UNIVERSITY OF OREGON | Office of Campus Planning

May 31, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the May 14, 2024, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Ravi Cullop, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Amy Kalani, Diana Libuda, Carrie McCurdy, Eric Owens, Daniel Rosenberg, Hal Sadofsky, Henry Schadwinkel

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw Architects), Larissa Ennis (Community Relations), Dorothy Faris (Mithun), Ann Greenfield (University Advancement), Colette Lajoie (Student), Steve McKenzie (University Housing), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (Community Relations)

CPC Agenda

1. Bronze "Thinker Duck" Sculpture – Siting

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed site for a bronze "Thinker Duck" sculpture. The committee's role was to determine whether the proposed site was consistent with *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns (e.g., location, scale, maintenance).

CPC staff reviewed relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the process for art proposal acceptance and the role of the committee, art context, sculpture size, materials, and details, campus planning considerations, siting location considerations, and the proposed site.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Olsen and Ann Greenfield (UO Advancement):

Regarding accessibility:

- Member: Consider those who may access this art by feeling and not sight. Recommend creating a perimeter around the sculpture on the ground for people who are blind or low vision, E.g., ground texture bumps. Support for Braille to be included on the plaque for inclusivity .
    - Olsen and Greenfield: Similar to the sculpture in Portland, this statue will include a plaque which Braille can be added to.

Regarding siting considerations:

- Members and a guest asked if the following sites were considered for the sculpture location:
    - Chiles plaza,
    - The planting space near the corner of Gilbert Plaza and Lilis, out of the walkway,
    - The raised planter bed in Gilbert Plaza, or in place of the planter after removing the planter,
    - The area to the left (while facing Lillis) of Gilbert Plaza. (There is more foot traffic during peak hours to the right vs. left of the plaza),
    - The previous Pioneer Father sculpture location (removed 2020),
    - An interior location inside Lillis,
    - The north side of Lillis,
    - Sites around the EMU, and
    - The Memorial Quad along 13th Avenue, between Chapman and Condon.
        - Olsen: The location in front of Chiles was considered, however, was not preferred due to the amount of pedestrian traffic at the intersection of 13th and Kincaid. The plaza may be renovated as a part of the 13th Avenue redesign.
        - Olsen: The sculpture is meant to be viewed from all sides and pedestrian circulation will be considered.
        - Olsen: The planter is not an ideal location due to picture taking activities and ensuring the sculpture is at ground level for direct engagement. The planters in that space have a symmetry that reinforces that space; the desire is to not change the overall space layout.
        - Olsen: Part of selecting the right side of Gilbert Plaza was considering people entering campus and seeing the sculpture as they are entering from the west.

    - Olsen: The relationship to Lillis is a part of the sculpture's acceptance. There is a significance of the space where the Pioneer Father statue was located that would likely not be an appropriate setting for the duck sculpture.
    - Member: There is a smaller duck sculpture located inside Lillis.
    - Olsen: The space where the paths come together on the north side of Lillis was considered with the option of removing the grass and placing the sculpture at the intersection. Consideration was for the existing sculpture there and ensuring the two art pieces stand alone and read individually as their own elements. The south side of Lillis was looked at as having a higher visibility with adjacency to 13th avenue, a primary pathway.
    - Olsen: The focus was looking at sites around Lillis.
    - Olsen: The Memorial Quad is a historically significant open space; placing a sculpture in that area did not seem appropriate. The *Campus Plan* indicates keeping that open space and views open.
- Member: Has the placement of the sculpture been considered in relation to the big "O" (on the south façade of Lillis), picture taking, and pedestrian traffic at peak times?
    - Olsen: The backdrop of the "O" was considered.
- Member: Consider placing two campus benches at either end of the planter (moving one that is nearby), to create a gathering space and intentional seating area near the sculpture.
- Member: Consider the sculpture content and impacts of locating it in a place of prominence.
- Member: The Campus Planning office has considered the needs of the project and campus, while balancing all needs and considering students and this art as a part of their experience.
- Member: Does the duck statue outside of the Ford Alumni Center contribute significantly to campus?
    - Greenfield: The number of students for commencements, families, and incoming students is significant with picture taking, and it is a significant attraction. This statue located in front of the "O" would be a similar attraction.
- Member: The current site proposal seems out of context with the architectural design of Gilbert Plaza and the Memorial Quad.
- Member: The proposed location seems to break up architectural lines that lead to the big "O."

- Member: Consider this is a fun element as part of what makes a campus. Connecting this art with the business school will connect with prospective students and alumni.
- Member: Can the sculpture be incorporated into Chiles Plaza as a part of the 13th Avenue redesign?
    - Member: Implementation of that is several years away; those improvements are not funded and still in schematic design.
    - Olsen: The timing would not align with the acceptance of the art piece.
- Member: Has the mascot organization been contacted about the sculpture design? Suggestion to coordinate with (athletics).
    - Greenfield: The artist is an alum and has worked very closely with the university; this has been considered and Athletics has been involved.
- Member: Is proximity to Lillis a requirement?
    - Olsen: We will coordinate with partners in Advancement.
    - Greenfield: The donor is a Business School alumnus and offered this sculpture as leaving a legacy connected to their alma mater, and views this as a gift to students in a place that is popular and well-traveled.

Regarding sculpture details:

- Guest: What is the sculpture height?
    - Olsen and Greenfield: The sculpture is nine feet tall including the base.
- Member: Does the plaque on the sculpture indicate anything specifically about the Business School?
    - Guest and Greenfield: The plaque will be like the one in Portland that states, "A thinker duck will soar to new heights," "A gift from family."
        - Member: Considering a bronze statue, expanding the study area given that it is not a business specific statue would be appropriate, especially considering there are other student facing centers around campus other than the business school.

Action: With 12 in favor, 1 abstention, and 1 in opposition, the committee agreed that the **Bronze "Thinker Duck" sculpture siting** should be delayed until a future meeting.

2. East Campus Plan Update Related to the Next Generation Housing Development Plan – Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to discuss a future amendment to the East Campus Plan related to the Next Generation Housing Development Plan.
Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the proposed anticipated changes to the 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area (East Campus Plan), project timeline, outreach, history, existing plan organization, area context, and approach.

Discussion:
The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Olsen:

Regarding future building programming:

- Member: Will classrooms be allowed in buildings in this area?
    - Olsen: Like Global Scholars Hall, there could be classrooms, however, the programming of future buildings is not yet defined.

Regarding the planning process:

- Member: Will the plan refer to future building projects, or are future projects external to the plan?
    - Olsen: The plan update will have the opportunity to incorporate new findings and language from the completion of the Next Generation Housing Development Plan, E.g., potential future uses. The current East Campus Plan does not specify programmatic elements.
    - Member: *Campus Plan* Principle 12 includes descriptions of designated open spaces and opportunities and constraints, which will be updated as a part of this process, to integrate feedback regarding details for potential future uses.

Regarding alley vacations:

- Member: What is the definition of vacating alleys and which alleys will be included?
    - Olsen: Vacating alleys means alleys that are in the public right of way would be purchased from the City of Eugene. UO would be buying the land, and the city council would be approving the vacation of the right of way. This is needed for the Next Generation Housing Residence Hall Project and includes the alley between Columbia and Moss streets, and the alley between Moss and Villard streets.
    - Member: What is the benefit to UO in vacating alleys?

- Olsen: An example is 13th and 15th Avenues. Vacating an alley allows UO to close the alley to public through-traffic in those areas, and develop, in this case, a residence hall over the alley. There are still potential limitations, E.g., utility and access easements and agreements, however, it allows for more design flexibility.
- Member: It is converting the alley from a city street to UO property.
- Member: Does it involve a contract or a MOU?
    - Olsen: This is a city council process through public works.
    - Member: "Vacating" is the term the city uses when relinquishing a public right of way.
    - Guest: The city owns the alley; however, they do not care for it; it is the property owner's responsibility to take care of the alley.

Regarding proposed plan changes and timing:

- Member: Will the open space framework that is being developed by the Next Generation Housing Plan become a part of the East Campus Plan?
    - Olsen: As part of the East Campus Plan update, there will be a concurrent *Campus Plan* amendment, based on the Next Generation Housing Development Plan, which will primarily include amendments to the open space framework, densities, and Principle 12 opportunities and constraints.
- Member: Why does the Next Generation Housing Development Plan precede the East Campus Plan chronologically in terms of thinking about a vision for this part of campus?
    - Olsen: The first step is understanding what changes need to happen with the East Campus Plan and *Campus Plan* to accommodate current needs. Studying future needs, E.g., housing, and other institutional needs for the area will inform us of changes we should be considering.
    - Member: Why does the plan for the Phase 1 Residence Hall building site precede broader considerations about East Campus?
        - Olsen: This is related to project needs and timing; the project needs to be opened by Fall of 2027, which is why it is being planned concurrently with the East Campus Plan update.

Regarding building height, size, and location:

- Member: The proposal for the Phase 1 Residence building South of 17th is too big a building for the site. There are holistic considerations regarding the area south of 17th that have not been thoroughly considered in relation to the current plans for the building.
- Member: What is the language regarding a 4-story height limit near the intersection of 17th and Agate?
    - Olsen: The institutional zone references a 4-story height consideration, which is also a *Campus Plan* pattern. This is a notion of the scale of development for campus to consider. The 4-story limit is different for institutional buildings than what a residential 4-story building would be.
        - Member: Consider this for the whole area south of 17th.
- Member: Why remove the preference of developing along 15th Avenue before 17th?
    - Olsen: The plan currently indicates sequencing development this way unless there is rationale otherwise. As the next residence halls are built, the last development area will be between 15th and 17th Avenues.
        - Member: This seems contradicted by the pattern of development.
        - Olsen: When the committee looks at the siting for the second building, there will be a rationale of why that has to occur and will be proposed different than starting at 15th Avenue.
        - Member: This is an example of a current building proposal preceding holistic design.
- Member: What is the modification to the transition to adjacent residential areas?
    - Olsen: Currently, within the limited high-density residential/limited institutional area, there is an overlay zone within 60 feet along the east side (along the residential zoned properties) that indicates development withing 60 feet can be no taller than 30 feet. The current Eugene code for R1 zoning, with the middle housing changes, is a 30 feet maximum height. Therefore, the transition area that currently indicates development only up to 30 feet in that area, now matches what that adjacent zoning allows. The appropriate transition will be reevaluated, considering that that taller height is now allowed in the residential zoning.
        - Member: The question is not modifying our language in the transition to adjacent residential, it is increasing the height in the areas adjacent to residential.
        - Olsen: Modifying the width of the transition area will also be studied.
- Member: Will the height be increasing from 3 stories to 5-7 stories in the limited high-density residential/limited institutional area? Consider 7 stories feels too high in this area and not a graceful transition to the neighborhood; stay within 5 stories and maintain a residential feel.

- Member: Our primary accountability is to our increasing number of UO students. Support for students to not be priced out of housing because of the limited number of beds. This is more important than a couple of stories difference due to aesthetics, especially if predicting an increase in the number of students in the future. Be prepared and do so in a way that is sound in a city planning sense, in terms of density rather than sprawl, E.g. Bean Hall is shorter and takes up more space, vs. Unthank Hall takes up less space, is taller, and holds more occupants with reasonable room size. Support for tall, dense buildings near less tall, less dense buildings.
- Member: This is not a question of aesthetics; there are many aspects involved; there are sites available to build tall buildings north of the proposed location.

Other planning considerations:

- Member: Support for improving the safety of the Agate and 17th pedestrian crossing.
- Will the presentation be available after the meeting?
    - There will be a project website coming soon with presentations and meeting materials available online.

Action: No formal action was requested.