



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

February 23, 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
Campus Planning and Real Estate

Subject: **Record** of the February 16, 2012 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (Chair), Uri Farkas, Natalya Jenney, Elaine Jones, Gregg Lobisser, Janet Lobue, Sophie Luthin, Randall McGowen, Dennis Munroe, Chris Ramey, Eric Selker, Theodore Sweeney, Rob Thallon, Laura Willey

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (Campus Planning and Real Estate)

Guests: Emily Eng (CPRE), Matt Koehler (CMGS), Gene Mowery (CPRE), Bryan Haurert (PE and Rec), Otto Poticha (Architecture), Jeff Schaub (RDG), Carl Sherwood (Robertson Sherwood)

Agenda:

1. Student Recreation Center Expansion and Renovation Project – Second Check-in

Background: Staff reviewed the purpose of the second check-in meeting. She summarized prior committee comments and applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns as described in the meeting mailing.

Gene Mowery, CPRE Project Planner, introduced the project and explained that the focus of today's review would be on building elevations, in particular the south elevation and the pedestrian/bike pathway on the east side of the facility.

Carl Sherwood, Robertson Sherwood, described the project design's two primary areas of focus, which grew out of *Campus Plan* policies and patterns:

- Architectural Style (*Campus Plan* policy and pattern) – The goal is to unify the series of buildings that comprise the SRC and link to the architectural style of the SRC and the rest of campus.
- Dynamic Building (Project Pattern developed by the User Group) – The goal is to convey an honest expression of activities within the building so as to differentiate it from academic buildings.

Jeff Schaub, RDG, introduced the building design as described in the meeting mailing drawings. The proposal creates a unifying north/south interior corridor that links to the proposed new eastern entry and eastern views. The Design Team has been working to refine the proposed design in response to CPC comments. The proposed architectural design draws upon the following features found in existing campus buildings (Esslinger Hall, the SRC, Gerlinger Hall, EMU Fish Bowl, and Straub Hall):

CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 www.uoregon.edu/~uplan

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

- SRC northeast corner facade - the proposed entrance is similar in scale and style, creating bookends for the gable end.
- SRC gable end – the proposed large glass façade is similar in scale.
- Use of arcades.
- Rhythm of window openings.
- Established building base, middle, and top - the proposed horizontal datum line at the addition's arcade level establishes a base and other façade elements define a middle and top.
- Use of details such as accent panels

The project fully intends to take advantage of solar heating options. The large roof expanse and building use provides many opportunities to do so. The east entry opening has been widened and the recess shortened to make it feel more welcoming.

As requested by the committee, the angled cantilevered façade was assessed to determine whether it fits the architecture style of the campus. It is thought to be within the university's wide palette of materials and architectural expressions. More importantly, it serves as an honest expression of the building's unique recreational use, thus differentiating it from academic buildings. Also, it takes advantage of northeastern views. Sunscreens (possibly vertical elements) and other shading devices would be used to properly control day lighting and break up the large expanse of glass. Proposed building materials stem from the existing SRC – brick, ceramic tile accents, a standing seam copper roof, and aluminum window panels. However, alternate materials, such as metal panels, are being considered in place of synthetic stucco due to durability concerns (the existing synthetic stucco system is beginning to fail).

Matt Koehler, CMGS, provided updated drawings showing the proposed site improvements in three key areas – the intersection at 15th Avenue and the north/south pathway, along the eastern façade of the addition, and further south along the pathway. The revised drawings further enhance the pathway for both bikes and pedestrians by eliminating the jogs, widening it to 16'-17' along the new SRC edge, installing a consistent paved surface, installing special paving at the new east entrance, adding more terraced seating, and adding required bike parking.

Preliminary bike parking requirements indicate a need for 56 covered bike-parking spaces. About 35-40 spaces would be placed adjacent to the bonus room and next to the new building. Replacing some of the existing covered racks along 15th Avenue with more efficient bike racks would provide another 10-15 spaces. The project would shift the existing 48 uncovered spaces further south near the tables and water fountain.

Matt reminded the committee that the project's open-space enhancement requirement equals about 16,000 square feet. One idea being considered by the design team is using some of the open-space enhancement funds to improve the 15th Avenue and north/south path intersection (about 3,000 sf) and the remaining funds to enhance the north/south pathway, which is not a designated open space (about 12,000 sf). The 15th Avenue improvements (raised crossing and flow through planters) would help transition auto traffic to a narrower road width, provide better protection for pedestrians crossing 15th Avenue, enhance the link to the Emerald Axis, and treat storm water for large portion of 15th Avenue. The proposal would result in the loss of one commercial parking space, one permitted space, and two DPS spaces. Staff clarified that the committee was not being asked to make a determination at this time. A more thorough analysis including detailed information about the *Campus Plan* requirement and possible implications would be provided to the committee before it is asked to consider whether this proposal meets the intent of the *Campus Plan* designated open-space enhancement requirement.

Discussion: The following is a compilation member's comments about the proposed design:

- Refine how much bike parking is needed to meet the needs of the facility (not just required by code) and determine appropriate design solutions.
- Determine how to ensure a safe environment for bicyclists and pedestrians along the north/south path. A wide range of possible solutions was suggested including marking lanes for bikes and peds, widening the path, slowing bike travel speed, and doing nothing for now (wait until the pathway is constructed and then determine whether any changes are required).
- If the project intends to propose a shift of some open-space enhancement funds to improve a non-designated open space (the north/south pathway), demonstrate how a majority of effort will go towards designated open-space improvements. If a small percentage of funds are used outside a designated open space, the proposal may be more acceptable. For example, enlarge the 15th Avenue improvement area to address the entire intersection and better link to the Emerald Axis.
- Ensure that the 15th Avenue intersection improvements respond to bike access needs.
- Add more brick elements to better link the proposed addition to the existing building and the broader campus context, if funding allows.
- Continue to work to make the east main entrance clearer and more defined. Possible solutions include further diminishing the depth of the recess, adding a projection beyond the building façade (this also would provide weather protection), adding landscape features at the pathway's intersection (e.g., lanterns reminiscent of the main SRC entrance), or adding a marquee.
- A pitched roof (versus flat) on the projecting roof elements on the gymnasium is preferred.
- Resolve how the south edge of the natatorium terminates. Ensure that its design is refined in a way that addresses the human scale and relates to the architectural character of the building.
- Consider the potential for a green roof. Take advantage of the multiple flat roofs.
- Ensure that the proposed large glass area is divided into smaller elements to relate to a human scale (e.g., sunscreens, panels, and other elements). Use the southern section of the proposed natatorium's façade as an example of how to break down a building massing into elements that are human scaled.
- The angle in the cantilever does not work within the context of the campus nor does it convey the inside activity. The interior building use does not justify the highly unique character of the proposed angle.
- Consider the importance of providing a design element like the angled cantilever that pushes the envelope for a student facility. There is no use quite like this on campus making this a bold opportunity for the students to make a point (as demonstrated at recreation centers on other campuses).

In addition the Design Team and staff responded to member's questions.

- Jeff explained that replacing existing stucco is not financially possible as part of this project (small areas affected by construction would be included).
- Dennis Munroe, User Group chair, said that he is well aware of the potential to improve the design and quality of the existing covered tennis courts, but this would be part of a future tennis expansion project, not the current project.
- Emily Eng, CPRE, explained that the identified bike parking requirements are preliminary. Further research and assessment is under way to determine the appropriate number of spaces.

Action: No formal action was requested. The committee's comments will be taken into consideration as the proposal is refined and moves forward for further review.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Vince Babkirk, Campus Operations

Jane Brubaker, Campus Operations
Gwen Bolden, DPS
Darin Dehle, Campus Operations
Ben Eckstein, ASUO
Emily Eng, CPRE
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning
Dave Guadagni, Robertson Sherwood
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning
Brent Harrison, SRC
Bryan Haunert, PE and Rec
Dave Hubin, President's Office
Matt Koehler, CMGS
Charlene Lindsay, Campus Ops
Garrick Mishaga, Campus Ops
Gene Mowery, CPRE
Dennis Munroe, PE and Rec
Jack Patton, RDG
Otto Poticha, Architecture
Jeff Schaub, RDG
Carl Sherwood, Robertson Sherwood
Fred Tepfer, CPRE