



March 21, 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the March 15, 2012 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Roberta Mann (Acting Chair), G.Z. Brown, Emilio Hernandez, Dana Johnston, Gregg Lobisser, Janet Lobue, Dennis Munroe, Roxann Prazniak, Chris Ramey, Greg Rikhoff, Eric Selker, Theodore Sweeney, Rob Thallon, Laura Willey

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

Guests: Vince Babkirk (Campus Ops), James Bartik (NSU, AASU), Martina Bill (CPRE), Dan Geiger (EMU), Larry Gilbert (Cameron McCarthy), David Martin (AC Martin), Lisa Petterson (SERA), Wendy Polhemus (EMU), Walker Templeton (SERA), Fred Tepfer (CPRE), Dana Winitzky (EMU)

**Agenda:**

**1. Erb Memorial Union Expansion and Renovation Project – Second Check-in**

Background: The chair reviewed the purpose of the check-in meeting as described in the meeting mailing.

Staff clarified the role of the Campus Planning Committee. The committee is responsible for addressing building and site design elements related to the larger campus context, not interior uses or methods of funding. Staff reviewed applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns.

Gregg Lobisser, user group chair, introduced the project. The proposed design would preserve historically significant portions of the Ellis Lawrence building, thoughtfully integrate new construction, reduce parking in the heart of campus yet accommodate performance hall needs, introduce a new bike-rider support model, exceed open-space enhancement requirements, focus on pedestrian circulation to and through the area, activate 13th Avenue and University Street edges, save significant trees, and improve access in the building and site for all.

David Martin, AC Martin Architects, and Walker Templeton, SERA Architects, described the proposed design as conveyed in the meeting mailing and further described at the meeting using a model and detailed PowerPoint presentation. The

**CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE**

underlying premise is to address all applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns as well as additional patterns specific to this project.

The refined site and massing design incorporates changes in response to prior committee comments. The base elevation of 440 feet would be used through the site creating a fully accessible site and transform the hidden basement level spaces into active and bright first-floor-level spaces. The primary diagonal pedestrian path through the site would be maintained, and there would be no building on designated open space. The pathway, however, would pass through the building. The intent of the pathway would be to provide a clear yet slightly elongated path (five versus two minutes travel time) that would entice people to spend a bit more time in the building. The redesigned proposed southern outdoor space would accommodate large formal events (e.g., commencement) as well as informal activities. The paved Onyx Street spur would be transformed to become a part of this open space except when needed for special event parking (about 10% of the time during evening hours). A new berm surrounding the concert hall would encourage casual outdoor seating. Sustainable design has been a primary factor from the very beginning—for example, the addition's orientation and atrium space provide ample opportunities for daylighting. The new north façade would be closer to the 13th Avenue sidewalk edge at the 440-foot base elevation, creating an active and accessible area (a new turn around is no longer proposed). To begin to activate University Street, a portion of the existing retaining wall would be removed and replaced with an enclosed outdoor Craft Center workspace. All parking on University Street from 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Johnson Lane would be removed and converted into a pedestrian and bike parking zone. The existing loading dock would be buffered by landscaping and a wall. Historically significant landscape features and trees would be preserved.

The design team described the proposed elevations as conveyed in the meeting mailing. The primary materials would be brick and limestone; the intent is to relate the new building to the existing building and the surrounding campus context, yet reflect the modern era. The predominant material would shift from brick on the north-facing student activities wing to limestone as it wraps around the new concert hall and south façade. The northwest corner of the existing building is opened up by adding a primarily glass first floor addition that would house the bookstore annex. This new addition would allow for a completely accessible path around the exterior of the building. The intent of the north façade's design is to reflect the base, middle, and top composition described in the *Campus Plan*. The addition would be predominantly brick with a flexible storefront system. Windows would create a syncopated pattern reflective of the existing EMU building and shaped to maximize daylighting as well as views. The special event multi-purpose room would be highlighted by framing it in limestone and projecting it out beyond the façade.

The concert hall would have a predominantly glass north façade in reference to the fishbowl, with the intent of creating glass bookends. A wood interior wall would add warmth to the building. The massing of the performance hall façade would be scaled down through the use of an exterior berm, window openings, and an exterior glass-enclosed stair.

Limestone and glass would be the predominant materials on the east and south façades, reflecting a more contemporary style.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of committee members' comments and suggestions about the proposed design:

- Ensure that the berm proposed for the south side of the concert hall is designed to accommodate casual sitting (e.g., appropriate slope).
- Refine the design and location of the south plaza west entrance to clearly convey its role as a main entrance, which leads to a significant public space and provides clear and direct access through the building. As designed, the entrance does not stand out as a main entrance, and it is not aligned with site lines or the most direct travel paths through the building.
- Provide a direct pedestrian route through the building for those desiring a direct path. If all travel paths are too circuitous (even two minutes versus five minutes) students may avoid entering the building at all.
- Explore ways to better relate the south façade's design to the historic EMU building and to the campus context as described in the *Campus Plan*. While a contemporary design is acceptable, the proposed design should be timeless and feel like an integral part of the University of Oregon campus. This is particularly important for a student center, which is the heart of student life on campus; it should be clear that you are on the University of Oregon campus when looking at the building from all sides. The current design, in particular the south façade, does not seem to do this—it is too boxy with limited use of brick. Landscape features of brick and limestone are a good way to link the site to the larger campus, but the building itself should also relate to the campus context.
- Explore ways to better relate the design of the concert hall to the historic EMU building and the campus context. While a contemporary design is acceptable, including the possible use of some limestone and other materials, the proposed design should integrate the scale and detailing of the existing EMU and other campus brick buildings. The current predominant use of limestone and glass does not achieve this goal; therefore, consider design options that feature brick.
- Ensure that connections to the streets work well.
- Continue to strive for universal access throughout the site.
- Continue efforts to enhance bike and pedestrian access on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and University Street.
- Ensure that the reduction of auto parking would not have a deleterious effect on the rest of campus. Ensure that parking and service needs would still be adequately addressed in this area and the surrounding areas.

In response to a member's question, the design team described the proposed bike parking locations, noting that limited bike parking is proposed for the south side because this is a bike dismount area. In response to a guest's question, the design team reviewed building access points on the east and south façades. Also they reviewed the intent of the cantilevered student gathering space on the north façade.

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. Vicki Arbeiter, Geological Sciences (Columbia and Volcanology Bldg Mgr)  
RaDonna Aymong, Environmental Studies (Columbia Bldg Mgr)  
Vince Babkirk, Campus Ops  
James Bartik, NSU, AASU  
Patrick Bartlein, Geography (Columbia Bldg Mgr)  
Martina Bill, CPRE  
David Opp-Beckman, Housing  
Gwen Bolden, DPS

Jane Brubaker, Campus Ops  
Linda Campbell, Linguistics (Straub Bldg Mgr)  
Kathy Cashman, Geological Sciences (Volcanology Bldg Mgr)  
Darin Dehle, Campus Ops  
Ben Eckstein, ASUO  
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning  
Dan Geiger, Outdoor Program  
Keith Gonzalez, Biology (Willamette Bldg Mgr)  
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning  
George Helbling, Psychology (Straub Bldg Mgr)  
Dave Hubin, President's Office  
Natasha Koiv, SERA Architects  
Harlan Lefevre, Physics (Volcanology Bldg Mgr)  
Garrick Mishaga, Campus Ops  
Wendy Polhemus, EMU  
Geri Richmond, Chemistry (Willamette Bldg Mgr)  
David Strom, Physics (Volcanology Bldg Mgr)  
Fred Tepfer, CPRE  
Dana Winitzky, EMU