



May 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee
From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
Campus Planning and Real Estate
Subject: Campus Planning Committee June 3, 2009 Meeting

The next meeting of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) will be held on Wednesday, June 3, 2009 from 10:30 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. in Chiles Hall, Room 228 (western part of the Lillis Business Complex).

Please review the background materials and visit the site prior to the meeting.

All meetings are open to the public.

Agenda:

1. 2009-2011 Biennial Capacity Plan

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to review the draft 2009-2011 Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP).

The *Campus Plan's* founding premise is that it is a user-driven process rather than a fixed image plan to allow for maximum flexibility to respond to unpredictable changes when planning. Within this planning framework, the BCP is created every two years as part of the preparation of the university's capital construction budget proposal (refer to pp 20-21 in the *Campus Plan*).

The BCP is designed to ensure there are continued sustainable and viable development opportunities by examining the campus's development capacity and the ongoing effectiveness of the *Campus Plan*. In particular, the BCP calculates the maximum allowed build-out of campus (established by Policy 3: Densities, pp 31-34) and determines whether adequate siting opportunities exist to accommodate future campus building needs.

Please refer to the attached one-page BCP. The map detailing the findings (referred to as Map 1 in the BCP) will be presented at the meeting.

Action: The committee is asked to review the 2009-2011 Biennial Capacity Plan and determine whether

- (2) in the aggregate, sufficient siting opportunities exist for the remaining identified capital projects.

CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE

- (1) sites meeting the requirements of the *Campus Plan* are identified for the first-biennium projects or, revisions are identified if they are needed, and

If capacity is needed or appropriately located sites are not available, the Campus Planning Committee shall consider amendments to the *Campus Plan*.

The committees' comments are requested 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. Lewis Integrative Science Building (LISB) – 2nd Check in

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to review and comment on refinements to preliminary site plans for the LISB project. Materials will be presented at the meeting.

As usual the project will come back to the CPC for formal review when the schematic design is complete. Any related proposed *Campus Plan* amendments will proceed through the standard amendment process (described on pp. 19-20 of the *Campus Plan*).

The CPC had an opportunity to review initial site plans at its May 6, 2009 meeting. The committee made the following comments:

- Ensure the campus's edge does not become more impenetrable. Explore options to prevent furthering the sense of a "wall" along the Franklin edge.
- Very carefully re-evaluate the proposed building configuration to find a way to maintain a ground-level north/south pedestrian connection from the Science Green to the campus edge. Overall, ensure that north/south pedestrian access through this area functions well.
- Enhance visual transparency through the building to allow views into campus from the public edge. Make it feel welcoming to open.
- Explore options to reduce the overall building size, in particular its footprint. Make full use of basements and consider additional floor levels. Pay special attention to the building's relationship to and distance from the UO entry sign (Agate Entrance Green) and the Franklin edge. The current proposal appears to be too restricted. Verify that the building would not extend into the Agate Entrance Green.
- Ensure the building is designed to take advantage of local climate conditions (e.g. prevailing winds).
- Design the Franklin edge as a functional and landscaped open space with views in, not as a buffer.
- Make the south entrance facing the Science Green more dominant and connected to the open space.
- Choose an architectural character that conveys an academic message by relating to the academic function and the character of other campus academic buildings. This is particularly important in light of current athletics projects that are under construction along the Franklin edge near the main campus entrance, which possess a unique architectural style. There is a need to counterbalance the strong athletics image.
- Ensure that the existing oak trees are fully protected – verify that the building does not encroach into root zone and that all precautions are taken during construction.

A summary of the CPC's action and comments from Meeting One for this project (May 22, 2008) is provided as an attachment to this mailing (see page 3).

Action: No formal action is required at this time. The committee's comments will be considered as the project moves forward.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Vince Babkirk, Facilities Services
- Paul Bloch, Computer and Info Science (Deschutes Building Manager)
- Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services
- Becca Cavell, THA Architecture Inc.
- John Donovan, CAMCOR (Lokey Labs Building Manager)
- Sam Dotters-Katz, ASUO
- Shelley Elliott, Biology (Klamath Building Manager)
- Emily Eng, CPRE
- Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division
- Terri Harding, Eugene Planning
- Thomas Hacker, THA Architecture Inc.
- Jim Hutchison, Chemistry (User Group co-chair)
- Lou Moses, Psychology (User Group co-chair)
- Bruce Powers, THA Architecture Inc.
- Greg Rikhoff, Community Relations
- Roger Snyder, HDR Inc.
- Cathy Soutar, CPRE
- Denise Stewart, Facilities Services
- Fred Tepfer, CPRE
- Holly Thaxton, Business Affairs (Oregon Hall Building Manager)
- Paul van Donkelaar, Human Physiology (University Senate)
- Bruce Wilson, Molecular Biology (Huestis, Klamath, and Streisinger Building Manager)

Attachment

Lewis Integrative Science Building (LISB)

Summary of CPC Action and Comments from Meeting One

At the CPC's "Meeting One" for this project (May 22, 2008), the committee recommended to the president that the proposed site for the Integrative Science Complex (now known as LISB) be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. As the building's location and scale are established, it shall recognize the need to balance the value of retaining open space, protecting the two significant maple trees, developing interdisciplinary facilities, enhancing the campus edge/public image, and meeting campus height restrictions.
2. The project will come back to the committee for initial review once preliminary siting and massing options have been developed.

In addition, the committee unanimously supported the identified key *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the committee's comments also will be considered as the project moves forward. The committee made the following comments:

- Work to improve the campus's open-space framework, pathway system, and public edge while accommodating desired development.
- Ensure that the importance of the public edge along Franklin Boulevard is addressed.
- Convey to the public the importance of the university's research and academic mission through design elements, open spaces, and buildings to counterbalance the strong athletic image that will be conveyed in the vicinity of the Matthew Knight Arena east of Agate Street.
- Recognize the significance of the two maple trees.
- Ensure that the campus edge does not become more impenetrable. Convey to the public the significance of open spaces, one of campus's predominant character-defining features.
- The Science Green is one of the few remaining open spaces visible to the public. If an open space is removed, it likely will not be replaced.
- Pay particular attention to the importance of the pattern "Positive Outdoor Space."
- Assess and address existing and projected foot traffic in the area when considering changes to the pedestrian pathways.