



Conceptual Vision DRAFT

THE URBAN DESIGN LAB

Mark Gillem, PhD, AIA, AICP  
Barry Gordon, MLA and MRCP

University of Oregon  
School of Architecture and Allied Arts







# Lane Community College

DRAFT

CONCEPTUAL VISION

AUGUST 2010

Report prepared by:

**THE URBAN DESIGN LAB**  
University of Oregon  
School of Architecture and Allied Arts

in association with:

The Sustainable Cities Studio

Dustin Capri, Emily Clancy, Colin Dean, Matt Dreska, Nicole Gay, Allyson Harris, Ian Hoffman, Mark Holzman, Harlan Justice, Tim Kuzma, Sean Landry, Patrick Madulid, Phil Nachbar, Stephanie Nelson, Amanda Rae, Rochelle Sanchez, Susan Spence, Nicholas Tsontakis, Mike Wilson.

Mark Gillem, Phd, AIA, AICP

Barry Gordon, MLA, MCRP

Richard Shugar, AIA



## Acknowledgements:

Special thanks to:

Mary Spilde, LCC President

Sonya Christian, LCC Vice President, Academic & Student Affairs

LCC Facilities Council and Master Planning Task Force:

Alen Bahret\*

Paul Croker\*

Jennifer Hayward

Phil Martinez\*

Robert Mention\*

Andrea Newton\*

Tamara Pinkas\*\*\*

Catherine Reschke\*

Margaret Robertson\*\*

Joe Russin\*

Todd Smith

Craig Taylor\*

Dave Willis\*

Additional thanks to:

Marston Morgan, AIA and numerous other participants.

\* denotes Master Planning Task Force members

\*\* denotes Facilities Council Chair

\*\*\*denotes Master Planning Task Force Chair





## Workshop Participants

Brian Kelly  
Donna Koechig  
Tracy Simms  
Mark Oberle  
Ken Murdoff  
Craig Taylor  
Rodger Bates  
Andrea Newton  
Michael O'Neil  
Barb Decansky  
Marston Morgan, AIA  
Elizabeth Andrade  
Stacey Schultz  
Helen B. Garrett  
Kate Barry  
Deanna Murphy  
Jonathon Price  
Margaret Robertson  
Todd Lutz  
Greg Morgan  
Brett Rowlett  
Len W. Heflin  
Alan Bahner  
Jennifer Hayward  
Jim Lindly

Marilyn Walker  
Dennis Carr  
Pat Albright  
Rodger W. Gamblin  
Sarah Ulerich  
Philip Richardson  
Le Andra Bell Matson  
Moshtz Immgrman  
Barbara Dumbleton  
Joe Russin  
Melissa Hicks  
Jim Lewis  
Robert Thompson  
Rick Satre, Principal, Satre Associates Landscape Architecture  
John Lawless, Principal, TBG Architects  
David Dougherty, Dougherty Landscape Architecture  
Larry Reed, JHR Engineering  
Toby Barwood, Principle, Pivot Architecture  
Randy Nishimura, Senior Associate, Robertson Sherwood Architecture  
Mark Miksis, Director of Development, Arlie and Co.  
Brian McCarthy, Principal, CMGS Landscape Architecture

Carol Schirmer, Principal, Schirmer & Associates Landscape Architecture  
Erika Palmer, Associate Planner, Damascus  
Michael Fifield, AIA  
Matt Bray, GBD Architects  
Rob Thallon, AIA  
Erik Knobelspiesse, Associate AIA  
Dannon Canterbuty, Associate AIA  
David Posada  
Don Kahle  
Peter Keyes, AIA  
Josh Hilton, AIA, Solarc Architecture and Engineering  
Anita Van Aspert  
Lucas Posada, LEED AP, GBD Architects  
Phil Farrington  
Kurt Albrecht  
Alison Kwok  
Phil Beyl, AIA, Principal, GBD Architects  
Jenny Young  
Paul Dustrud  
Patrick Stevens  
Gabe Grainer  
Jenna Fribley, Associate AIA  
Greg Sanders

## Contents

### 12 Executive Summary

## Part One

### On Colleges

- 16 Chapter One: The Perfect Storm
- 18 Components of the Problem
- 20 Adaptation
- 22 Making Sense of Change
- 23 Literature on Residential Colleges
- 28 Chapter Two: Perpetual Transformation
- 30 Human Settlement
- 32 Representative Fringe Development
- 33 Blurring the Boundaries
- 33 Fiscal Sustainability
- 36 Chapter Three: The Campus Paradigm
- 38 Campus Planning Trends
- 44 Defining Form and Character
- 46 Comparative Mapping

## Part Two

### LCC Today

- 70 Chapter Four: Participation
- 72 Definitions
- 73 Seven Degrees of Participation
- 76 A Brief History
- 78 Benefits and Limitations
- 80 The Six Principles
- 83 The Role of the Professional
- 88 Chapter Five: The Present Conditions

90	The Study Area
94	Participatory Planning in Action
103	Research for the Future
106	Vision, Goals, Principles

## Part Three

## LCC Tomorrow

120	Chapter Six: Putting It All Together
122	Twelve Schemes
136	Development Option 1
138	Development Option 2
140	Development Option 3
142	Evaluation Workshop
146	Revised Development Option 4
148	Option 4 Phasing
152	Revised Development Option 5: LCC Owned Land
154	Revised Development Option 5: Land Swap
156	Revised Development Option 5: Purchase Parcel
158	Appendix I: Student Prototype Projects and Proformas
168	Appendix II: Bond Project Comparison
170	Appendix III: Survey Results
194	Appendix IV: Survey Questionnaire
188	Appendix V: Design Guideline Evaluation
204	Bibliography

# Executive Summary

This conceptual visioning document and the master planning process is a Lane Community College shared governance led process that the Urban Design Lab is helping to carry out.

The New Oxford American dictionary defines the verb planning as the act of making “preparations for an anticipated event or time”; and the noun, plan, as “a detailed proposal for doing or achieving something” (McKean 2005). Planning for new development is created by forming a vision, assembling a team, and by generating goals and principles to implement the vision. It is imperative to have a plan in place prior to the need. Planning takes foresight and timing.

By linking contemporary research and lessons from case studies with results from a survey, this conceptual vision attempts to identify a sustainable growth management strategy for the twenty-first century community college.

Institutions of higher education across the country are being hit by economic hardship. The current recession is forcing more state legislatures to cut funding in support of higher education, leaving schools to compete for limited resources just at the time when enrollment is increasing (Halligan 2008). The initial extent of this project was to prepare a visioning document for Lane Community College (LCC) that uses its perimeter – non-core campus land – for expansion. Subsequently, it has led the Urban Design Lab to develop a long range conceptual vision proposal\* plan that uses its land as a resource to support the educational mission of the institution through economic, social, and

environmental sustainability. (\*This proposal is not an official LCC approved document.)

Although LCC did not choose to hire a professional design team, they knew that outside collaboration was necessary. A local architect affiliated with LCC and with prior experience working with the University of Oregon’s School of Architecture and Allied Arts Department, contacted the Urban Design Lab (UDL), a landscape architecture, architecture and urban design based organization. The initial design team consisted of students in their final architecture studio working to collect data, research case studies and formulate alternative framework designs. Later in the process, the design team consisted of four architecture student interns and a project manager.

The Urban Design Lab started with the following hypothesis:

**By integrating housing and services with the campus, Lane Community College could create a living, learning, and working environment that generates an alternative revenue stream while supporting its educational mission and fulfilling its obligations to the community in a sustainable and ethical manner.**

To facilitate this process, the UDL developed a mixed methodological approach that investigates the history of campus form leading up to contemporary community colleges. First, if one is to design for the future of community colleges, one must understand its past. How did commu-

nity colleges originally develop? What factors were used in choosing sites? What development typologies, characteristics and forms exist? Part one, **On Community Colleges**, focuses on these questions. The first chapter gives an account of how institutions of higher education are dealing with the economic crisis, budget cuts and spiking enrollment. The second chapter tracks the influence sprawl and contemporary urbanization has had on urban form, presents community colleges as a representative development typology, and illustrates examples of how contemporary innovations are changing the community college campus. The third chapter explores the characteristics and forms of the campus as it has evolved and concludes the chapter with key lessons from a comparative mapping case study.

Part two, **LCC Today**, focuses on the site and the participatory planning process that facilitated the identification of the choices, preferences and opinions of the people who use LCC in its current state. Chapter four presents the history and theory behind the method of participatory planning; highlight its history, advantages, shortcomings, and outline the over arching concepts and procedures of the process. The fifth chapter looks at the site, its characteristics and history, and provide a description of the site through narrative of the people who use it on a daily basis – highlighting the findings from public workshops. Ultimately, it will link together the findings from the previous chapters to bridge the gap between the iterative planning and design processes to identify the vision, goals, and principles. The vision and goals have been developed by the Urban Design

Lab with data gathered through two collaborative, public design workshops. The principles incorporate 100% of LCC's existing design guidelines with several additions also gathered at the design workshops.

The Vision, Goals and Principles would need to go through Lane Community College's shared governance system to be formally approved, adopted, and incorporated into the College's planning efforts.

Part three, **LCC Tomorrow**, introduces the draft alternative visions, reports on the iterative stakeholder evaluation process, and presents the draft preferred framework. Chapter six addresses how, by integrating housing and services with the campus, LCC could create a living & learning environment that also generates an alternative revenue stream supporting its educational mission while fulfilling its obligations to the community in an sustainable and ethical manner.

Several appendices present other research and findings from the planning and design process. Appendix I presents prototype designs produced by graduating architecture students in the 2009-2010 academic year. Appendix II reviews the existing LCC Bond Projects. These bond projects are a list of projects made possible through voter-approved bonds. Appendices III-V present and discuss the methodology and results from the dual-objective preference assessment survey, and documents multiple survey/questionnaires.