



May 19, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the May 10, 2005 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, Dietrich Belitz, G. Z. Brown, Sebastian Collet, Michael Fifield, Richard Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Randall McGowan, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Michael Stamm

Guests: Meghann Cuniff (ODE),

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: **Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election**  
**Long Range Campus Development Plan Update – Proposed Revisions**

**1. Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election**

Background: Staff explained that the CPC chair is either a member who will be serving the second year of his/her two-year appointment or a new member who has previously served on the committee.

Those returning for their second year include Carole Daly, Randall McGowan, Andrzej Proskurowski, and Robert Ribe. It is not known who the incoming members will be.

Discussion: Randy McGowan said he is unable to serve his second term; therefore, he is not a candidate for chair. A member nominated Carole Daly to serve as the committee's 2005-2006 chair. Carole accepted the nomination saying that she is happy to serve as chair for another year, but she is also more than willing to give another member the opportunity.

**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)

Action: The committee unanimously elected Carole Daly to serve as the 2005-2006 Campus Planning Committee chair.

## **2. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update – Proposed Revisions**

Background: Staff reviewed the two remaining proposed substantive revisions to the January 25, 2005 draft version of the updated Campus Plan that were not reviewed by the committee at its April 26, 2005 meeting. This included revisions to maximum allowed densities and proposed text for the “Policy 11: Patterns” chapter as described in the meeting mailing.

Staff said minor changes to the density allowances are required to more accurately represent the size of existing buildings. Staff conducted a detailed review of the size of existing buildings and design areas over the past few weeks and discovered that the draft density calculations did not accurately represent the size of a number of existing buildings. For example, the Hayward Grandstands are now considered a two-story facility using up twice as much gross square footage allotted to the Design Area as originally calculated. This unintentionally reduces the future development capacity in the area. Therefore, some minor adjustments to the proposed density ratios are necessary to maintain the originally proposed future development capacity.

Staff asked for committee comments and feedback.

Discussion: In response to a member’s question, staff confirmed that the overall desired density ratios and relationships to other areas were kept in mind when making the most recent minor adjustments. The density ratios are intentionally different for each design area to address individual development needs and design characteristics. However, the ratios also relate to each other to establish a balance across campus. The Biennial Capacity Plan allows an opportunity to regularly assess the density ratios and determine if an increase is appropriate or if the density limits should be strengthened.

In response to a member’s question about Design Area D (Sciences and Oregon Hall), staff said the proposed density ratio has not changed. It accounts for underground and partial above-ground development.

Committee members made the following suggestions and comments about maximum allowed densities:

- Do not assume that a correction that results in an increase in the existing building size should always result in an increase in the allowed density ratio. The density ratios are established as a way to compare and establish appropriate densities. They should relate to the surrounding densities and have established maximums even if corrections are made.
- Add subcategories for Area D and fix the subcategories for Area E on the density table.

Members discussed the proposed pattern text.

In response to a member's question about appropriate pattern text, staff said language defining a design solution often is intentionally specific because it grabs the user's attention and generates dialog. Patterns are intended to stimulate discussion about issues and generate possible design solutions; the pattern's stated design solution, however, does not need to be followed exactly. This is what makes a pattern different from a policy.

Committee members made the following suggestions and comments about patterns:

- Make the Patterns chapter easy to find. Consider moving the Patterns chapter so that it is the second policy chapter since all subsequent chapters refer to the patterns.
- Use chapter titles on the tabs if possible.
- Make the Campus Pattern List easier to understand. The bolded text is helpful. The clustering and spacing are confusing.
- Add a note to the Campus Pattern List that definitions are provided on the following page.
- Consider changing the "Connected Buildings" pattern text so that the proposed solution is not so limiting. For example, add "when programmatically appropriate."
- Consider changing the "Fabric of Departments" pattern text so that the proposed solution is not so limiting. Provide and encourage some flexibility.
- Make use of drawings and photographs to help describe patterns.

Action: No formal action was required.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Meghann Cuniff, ODE  
Kathy Wagner, President's Office  
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning