UNIVERSITY OF OREGON | Office of Campus Planning

July 11, 2022

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the June 24, 2022 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Ann Brown, Deborah Butler, Michael Griffel, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Janet Rose, Christine Thompson, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Cassie Taylor (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), Cami Thompson (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

1. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Framework Vision Project and Southeast Campus Design Area – Final Draft Review and Action

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review, discuss, and take action on the proposed final draft amendment to the *Campus Plan* related to integrating Framework Vision Project recommendations into the Southeast Campus Design Area and incorporate changes from the recently completed Hayward Field. The project description and background information were included in the meeting mailing.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, CPC meeting history regarding the agenda item, and the proposed amendment. Included were details of proposed changes to *Campus Plan* Principles 2, 3, and 12, and key recommendations from the Framework Vision Project (FVP).

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records are available on the project website at:

https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- The proposed densities, including potential buildings along University Street, do not necessarily require removing all existing buildings, however, they provide an allowance. E.g. Mac Court could be reused and/or part of a future project. The shift in the proposed densities is about scale; the sites along University Street can accommodate taller, denser, more efficient buildings. University Street also deserves attention in terms of enhancement, to bring the campus character to this location.
- Member support for amendment language regarding the proposed mid-block east-west designated *Campus Plan* pathway in the Southeast Campus Design Area.
- Is there a proposed group to monitor the pathway over time and take corrective action, E.g. if it is closed? If not, should CPC recommend a group?
- It is not in the purview of the CPC or Campus Planning to monitor pathway use. The goal of including the pathway in the *Campus Plan* is to make it clear that it is important from a use and campus planning circulation network perspective, and future projects should incorporate it as part of the campus context.
- The Hayward Field renovation project was designated a Track 'C' project by the president and was not reviewed by the CPC at the time. The result of that project exceeded the *Campus Plan* maximum density for the Southeast Campus Design Area. It seems that the CPC is now being asked to backfill a decision made by the president to circumvent the *Campus Plan* and the CPC. The *Campus Plan* in theory is what governs campus development. Is there language in the *Campus Plan* to explain this about Track 'C' projects?
- When a proposed project proceeds as a Track 'C' project, E.g. some element or elements of the *Campus Plan* principles are not addressed, there is an agreement that is stated upfront. The CPC received a letter for the Hayward project regarding Track 'C'. At the time, the CPC provided input and feedback. Track 'C' letters include clarity about which *Campus Plan* principles will be addressed and how the CPC will be involved (E.g., the level of review and type of recommendation for approval or comments).
- Recommend that Track 'C' letters, while they clearly spell out CPC involvement, also clarify when there's a clear deviation from the *Campus Plan*, and state the consequences of the unaddressed elements

[Note from CPC staff: The primary reason for the Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Framework Vision Project and Southeast Campus Design Area was not to incorporate the density changes from the Hayward Field renovation project, but to incorporate the Framework Vision Project recommendations into that Design Area to accommodate future needs along University Street. However, the Hayward project drove the timing of this amendment because of its impact on the existing maximum densities in the design area.]

Action: With 6 in favor and 3 abstentions, the committee agreed that the **Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Framework Vision Project and Southeast Campus Design Area** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the area southeast of the Franklin Circle Design Area – Final Draft Review and Action

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review, discuss, and take action on the proposed final draft amendment to the *Campus Plan* to incorporate the university's land southeast of the Franklin Circle Design Area into the *Campus Plan* to guide future campus development based on *Campus Plan* principles and to integrate Framework Vision project recommendations. The project description and background information were included in the meeting mailing.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, CPC meeting history regarding the agenda item, and reviewed the proposed amendment. Included were details of proposed changes to *Campus Plan* Principles 2, 3, and 12, and key recommendations from the Framework Vision Project (FVP).

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records are available on the project website at:
https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- The Franklin Triangle Design Area contains parking for University Theatre events. Will this parking be lost as part of the proposed amendment?
- The parking in this area is an essential function for University Theatre; consider with future planning.
- The need for parking for University Theatre is clear and understood. *Campus Plan* Principle 5: Replacement of Displaced Uses, including parking, is a requirement for all projects, even if as a temporary disruption. This would be included in future planning; there is currently no proposal for projects in this area. This proposed amendment is for long range planning and routine maintenance of the *Campus Plan*.
- Can the total proposed Franklin Triangle Design Area square footage (coverage) be applied to any type of development or is it limited to the square footages defined for specific uses (general building and parking)? Consider the wholistic picture of parking around campus; avoid locking into square footage that ten years from now might not be the direction for campus. Is there future flexibility in the proposed square footage (e.g., for academic use)?
- Is the proposed square footage (coverage) for parking vs. non-parking uses fungible, depending on future needs? Consider the campus goal of increasing mode shift, E.g. encouraging biking, walking and transit use.
- Proposed amendment writing does not convey flexibility; however, the intent is to have flexibility. Suggest a condition of approval to provide this. The reason that the uses are differentiated, in general and historically, is because parking structures must be a certain size to have merit and density efficiency. Additionally, parking structure levels are much shorter than a typical height of a building, so the GSF number is higher, but reflects the same size building (height) as an academic building. Campus Planning will reassess and ensure density equitability for both parking and academic buildings.
- Does Campus Planning decide the final sizes of buildings?
- The proposed amendment is establishing a maximum allowable footprint and gsf; these numbers do not describe what the specific size of future buildings will be, they set a maximum allowed.
- Does the proposed *Campus Plan* designated pathway shown assume the EmX station would move in the future?

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Emily Eng (Campus Planning) and CPC staff provided the following clarifications:

- The Franklin Circle Design Area has been identified in the Framework Vision Project (FVP) as one of the few suitable and feasible places on campus for a parking structure. This is why that specific use is identified.
- The density numbers should be fungible and flexible between the two types of uses; they give an idea of the overall building mass that would be allowed in the design area. For a parking structure in that location, there may be other uses on the lower levels of the building. These needs would be addressed during future programming and the design process.
- The proposed *Campus Plan* designated pathway is shown as diagrammatic and aspirational, with the concept of a pedestrian connection closing the gap between where the existing *Campus Plan* designated pathway ends south of East 11th Avenue, to where the existing *Campus Plan* designated pathway north of Franklin Boulevard starts. The specific pathway location would be assessed as part of any future development in the area. The goal is to improve pedestrian circulation and safety in the area, and provide a north-south connection.

Action: With 8 in favor and 1 abstention, the committee agreed that the **Campus Plan Amendment Related to the area southeast of the Franklin Circle Design Area** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following condition:

1. Reassess density for equitability between parking uses and other uses, ensuring the maximum allowed density for non-parking development (academic type or other), is not less than the density allowances for a parking structure (footprint and massing).