



March 3, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Emily Eng
Office of Campus Planning, CPFM

Subject: Campus Planning Committee Meeting, March 6, 2020

The next meeting of the 2019-20 Campus Planning Committee (CPC) will be held on Friday, March 6, 2020, from 10am - 12pm in the Ford Alumni Center (room #403).

Please visit the proposed project sites prior to the meeting.

All meetings are open to the public.

Agenda:

1. Campus Plan Amendment: North of Franklin Boulevard - Initial Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to have an initial discussion on the draft amendment work related to Principles 2 (Open-space Framework), 3 (Densities), and 12 (Design Area Special Conditions) for a *Campus Plan* amendment to incorporate the university's land between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River. This amendment will establish a framework of designated open spaces and major campus pathways, establish building density guidelines, and identify development opportunities and constraints. Following an introduction at the last CPC meeting (February 18, 2020), this is the second in a series of CPC meetings that will discuss and review this *Campus Plan* amendment.

This *Campus Plan* amendment is part of a multi-year, multi-step planning process led by the Office of Campus Planning for university land north of Franklin Boulevard. Previous steps have included the Framework Vision Project (2014-16), the North Campus Conditional Use Permit Project (2016-18), and the Recreation Field Location Options Study (2018-19), all of which have included extensive public outreach and CPC input. On November 28, 2017, the CPC agreed with ten members in favor and one opposed to recommend to the president the North Campus Conditional Use Permit be approved as a land use application to submit to the City of Eugene, with the understanding that a Campus Plan amendment for this area of campus would come back to the CPC for further discussion. The City of Eugene approved the North Campus Conditional Use Permit on October 21, 2018.

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

Please review the attachments for background information about the project. In addition, please see the following excerpts from Principles 2, 3, and 12. To review these principles in full, see the *Campus Plan*.

Principle 2: Open-space Framework

The Forms and Character of Designated Open Spaces

The campus is developed around a series of open spaces connected by pathways. This system is the framework that dictates the arrangement of buildings. Public open spaces are intended for use by the entire campus community. The *Campus Plan* refers to these spaces as Designated Open Spaces and Pathways (refer to Maps 3 and 4 on pages 29 and 30).

QUADRANGLES

(Examples: Memorial Quad, Old Campus Quad, Women's Memorial Quadrangle)

Quadrangles are rectangular open spaces that are formed by the fronts of three-story or four-story buildings on the long sides and by monumental buildings at one or both ends. Typically, axes cross a quadrangle, connecting it to other axes, quadrangles, or open spaces.

AXES

(Examples: 13th, Dads' Gates, Deady Walk, Gallery Walk, Knight Library, Southwest Campus, University Street)

Axes are longer and narrower than quadrangles. They serve primarily to interconnect other open spaces on the campus. They are typically rectangular and contain informal or formal sidewalks and plantings. They often contain a long view of the campus.

PROMENADES

(Example: Promenade)

Promenades are less formal axes that connect open spaces. They typically are large-scale pathways. Their plantings are largely informal, as are the sidewalks within them.

GREENS

(Examples: Agate Entrance, Amphitheater, East Campus, EMU, Gerlinger Field, Living/Learning Center, Millrace, Science, Southwest Campus, Straub Hall, Villard Hall)

Greens are significant public open spaces that are larger than a private courtyard yet smaller than a quadrangle. Some greens may share many of the aspects of quadrangles while others function more like plazas. In some cases the buildings surrounding them lack the scale that would give them the formal presence of a quadrangle. In most cases they are informally planted and may have an irregular form.

Principle 3: Densities

Development densities are established to preserve the historic character of the

university campus as a setting conducive to thoughtful and reflective endeavor, while at the same time allowing for accommodation of new facilities. To control the look and feel of the campus, no construction project shall result in a density in excess of the maximum densities established in the *Campus Plan*... A maximum building footprint (SF) and maximum gross square footage (floor area ratio) are established for each Design Area.

Principle 12: Design Area Special Conditions

Design Area Special Conditions shall be considered whenever construction is proposed for a particular Design Area (Design Areas are further described in Principle 3: Densities, page 35).

Design Area Special Conditions provide specific guidance for development and building use in the part of campus to which they apply. These conditions are organized by Designated Open Spaces because the university's open-space framework is the primary design element that defines the campus character.

Conditions for the overall design area are described in the following sections: Area-wide Space Use Comments, and Campus Edge(s). Conditions for each designated open space are organized by the following categories: Current Use, Pathways/Gateways, Form, Trees/Landscape, and Opportunities and Constraints.

At the February 18, 2020 CPC meeting, Aaron Olsen introduced the Campus Plan Amendment to the CPC. He provided an overview of the amendment process and gave an introduction about the Principles of the *Campus Plan* that will be amended (primarily Principles 2, 3, and 12). The following discussion points were made by committee members, guests, and Olsen:

- A guest stated that the planning process for the North Campus Conditional Use Permit (CUP) happened during the summer and holidays when it was difficult for faculty to be involved; therefore, she felt that engagement did not encompass a wide array of voices. Also, students use the land and so it is important for them to participate. She noted that some people were upset because the CPC approved allowing recreation fields north of the railroad track, and that the UO Senate voted against the CUP.
- A member reminded the committee that the CPC recommended approval of the CUP with a 10-1 vote.
- Another member stated that the Senate voted against putting fields in North Campus, and asked about engagement with Senate in campus planning process. Olsen indicated that the CPC is the primary review body for Campus Plan amendments. The CPC includes representation from the Senate.
- Another member noted that he is representing the Senate currently.
- A guest asked if the Campus Plan defines active and passive recreation, and suggested looking at the Whilamut Natural Area (East Alton Baker Park), designated

by the City for passive recreation, for examples and a definition. A member added that the Campus Plan defines open spaces as “formal” (designed for scheduled, organized activities) and “informal” open spaces (designed for more casual, non-scheduled activities).

- The guest asked if the Recreation Field Location Options Study was completed. Olsen noted that the study is complete, but he is still working on the final formatting. All information and analysis is on the project web page (and the report will be posted there when complete): <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/recreation-field-location-options-study>
- Concerning “areas unlikely to change,” a member asked if the development in the campus operations/power station area within the Millrace Design Area would be subject to CPC review. Another member explained that major changes (such as a new building or major shift to service circulation) would go through CPC review, similar to other areas of campus. Minor changes may not be subject to CPC review (although they would be internally reviewed by the Office of Campus Planning).
- A member noted the importance of considering the 7-minute walking circle in relation to the area to inform proposed uses, such as classrooms. Another member noted that the Campus Plan (and Framework Vision Project) used the 7-minute walking circles to inform proposed uses. Generally, classrooms are not encouraged in this area, except when associated with specialized studio classes and research needs (for example, the College of Design art studios).
- A member emphasized the need to think about providing the ability to grow Knight Campus programs as the needs arise, including potential classrooms serving those programs.
- Another member emphasized the importance of recreation fields, used by at least 4,200 students annually. She was also supportive about opportunities to move Outdoor Program functions to the riverfront because of the program’s connection to river recreation.
- A member reminded the committee about the importance of assessing each open space and to carefully consider what we are trying to achieve when we draw an open space line. The member also suggested assessing the benefits of extending the E-W open space axis shown north of ZIRC further east.
- A guest advised defining more carefully the kinds of open space. The ecology is different when talking about the river. A member noted that there appear to be four primary types of open space in this area. Olsen noted that the Campus Plan currently describes each designated open space on campus and will describe the unique types of open spaces in the area.
- Members advised keeping in mind the greater context, such as the City’s development projects adjacent to this area and the new giant student housing complex.
- A member appreciated the amendment will consider the ZIRC facility staying in the foreseeable future, a beacon to science research here.
- A member, who could not attend but provided written comments, felt that the FVP and CUP do not provide a fully satisfactory basis for the Campus Plan amendments related to the riverfront land north of the railroad tracks for the following reasons

(read aloud by the CPC Chair in full and summarized below):

1. The FVP does not specifically assign importance to the preservation of natural areas and to their enhancement. The Campus Plan gives no specific weight to natural areas.
2. The CUP permits construction of large, fenced, floodlit artificial-turf playing fields in proximity to the river. Now (during this Campus Plan amendment process) is therefore the time to rule out construction of artificial turf rec fields on the land between the railroad tracks and the river.
3. The FVP should be regarded as providing no useful guidance. While the FVP maps indicated the possibility of rec fields in this area, the FVP did not undertake a study of alternative uses of the riverfront land.
4. The UO Senate opposed the CUP application emphasizing the importance of protecting and enhancing the unique features of the Willamette River and associated habitats.

Please contact this office if you have questions.