two Floors Concrete
The Process

Site Evaluation – Topography: East to West Across Site

**Building Code Height Limitation:**

Building height limited to 70’ above average grade plane of site measured to parapet

**Fire Code Height Limitation:**

Limited to 75’ maximum measured from the elevation of the fire truck access road to floor of highest occupiable level

New fire access road
The Process

Building Code Height Limitation: Building height limited to 70' above average grade plane of site

Fire Code Height Limitation: Limited to 75' maximum measured from the elevation of the fire truck access road to floor of highest occupiable level

Average grade – 0'

Building code height – 70'

Fire code height - 75'

Fire Truck Turn-Around
Steep Slopes: “Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) Ordinance 25.09
Defined as “Slopes with an incline of forty (40) percent or more within a vertical elevation change of at least ten feet (10’).”
The Process

Site Evaluation – Grade Change Across the Site

Section A

Section B

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Site Evaluation – Grade Change Across the Site

Section C

Section D

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Potential Buildable Area

+/- 137,000 sq.ft.

+202

+189 12,500

+160 63,700

+150 5,600

+140 13,700

+175

+130 40,000

168

---

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Understanding the Significant Grade Change Across Site

Whitman Court
EL: 175'0"

Fire Access Road
EL: 135'0"

40 BEDS

40 BEDS

40 BEDS

40 BEDS

AMENITIES

67'-6"

AMENITIES

AMENITIES

BUILDING SUPPORT

BASEMENT/PARKING

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS

30 BEDS
Site Evaluation _Non-Housing Related Structures

The Process

Site Evaluation _Non-Housing Related Structures

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Site Evaluation _Arrival at the North Campus

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process Community Connections _ NE 45th Street/Fraternity Row

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Visual Connections _ To the Academic Core and to Hansee

[Images of visual connections and paths on the university campus]

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Pedestrian Connections Through North Campus

Connection 1

Connection 2

Connection 3

Connection 4

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Site Study – Testing the Poplar Model on the Site

Hansee Hall 333 beds
Poplar model 260 beds
Total buildings 10
Total Potential: 2,933 beds

Hansee Hall 333 beds
Poplar model 238 beds
Total buildings 8
Total Potential: 2,621 beds

Hansee Hall 333 beds
Poplar model 260 beds
Total buildings 4
Total Potential: 2,933 beds

Site Study
Testing the Poplar model
Bed Count Target: 3,000
The Process

Recognizing the Site Challenges – Depth of Sites for Buildings

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

North Campus Student Housing Study
Testing Building Prototypes that Better Respond to Site Conditions

Residential prototypes with various building widths to respond to specific site conditions

Shared/double bedrooms with communal hall baths

Double bedrooms/shared baths

41'-6"
UCLA

47’-2”
MERCER

61’-2”
POPLAR
Mercer Hall - “5 Over 2” Construction - Adjusted for Hillside Conditions
The Process

Overlaying the Mercer Prototype on the Site

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Overlaying the Mercer Prototype on the Site
The Process

Testing Building Prototypes that Better Respond to Site Conditions

Retain McMahon Given Bed Count of +1000
The Process

Testing and Confirming the Program/Beds on the Site

Test Scheme

Mercer

~ 20 feet
~ 36 feet
~ 20 feet

~ 35 feet

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Process

Establishing Initial Guiding Principles

North Campus Student Housing Study
THE RESULTS: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Results

Findings and Recommendations – Connectivity Within North Campus

- Remove parking
- Extend Whitman Court - Consider as Limited Vehicular Traffic
The Results

Findings and Recommendations – New Fire Access Road

Provide hammer head turn-around

Re-grade road at maximum +/-8% slope.
The Results

Findings and Recommendations – Residence Halls to Be Retained/Renovated

- McMahon Hall - Renovate
- Hansee Hall - Retain as is
- Housing Sites

McMahon Hall - Renovate
Hansee Hall - Retain as is

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Findings and Recommendations – McMahon Hall Renovation

McMahon Hall – Ground Floor

Before

After

Highlights: Make entry floor much more visibly open and transparent
Reprogram spaces to include meeting rooms, group study, communal kitchen, lounges
McMahon Hall – Typical Floor

Before

After

Highlights:  
- Make all corridors public w/access to restrooms  
- Provide lounges/group study rooms per floor  
- Consider enclosing select balconies to create occasional floor lounge
The Results

Recommendations - Visual and Physical Connectivity

Between Academic Core and North Campus
The Results

Recommendations - Visual and Physical Connectivity

Highlights:

- Visually extend the campus axis of the Academic Core to the North Campus

Create North Campus plaza/overlook as visual and pedestrian terminus to Pierce Lane
The Results

Recommendations - Visual and Physical Connectivity

**Highlights:**

- Provide view/overlook opportunity, taking advantage of long range views to the Cascades

- Long-term, consider elevator as visual icon and connector from fire access road level to lower elevation and ultimately to East Campus E-1 Parking Lot.
The Results

Recommendations - Visual and Physical Connectivity

Highlights:

- Integrate indoor and outdoor spaces
- Create pedestrian ways and exterior plazas to connect regional amenities
- Consider providing controlled access from interior courtyards
- Provide view opportunities and visual precocity from within the residential housing clusters
- Maintain appropriate visual setback between student windows
The Results

Framework Recommendations - Preserving the Character of the North Campus

Highlights:

- Minimize disturbance to existing mature landscape both in building placement as well as during construction
The Results  

Framework Recommendations - Potential Program Distribution

Potential Distribution of Regional Amenities
Highlights:

- Further test concept of renovating parking to accommodate commissary

- Emphasize entry to dining from northern pedestrian connection from new residence hall, overlook plaza and regional amenities
The Results

Framework Recommendations - Potential Program Distribution: Parking

Existing Parking

Proposed Parking

SURFACE PARKING: 35 SPACES
HAGGERT: 160 SPACES
MCMAHON: 168 SPACES
363 SPACES TOTAL

SURFACE PARKING: 0 SPACES
HAGGERT SITE: 140 SPACES
MCMAHON: 61 SPACES
MCCARTY SITE: 140 SPACES
341 SPACES TOTAL
Existing Utilities Serving the North Campus
1. Utility Tunnel and Utility Lines
2. Water Service
3. Sanitary Service/Storm Drainage
4. Natural Gas
5. UW Campus Steam and Condensate Return
6. UW Campus Chilled Water

 Likely Required Improvements/Relocations
1. Tunnel and Manhole Relocations
2. Relocation of Steam
3. Water Service Rerouting

Electrical Service, Location and Capacities
1. Normal Power
2. Emergency Power
3. Recommended Improvements/Relocations
The Results

Existing Buildings

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Potential Regional and Building Amenities

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Potential Residence Hall Locations

North Site

South Site

North Site

Hansee

Mc Cahon

SOUTH SITE

NORTH SITE

HANSEE
The Results

Before and After Potential Massing

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Framework Plan Recommendations – North Campus “Edges”

Gate House Zone

Diagram 9
The Results

Framework Plan Recommendations – North Campus “Edges”

NE 45t Street Today

Highlights:

• North campus “occupies” a significant amount of UW’s NE 45th Street edge

• Conveys little of the character and quality of the University – feels like “back door” to campus

• Major pedestrian route from campus to University Village
The Results

Framework Plan Recommendations - Campus Open Space

- Organizational framework
- Orientation of through campus travel
- Identity of place within the region
Identity and tradition rooted in iconic campus open space system
The Results

Recommendations – Preserving and Enhancing the Identity

- Distinctive northwest character
- Topography / bridges
- Circulation through lowland Northwest forest
- View sequences: narrow alternating with expansive openings and regional views
- Clarification of the precinct’s place within the campus, the City and the region
Recommendations – Existing North Campus Open Space

- Iconic Northwest landscape
- Dramatic topography and tree canopy
- Regional views
- Historic buildings
- Organizational complexity
Clarifies / strengthens:

- Open Space
- Linkages
- Regional views
- Orientation
Recommendations – Integration of Landscape, Open Space, Pedestrian Circulation

- Web of connection / access
- Landscape influenced circulation
- Staged entry / arrival sequences
- Orientation
The Results

Recommendations – Framing Views

- Landscape influenced view sequences
- Expansive internal views: precinct orientation
- External views: regional orientation
Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Landscape and Open Space

A. Northwest Lowland Forest
B. Canopied Open space
C. Open space / Lawn/Hardscape
D. Regional Views
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Building Sites

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Pedestrian Access

Formal building entrances/addresses
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Pedestrian Access

Formal building entrances/addresses

Student movement between residence halls and between regional amenities

North Campus Student Housing Study
Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Pedestrian Access

The Results

- Formal building entrances/addresses
- Student movement between residence halls and between regional amenities
- Pathways from academic core to and through North Campus
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Pedestrian Access

- Formal building entrances/addresses
- Student movement between residence halls and between regional amenities
- Pathways from academic core to and through North Campus
- Belvedere, “grand stair” and transition space to regional amenities and lower campus
Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – Pedestrian Access

The Results

North Campus Student Housing Study
Building services, deliveries and entries to parking
PHASING AND IMPLEMENTATION
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

1. Phase 1
   - Renovate McMahon
   - Add commissary
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

Phase 1
- Renovate McMahon
- Add commissary
- Implement initial phase of fire access/service road
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

Phase 1
- Renovate McMahon
- Add commissary
- Implement initial phase of fire access/service road

Phase 2
- Demolish Haggett
- Construct new Haggett
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

Phase 1
- Renovate McMahon
- Add commissary
- Implement initial phase of fire access/service road

Phase 2
- Demolish Haggett
- Construct new Haggett
- Construct new belvedere/overlook
- Extend fire access road

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

Phase 1
- Renovate McMahon
- Add commissary
- Implement initial phase of fire access/service road

Phase 2
- Demolish Haggett
- Construct new Haggett
  -- Construct new belvedere/overlook
- Extend fire access road

Phase 3
- Demolish McCarty
- Construct new McCarty

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Phasing and Implementation

1. Phase 1
   - Renovate McMahon
   - Add commissary
   - Implement initial phase of fire access/service road

2. Phase 2
   - Demolish Haggett
   - Construct new Haggett
   - Construct new belvedere/overlook
   - Extend fire access road

3. Phase 3
   - Demolish McCarty
   - Construct new McCarty
   - Extend Whitman Court
   - Complete fire access road
The Results

Future Sites for North Campus Facilities

- A: Potential North Campus residence hall or community building
- B: Potential North Campus residence hall or student apartments as identified in earlier North Campus master plan
- C: Potential adaptive re-use of Lewis Hall as North Campus services building and/or other “regional” facility

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Future Facilities – Recreation/Long-Term

- Re-locate tennis courts to laboratory sites
- “Grow” and reshape Denny field
- Extend and enhance pedestrian trails, including Burke Gilman Trail
- Provide new site elevator, stair to connect recreation area to North Campus
- In short-term, “re-claim” open space ravine - improve trails, provide low level lighting

North Campus Student Housing Study
The Results

Conceptual Framework for Moving Forward – NE 45th Street

Long Term Improvements to NE 45th Street Edge

Highlights:

- Increase visibility of portals and pedestrian entries, maintaining NW “forest” yet marking campus entries
- Consider adding low stone wall near Hansee to signify campus edge and help screen loading
- Increase visibility of Hansee, using its architecture to signal campus character
- Consider adding low level lighting
The Results

Future Precinct-Wide Improvements

A. NE 45th Street Improvements
   - Landscape
   - Lighting
   - Low site wall
   - Screening of Hansee service

B. Denny Field
   - Remove/relocate tennis
   - Reshape/regrade field
   - New pathways
   - Low level lighting at edges

C. Expanded Green
   - Remove/relocate tennis
   - Create new landscape green
   - Open views to academic core

D. Transition Zone to Parking
   - Selective trimming/pruning
   - Improve pathways to parking
   - Provide low level lighting
   - Remove fence around theater pen space, visually opening it up to North Campus/Whitman

E. Extend Axis
   - Improve walkway
   - Landscape
   - Provide low level lighting
Next Steps

• Present to Architectural Commission – Monday, June 4 to request Concept Plan Approval

• Develop program and budget for Phase 1 housing project – the renovation of McMahon Hall and associated site work

• Begin architectural selection process for the renovation of McMahon Hall

• Consider updating the Campus Master Plan to incorporate the Framework Plan for the North Campus
Next Steps – Getting from Here to There

Current Built Form (as of the time of the Campus Master Plan)

Illustrative Potential Future Built Form
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