November 7, 2014

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson
Campus Planning, Design & Construction

Subject: Record of the November 5, 2014 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ed Teague (Acting Chair), Sue Eveland, Fritz Gearhart, Alicia Going, Pat Jones, Ken Kato, Peter Keyes, Graham Kribbs, Richelle Krotts, Gregg Lobisser, Jeff Madsen, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (CPDC)

Guests: Darin Dehl (CPDC), Emily Eng (CPDC), Phil Farrington (CPDC), Dan Geiger (EMU), Michael Griffel (Housing), Herb Horner (UOPD), Gus Lim (Housing), Charlene Linsday (CPDC), Rob Mullens (Athletics), Garrick Mishaga (Campus Operations), Lisa Peterson (Athletics), Eric Roedl (Athletics), Robert Sabbatini (Robert Sabbatini Planning and Design), Tom Shepard (CPDC), Fred Tepfer (CPDC) Dave Villalobos (Outdoor Program), Colleen Wolfe (Place Studio)

Agenda:

1. Jane Sanders Softball Stadium Project – Meeting One
   
   Background: Staff introduced the purpose of Meeting One and summarized the requested Campus Planning Committee actions as described in the meeting mailing.

   Rob Mullens from Athletics introduced the project and its purpose.

   Phil Farrington from Campus Planning, Design & Construction reviewed the details of the site selection process as described in the meeting mailing and associated background materials. Robert Sabbatini presented the results of the Area Study.

   Tom Shepard reviewed the proposed User Group representation and key Campus Plan patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing. He added that the CPC would be invited to a design charrette.

   Discussion:

   Site Selection: Staff shared comments from the chair, who was unable to attend the meeting. She said the chair supports the proposed site. However, he thought it would be important to consider carefully options for service access routes that could serve future academic buildings proposed for the area. The Area Study shows a service zone tucked behind future buildings, but there is no apparent connection to
any street. Service areas for future academic buildings should not be directly on University Street. Therefore, possible alternate access points (e.g., 18th Avenue) should be considered to ensure that the Softball Project does not eliminate the potential to resolve this issue. Another member added that it is also important to consider carefully service access to the new softball stadium site, which is essentially landlocked. Providing service access from 18th Avenue is preferred, at least in the long term.

Robert confirmed that the 70-foot width reserved for an academic building did not include an additional setback area from the street edge.

A member said the proposed east/west pedestrian connection is a very important element. This project has the opportunity to establish a true east/west connection that connects to the existing north/south mid-block bike and pedestrian pathway. Every effort should be made to develop fully this pathway as part of the project. A guest agreed, noting that the proposed 25-foot width does not seem wide enough in comparison to other pathway corridors on campus. Another member thought the specific pathway width is not as important as the design. The design should be very carefully considered as part of the softball project to ensure it can successfully connect to the north/south mid-block pathway. Other members added their support, adding that the pathway’s eventual connection to Agate Street is important to consider as well (albeit challenging). Also, the design of the north/south mid-block pathway should be considered carefully as the stadium design is developed. Completing the pedestrian network in this area would greatly enhance access and enliven the area.

A member questioned the need to designate the proposed 100-foot-wide open space at this time. The dimension deserves further study, especially in the context of future academic buildings. It may be that the best academic building for this site would preclude a 100-foot-wide open space. Another member countered that the proposed dimension of the open space and building reflects the established campus character. Some variation in size might be possible but it is important to establish an open space to ensure that the area is positioned to transform into a campus-like area as development occurs. Another member added that change happens incrementally making it impossible to wait to make a design decision until an area is fully built out. This is an opportunity to make the best decision possible based upon known needs and goals. If the campus’ needs and goals change in the future, the area’s design could be reconsidered. Robert noted that the open space framework for this area would be the topic of further discussion as part of the Framework Vision Project. The exact dimension of the open space does not directly affect the softball site; the northern border of the softball site is defined by the edge of the proposed east/west pathway, not the open space.

A member said it is important to collaborate closely with the Outdoor Program throughout the design process. In particular, be sure to retain the function of the turn-around space, which is an essential element of the program. Another member said the long-term vision for the area should not be limited by the specific needs of the turn-around space. Others agreed that the Outdoor Program would likely move to another location in the future. Until that time, its function should not be impeded.

A member said academic space needs are so great that the entire site should be reserved for academic use. Current classroom space, for example at HEDCO, is further away than Howe Field. It seems that academic uses should have priority. Also, while he appreciated the proposal to reserve space for an academic building along University Street, he questioned whether enough space was allocated to build a
functional academic building. Another member confirmed that 70 feet is a generous width relative to other academic buildings. For example, in comparison, HEDCO is 50 feet wide. Another member said every effort should be made to maximize the opportunity for an academic building (beyond the 70-foot minimum building width requirement).

A member expressed support for the proposed academic building but questioned whether stadium noise would be a problem. Another member and guest explained that during weekdays there are ten softball games per year, all at 4:00 p.m. on Friday afternoons. Therefore, noise should not be a problem.

In response to a member’s question, Robert confirmed that the proposed site and design constraints would still allow the softball program to meet its facility needs.

**User Group, Key Policies & Patterns, & Other Campus-wide Opportunities:**

Members discussed the proposed user group membership. A guest from the Outdoor Program suggested adding a representative from the Outdoor Program, recalling the benefits of engaging neighbors when they went through an expansion process. Another member said that a “neighbor” representative from the Outdoor Program versus the Student Recreation Center is preferred if it is possible to switch. Tom agreed that it would be important to keep the Outdoor Program engaged, at a minimum as part of a focus group and by participating in the upcoming charrette.

Members discussed the key policies and patterns. A member noted the importance of paying attention to the 18th Avenue edge. An effort should be made to improve the university’s public face. Its current condition is unappealing.

A member said the Howe Field gates and fence, designed by O. B. Dawson, have historic significance. The project should be sure to consider thoughtfully how they tie into the design.

A member noted the importance and challenge of providing bike parking. Another member added that it would be particularly helpful to consider carefully how to accommodate game-day parking.

A guest suggested considering University Street from 15th to 18th Avenues as an independent project so that it could be completed in its entirety, versus incrementally. The design could be refined as part of the Framework Vision Project.

**Action:** The committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the president the following actions related to the Jane Sanders Softball Stadium Project:

A. Approve the preferred site (including the Advisory Group provisions) with the understanding that the comments listed in the next action item will be considered as the project moves forward.

B. Support the identified *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the following comments will be considered as the project moves forward:

1. Carefully consider options for service access routes that could serve future academic buildings. Service areas for future academic buildings should not be directly on University Street. Possible alternate access points (e.g., 18th Avenue) should be considered to ensure that the Softball Project does not
eliminate the potential to resolve this issue.
2. Carefully consider service access to the new softball stadium site, which is essentially landlocked. Providing service access from 18th Avenue is preferred, at least in the long term.
3. Carefully consider the design of the east/west pedestrian connection as part of the softball project to ensure it successfully connects to the north/south mid-block pathway. Make every effort to develop fully this pathway as part of the project. In addition, carefully consider the design of the north/south mid-block pathway.
4. Ensure that the project does not preclude the opportunity to refine the proposed new open space as part of the Framework Vision Project.
5. Ensure close collaboration with the Outdoor Program throughout the design process. In particular, be sure to retain the function of the turn-around space.
6. Make every effort to maximize the opportunity for a future academic building along University Street (beyond the 70-foot minimum building width requirement).
7. Pay attention to the 18th Avenue edge and make an effort to improve the university’s public face.
8. Recognize that the Howe Field gates and fence have historic significance and thoughtfully consider how they tie into the design.
9. Thoughtfully consider how to provide bike parking, including game-day parking.

C. Support the identified user group representation for the project with the following suggestion:

Be sure to engage the Outdoor Program throughout the process. Consider adding a representative from the Outdoor Program to the User Group.

2. Science Project – Meeting One, Site Selection

Background: Staff introduced the purpose of Meeting One and summarized the requested Campus Planning Committee action. She reminded the committee that it would take action only on the proposed site at this time.

Phil Farrington from Campus Planning, Design & Construction introduced the project and recapped the details of the site selection process as described in the meeting mailing and associated background materials. Robert Sabbatini presented the results of the Area Study.

Tom Shepard presented the proposed User Group representation and key Campus Plan patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing.

Discussion: Staff shared that chair, who was unable to attend the meeting, supports the proposed site.

A member suggested integrating classroom space into the project to address the overall need for additional classrooms.

Robert confirmed that the proposed requirement to respond to the orthogonal grid is an essential element.
A member said the design and implementation of the skybridge is essential to consider thoughtfully. Another member questioned the use of a skybridge, noting that this would set a precedence for future development. He questioned whether interior connections are essential to the sciences—how are they different from other departments? A member added that the existing science buildings are interconnected, which is a tremendous benefit to the interdisciplinary sciences. Phil clarified that the proposed skybridge is not intended for general use. It is intended to serve primarily building occupants. The proposed new building and skybridge would not impede bigger and longer-term solutions. Members deliberated the best way to connect north campus to main campus. It will be important to think about long-term solutions to connect to north campus as part of the Framework Vision Project.

A member noted that the site is currently foundation-owned. It should be incorporated into the Campus Plan in the long term. Another member noted that this step would be part of the Framework Vision Project.

A member asked about other possible sites, for example east of Lewis, including the potential to replace Oregon Hall. Another member expressed support for the proposed site.

**Action:** The committee agreed, with twelve in favor and one abstention, to recommend to the president that the preferred site for the Science Project (including the Advisory Group provisions) be approved.

Please contact this office if you have questions.
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