



Capital Planning & Development  
**CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

<b>DATE</b>	March 16, 2022
<b>FACILITATOR(S)</b>	Bob Richardson, ULUP Manager
<b>MINUTES TAKEN BY</b>	Bob Richardson, ULUP Manager
<b>MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE</b>	Joe Majeski, Erika McCalpine, Selina Heppell, Deb Mott, Gabe Merrell, Bill Callender, Patrick Robinson, Kate Hunter-Zaworski
<b>VISITORS</b>	Libby Ramirez, Susan Padgett, Sara Robertson, John Doty, Octavio Gutierrez, Jason Yaich, Dave Craig
<b>LOCATION</b>	Video Conference

**I. Call to Order**

Bob Richardson, ULUP Manager called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

**II. Project / Construction Updates**

Libby gave construction updates including a brief overview of the status of the Collaborative Innovation Complex (CIC).

**III. Minutes Approval**

Erika moved to approve and Joe seconded motion to approve the January 22, 2022 CPC minutes. The CPC minutes were approved.

**IV. Schematic Design and Site Approval Requests**

Upper Division and Graduate Housing - Schematic Design Approval

Bob provided a brief history of the project and explained that in 2016, the Upper Division and Graduate Student housing project received Site and Schematic Design approval to construct approximately 285 housing units, primarily studios, within two buildings totaling approximately 120,000 SF. The area of the Site Approval is on the east side of campus, bound by SW 11th Street, SW 9th Street, SW Madison Avenue, and SW Monroe Avenue.

The ability to develop the site with two buildings was dependent on City approval to transfer development and open space allocation within campus to increase the amount of development allocation permitted and to reduce the minimum amount of open space allocation required in Sector D.

The City Council did not approve the request to reduce the minimum amount of open space allocation required in Sector D and the project was significantly delayed first by land use appeals, then by uncertainty caused by the COVID pandemic. These delays, and the fact that the request to reduce the amount of open space allocation in Sector D was not approved, added site and budget constraints leading to the design modifications shown in the current Schematic Design approval request.

Bob explained that the modified design includes a single 89,091 SF building providing 124 units (25 studios and 99 2-bedroom units) with a total bed count of 223. The building would be located near the corner of SW Madison Ave and SW 11th Street, and would be 5-stories tall.

Bob reviewed the site plan and building design noting that 34 vehicle parking stalls were proposed and 179 bicycle parking spaces, half of which would be covered. New 8-ft wide sidewalks are proposed on SW 11<sup>th</sup> Street and SW Madison Avenue along with OSU standard acorn lights. The area of the site in the Highly Protected Significant Vegetation area would not be developed.

Bob briefly reviewed the building design and materials relative to their consistency with Campus Master Plan (CMP) design guidelines.

At the conclusion of the presentation there were a number of questions regarding the project. Kate asked about the sustainable design standards of the building, which Octavio from Mahlum Architects responded met LEED Silver equivalent. Deb asked about the ability of the public utilities to handle the increased volumes of storm and sewer water. Bob responded that OSU pays system development charge fees that the City uses to ensure the public infrastructure is of adequate capacity. There was greater discussion regarding the proposed building materials. Joe referenced CMP guideline 5.2.h.10, which states,

10.0 Building Materials The building shall be predominately red brick, with stone and terra cotta used for accented features. Accented features commonly include building entries, window surrounds, bases, cornices, and special volumetric elements such as porches, atriums or courtyards. Generally, stone and terra cotta are most elaborate at the building entry. Exterior finishes shall be durable and consistent with newer adjacent buildings. Samples of all proposed building materials shall be reviewed by the assigned Facilities Services construction project manager. Wood siding and synthetic stucco finishes are prohibited.

Joe questioned why the building was not predominately red brick with stone and terra cotta accents. Bob responded that the materials proposed were the same previously approved by the CPC. Project Manager, John Doty, expressed concern that using more expensive materials like red brick and stone on this building would make the building unaffordable for students. Dave Craig, UHDS, explained that an additional reason for the proposed materials was to better fit within the context of surrounding buildings both on and off campus.

Joe acknowledged the merit of those reasons, but also expressed concern about not closely following the guidelines without having criteria or pre-determined reasons for when different building materials or styles might be appropriate. He asked for a future session to be dedicated to discussing the Campus Master Plan, how it impacts building design and the concept of campus neighborhoods to be explored.

Selina expressed concern that there may not be sufficient vehicle parking for residents of the building as it is intended for graduate student housing, and those students may have responsibilities off-campus requiring easier access to their private car. This concern led to a brief discussion regarding equity and how campus parking locations and management may disproportionately affect some campus residents and employees, especially those who need to drive to campus because they cannot afford to live in Corvallis or are unable to take advantage of other transportation options.

Deb moved to approve the proposal as presented in the report to the CPC. Selina seconded the motion. Eight members voted to recommended approval, one was opposed.

**V. Other Business**

There was additional discussion regarding the nature and applicability of the CMP guidelines, including a request to revisit this topic during a future CPC meeting.

**VI. Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for mid-June. Bob will send a poll to find the best date given that June is often a very busy time for some CPC members.

**VII. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM