

October 18, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Buildings and Grounds Committee:

The Honorable Lewis F. Payne, Chair
Daniel R. Abramson
The Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein
Susan Y. Dorsey
Helen E. Dragas
Thomas F. Farrell, II
Adom Getachew
Vincent J. Mastracco, Jr.
Don R. Pippin
Michael Turner, Consulting Member
W. Heywood Fralin, Ex Officio

and

The Remaining Members of the Board:

A. Macdonald Caputo Austin Ligon
Robert D. Hardie Warren M. Thompson
Glynn D. Key E. Darracott Vaughan, Jr., M.D.
John O. Wynne

FROM: Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr.

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Meeting of the Buildings and Grounds
Committee on October 18, 2008

The Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia met, in Open Session, at 12:40 p.m., Saturday, October 18, 2008, in the Conference Room at Madison Hall; the Honorable Lewis F. Payne, Chair, presided.

Daniel R. Abramson, Ms. Susan Y. Dorsey, Ms. Helen E. Dragas, Vincent J. Mastracco, Jr., and W. Heywood Fralin, Rector, were present. Don R. Pippin and Ms. Adom Getachew participated by telephone.

Michael Turner, the Consulting Member from the Council of Foundations, also participated by telephone.

Present as well were A. Macdonald Caputo, and Robert D. Hardie.

Also present were Leonard W. Sandridge, Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr., Ms. Colette Sheehy, and David Neuman.

The Committee met to consider two resolutions tabled at its meeting on October 2, 2008 (see the Minutes of that meeting): "Approval of the Schematic Design for the Information Technology Engineering Building," and "Approval of the Schematic Design for the Arts and Sciences Research Building." The resolutions were tabled because the Committee had serious concerns about some of the proposed elements of the original architectural plans.

The Chair prefaced the discussion by saying that there is a need for better review of projects by the Committee before the projects are considered formally. The Rector said project architects need to have guidelines for work being done in "sensitive" areas of the University; he noted, too, Mr. Diamonstein's concerns that local architects be used for University projects. Mr. Mastracco said that while it is important to use Virginia architectural firms, the architecture of the University is of such significance that the "best architects in the world" should be encouraged to participate in University projects.

Mr. Neuman, the Architect for the University, said that guidelines for architects engaged on University projects are in preparation and could be ready for the Committee's consideration in February.

He spoke, too, to the need to clarify the Committee's review process.

After describing the "givens" for the two buildings, Mr. Neuman showed the Committee the revised plans: several architectural elements were changed, principally the roof lines.

There was considerable discussion: Mr. Pippin expressed concerns about the "porch" on the Engineering building, wondering if it would be large enough to do what it was intended to do, which is to shelter the main entrance. Mr. Abramson said the revised plans were an improvement, but he hoped the architects could add embellishments to both buildings. Ms. Dorsey commented that it is important to consider the buildings in the context of being adjacent to Scott Stadium. She said, too, she thought the "roof hats" were a waste of money and that the new plans for the Engineering building are not as good as the original. Mr. Hardie said he thought that in the context of the University, the buildings simply didn't fit. Ms. Getachew said she liked the

buildings and asked what parts of them were objectionable to Members. Mr. Hardie replied that he did not understand the expanse of glass or the projection of the roofs. Ms. Dragas commented that the scale of the Engineering building was too big.

The Rector, in summary, said the present designs are far better than the designs presented to the Committee at its previous meeting. Time, in this building process, is of the essence. He suggested that the Committee could live with the present designs because they are better than the original, though he wished there were more time to rework the plans. It is important to approve the plans now, but with the understanding that the architects will work to make the buildings blend in with other buildings at the University.

Several Members expressed the opinion that of the recent new buildings on the Grounds, Robertson Hall, the addition to Rouss Hall at the south end of the Lawn, is the most successful from the point of view of compatibility with its surroundings.

On motion, the Committee approved the following two resolutions:

APPROVAL OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ENGINEERING BUILDING

RESOLVED, the schematic design, dated October 18, 2008, and prepared by Bohlin Cywinski Jackson, in conjunction with the Architect for the University, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and Facilities Management, for the construction of Information Technology Engineering Building, is approved for further development and construction.

APPROVAL OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR THE ARTS AND SCIENCES RESEARCH BUILDING

RESOLVED, the schematic design, dated October 18, 2008 and prepared by Bohlin Cywinski Jackson, in conjunction with the Architect for the University, the College and Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, and Facilities Management, for the construction of the Arts and Sciences Research Building, is approved for further development and construction.

On further motion, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

AGG:jb

These minutes have been posted to the University of Virginia's Board of Visitors website.

<http://www.virginia.edu/bov/buildingsgroundsminutes.html>