

June 1, 2004

## MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate University Planning

Subject: **Record** of Campus Planning Committee meeting, May 26, 2004

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), G. Z. Brown, Garry Fritz, Gregg Lobisser, Chris Loschiavo, Gordon Melby, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Michael Stamm, Christine Theodoropoulos

Guests: Tim Akinoff (Student), Noelani Baker (student), Jane Brubaker (Facilities Services), Gwen Jansen (UHCC), Tim King (Facilities Services), Anne Mattson (UHCC), Jessica Nail (student), Tom Ryan (UHCC), Cathy Soutar (University Planning)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

### **Agenda:**

#### **1. UO 2005 —2007 Capital Construction Budget Request**

#### **2. University Health and Counseling Center Expansion and Alterations Project - Preliminary Review**

#### **3. Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election**

#### **1. UO 2005 —2007 Capital Construction Budget Request**

**Background:** Cathy Soutar, University Planning, described the Capital Construction Budget process and reviewed the projects contained in the budget request as summarized in the meeting mailing.

Cathy said the proposed Integrative Science Complex is the only project that exceeds allowed Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRDCP) densities. This is because the project's size has grown since it was last considered in the Biennial Implementation Plan. In addition, the existing density of Columbia Hall was overlooked when the LRCDP was created, resulting in less available density than

originally intended in Analytical Area 14 (46,409 gsf). However, the size of the proposed Integrative Science Complex (100,000 gsf) would still exceed the originally intended available density (83,964 gsf ) by about 16,000 gsf.

**Discussion:** In response to a member's question, Cathy said previously authorized projects not yet built are not accounted for in the aggregate available density. She said she was sure, however, that there was plenty of remaining available density to cover these projects. A member added that it is difficult to know which projects to include in the density analysis because project status changes regularly. Cathy said it would be possible, in future reviews, to account for previously authorized projects that are still active (authorized within the past six years).

Staff explained that the relocated tennis courts are not addressed in the density analysis because they will not generate additional building density.

A member questioned why the Analytical Area 14 boundary bisects Pacific Hall. Another member explained that Analytical Area boundaries are based upon disciplines. The first member responded that use-based boundaries may make sense for academic planning purposes, but not for campus planning and design purposes. Buildings and open spaces should not be divided into different Analytical Areas.

Staff said the Capital Construction Budget is presented to the CPC to identify potential LRCDP conflicts and provide comments to the president to help prepare for potential issues.

A member said the proposed increased density in the sciences area (Analytical Area 14) is an issue. It is already the densest area of campus, and, if the entire campus becomes that dense, the university will have to do things differently, for example consolidate parking to structures and build in a denser pattern. This is not necessarily a good idea. Even if this one area increases beyond the allowed density, change would have to occur to accommodate and compensate for it. For example, perhaps less efficient, smaller buildings in the area, such as Volcanology, would need to be replaced. Another alternative would be denser development in an adjacent analytical area. The desired alternative is to look for opportunities to make improvements to the area while meeting the science-project needs and the LRCDP.

Another member echoed concerns about added density, clarifying that it is a serious concern. Although it may not seem like an additional 16,000 gsf is much, continual, incremental changes add up quickly. A detailed study to determine the effects of the proposed additional density and the potential for mitigation should be required prior to considering a LRCDP amendment. The goal of the proposed area study should be to find ways to meet the science-project goals without requiring an amendment to the LRCDP.

A member questioned why the CPC is being asked to review potential density impacts of capital construction projects if other projects, such as the Arena, can be independently proposed and do not comply with the LRCDP. Thoughtful planning takes a considerable amount of staff and CPC-member time, but this effort is wasted if the LRCDP patterns and policies are not followed by all projects.

Another member said this is an opportunity for the CPC to express its thanks to the president for the opportunity to comment, because it is very important for all projects to follow the LRCDP. Another member added that the CPC's comments should emphasize how important it is for all projects to follow the LRCDP regardless of the source of funding and project type. The intention of the LRCDP is to create a wonderful campus of which we all can be proud.

A member said other than the Integrative Science Complex, the Capital Construction budget appears fine.

Members agreed that the committee's comments should be provided to the president in the form of a letter from the chair. The chair will contact members for assistance as needed.

A member noted that a review of existing uses in Analytical Area 14 should be included in the study to determine if there are more appropriate locations elsewhere that would free up needed space. Another member confirmed that it would be included.

**Action:** The committee unanimously agreed to authorize the chair to send a letter to the president with the following comments about the Capital Construction budget:

1. Express appreciation for the opportunity to review and comment on the 2005-2007 Capital Construction Budget Request because it is very important for all projects to follow the LRCDP regardless of the source of funding and project type. The intention of the LRCDP is to create a wonderful campus of which we all can be proud.
2. State that the committee reviewed the 2005-2007 Capital Construction Budget Request and, based upon the relevant LRCDP policies and patterns in the Land Development, determined that:
  - a. there is, in aggregate, sufficient land to accommodate the proposed 2005 - 2007 capital construction development,
  - b. there are siting opportunities identified for each capital building project proposed for funding that meet the LRCDP density requirements, with the exception of the Integrative Science Complex (discussed below), and
  - c. the proposed projects have siting opportunities that are consistent with the analytical area land-use provisions.
1. Express serious concern about the proposed size of the Integrative Science Complex, which would require a LRCDP amendment to increase the allowed density in Analytical Area 14 (currently the densest area of campus).
2. Require a detailed study to determine the effects of the proposed additional density in Analytical Area 14 and the potential for mitigation prior to considering a LRCDP amendment. The goal of the proposed area study should be to find ways to meet the science-project goals without requiring an amendment to the LRCDP.
3. Note that the committee provides these comments with the understanding that it will have an opportunity to review the proposed projects at a future date to ensure that all LRCDP patterns and policies are met.

## 2. University Health and Counseling Center (UHCC) Expansion and Alterations Project - Preliminary Review

**Background:** Staff reviewed the applicable LRCDP patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing.

Anne Mattson, University Health Center and User Group co-chair for the UHCC, introduced the project as described in the meeting mailing. She provided a brief history of the building's use and described the Health Center's needs for the project.

Gwen Jansen, University Counseling Center, reviewed the Counseling Center's needs for the project and pointed out the need for additional space and the importance of establishing a main entrance for the center.

Cathy described some of the initial expansion ideas. Establishing a universal main entrance on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a primary project goal, as well as establishing a connection with the EMU Promenade.

The current building is 39,000 gsf and the proposed expansion is about 10,000/11,000 gsf. Preliminary ideas include an addition to the northeast corner of the building. Currently, the buildings in the area do not relate to one another or establish an entrance/gateway. The proposed addition would mirror the Oregon Hall building mass to connect UHCC with Oregon Hall and begin to create a sequence of connected open spaces as described in the Eastgate Conceptual Study.

A second proposed addition to the southeast corner of the building would meet programmatic needs. The existing basketball hoops may need to be relocated to create a new south-facing entrance.

Anne added that an overall project goal is to create a health and wellness resource center that is open and welcoming to the campus community.

**Discussion:** The UHCC user group representative said he has been impressed by effort put forth by the user group and architect to work together to create a campus-wide center that is a positive and inviting environment.

Gwen noted that they are trying to maximize the program with the limited available funds.

In response to a member's question, Cathy said the southeast addition is proposed to accommodate programmatic needs and to allow opportunities for new linkages within the building. The current building circulation is problematic and new connections between the north and south portions are being explored. A member added that the proposed addition locations relate to the existing building organization and the need to correspond with program proximity requirements.

A member said site conditions and programmatic needs should not be the only factors affecting proposed changes to the building's massing. Environmental concerns, such as day lighting and ventilation, should be integral to decisions about building shape early on because it is difficult to add these features later.

Cathy said the L-shape of the proposed northeast addition is intended to preserve natural light along the north side of the existing building. Also, it is more expensive to build against a bearing wall, and an L-shape limits direct connection. Finally, it provides an opportunity to create a new courtyard space.

A member said the northeast addition design should take advantage of the heavy pedestrian traffic at the intersection of Agate Street and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If the entrance is hidden on the west side, it will not be inviting. Another member added that the existing entrance is not very visible and supported the idea of a more prominent entrance. She also suggested softening the character of the existing oversized concrete walkway that leads to the entrance.

A member said the southeast addition allows an opportunity to create direct access to the UHCC from the heavily traveled EMU promenade.

A member said the Beech Street parking/Carson turn-around area should be considered as a possible addition site, because the area is currently underused and unappealing; there is an opportunity to make improvements. Cathy said all options are being considered. This area must continue to serve as a service area, however, so it is not likely to change.

A member said the existing three basketball areas are the most used courts on campus, other than the Bean courts. He said it is important to relocate them in the same vicinity. The problem is increased by the need to also relocate the four hoops on the Living Learning Center site. Cathy said the UHCC project will include suitable relocation of any basketball hoops that need to be moved due to the project.

A member noted that students experience the UHCC from all sides. The opportunity to reexamine how the service area is designed may result in added opportunity.

A member expressed concern about the small, narrow open spaces resulting from proposed additions. Historically, "box canyons" have not worked well on campus because they take up a large footprint and are not inviting spaces. For example, most of the residence hall courts are dead, unused space. Such courts must be carefully designed to work well. Another member speculated that three-sided courts (e.g., the dormitories) are more problematic, versus four-sided courts (e.g., the new Museum of Art courts).

A member said it is difficult to capture the benefits of potential associations with nearby energy uses when projects are designed and reviewed independently.

**Action:** The committee comments will be forwarded to the UHCC user group and architect.

### 3. Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election

**Background:** Staff explained that the CPC chair is either a member who will be serving the second year of his/her two-year appointment or a new member who has previously served on the committee.

Those returning for their second year include Charlie Brown, David Heeke, Gordon Melby, and Stephen Owen. In addition, Carole Daly has been re-appointed by the Committee on Committees to serve another two-year term.

**Discussion:** A member nominated Carole Daly and asked if she would be willing to serve another year as chair. Carole confirmed that she would be willing to continue as chair, but asked if others were interested. No one responded.

**Action:** The committee unanimously recommended that Carole Daly serve as chair of the 2004-5 CPC committee.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

c'. Tim Akinoff, Student

Noelani Baker, Student

Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services

Calvert Helms, BOORA Architects, Inc.

Robin Holmes, UHCC (User Group)

Gwen Jansen, UHCC

Tim King, Facilities Services

Anne Leavitt, Student Affairs

Anne Mattson, UHCC (User Group)

Dave Musgrove, Business Affairs (Oregon Hall Building Manager)

Jessica Nail, Student

Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning

Tom Pene, BOORA Architects, Inc.

Allan Price, Advancement

Tom Ryan, UHCC

Cathy Soutar, Planning Office

Rand Stamm, Public Safety

Kathy Wagner, President's Office

Lew Williams, Foundation

## **Nancy Wright, Housing (Facilities)**