



August 17, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the August 4, 2020 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (chair), George Evans, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Diana Libuda, Dean Livelybrooks, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), Craig Ashford (General Counsel), George Bleekman (CPFM), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Jen Miley (University Housing), Lori Nelson (Rowell Brokaw), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Greg Ottoman (University Housing), Ivy Pitts (Campus Planning), Kevin Reed (General Counsel), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), John Rowell (Rowell Brokaw), Ethan Shafer (ASUO), Carlo Yozzo (University Housing)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Housing Storage Building Project – Meeting One

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to hold Meeting One for the Housing Storage Building Project.

Jen Miley, University Housing Capital Construction Director, Carlo Yozzo, University Housing Facilities Manager, and Michael Griffel, University Housing Director, introduced and explained the project purpose and needs.

CPC staff introduced the purpose of the requested action agenda item as described in the meeting mailing, the tasks being asked of the committee, and the relevant key *Campus Plan* principles and applicable patterns to the project.

Emily Eng, Campus Planning Senior Planner, shared overview information of the East Campus Development Policy, and presented a detailed analysis of site selection criteria and recommendations for four different site options under consideration. The pros and cons were presented for each site, and the proposed site was identified as Site C, “Moss Alley South”. The Proposed User Group and Key Campus Planning Requirements were outlined.

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

#### **Site selection**

- Clarify the Villard Alley site location.
- Do any of the site options conflict with potential future recreational field locations?
- Regarding the proposed site, what is the visual and neighborhood impact of the building on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue?
- The proposed site is not adjacent to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is further to the south of Site C, and is not in view of 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Be considerate of future adjacent open spaces to the proposed site.
- Has the area north of NILL, adjacent to the east of Moss Street, been considered as a potential site?
- Site C is supported. With the planned open spaces to the north and south, it seems like a better choice because the area available for future development is limited.
- Is there any concern about the addition of large vehicle traffic along Moss Alley, running adjacent to private property? Are the property owners aware of potential increased traffic?
- Reach out to adjacent private property owners, including Don Dumond to provide information and opportunity for input.
- Site C will have lesser traffic impact on the neighboring childcare facilities that are nearer to sites A, B, and D.
- What is the long term plan for the East Campus houses near Site D?
- What type of worker activity will occur at the future building?
- Site B would require City of Eugene site review because it's within 100' of the private property; however, Site C does not have this same requirement?

### Proposed User Groups

- The College of Design representative is optional.
- Will this project return to CPC for design review?
- This project will come back to CPC for design review and a *Campus Plan* density amendment.
- Reach out to adjacent private property owners, including Don Dumond and neighbor to the south to provide information and opportunity for input.
- Should there be a graduate student representative?

### Campus Plan Requirements

- Why is the landscape buffer shown for the green spaces and not the residences?
- Carefully consider the transition between the development site and adjacent residences to the east.
- Identify the campus opportunity of encouraging demolition at 1802 Moss Street if possible, especially if funding is available.
  - Housing supports the removal of 1802 Moss Street if funding is available.
  - Follow-up with discussion between CPFM and UO leadership to assess costs versus benefits.
  - Removal of this residence would not only remove a derelict structure, it would have the added benefit of providing additional yard space.
  - Removal would increase the allowed density in this area, perhaps eliminating the need to amend the *Campus Plan*.
- Be sensitive to safety and security for this area and carefully address this in the design.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

#### Site selection

- Reach out to the neighbor to the south of the Central Kitchen to provide information and opportunity for input.
- Are the three houses near Site C part of university owned houses for graduate students? Would this building be displacing the backyard spaces for those houses? What is the impact of construction on those two homes if site C is chosen?
- Site C is appreciated as it is located further away from main campus, and the utilization of this area is appropriate.

- When new occupants sign their housing lease for their new home, any construction notice will be written into the contract in advance and occupants will be notified.

### **Proposed User Groups**

- Ensure that Housing reaches out to students involved in housing projects to get a student perspective.
- There could be benefit to reaching out to a College of Design graduate student, however, this is not a necessity.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Eng, Miley, and Yozzo provided the following clarifications:

#### **Site selection**

- The Villard Alley site is shown in the backyards of the residential homes, not the alley.
- The only site that overlaps with a potential recreational field is Site A, which is not a recommended site. The recommended site does not conflict with any of the considered recreation field locations. A recreation field would not fit in the recommended site.
- There will be a buffer to screen the building from the adjacent future open spaces.
- The open space to the north of NILI, east of Moss Street, was not considered because of its location in the primary view of Moss Street and has the potential to be used for larger-scale development.
- The intent of Moss Alley traffic would be to use the current traffic pattern.
- This proposed use does not anticipate frequent large truck deliveries. 1 to 2 workers will be utilizing the new building daily with very minimal large truck service activity (3-4 large truck deliveries per year).
- Site D has a higher potential for future development because of its location in the institutional zone and accessibility to the street.
- Site C does not require site review, it is located outside of the City of Eugene site review zone.
- The three houses near Site C are university-owned houses, with 1802 Moss Street being vacant. The new building would displace those backyard spaces.

- The construction method of the new building that will be used is a pre-engineered structure that has a faster construction process, so impacts to neighboring residents will be limited.
- A part of the project process is to reach out to UO neighbors; the project team will coordinate with Matt Roberts in Community Relations to ensure that all affected neighbors have been contacted.

### **Campus Plan Requirements**

- There will be shielding along the east side of the building that might not be a landscape buffer, it might be fencing or, more likely the building itself (which will not have openings facing east).
- Approval of Site C would require a *Campus Plan* amendment to increase the density using the FVP to help inform the increase.
- Housing is aware of safety and security and this topic will be revisited in the future, during the design phase for the building.

### **Action:**

#### **Site selection**

With 10 in favor, the committee agreed that Site C for the Housing Storage Building Project is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved. This is with the understanding that a *Campus Plan* amendment to increase the area density is required.

#### **Proposed User Groups and Campus Plan Requirements**

With 10 in favor, the committee agreed that the proposed Housing Storage Building Project User Group and Campus Plan Requirements are consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that they be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Consider a College of Design representative for the proposed user group.
2. Carefully consider the transition between the development site and the residences to the east.
3. Identify the potential removal of 1802 Moss Street as a campus-wide opportunity related to the project.

## 2. Barnhart Hall Site Security Project – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to review the proposed schematic design for the Barnhart Hall Site Security Project and determine whether the design is consistent with *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Jen Miley, University Housing Capital Construction Director, and Carlo Yozzo, University Housing Facilities Manager, introduced and explained the project purpose and needs.

CPC staff introduced the purpose of the requested action agenda item as described in the meeting mailing, the tasks being asked of the committee, and the relevant key *Campus Plan* principles and applicable patterns to the project.

Campus Planning staff, Aaron Olsen, presented the site context for the project area, proposed fence type, and proposed fence locations with alternatives.

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

- Very good proposal. The neighbors will appreciate the goals of this project as safety is a big concern in the area.
- Carefully assess and refine the location and design of the fencing along Patterson Street (in particular, the proposed 6' high fence along the edge of sidewalk).
  - A 6' height fence along the edge of sidewalk at Patterson is not a very gracious neighbor edge.
  - Would the standard 10' fence setback along the entire length of Patterson be better? Why not implement a setback along the entire edge?
  - Can the fence that borders Patterson be shorter than 6' and serve the same purpose?
  - Consider that a fence that still allows access, and is only a visual barrier, is inconsistent with the University's existence as a public entity and does not align with the public role of having spaces open to the public.
- Are there gates to prevent access along Patterson Street?

- There is a gap at the north end of Barnhart Hall, where there are vehicle access drives, that doesn't prevent pedestrians from accessing the west portion of the site.
- The goal is to incrementally implement this fencing and security measures project, as needed.
- There is support to set the fence back further to the west of Patterson Street to create a better edge along the public sidewalk.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Olsen and Miley provided the following clarifications:

- The fence without the setback along the southern portion of Patterson allows for more use of the open sunny lawn areas.
- No gates are proposed at this time along Patterson; however gates can be added in the future if needed for additional security.
- The vehicular access drive at the north end of Barnhart Hall would remain open because it would be challenging to secure this area while still allowing vehicle access into the parking lot.
- The overall goal of this fencing project is not to fully secure the site at this time, but eliminate the current diagonal foot traffic across the site, give a feeling of place and definition at the site edges for students, and further define the outdoor spaces to encourage use by students.
- A shorter than 6' fence height will not allow for future gate installation.

Action: With 10 in favor, the committee agreed that the proposed Barnhart Site Security Project schematic design is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

1. Carefully assess and refine the location and design of the fencing along Patterson Street.