

March 3, 2004

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate University Planning

Subject: Record of Campus Planning Committee meeting, February 19, 2004

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), G. Z. Brown, Bryn Hammond Anderson, Gregg Lobisser, Chris Loschiavo, Eugene Luks, Gordon Melby, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Christine Theodoropoulos

Guests: Rand Stamm (DPS)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda:

1. Living Learning Center - Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP) Amendments Review (continued)

Chris Ramey, University Planning, provided a basketball arena update. He said the project has been put on indefinite hold. In response to a member's question, he said he believes that the Howe Field area can be considered a possible tennis-court relocation site.

1. Living Learning Center - LRCDP Amendments Review (continued)

Background: The proposed LRCDP amendments required to accommodate the Living Learning Center were described at the January 29, 2004 meeting. The CPC began its review of the amendments and acted on the first amendment at that meeting. The first amendment--to allow an increase in density in Analytical Area 42--was recommended for approval by the CPC. At its February 5, 2004 meeting, the CPC reviewed and recommended approval of the Living Learning Center's schematic design subject to a series of conditions. Two proposed LRCDP amendments remain for CPC review (proposed text is underlined):

(2a.) Areas 41 and 42

These areas are devoted exclusively to residential halls and related activity and open spaces with the exception of Straub Hall [new text would fix long-standing inconsistency]. ~~Minor adjustments in footprint and gross floor area are possible, but for all practical purposes, both areas are considered fully developed.~~

(2b.) 1. Existing recreation spaces, both active and passive, located in these areas are essential elements in the residence hall program and are to be preserved and, wherever possible, enhanced. The removal of the recreational courts to accommodate the Living Learning Center is an exception with the understanding that the tennis courts will be relocated to a suitable site. Future development in this area also will remodel existing area residence halls in a manner that enhances existing, or creates additional, active and passive recreation spaces.

Staff referred members to comments sent by e-mail from Mike Eyster, University Housing (copies were distributed at the meeting). He was unable to attend this meeting.

Discussion: CPC members discussed amendment 2a. A member said the existing policy text that allows only minor density adjustments in areas 41 and 42 should not be struck as proposed. It is important to retain this policy text because it will still be applicable after the Living Learning Center is built.

A member said the record will show that the Living Learning Center project was an exception to the LRCDP, but the premise of the LRCDP should remain intact. Further amendments related to the Living Learning Center are not necessary since the CPC already acted (at its 1/29 meeting) on the one LRCDP amendment that allows an increase in density. Furthermore the CPC already reviewed and recommended approval of the schematic design with conditions. Members felt that the conditions placed on the schematic design expressed and addressed their concerns.

Staff explained that the text was originally proposed for removal because the proposed Living Learning Center is in conflict with it. The Living Learning Center is more than a "minor adjustment" in density. However, it was assumed that the amendment process would occur prior to CPC action on the schematic design.

A member said a reference to the one non-residential use, Straub Hall, should be added as proposed. This suggested change is not required to accommodate the Living Learning Center but to fix a long-standing inaccuracy identified during this process. A member asked if other similar inaccuracies occur in the LRCDP. Another member said this is uncommon.

Staff said the LRCDP does not contain a section that grandfathered in existing uses like Straub Hall because some other existing uses do not conform to the long-range plan for the area.

The CPC took action on amendment 2a (see Action section below).

CPC members discussed amendment 2b. Members said the proposed new text related to the Living Learning Center is not necessary for the same reasons stated above. In addition, the text is too specific for LRCDP policy.

Staff agreed that the language is more specific than typical LRCDP policy text. However, she said specific language was needed to accommodate the proposed Living Learning Center without modifying the overall intent of the LRCDP.

Members said the CPC already acted on the Living Learning Center schematic design so the amendment is not necessary. Adding specific language will only remind people that the exception was made, perhaps implying that additional changes are possible in the future.

A member said it is most important to note for the record that the project is an exception to the LRCDP.

Members discussed concerns expressed in an e-mail from Mike Eyster, Housing Director (copies of the e-mail were distributed at the meeting). A member pointed out that this was an opportunity to address Mike's concerns about the following existing text: "Existing recreation spaces, both active and passive, located in these areas are essential elements in the residence hall program and are to be preserved and, wherever possible, enhanced." A member encouraged the committee to remove this phrase since it is not an accurate statement as described in the e-mail.

A member said the concept of recreational uses is important to retain. The LRCDP must represent the good of the entire campus. Individual departments cannot be given jurisdiction over certain campus areas with the ability to apply different policies. The statement is important to retain because it triggers discussion and CPC review.

A member suggested removing the phrase "in the residence hall program" to retain the intent of the policy but remove the direct reference to Housing. The LRCDP should not prescribe what residential uses are required for residence halls.

Another member suggested retaining the connection to residence halls but softening the language to convey that recreational uses are not tied solely to residence halls.

A member expressed concern about how the current text states that "existing" recreational uses are "essential" to the residence hall program and must be "preserved." This may have been true in 1991, but Mike's e-mail clearly states that this is not the case today. Another member added that tennis courts are not a primary recreational asset to the residence-hall program.

The CPC took action on amendment 2b (see the Action section below).

The CPC reviewed a draft letter to the president prepared by a member to determine if the committee as a whole wanted to endorse it. The letter addresses concerns about the Living Learning Center planning and decision-making process with hopes that the situation will not be repeated (copies of the letter were distributed to members at the meeting).

The letter's author said the letter is intended to represent a minority opinion since a majority of the CPC approved the LRCDP density increase to accommodate the Living Learning Center. It was not originally written to come from the entire CPC.

A member said he agrees with the stated concerns in general, but believes he is not able to support a letter that specifically addresses the Living Learning Center project since he voted to approve the density increase. If members were against the siting, they could have made this clear through their vote against the density increase. He encouraged revising the letter to express the concerns in general terms.

A member noted that even if CPC members voted in favor of the density increase, it is important to point out that the normal planning and decision-making process was not followed. A member added that the CPC was asked for input about the siting twice during the preliminary planning stage. Both times it thoughtfully stated its concerns about the selected site to housing and the president. However, the CPC was not asked to formally recommend a final action until after the siting decision was already made by administration. This made the CPC's ultimate action ineffective. At this point, it is most important to ensure that this does not happen again.

A member said the eventual design took into account the CPC's concerns. The design was revised to come closer to meeting the LRCDP policies. Other members did not agree.

A member said it is most appropriate for concerns about the planning and decision-making process to come from the CPC. The University Senate expressed similar concerns when the arena siting decision was made.

Staff confirmed that individual members could submit comments as long as they clearly indicate they are not representing the CPC.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to recommend approval of the following proposed LRCDP amendment 2a to the president:

Amend Analytical Areas 41 and 42 Level 2 Policies and Standards text on pages 25 and 26 read as follows (proposed text is underlined):

(2a.) Areas 41 and 42

These areas are devoted exclusively to residential halls and related activity and open spaces with the exception of Straub Hall. Minor adjustments in footprint and gross floor area are possible, but for all practical purposes, both areas are considered fully developed.

Note: The last sentence of this policy addressing minor adjustments, originally proposed for removal, was retained.

The committee agreed, with five in favor, three opposed, and one abstention, to recommend the following LRCDP amendment 2b to the president:

Amend Analytical Areas 41 and 42 Level 2 Policies and Standards text on pages 25 and 26 read as follows:

(2b.) 1. Existing recreation spaces, both active and passive, located in these areas are essential elements ~~in the residence hall program~~ and are to be preserved and, wherever possible, enhanced.

Note: The proposed addition to this policy addressing removal of recreational courts to accommodate the Living Learning Center was not added.

The committee did not agree, with three in favor, five opposed, and one abstention, to endorse a letter about the Living Learning Center planning process from the CPC to the president.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Mike Eyster, Housing

Mark Foster, ZGF

Allen Gidley, Housing

Larry Gilbert, CMGS

Drew Gilliland, PARS

Becky Goodrich, Straub Building Manager

John Hollan, Housing

Tim King, Facilities Services

Anne Leavitt, Student Affairs

Steve McBride, Athletics

Dennis Munroe, PARS

Jeff Nelson, Fairmount Neighbors

Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning

Peg Peters, South University Neighbors

Karen Sprague, Undergraduate Studies

Rand Stamm, Public Safety

Kristen Taylor, Fairmount Neighbors

Fred Tepfer, University Planning

Zachary Vishanoff

Dan Williams, Administration

Lew Williams, Foundation

Nancy Wright, Housing (DAG chair)