



May 24, 2006

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the May 11, 2006 CPC Meeting and DR Meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Patti Hachten, Stan Jones, Douglas Kennett,
Andrea Matthews, Gregg Lobisser, Andrzej Proskurowski,
Chris Ramey, Greg Stripp

Guests: Jane Brubaker (Facilities Services), Tim King (Facilities Services),
Cathy Soutar (University Planning)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Campus Planning Committee:

1. 2006-2007 Biennial Capacity Plan

Background: Cathy Soutar from the University Planning Office described the purpose of the Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP) and the role of the CPC as described in the meeting mailing. She said the BCP was atypical this year; the *Campus Plan* was updated last year causing a one-year delay in the completion of the BCP.

The overall goal of the study is to confirm that projected growth needs are in line with *Campus Plan* policies, in particular, Policy 3: Densities. Since the *Campus Plan* was just updated, it is no surprise that future growth projections do not challenge any of the allowed density levels.

Cathy distributed a summary of the previously approved capital projects and proposed projects for the next biennium (2007-2009) and post-2009.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, Cathy said capacity exists for development in all Design Areas. Design Area D: Sciences and Oregon Hall is the fullest, and the proposed Integrative Sciences building project will use all available capacity.

In response to a member's question, Cathy said proposed buildings assume a four-story limit. The Integrative Sciences building is listed as five stories because it would have a basement level.

UNIVERSITY PLANNING OFFICE

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 www.uoregon.edu/~uplan

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

Cathy confirmed that all previously approved projects (those listed on the summary of projects distributed at the meeting) are included in the BCP density calculations. However, some earlier projects that were identified as a general need but not formally authorized have been removed from the map because they are no longer identified as a general need.

A member expressed concern about approving the BCP map that is intentionally general, yet may become, by default, a basis for future building siting and design decisions. Staff suggested adding a clarifying statement to the committee's motion explaining that approval is provided with the understanding that the CPC will have an opportunity to review the proposed projects at a future date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are met (this suggested text was provided in the meeting mailing).

A member said the action should clarify that the committee did not review the entire BCP report.

Action: The committee reviewed the Executive Summary of the 2006-2007 Biennial Capacity Plan and agreed unanimously that, with regard to the relevant *Campus Plan* policies and patterns:

- (1) sites meeting the requirements of the *Campus Plan* are identified for the first-biennium projects, and
- (2) in the aggregate, sufficient siting opportunities exist for the remaining identified capital projects.

The committee's comments are provided with the understanding that the CPC will have an opportunity to review the proposed projects at a future date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are met.

2. Capital Construction Budget Request 2007-2013

Background: Cathy described the purpose of the Capital Construction Budget Request and the role of the CPC as described in the meeting mailing.

Cathy clarified that the committee is being asked to review only the first-biennium projects. She referred to the summary of first-biennium projects identified in the list distributed at the meeting.

Discussion: A member expressed concern about making a motion that implies that committee reviewed the entire Capital Construction Budget request when it only reviewed the first-biennium Capital Construction Projects (and associated maps). Staff explained that the requested action items specify that the committee is asked only to comment on particular aspects of the budget request as they apply to the *Campus Plan* and the role of the CPC. The motion can be stated in a manner that clarifies which portions of the document the CPC reviewed.

Members discussed ways to improve the understanding of the CPC's role with respect to the BCP and the Capital Construction Budget Request. Some suggested a simple quantitative approach while others preferred the visual map and a list of projects. A combination of both is perhaps the best.

Action: The committee reviewed the proposed first biennium projects identified in the 2007-2013 Capital Construction Budget Request and agreed with eight in favor and one abstention that, with regard to the relevant *Campus Plan* policies and patterns:

- (1) sufficient land exists, in aggregate, to accommodate the prioritized first-biennium capital construction projects,
- (2) each capital building project proposed for funding in the first biennium has siting opportunities that are consistent with the *Campus Plan*, and

The committee's comments are provided with the understanding that the CPC will have an opportunity to review the proposed projects at a future date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are met.

Design Review Subcommittee

3. Lawrence Hall Courtyard – Schematic Design

Background: Staff summarized applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns.

Stan Jones from Landscape Architecture described the overall concept to remodel the Lawrence Hall courtyard as described in the meeting mailing. He said students are developing the schematic design as part of a design/build studio. It will be completed at the end of this term.

The trees will be preserved, but all other elements (paving, the fountain, etc.) will be removed and replaced with new materials that are more cohesive with the area's use and circulation patterns. New paving will have concrete banding that ties to the building's column grid pattern. Concrete will be used in high traffic areas, while pavers and perhaps gravel will be used in between the banding elsewhere.

The proposed design also better addresses ADA access. New ADA ramps will be built with a slope less than five percent to avoid the need for handrails.

The project will be completed in phases as funds become available. The first phase will take place this summer and replace the central paved area and possibly the east and west entry areas. Later phases may include building additions on the east side and a fountain. Staff clarified that the committee is not being asked to review these future phases.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, Stan said patio seating is being considered along the north edge.

Members stressed the importance of having an arborist review the proposed alterations to ensure trees have adequate root space. Members suggested using gravel near tree-root zones and concrete in heavy pedestrian traffic areas. Tim King, Campus and Grounds, supported the use of gravel near the northern tree-planting area even though maintenance will be more difficult; the health of the trees is of primary importance. Stan said the planting area will be enlarged to address current problems.

A member said the primary problem with the current courtyard design is that

it consists of unrelated components. He expressed concern that the proposed phased approach for the new design would result in a similar effect, thus recreating the problem. Stan said there is significant motivation to complete the project. A member said the first phase should work with or without future phases.

A member questioned whether there is room to construct a ramp with less than a five percent grade. He encouraged Stan to verify the grades and available space.

Members agreed that more detail is needed for them to review the proposed design. Stan agreed and said he would bring the design back for subcommittee review once the students have completed their design work. A member said it was particularly important to provide additional design information about *Campus Plan* issues – circulation patterns, ADA accessibility, tree protection, and connection to the Old Campus Quadrangle.

Action: No formal action was taken. The project will come back for Design Review Subcommittee review when the schematic design is complete.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services
- Peter Keyes, Architecture (University Senate)
- Tim King, Facilities Services
- Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning
- Michael Smith, AAA Building Manager
- Cathy Soutar, University Planning