



November 28, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the November 22, 2005 CPC Meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Nancy Cheng, Darin Dehle, Frances Dyke, Michael Fifield, Bill Harbaugh, Douglas Kennett, Rich Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Andrea Matthews, Dennis Munroe, Steve Pickett, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey

Guests: John Anthony (Facilities Services), Vince Babkirk (Facilities Services), Meghann M. Cuniff (ODE), Roger Kerrigan (Facilities Services), Rand Stamm (DPS)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda:  
College of Education Additions and Alterations Project – Meeting One

**1. College of Education Additions and Alterations Project – Meeting One**

Background: The chair explained that the committee is being asked to identify key Campus Plan policies, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues for the College of Education Additions and Alterations Project. In addition, the committee is asked to comment on the proposed user group representation.

Andrea Wiggins, College of Education and user group member, described the project's purpose as described in the meeting mailing. The project will address severe space needs, help bring together twenty-one fragmented sites, and address the changing educational model. New and renovated space will accommodate specialized teaching areas, collaborative environments, distance learning, performance studies, a curriculum-design center, new technologies, clinical uses, and student and faculty gatherings.

Andrea passed around conceptual drawings that convey ideas about creating gathering spaces and better connections among existing education buildings. The concept included new construction on the existing parking lot with parking replaced below the building. Chris Ramey explained that the

**UNIVERSITY PLANNING OFFICE**

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 [www.uoregon.edu/~uplan](http://www.uoregon.edu/~uplan)

*An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act*

conceptual drawings do not represent the proposed design. A conceptual drawing is prepared to help establish the project scope, identify issues, and enable fundraising.

The overall project size is 90,000-100,000 gsf of new construction and 17,000 gsf of renovation totaling \$48 million.

Chris provided an overview of the key policies affecting this project. As always, Policy I: Participation is important. The relatively large user group represents the large and diverse College of Education. Consultant interviews will take place the second week of winter term. The design phase of the project should be completed by summer 2006.

Policy 2: Open-Space Framework is important because there is great potential to improve and better define the designated open spaces in the southwest campus area, in particular the north/south southwest campus axis. The proposed development site will allow the open spaces to be better defined and link the various education buildings to one another. The Music expansion project also may contribute to area improvements, in particular by relocating auto access to the cemetery and eastern-most parking lot from the southwest campus axis open space to the area behind (east of) the Music building. In addition, the 18th Avenue and Alder Street edges will be important to address. They present opportunities for creating gateways. Pathways through the area will be retained.

Policy 5: Replacement of Displaced Uses will be important because the likely location for a new building is where parking currently is located. Resolving parking needs will be a big challenge. Ideally parking will be moved beneath the building if funding allows.

Policy 7, which addresses Architectural Style, will be important as the project attempts to link older brick buildings with the newer 1970s, less compatible Clinical Services Building.

Policy 8: University Access is a core value for the College and the project. The sloped site will present challenges.

Chris distributed a draft pattern list for the project that was created by the project user group.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, Chris said it was not out of the question to replace the poorly functioning Clinical Services building, but it is unlikely. The main goal will be to determine the best value—renovation versus new construction—and to make the best use of existing spaces. The likely decision to keep Clinical Services is primarily budget driven.

A member said it would be beneficial for the CPC to review the proposed schematic design as early as possible, noting the importance to respond to campus-wide issues and to establish strong connections to the campus. He said the conceptual design appears to be oriented towards Alder Street and the community rather than the campus.

A member said courtyard schemes, such as the conceptual design, usually

work well when surrounded by active public spaces. However, there is a greater need to ensure that the campus side facing the designated open space (southwest campus axis) functions well and has adjacent public activity. The new education complex should reinforce campus open spaces. Perhaps a pass-through that links the axis with the courtyard could share a public activity node.

Chris added that the project's intent is to orient the primary façade towards campus (southwest campus axis) to better define the open space. On the other hand, the College of Education's programs and clinics have significant associations with the community. Therefore, the College's connection to Alder Street will be important as well.

A guest said it would be beneficial to resolve the intersections at Alder Street and 16th and 17th Avenues. Members agreed. Members discussed whether it was necessary to maintain primary vehicular access to Beall Hall. At a minimum, some form of drop-off is needed. Also, the view of the Beall Hall façade from Alder Street should be projected.

A member noted that the corner of 18th Avenue and Alder Street is a more appropriate location for a primary campus gateway than the southwest campus axis terminus at 18th Avenue. She suggested removing existing structures and creating a gateway element as part of this project. Chris added that a series of gateways is possible. Perhaps the corner best serves as a primary campus gateway while other smaller entrances along 18th Avenue and Alder Street would serve as gateways to the School of Music and the College of Education.

A member said there is no obvious "front door" to the College of Education. Hopefully, this project will resolve this problem. In addition, the project should consider enhancing public connections throughout the area. In particular, perhaps it would be beneficial to create a more direct public connection from the southwest campus axis through the College of Education to Kincaid Street.

In response to a member's question, Chris said the conceptual plan showed a combination of a three- and four-story building in response to the sloped site. A member said the project should take advantage of the opportunities presented by the sloped terrain, for example views to the west as well as the definition of open spaces.

A member said the project should carefully consider how best to address Alder Street. Perhaps it is worth establishing a closer setback similar to existing buildings on the west side of Alder Street. Also, the project should thoughtfully consider the purpose of green spaces (for example, the existing lawn), making sure they are an effective part of the design.

A member noted that the unusually large development site presents challenges as well as opportunities for both the university as a whole and the College of Education. CPC input will be important as this project moves forward. For example, there is an opportunity to resolve existing conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and autos.

In response to a member's question, Chris said *Campus Plan* policy requires that existing parking be replaced on a one-to-one ratio (in the same area) unless the president says otherwise. The total number of required spaces is defined by city code (based upon student enrollment). Since the project will not result in an increase in student enrollment, no additional spaces are required by city code. However, the project also will look at any potential change in parking needs resulting from programmatic shifts. This is unlikely because the project will not result in an increase in faculty and staff in the area—the expansion is designed to meet current faculty and staff space needs. Existing off-campus clinics will remain off-campus for the most part. However, projects always look for opportunities to increase parking options. Even if it is not possible to fund additional spaces as part of this project, providing opportunities for future expansion, for example by minimizing the building footprint, will be considered.

A member suggested adding a non-education representative to the user group to create a better balance between those concerned primarily with internal issues and those concerned with external, campus-wide, issues. He noted that similar imbalanced representation has created difficulty on prior user groups. Others shared this concern. Chris acknowledged the problem, but expressed concern about adding another member to an already large user group. He suggested that the CPC ask the project to come back to the full CPC for a check in review mid-way during schematic design to make sure campus-wide issues are adequately addressed.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to require the College of Education Additions and Alterations Project to come back to the CPC for a check-in review (when site plan alternates are ready) prior to final CPC schematic design review to ensure that campus-wide issues are adequately addressed.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. John Anthony, Facilities Services  
Vince Babkirk, Facilities Services  
Judi Byrum, Knight Library building manager  
Meghann M. Cuniff, ODE  
Elaine Jones, Education User Group Chair  
Roger Kerrigan, Facilities Services  
Peter Keyes, Architecture (Senate)  
Tim King, Facilities Services  
Janet Lobue, Facilities Services  
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning  
Bob Peters, SUNA  
Rand Stamm, DPS  
Janet Stewart, School of Music  
Andrea Wiggins, Education  
James Yamada, Architecture  
Danielle Zeghib, Architecture