

CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of January 17, 2019 Meeting

PRESENT

Adrian Borsa
Tara Cameron
Ramona Ferreira
David Hickman
Jeff Kaplan (Co-Chair)
Ken Hall
Russ King
Noah Palafox
Marlene Shaver
Frank Silva
Cristy Winter

ABSENT

Neal Devaraj
Tal Golan
John Hughes
Keith Pezzoli
Charles Sprenger (Co-Chair)
Rand Steiger
Andrea Tao
David Traver
Joel Watson

CAMPUS PLANNING STAFF

Raeanon Hartigan
Robert Clossin
Cathy Presmyk
Lauren Kahal
Elyse Sanchez
Ginger Stout

GUESTS/CONSULTANTS

Joel King, Design and Development Services
Adrienne Gallo, Campus Planning
Deborah Wylie, HED
Dan Benjamin, HED
Kate Brooks, Walker Macy
Carolyn Sheehan, Nano-Engineering
Walt Kanzler, Design and Development Services
Laura McCarty, Capital Program Management
Todd Miller, Real Estate
Todd Pitman, Campus Planning

Business Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the December 20th, 2018 meeting were unanimously approved without further comment.

Action Item: Pepper Canyon Neighborhood Planning Study (HED, Walker-Macy)

Raeanon Hartigan introduced the Pepper Canyon Neighborhood Planning Study (PCNPS) to the Committee for potential endorsement. A link was sent out to the Committee to review the Study, and it was noted that any further comments must be received by January 25th to send to the Price Center West Housing project team. Previous comments from the Committee have been incorporated into the Study. The final Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting had taken place, with plan endorsement, and some comments from the PAC will be incorporated into the Study. The Study team met with the Campus Fire Marshal who asked for some minor changes. Additional meetings with the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor were also held. The Study will be presented at Design Review Board on February 6th, with a focus on the design guidelines.

Deborah Wylie noted the presentation closely follows the PCNPS document and the comments received from the PAC will be incorporated into the document by the following week. The PCNPS aligns with the 1989 Master Planning Study, the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Open Space Master Planning Study, and the 2018 Long Range Development Plan.

Nineteen other projects are currently in planning or construction within the Pepper Canyon NPS site. The Master Plan Principle of 'Connections' is addressed through the extension of Rupertus Way to connect the University Center to the Light Rail Trolley (LRT) station within the PCNPS site and bike/ped paths connecting to the new Gilman Bridge. Pepper Canyon remains an Open Space Preserve with additional pathways and lighting to enhance security.

The existing 6th College housing is inward facing and very low density. The PCNPS proposes to celebrate the Canyon as the identity of the Neighborhood. It envisions two integrated villages on the east and west sides, connected via Rupertus Walk and canyon pathways. The Rupertus Walk corridor proposes a series of destinations along the walk, to create destination spaces rather than just a through-corridor. An organizing concept of the buildings is opening them towards the canyon to create visual connections across and through the open space and the canyon. The placement of the buildings could allow for an increased number of residents to enjoy canyon views. A mixed-use building on the north-east section of the site could become a visual destination while heading east along Rupertus Walk and further activate the Neighborhood by infusing it with a diversity of uses.

Sustainability goals are outlined within the PCNPS. The built environment would include active spaces and create locations for multiple types of social interactions to ensure healthy placemaking. Active transportation would be encouraged through the creation of safe pathways. Access to green spaces and the natural environment should help promote an active and healthy lifestyle.

Rupertus Walk would extend across to the east side of Pepper Canyon where a potential mixed-use building could be a focal point. Ground floor retail along Rupertus Walk are proposed to be used to activate the residential areas. The needs of students and those arriving from the LRT station should be considered along this corridor, potentially including childcare in the vicinity.

North and south access is proposed via separated bike lanes and micro mobility pathways along the rim of the canyon from Gilman Drive allowing access to Rupertus Walk and the rest of the campus beyond. Ground floor breezeways to enter the residential buildings and allow access to the canyon through the buildings are proposed. A pedestrian walk that also serves service vehicles, a “Woonerf”, is proposed between the Gilman Parking Structure/Pepper Canyon Hall and the residential buildings to the east. A potential development site to the south of Warren Field could be home to an early childhood education center.

Robert Clossin mentioned with the moving of Sixth College to the new Living and Learning Neighborhood, this area is poised to be redeveloped on the west side of the canyon (PC West), with the east side (PC East) redevelopment happening at a future time.

Sun studies illuminate massing strategies that would maximize sunlight for the greatest number of outdoor areas. For PC West, the massing strategy proposes taller buildings towards the middle of the site and along the west side. East-west bars meet the canyon. Stepping the buildings down towards Gilman Drive at the south would help not to overwhelm the view from Villa La Jolla Drive, and stepping down toward Rupertus would provide a pedestrian scale massing at Rupertus.

The buildings along I-5 in PC East Village are oriented to mitigate freeway noise and pollution in the neighborhood. Air conditioning will likely be required for these buildings. A planning level air quality analysis was conducted and gives guidance on appropriate heights for these buildings.

Russ King inquired if the active spaces on the east and west side under the LRT station are connected and cohesive. The walkway under the LRT guideway gives a feeling of walking through a pinhole. Part of the design on the east side should create a reason for people to want to visit the east side. The addition of the mixed-use building on the far east will give visual cues to approaching a destination. The shuttle route will be along the east side as well.

Walt Kanzler brought up The Regents’ discussion regarding the gross square feet per bed and if this topic is in the plan (for the Pepper Canyon West Housing). Wylie responded the plan shows test fits and not designs, but Pepper Canyon West will be 1 bed per bedroom for upper division undergraduate students. Joel King mentioned this topic may return to The Regents for further discussion. The Regents are interested in the number of beds per acre achieved. Kanzler shared that based on the numbers provided it appears to be approximately 410 sf/bed. Clossin noted the design and massing needs to be comfortable for the residents. Marlene Shaver asked to incorporate programming near the housing that is attractive for upper division students. These apartments are shown as one bed per room, not one bedroom apartments. Shaver mentioned the sun seems to be shading most of the lower buildings. Wylie shared sun studies and noted that density will mean some areas will be shaded with any massing strategy.

Todd Miller inquired as to the length of time students can live in these apartments. Russ King stated the Chancellor wants to offer 4 year housing guarantees, but the first phase of housing is intended for 3rd and 4th year students. Tara Cameron asked if services offered to upper division students are different from lower division. King stated upper division students request programmatic spaces that are engaging for socializing and are mixed-use and urban.

The PC East and West 'villages' in Pepper Canyon will be connected through promenades and bicycle paths. A promenade along the west side of the canyon will replace the rim trail. The pedestrian walk on the east of Gilman Parking Structure/PCH is envisioned as to serve as a street plaza with no curb to allow service vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles through. Bicycle racks are proposed on the west side of the Pepper Canyon West housing, along with entries to the buildings and lawn or garden areas.

The LRT is 3-4 stories above grade with respect to the ground floors of the housing and approximately 70 feet above the canyon floor. The sun studies show light reaching most areas for the March and June dates, but December is mostly shade within the building courtyards. To the east the studies shows high amounts of sunlight reaching interior spaces on December 21st. Common areas and spaces are proposed along the ground floor facing the canyon, and some residential units may also be on the ground floor.

The Canyonview recreation area was included in the PCNPS study area and has the capacity to provide recreational amenities for the additional students living on the west side of campus. Yoga, fitness classes, administrative offices and a welcome center are proposed in the new building expansion, with potential space on the west side for new locker rooms.

The Committee discussed the possibility of an Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) aimed at care for up to 60 infants and toddlers. The development site is located at the south side of Warren Field, and would be accessible from the existing parking lot off of Gilman Drive, to the north of Sixth College. The Study Team has examined incorporating childcare into the Pepper Canyon West residential buildings, but the cons of this placement outweigh the pros. The location is already very dense and requirements regarding open space for childcare locations are not achievable. Childcare is not a compatible land use within housing. Marlene Shaver mentioned the 14 foot incline from the parking lot to the ECEC site with a child in tow is very difficult. A ramp would be provided for ease of access and for ADA access. The ECEC site is located 500 ft from the freeway, which follows the requirement for schools, but no distance regulation currently exists for daycare facilities. The ECEC would be positioned with the play yard away from freeway for extra protection. Frank Silva recommend placing ECEC even further from freeway, due to studies demonstrating asthma rates for kids being much higher when they live closer to the freeway. Clossin mentioned an ECEC has been at the heart of campus before, and additional sites should be evaluated. Hartigan noted that further air quality analysis at the identified development site should be completed before the project begins. Jeff Kaplan wondered if ECEC administration has been involved in siting discussions. Kathryn Owen has been involved and was comfortable with placement of an ECEC at this location with the information that was available. Silva mentioned he has studied public health along freeways and feels it is still too close. Kaplan summarized that the Committee is expressing concern for multiple topics: distance from freeway, health impacts, and convenience for parents. Clossin offered that the plan does not commit that an ECEC must be at this location, only that it is a potential

development site. Any proposed ECEC will come back to this committee for site approval. Shaver said the ECEC has been a discussion topic for her 28 years at the university and does not want to site it in the wrong location again. Clossin discussed due to the doubling of housing on campus, multiple ECEC locations will be necessary and this is not the only location available. Cristy Winter inquired if the ECEC was being replaced. The infants and toddlers from Mesa's ECEC would be accepted into this new location, but the older children would remain at Mesa in the redeveloped childcare center proposed for South Mesa.

The Pepper Canyon East housing is sited to provide dense housing close to the canyon with the buildings oriented towards the canyon. A shared road to the east for private and services vehicles is proposed, with sidewalks on the west side. Resident access is proposed along the west side pedestrian paths which provide access into the canyon and courtyards. Breezeways are proposed into the private courtyards where bike storage could be provided. A courtyard with flexible recreation space is proposed. The upper floors could be housing and the lower floors could be shared use spaces. A dining hall or other type of food service is proposed in the northern most building along Rupertus Walk. The potential exists to model these residential units similarly to NTPLLN, with larger suites and more bedrooms within each. It is not known at this time if upper division students would live at this location. Pepper Canyon West is proposed as apartments and Pepper Canyon East could be suites. Clossin assured the Committee the east side redevelopment is many years away and there is time to figure out what is most needed and if the demand for on-campus housing will remain high after the LRT is open. Shaver asked if these units would these be operated like apartments where residents can live year-round. Russ King stated Pepper Canyon West would operate like apartments and the East may be 9 month leases.

The mixed-use building site is massed to fit approximately 40,000 sf per floor, with 9-12 stories. The site could be used for academics, research, or revenue generation, with possible subterranean parking.

Surface parking lot P510 was included in the Study Area and offers an opportunity for a new facility. Adrienne Gallo asked if the I-5 Switch Station project has been accommodated for but because the project is still under discussion the Study does not reflect accurate information.

Vehicular traffic is proposed to circumnavigate the site, prioritizing pedestrians and micro-mobility routes in the central areas.

A variety of open space and landscape types are proposed for the neighborhood. Along Rupertus Walk an amphitheater for public use is proposed, with private use areas within the residential courtyards. Warren field is huge amenity, and the pathways along the canyon would be public in nature. A native adaptive plant typology is proposed, with different plantings used to reinforce identity, uses and spaces. The canyon is identified as Urban Forest Open Space Preserve and the Study proposes to bring some of its rustic character into the residential courtyards. Through the course of the Study, it was determined that the character of the canyon should feel more park like than other canyons on campus so the Study proposes providing more pathways, lighting, cameras and fewer trees and shrubs where people can hide.

The documents design guidelines call for using street trees from the University Center Urban Core for continuity, and using Sycamores along Gilman Drive.

Pitman shared comments received from the Open Space Committee, including a new policy about how open space is looked at, with an overlay on Urban Forest to remove restrictions about ADA access, paving, and lighting; mobility and connection along Rupertus; large existing torrey pines in existing site, want them to be incorporated if possible; and maintenance of tree limb height for service.

The Committee discussed the comments Joel Watson emailed prior to C/CPC which echoed a comment from a previous meeting that supported Charles Sprenger's idea of maintaining an appropriately scaled view from the intersection of Villa La Jolla Drive and Gilman Drive. The Study adjusted the massing accordingly and discusses architectural solutions at this location. A challenge for the future design team will be to design a project with substantially more density than the surrounding area that feels appropriate.

Kanzler noted the importance of including sustainability and healthy placemaking in the Study and asked that the study encourage design teams to exceed minimum LEED requirements. Clossin shared John Hughes' comments which are that he's supportive of the plan and he's glad to hear Warren Field isn't being impacted by development.

Kaplan commended the consultant team on a job well done.

The Pepper Canyon Neighborhood Planning Study was brought as an action item to endorse the plan to send to the Chancellor.

The Committee endorsed the Planning Study with the following comments:

1. The Committee requested positioning the potential Childcare Center as far as possible from the freeway for the health and safety of the infants and toddlers.
2. The Committee requested that the DRB evaluate how the Study addresses the view from the intersection of Gilman Drive and Villa La Jolla. The Committee noted that the view should be welcoming and the buildings should not overwhelm the arrival experience.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ginger Stout". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ginger Stout
Associate Planner