November 19, 2004

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
       University Planning

Subject: Record of the November 17, 2004 CPC meeting


Guests: Greg Brokaw (Rowell Brokaw Architects), Howard Davis (Architecture), Mike Eyster (Housing), John Rowell (Rowell Brokaw Architects), Lew Williams (Foundation)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: 1. East Campus Framework Study - Presentation
         2. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction and Initial Discussion

1. East Campus Framework Study - Presentation

   Background: Staff reviewed the purpose of the East Campus Framework Study as described in the meeting mailing. She explained that the resulting framework study will help staff and future user groups interpret and implement established East Campus policies and patterns (described in the approved East Campus Development Policy). The conceptual study will not be subject to CPC approval.

   The study’s consultants, John Rowell and Howard Davis, reviewed the steps taken to prepare the East Campus Framework Study. Potential building development simulations were developed to test open-space framework solutions. When testing sequential development simulations, some basic concepts became clear:
• Open spaces have greater priority than buildings when establishing a cohesive character for the area.
• Streets are the primary open spaces, except for the middle of the super block (east/west streets have a different character than north/south streets).
• There should be a range of connected open space sizes.
• The obvious place for parking is in the middle of the blocks (e.g., along alleys).

The resulting study is not a fixed-image plan. Images contained in the document are used to convey ideas and only represent one possible outcome. John and Howard explained that the study is arranged into three sections:

1. Overall Framework – describes the proposed large-scale organizational principles of the east campus and how it is intended to relate to the main campus.
2. Guidelines – describes how the design of specific elements is to be done in a way that supports the Overall Framework and results in successful places at a local level.
3. Design Areas – describes the particular issues regarding the principal places of the East Campus Area and how the overall Framework and Guidelines are to be applied to the design and improvement of those places.

John said the proposed design areas focus on streets since they are the key open-space framework elements. John passed around some draft versions of the document.

Discussion: In response to a member’s question, John said the East Campus Development Policy defines the Analytical Areas and the minimum required open space.

A member expressed concern about using narrow alleys for parking. John said the alleys are wide enough for two-way access if they are improved. He used the Graduate Village as an example.

A member expressed concern about generating more traffic by drivers searching through many hidden alley lots for a parking space. John and Howard clarified that the small alley parking areas would best serve local parking needs, while a larger central parking structure would best serve general university parking needs. In response to another member’s question, John and Howard said they do not recommend eliminating all Moss Street parking; rather, it would be limited to prevent a continuous row of parked cars. A member suggested using small parking lots for multiple uses if possible (e.g., a basketball court).

John and staff confirmed that the building mass and height are designed to diminish in scale as development moves closer to the existing single-family neighborhood.

A member suggested that the guidelines should incorporate the potential effects of microclimates. For example, east-west building orientations and possibly greater development on one side of the street would likely lead to substantial day lighting and ventilation benefits. John said the study did not analyze the impact of microclimates, but
the allowed building coverage provides ample opportunity for appropriately siting new buildings.

A member said main pathways should be defined to determine which should be lit at night, thus preventing the need to light all pathways.

Staff explained that the next step is to use the guidelines to help interpret the East Campus Development Policy when the next East Campus building project is proposed. The study ensures that we are better prepared when upcoming development proposals come forward. It establishes existing conditions and opportunities, and it identifies key issues to which the designers should pay attention.

**Action:** No formal action was required. The committee’s comments will be taken into consideration when preparing the final version of the study.

2. **Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction and Initial Discussion**

**Background:** Staff described the proposed scope of and process for the LRCDP update as described in the meeting mailing.

The LRCDP Advisory Group has met a number of times and is making good progress reviewing the first draft of suggested text changes.

The CPC will continue to be appraised of the project’s progress and will be invited to a campus-wide open house winter term. The committee will hold a public hearing in the spring before reviewing and taking action on the proposed update.

**Discussion:** No comments and suggestions were made.

**Action:** No formal action was required for this informational item.

Please contact this office if you have questions.
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