

Master Plan Committee – Minutes 5/8/2019

Participants: Lynn Johnson, Blanche Hughes, Dell Rae Ciaravola, Rick Miranda, Doug Max, Dave Bradford, Fred Haberecht, Nick Lobjeck, Mike Rush, Alan Rudolph, Rick Callan on behalf of Nancy Hurt, Leslie Taylor, Julia Innes, Kristi Buffington

University Avenue Character Zone and Setbacks

1. Campus Pedestrian Framework Plan includes feeling of openness and having active social places on campus core. Characteristics are:
 - a. Academic core that is walkable (within ¼ mile) – largely free of parking and vehicles
 - b. Maintain views to the west – Great Green is 42-acre community park
 - c. Acknowledge flood plain
 - d. Importance of front lawn to the University as institutional permanence, inviting people into campus
2. University Ave from College Ave to Meridian (the Recreation Fields) – overall character zones are:
 - a. Entrance experience for the University (West of College Ave)
 - b. Historic Character Zone
 - c. Pedestrian Mall Zone
 - d. Plaza/Pedestrian Mixing Zone
 - e. Bike and Pedestrian Movement Zone that opens up to the mountains
3. Existing Setbacks vary:
 - a. University Ave
 - i. Building to Building
 - A. 120 ft. – Morgan Library to Student Center
 - B. 105 ft. – Michael Smith Natural Resources and Clark
 - C. 106 ft. – Michael Smith Natural Resources to Plant Sciences
 - D. 130 ft. – Student Services to Military Sciences
 - ii. Building to Curb – 60 ft. at University Ave down to 18 ft. at LSC and Michael Smith Natural Resources
 - b. Center Ave
 - i. 30 ft. wide pedestrian zone and remaining area is landscape buffer – approximately 120 ft. – becomes narrower between Clark and Eddy and at Morgan Library and Clark.
4. Proposal for general setbacks:
 - a. Minimum baseline between buildings – must have at least 32 ft. of pavement for pedestrians, bikes, and service vehicles to function on the street. Need 20 ft. setback on each side from the 32 ft. zone to accommodate pedestrians, landscaping, and for universal design. Therefore, minimum distance between buildings needs to be 72 ft. – justified off-center line because views are important to campus.
 - b. While the generic recommendation is for buildings to be set back at a minimum of 72 ft., the building face to building face recommendation is no more than 120 ft. to allow for view corridors.
 - i. Building lengths should not exceed 100 ft. without a step in the façade.
5. Flexibility within the standards:
 - a. Example: Plant Science is across from Sherwood Forest, which creates space.

- b. Example: Shepardson comes closer to the street, yet the Administration Building parking lot gives space.
- c. As buildings overlap, not more than 25% of building façade/mass will overlap across streets.
- d. Consideration for the shade buildings cast on streets.
 - i. North-south or east-west alignment
 - ii. Height of buildings

6. Discussion

- a. Alan Rudolph asks if there are cost tradeoffs between these decisions.
 - i. Fred Haberecht – Yes, for example, if we were to build an addition to Clark that comes up to the indicated guideline, then we couldn't do an addition to Computer Sciences.
 - A. Consideration of real estate could influence other building opportunities.
- b. Mike Rush thinks it's important to have an "organic" opportunity to move the line back and forth while maintaining the 120 ft. guideline.
 - i. Break up the planes. Incorporate language about how to encourage horizontality in the building expression.
 - ii. The face of the building should step back some as buildings become closer together, such as the Health and Medical Center, so it doesn't create a canyon effect.
 - iii. Consider shade and shadow implications – for example, mitigation of sun penetration coming in through the west.
- c. Lynn Johnson believes these types of guidelines help to provide a sense of openness and green space, which attracts people to campus. Also, thinks the committee needs to have the ability to discuss it, if there is a compelling reason to violate the guidelines.
 - i. Rick Miranda agrees that while the standards are good, there are times when we may want to relax them if there are mitigating circumstances.
 - ii. Fred Haberecht says the intention is to establish these standards by embedding them into the master plan and our aesthetic guidelines. The applicant, supported by staff, would then come to Master Plan Committee to ask the committee to consider a variance on the standards, providing compelling reasons for the variance request.

7. Recommended standards are:

- a. A minimum 32' of Paved Surface is required for emergency access & daily campus needs
- b. An additional 20' setback needed from pavement edge totaling a 72' wide corridor as a central organizer.
- c. Establish a 120' minimum building face to building face dimension across a pedestrian focused core campus street.
- d. A building face shall not exceed 100' in length without a substantial step in the plane.
- e. Building face may be immediately at the 20' setback line. 120' Minimum building face dimensions still apply.
- f. Building face overlaps across streets shall be limited to no more than 25%?
- g. If a building receives an addition, the 120' Minimum building face dimension restricts where an adjacent building can also build an addition, limiting the ability for the adjacent building to add within the same zone.
 - i. **Lynn Johnson makes the motion to adopt these as the standard for building setback as central to campus and academic core with the opportunity for Master Plan Committee**

to grant variances for that standard. Mike Rush seconds the motion. All are in favor; none are opposed.

Vehicle Safety and Access Policy

1. Intent is to create a standard for a safer campus by having vehicles not come through the core of campus during peak academic hours (7:30–5:00).
 - a. Applies to all vehicles, including private vehicles and vendors, as well as all state and university vehicles. Emergency vehicles are exempt.
 - b. Extensive outreach to create this standard, including with Parking and Transportation Services, Housing and Dining Services, Facilities Management, Police Department, Central Receiving, vendors, etc.
2. Policy provides guidance to drivers through an exterior loop on campus, circumnavigating the campus core.
 - a. Need to educate drivers that they cannot drive through Newton’s Plaza and the pedestrian mall simply because it is more convenient. There are opportunities to access the service areas of buildings and campus by using the exterior loop.
 - b. Policy encourages drivers to come before academic hours. Dave Bradford says some units have discussed shifting their business hours to off-peak times.
 - i. Important for drivers to stand-down at class change times if maintenance vehicles do have to come through the core of campus.
3. Alan Rudolph asks if part of the vehicle safety and access work is testing our access, related to running fire drill models for access.
 - a. Mike Rush partners with Poudre Fire Authority (PFA); they run the model and keep it up to date. They do mock fire drills in buildings; on a quarterly basis, they test fire alarms and fire suppression systems and report back to the PFA.
 - b. Dave Bradford says they let us know about pinch points to improve access when redeveloping sites.
 - c. Chemistry Research to HEOC – the fire lane is leveraged into bike and pedestrian ways.
 - d. Emergency vehicles have a blanket ability to access all the zones.
4. Scooters
 - a. Scooters are covered in a wheeled-access policy.
 - i. 3-tiered speed limit for electric assist vehicles. Working with the City on their RFP. Creating a standard for dismount and slow-down zones. With the electric scooters, there is the ability though a geo-tracker to shut down vehicle if they come across certain area.
5. The Service Cart policy will parallel the Vehicle Safety and Access Policy.
 - i. Defines who is licensed to drive them
 - ii. Ensures they are in good operating order
 - iii. Makes sure there is safety equipment when purchased
 - iv. Indicates where to park and charge them
 - v. Indicates where they can drive them