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RE: Site Review of Science Building Siting Study – Expert Opinion

This memorandum addresses the Science Building Siting Study, one three siting studies prepared for the University of Oregon concerning three development projects:

- University of Oregon Softball Field Siting Study, September 2014
- University of Oregon Science Building Siting Study, September 2014
- University of Oregon Residence Hall Siting Study, September 2014

PURPOSE

Our evaluation of the siting studies identifies issues and opportunities for present development and future planning for the campus. As advocates for the campus's functional and aesthetic development, we posed the following question:

How can each project beneficially contribute to the campus physical environment today and how might it afford planning and design opportunities in the future?

We considered both near-term development requirements and long-term development flexibility.

In addition to the siting studies, our evaluation used the following background sources:

- University of Oregon 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area, Campus Planning and Real Estate, April 08, 2003
- University of Oregon Space Needs Plan, Space Advisory Group, September 2014
- 2013-2015 Biennial Capacity Plan, University of Oregon, Campus Planning and Real Estate, December 11, 2012
- Extending the Academic Campus, University Street Feasibility Study, Rowell Brokaw Architects, March 2012
- Conceptual Plan, Many Nations Longhouse Expansion, Expression Place & Many Nations Longhouse Axis, University of Oregon, Jones and Jones, December 2010

We reviewed each of the reports and focused on the one site selected by the Advisory Group. We summarize our conclusions below. Detailed reviews follow.

Science Building – Site A

The site is acceptable. The building siting and design should reflect the larger context of future science buildings north of Franklin Boulevard, the connection to the campus south of the boulevard, and the connection to the research park to the northeast.

Attachments

Site evaluations for the one site with accompanying graphic.

We prioritized our comments of each site as follows:

- Items of greatest concern
- Items to be considered

End of Memorandum
Summary
The site is acceptable. The building siting and design should reflect the larger context of future science buildings north of Franklin Boulevard, the connection to the campus south of the boulevard, and the connection to the research park to the northeast.

Items of greatest concern
1. Enhance and maintain a street edge with walks and trees of a scale appropriate to the campus structure and Franklin Boulevard. Mitigate service and back-of-house impacts through strong architectural and landscape architecture design.

2. Design building interiors to animate the building edge (with transparent façade) along Franklin Boulevard to announce the building being of the University.

3. Design the future sky bridge to be lighted and transparent, again to announce that the University is on both sides of Franklin Boulevard.

4. Set building (and future buildings) on an orthogonal grid to match that of the main campus. This is to create a visual cue that the new building is part of the campus.

5. Reinforce the Gallery Walk as it connects to Franklin Boulevard.

6. In the area study, consider plantings north and south of Franklin Boulevard that will blend the campus properties, not divide them.

7. Develop interior circulation to facilitate connections to potential future university buildings to the east and west.

8. Add a pedestrian path along the Mill Race that will extend as adjacent properties are improved.

9. Investigate how this building and future buildings can enhance connections to the research park.

10. Site building to keep the alignment of the current Gallery Walk (do not jog walk).

11. Improve Gallery Walk paving and lighting and study future connection to the proposed sky bridge.

Items to be considered
A. Although campus buildings are setback south of Franklin, consider following a tighter and varied setback north of Franklin to preserve as much building flexibility on the narrow lots. Vary setbacks on future buildings to create a diversity of edge conditions.

B. Study potential for shared bike and pedestrian paths back of curb, assuming roadway is not changed. And, study potential for shared bike with service road and parking in current roadway, assuming roadway width is reduced; see University and City studies:
   - http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/the_boulevard_study_gillem.pdf

C. Consider the building edge along Gallery Walk as an opportunity to expose users to the science within the building; e.g., gallery space, transparency, classrooms, seminar rooms, etc.

D. Provide functional open space along the west and east building edges and along the building edge facing the Mill Race.