**Campus Planning Committee Meeting Notes**

September 18, 2017

221 Weill Hall

3:00 - 4:30pm

*Attendees: Kellie Page, Bob Bertoia, TJ Ball, Christopher Dunn, Todd Bittner, Valerie Aymer, Jim Kazda, David Cutter, Reed Huegerich, Leslie Schill, Steven Wolf, Jack Elliott, Martin Hatch, Kristie Mahoney, Dan Schied, Ellen Chase, Mary-Lynn Cummings, Jeffrey Chusid, Nicholas Klein, Imani Allen, Susan Riley, Bert Bland, Bridgette Brady, Abe Stroock, and Lisa Ciaschi*

*Guests: Ryan Lombardi, Tiffany Robertson, Paul Stemkoski*

**Welcome and Introductions –** Steven Wolf, CPC Chair

Returning chair, Steven Wolf, welcomed new and returning committee members to the fall kickoff meeting to the CPC, reminding the committee of its charge and ambitions to reach out more broadly to campus and community to effect good planning outcomes on campus. He also thanked Jeff Chusid for serving as chair for the 2016-17 academic year.

**Planning in our Landscapes –** David Cutter, Campus Planning

David Cutter presented a number of landscape projects implemented/in design on campus during Summer/Fall 2017, most with a significant student engagement component. These included:

Events/initiatives:

* Park(ing) Day and Arbor Day
* Nature Rx update
* Cornell Sustainable Landscape Trail

Student design - studio work:

* Collegetown Walk -Eddy Gate to Schwartz Plaza (complete)
* Library Plaza
* Uris Tower Overlook

Upcoming:

* Ag Quad - Landscape Arch and Horticulture student plantings
* Biology Quad Site - studying art program, pollinator garden

Solicitation for new ideas for collaboration in campus landscapes faculty/student work- Campus Planning.

**State of the Campus Master Plan Report –** Leslie Schill, Campus Planning

Leslie Schill presented brief synopsis on the 2008 Campus Master Plan – a 30-50 year vision promoting integrated planning that considers comprehensive, systematic approach to campus development. Campus Planning Dept is now evaluating the CMP in a State of the Campus Master Plan Report, and key findings include:

* + - Robust academic building growth since 2008
    - CMP has been successful guide for focusing development at pre-approved sites
    - Core campus is fully developed (no remaining new CMP development sites exist) – renovation, adaptive building reuse and site reuse remain as options
    - Current funding model is a challenge for public realm improvements
    - Housing and student population growth will have major land use, campus system impacts

Particular successes, gaps, challenges and opportunities also highlighted.

Early Recommendations

* Form a CPC sub-committee to assist in finalizing State of report
* Long term - Update the CMP
* Updates to CMP how did it come about - existing condition work we are working towards greater planning initiatives would it be best to have incorporated with CMP

CPC Questions/Comments:

1. How is the CMP kept current? Three amendments have been made to the CMP, largely technical in nature, and a process for amendments has been established formally.
2. Suggestions that comprehensive transportation plan should be part of a CMP update, as a new element to the plan, in order to best integrate with other development and to have the authority of the Campus Master Plan.
3. How much community wide involvement will students and employees have? CPC subcommittee may include representatives serving in their assembly roles. Certainly, an update to the CMP would include robust public participation.
4. What is Cornell’s role in understanding the CMP within the overarching context of sustainability? This question asks about the lens through which future land use plan for campus may be developed.
5. CMP came out of a strategic academic plan of its time an the major focus was on landscape – other elements were not nearly as developed.
6. Will this State of the CMP report go to Trustees for approval? This report will be submitted to the Board of Trustees, as follow on to a Board-approved document, but it is not imagined that the report itself will be need approval. That said, recommendations and next steps from the report may trigger Board action. CMP amendments also go to the Trustees for approval.

**Implementing the Cornell Housing Master Plan on North Campus**

Ryan Lombardi, Student and Campus Life

Paul Stemkowski, Infrastructure, Properties and Planning

Ryan Lombardi presented the overarching themes, findings and recommendations coming out of the 2016 Cornell Housing Master Plan:

Three key drivers for HMP:

* Deferred maintenance $$ and swing space
* Capacity growth for current students
* Capacity growth for future students

Goals coming out of HMP:

* Create Swing space
* Meet sophomore housing demand – provide residential campus experience for all freshmen and sophomores
* Create a new Sophomore Village
* Increase dining capacity on North Campus to serve new residents

Aspiration - 2000 new beds, 275 new freshman/year for 4 years

Process

* Housing Master Plan will be shared with CPC in two weeks
* Early site review: North Campus the area of focus – existing freshman and number of sophomores, and area with developable sites
* RFP Process: 24 developers, 9 responses, interviewed 4
* Cornell funding decision: this will be owned and operated by Cornell
* Fee developer to construct
* Board of Trustees approved this early portion of the process over summer

Paul Stemkowski, serving as the North Campus Housing Expansion project manager reported:

* + - * We have a developer
      * Site analysis has commenced, reviewing municipal zoning and boundaries in the site areas, natural features, and a noted historic district
      * Phase 1: proposed as 800 beds on CC Lot (1200 beds initial studies) 4 and 5 story buildings and new dining element
      * Sophomore and freshman villages
      * Appel Fields: housing proposed here for 3 to 4 stories

Timeline: August 2020 goal for phase 1 phase 2: 2021

Phase I will open spaces for deferred maintenance work- Balch Hall needs lots of restoration, rehabilitation

CPC Questions/Concerns:

* How do we get the word out to the campus community? CPC is being tapped as a representative committee of campus constituents for feedback. We ask members to take this information back to their home organizations to share. Student and Campus Life will be holding forums with students in late fall when design is more developed to share and gather feedback.
* Has topography been considered on North Campus when developing these schemes? Site plan view does not attend to this detail. Topography, views, and connections are key considerations that must be tested in design, but they are known features in the vicinity that must be addressewd.
* In keeping with the aggressive timeline and budget, is there a push for aggressive sustainability in this initiative? We should be using best practices, look to Maplewood, and even engage resident faculty in North Campus buildings to provide feedback on sound levels, energy/comfort of building designs from first N Campus development. living faculty in residence, offer a lot of insight, and invite them to meetings
* Is a broader mix of uses in this residential area being explored? Dining is exploring other retail spaces and private dining experiences.
* There is a need for flexible, undefined space for students to meet who would like room for practicing music, performance together. This is lacking on N Campus today.
* Other project elements to be addressed? Recreational space – turf fields, transportation improvements to connect the greater N Campus precinct.
* What about lost parking on CC Lot when site is developed? We will not be replacing parking from cc lot. There is a study happening right now
* Helen Newman replacement is part of this? No, indoor recreation is not in plan being evaluated main issue is funding, fitness center pieces
* How can we insert our values and interests into this project? m
* Note that a successful project may look nothing like what is already there, very creative design. Are we too trapped in a model? We need to build sustainable buildings.
  + Project should address: Green infrastructure/storm water, renewable energy, architectural design guidelines

Action item:

Paul Stemkoski and Steven Wolf will identify a mechanism through which CPC can introduce constructive questions, ideas, and critiques into the planning process.

**Future Agenda Items, Announcements, and Wrap Up -** Steven Wolf, CPC Chair