May 17, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Eleni Tsivitzi, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: Record of the May 14, 2019 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (acting chair), George Evans, Emily Fenster, Kassy Fisher, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Dean Livelybrooks, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitzi (Campus Planning)

Guests: Bill Madden, Aaron Olsen, Matt Roberts

CPC Agenda:

1. Campus Plan Amendment - Hamilton and Walton Residence Halls Transformation Project - Initial Discussion

Background: CPC staff introduced this agenda item and reviewed the need for the Campus Plan amendment. She described recommended changes for open space framework amendments based on feedback from the previous meeting, as well as initial ideas for the density amendments to the Student Housing and Northeast Central Campus Design Areas (as presented). Staff also reviewed the process required for Campus Plan amendments.

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

- The following comments and questions refer to the proposed new designated open-space south of the Phase One building:
  - A number of members were in support of this open space proposal because of the care and thought that were put into siting the building by the Housing Transformation design team, because of the historical significance of the diagonal route through Humpy Lumpy, and because of the high volume of pedestrian traffic that exists currently on this route across campus. In addition, the desire to maintain the connection of East Campus to main campus and create one cohesive experience
across campus was supported.

- A member was concerned about what restrictions might be implied in designating this open space.
- Another member countered that designating this open space seems very restrictive because it is. The size of the proposed Phase One building what is appropriate for the overall density of that site. It is therefore necessary to protect the remaining open space to ensure cross-campus connectivity and a reasonable density for the whole design area.
- A member suggested considering adjusting the northern border of the designated open space to follow the south edge of the dining patio.
- A member suggested that a note be made in the Campus Plan explaining the rationale behind designating this relatively small open space so that campus planners and CPC members in the future do not feel obligated to do this for every similarly-sized open space.
- There was support for the recommendations to expand the Agate Street Axis designated open space and to designate the Humpy Lumpy replacement open space.
- The density amendments seem to make sense in general although it is difficult to understand the exact implication of the changes in coverage and floor area ratios.
- Different design areas on campus have different densities because they accommodate different uses and because of existing historic buildings or significant landscape spaces.
- Have there been any conversations about the future of Carson Hall? It seems likely that it would be needing renovation in the future and there are no additions to Carson shown on the drawings.
- A member expressed appreciation for the holistic look at density changes (current needs + projected needs per the FVP) so that multiple Campus Plan amendments are not required for each area in the future.

In response to questions from committee members and guests, staff provided the following clarifications:

- A strict 1:1 replacement of the Humpy Lumpy designated open-space is not required. The requirement is to replace the approximate size and function of the existing designated open-space.
- There would likely be some delineation of space (but not a full barrier or fence) between the patio and the remaining open space south of the Phase One building, similar to what exists between the dining terrace at Global Scholars Hall and the East Campus Green.
- Allowable densities are set per Design Area. The additional density is not prescribed for a particular site or building addition within that area although projections have been made in the Framework Vision Project for where the additional development may go based on known or future projected needs.

**Action:** No formal action was requested.