

February 13, 2004

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate University Planning

Subject: Record of Campus Planning Committee meeting, February 5, 2004

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), G. Z. Brown, Cynthia Girling, Bryn Hammond Anderson, Bethany Larson, Rich Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Eugene Luks, Gordon Melby, Stephen Owen, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Michael Stamm, Greg Stripp, Mick Westrick

Guests: Mike Eyster (Housing), Rachel Force (Historic Preservation), Mark Foster (ZGF), Larry Gilbert (CMGS), Tim King (Facilities Services), Dennis Munroe (PARS), Rand Stamm (DPS), Fred Tepfer (UPO), Nancy Wright (Housing), Ayisha Yahya (ODE)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda:

- 1. Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places - Dads' Gates**
- 2. Living Learning Center - Schematic Design**
- 3. Living Learning Center - Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP) Amendments Public Hearing and Review**

1. Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places - Dads' Gates

Background: Staff summarized the applicable LRCDP patterns and policies related to the proposed National Register nomination. She explain that Dads' Gates are within a LRCDP-designated open space identified for preservation and enhancement.

Staff said the nomination was prepared and submitted by Rachael Force, Historic Preservation student. She explained that the university, as a public institution, does not have

the ability to concur with or object to the proposed listing to the National Register. As a state entity, however, the university does have a responsibility to play a role in historic preservation. This includes submitting comments to the State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation, which will determine whether to recommend approval of the nomination to the National Keeper of the Register. She referred the committee to the suggested comments contained in the meeting mailing.

Rachel gave a brief history of the Dads' Gates as described in the meeting mailing. She said the gates are being nominated under two National Register criteria--association with significant events and representative of a master craftsman's work. She hopes designation will give Dads' Gates the recognition it deserves. She said Facilities Services plans to repaint the gates this summer.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, staff confirmed that Lane Transit District was aware of Dads' Gates historic significance when it designed the proposed nearby BRT station. Designation will not affect the ability to proceed with the BRT project.

In response to a member's question, staff said designation will not prevent the university from proceeding with development plans for the area. The proposed theater addition site and part of the Dads' Gates are currently within the Villard Hall National Landmark boundaries. Therefore, the proposed designation will not change the existing requirement to consider historic resources in the area when making changes. The proposed Dads' Gates boundaries are about four feet on either side of the gates.

In response to a member's question, staff said grant funds are possibly available to restore the gates.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to forward comments about the proposed Dads' Gates nomination contained in the meeting mailing to the president.

1. Living Learning Center - Schematic Design

Background: The committee agreed with the CPC chair's proposal to first discuss the proposed Living Learning Center's schematic design while the architect was in attendance and able to answer questions. Review of the proposed LRCDP amendments would follow.

Staff reminded the committee that the architect and landscape architect introduced the schematic design at its January 29, 2004 meeting. In addition, background information was provided in the related meeting mailing.

Discussion: A member expressed concern about the design of the courtyard facing the EMU Promenade. She questioned whether the design focused enough attention on the EMU Promenade, a LRCDP-designated open space. She questioned how the courtyard would be used since, although relatively large, it is north facing and not very inviting. Mark Foster, project architect from ZGF, and Larry Gilbert, project landscape architect from CMGS, explained how the new quadrangle between the two new buildings is intended to be the area's major public space. Orienting the courtyard to the north allows the café to face the quadrangle and be in a sunny

location. It also minimizes shady areas along the EMU Promenade. The courtyard's landscape design includes an active, paved sunny area adjacent to the EMU Promenade. The interior area, however, is intentionally designed to be a quiet garden area because it is adjacent to classrooms.

In response to a member's question, Mike Eyster, University Housing director, said the primary café customers will be students on the dining plan (resident hall occupants). Mark clarified that the primary entrance to the café will be through the main building entrances along the EMU Promenade. Most users will pass through the building to the café rather than through the north courtyard. The café will be very transparent both to the south quadrangle and the north courtyard, providing views of the new quadrangle through the building.

Larry said access to the northeast main entry has been revised. Rather than providing stair access only from the east, stairs now wrap around the north side as well. Also, a new path from the north side has been added to provide direct access to the Carson Hall entrance. Steps will be required on this pathway to accommodate steep grades.

A member expressed concern about the lack of main entrance definition, referring to the related LRCDP pattern. The building will have two primary sets of users, resident hall occupants at the northeast entry (residence hall front desk, mail, etc.) and non-residents at the northwest entry (classrooms). He said it is particularly important to define the northwest entry for the non-residents looking for classrooms.

Mark said recent discussions with the Design Advisory Group identified similar concerns. He said the projecting bays that mark both entrances perhaps could be enhanced. He said the northeast entrance is the larger entrance and clarified that both residents and non-residents can use it. Residents will know to proceed directly upstairs to the living spaces, while non-residents can proceed to the café or elsewhere. The northeast entrance is marked by a large walkway bisected by 12 grass panels leading from the west. Although the west entrance is recessed to save an existing tree, it is designed to have equal prominence. Fred Tepfer, project planner from University Planning, assured members that this classroom entrance will have prominence, using as examples the Lillis Business Center secondary entrances that lead directly to classrooms. Mark said perhaps the project has achieved the concepts expressed in the Family of Entrances pattern, but it needs to better define the Main Entrances pattern. A member encouraged the exploration of architectural and landscape elements to better define the main entrances.

A member expressed concern that the service drive will interfere with the stated intent to create a pedestrian connection from the new quadrangle to Walton Hall and eventually Agate Street. Larry said this should not be a problem because the service drive has been redesigned to be on grade with the surrounding landscape; the previously proposed loading dock has been removed. He said although the drive must be paved to accommodate service vehicles, use of different paving materials can define auto and pedestrian areas.

A member emphasized the importance of providing adequate space for dumpsters

and recycling. Larry said the south building will have interior dumpster rooms. The north building service area has not yet been designed, but either an interior room or a screened area will be provided. He agreed with a member's suggestion to consider incorporating space for existing dumpsters into the design (in particular, the Earl dumpster located along the EMU Promenade). He also agreed to consider consolidating site needs to avoid multiple small structures (e.g., integrate the dumpster storage area with bike parking enclosures).

In response to a member's question, Fred said secure bike parking for the north building will be provided by a bike cage near the main northeast entrance. Secure bike parking for the south building has not yet been designed; either a second exterior cage or an interior room will be provided. He suggested bringing a finalized bike-parking scheme back to the committee for review at a later date.

In response to a member's question, Fred said it is not possible to determine a final site for the relocated tennis courts until the Arena project is resolved. There are three or four viable sites, but the best alternative is in the area currently proposed for the Arena. This issue will be brought back to the CPC for review at a later date.

A member asked why the sand volleyball court was not being replaced. Fred said the volleyball court does not have to be removed as part of this project; it is independent of this project and should be considered as such. If Housing would like to pursue this, it will come to the CPC with a separate proposal. Staff said she would research whether removal of the court would require CPC review. Typically, changes to the landscape are subject to review.

A member expressed concern that the design did not incorporate replacement of the basketball hoops. Fred agreed that the hoops are used and that it would be possible to integrate them into the site design or to enhance the existing east campus basketball courts.

In response to a member's question, Larry said the grassy quadrangle is designed to be a multi-use area similar to the humpy lumpy area. It will provide outdoor space associated with the café and performance space. A member suggested integrating more active recreational uses (e.g., the basketball hoops) into the area to accommodate the needs of 400 additional freshman residents. Another member said the humpy lumpy area is heavily used, and supported the design of a large sunny lawn area. Mark said it is possible to provide both kinds of open-space uses.

A member said the basketball courts south of the University Health and Counseling Center should not be expanded because it may interfere with the center's expansion project that may result in a new main entrance facing the EMU Promenade.

A member pointed out how the new student recreation center, the existing residence halls, and the EMU create a residential triangle. As the afternoon progresses, the area becomes more alive as students engage in recreational activities. The new residence hall should not decrease residence-related activities; instead its new open spaces and uses should enhance this triangle of activities. The Walton Hall courtyards are examples of what not to do; they are non-functional and non-used spaces. Mark said the new quadrangle is designed as an intermediate-sized open

space to support such residence-related activities.

A member was concerned that the proposed landscape plan will create too much shade in the area, which is in opposition to the Tree Plan's goal to provide open, sunny spaces. Larry said many of the proposed new trees are small patio trees that do not create much shade. The larger proposed trees are widely spaced and deciduous. Shade on the west side of the building is most important. However, he agreed that the number of proposed trees on the north side in the EMU Promenade should be reconsidered. The current plan would result in a mostly shaded area along the promenade.

A member expressed concern about the proposed removal of the red oaks in the EMU Promenade and encouraged Larry to research alternate schemes that would preserve them. Larry said he looked at options to save these trees, but the building's location and the need to shift the existing walkway to the north does not make it possible. He said extra care will be afforded to protecting the trees that will remain during construction.

In response to a member's question, Larry said the site drainage will be good.

A member questioned the need for the roof extensions on the stair towers, noting that they create a harsh, industrial look. Mark said the extensions originally were designed to provide service access to the louvers. It appears that they may not be necessary, however. The exact configuration of the louvers has not been determined.

In response to a member's question, Larry said "special paving" noted on the drawing would be something other than a standard concrete surface. Sustainable materials, such as pavers, probably will be used.

In response to a member's question, Larry said the landscape design incorporates many sustainable elements including a rainwater, and possibly storm water, catchment system. The captured water will be used to flush toilets and possibly irrigate (if the quantity is sufficient). In addition, the irrigation system will be weather-based and plants will be selected to match soil type and minimize watering needs. No on-site storm water drainage is planned.

A member stressed the importance of addressing parking requirements. Fred said the city-defined parking requirements will be met, but are not addressed yet because they are somewhat independent of the schematic design; no-on site parking is proposed. A number of options are being considered, for example, reconfiguring 15th Avenue. Once a parking plan is completed, it will be brought back to the committee for review.

A member said the committee should not try to determine specific directives for items requiring further refinement. Instead, the items should come back to the committee for review.

Action: The committee agreed, with thirteen in favor, one opposed, and one abstention, that the proposed Living Learning Center schematic design is consistent with the Long Range Campus Development Plan and recommended to the president

that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Revise the main entrances' designs to ensure they are well defined and prominent. Explore the use of architectural and landscape elements.
2. Revise the proposed tree plan and canopy in the EMU Promenade to ensure adequate open, sunny spaces are provided.
3. Revise the stair-tower design to soften the harsh, industrial appearance. In particular remove the roof extensions if at all possible.
4. Replace all or some of the existing basketball hoops on or off site.
5. Complete the schematic design for bike parking.
6. Complete the auto-parking plan.
7. Replace the tennis courts and prepare a schematic design.

All of the required conditions will be presented to the CPC for review.

3. Living Learning Center - LRCDP Amendments - Review

This agenda item will be discussed at the next CPC meeting scheduled for February 19, 2004.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Sheri Donahoe-Whitmore, Housing

Mike Eyster, Housing

Rachel Force, Historic Preservation

Mark Foster, ZGF

Allen Gidley, Housing

Larry Gilbert, CMGS

Drew Gilliland, PARS

Becky Goodrich, Straub Building Manager

Melinda Grier, President's Office

Ken Guzowski, Eugene Planning

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

Barbara West, President's Office

Dan Williams, Administration

Lew Williams, Foundation

Nancy Wright, Housing (DAG chair)

Ayisha Yahya, ODE