

LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT WHITE PAPER

1. The 1988 Long Range Development Plan

LRDP Principles:

“...establishment of a core containing primarily academic uses...to promote pedestrian convenience...”

“...preservation of the natural physical setting to the maximum extent feasible...”

- a. No substantial development on slopes over 20%
- b. Infill first; then development in the north
- c. A focused EIR with public hearings for all projects over \$2M (in 1987 \$\$).
- d. Continue Core and College Concept
- e. Do not let buildings extend above treeline
- f. Public buildings to be located in Community Access Area
- g. Do not build on Reserve and Protected Landscape areas
- h. Do not build in ravines & arroyos, or grasslands
- i. Maintain continuity of wildlife corridors
- j. Protect major springs and seep zones

The 1988 LRDP contemplated the addition of 3,400,000 asf of buildings for a campus total of around 5,500,000 asf.

2. Existing Conditions

1. The 1988 LRDP was based on a certain historical context, some of which has changed independent of UCSC's growth. Consider articulating major changes in circumstance since the 1980s.

Campus has built nearly 1,000,000 asf since 1990 for a total of about 3,100,000 asf.

Campus projects include sensitive site analysis, building design, and construction standards to support the LRDP principles, e.g.:

- a. Limited building on slopes over 20%
 - Projects sited to take advantage of topography
- b. Limited development in north to date
 - Campus has developed as in-fill without moving north
- c. Environmental Impact Reports undertaken for all projects over \$2M (in 1987 \$\$)
- d. Core and College concept maintained
- e. Use of some redwood trees removed from construction sites (habitat restoration)
- f. No building done in Protected Landscape or Environmental Reserve land uses
- g. Wildlife corridors maintained

New conditions

- Two species listed by the US Fish & Wildlife Service
- City park established along the east boundary of campus
- State Department of Parks & Recreation acquired property along the west boundary of campus
- original vision (focus on certain parts) is alive in collective consciousness
- others

Campus Operations:

- developed a Site Stewardship Program in conjunction with Campus Natural Reverse program
- obtained maintenance funds for erosion control projects
- others

Quantify and illustrate:

- a. LRDP land use areas
- b. compare actual built area with area permitted under 1988 "umbrellas"
- c. users' perception of campus characteristics. Specific characteristics might include:
 - "successful" vs. "needs work" areas
 - "special" and "sacred" places
 - social spaces

[UC Santa Barbara did this as part of a recent urban design exercise. Workshop participants were given colored dots -- as always seems to be the case, red meant "bad" -- and asked to identify areas of the campus that were felt to be successful and those that "needed work." The correlation of where the colors were concentrated was both strong and quite revealing.]

A condensed presentation and analysis of the physical setting is also important, including.

- a. grades and slopes
- b. soils and hydrology
- c. plant communities
- d. sensitive species
- e. the 3-dimensionality of the campus (via large scale sectional drawing of the campus in both N-S and E-W directions)
- f. patterns of natural light and shadow
- g. density of buildings (and people) on campus
- h. scale of development
- i. inter-district relationships: how different areas of the campus affect each other and their habits of growth/change or lack of it.

3. Key Physical Issues

- a. Prioritization of development sites. Do we infill first, or go north first, for development sites?
- b. North campus development may require a second egress for fire safety, and land/vegetation management important because of reduced evacuation time.
- c. Above elevation of 900', new water tower/delivery mode.
- d. If a potential scenario is to locate uses to help the City rejuvenate West Side, then need to balance with city concern about loss of industrial-zoned land.(OR emphasize student/faculty/staff use of this area due to proximity to campus-- off-campus community-academic hub)
- e. New Inclusion Areas or which of Inclusion Areas are more or less buildable, considering impacts on and off campus, and approvable??
- f. New infrastructure requirements, and environmental consequences, of building in the north.
- g. Can we protrude above treeline if protrusion is not visible from elsewhere?
- h. Express and detail our definitions for stewardship of the environment.
- i. Implications of the Regents new sustainability policy [<http://www.ucop.edu/facil/greenbldgs/>] on future campus development.
- j. Continue to organize space around and in respect to the college model
- k. Connections and circulation between different areas of campus
- l. What are current environmental assumptions?

4. Possible Approaches

This section offers a first cut at possible approaches to addressing the issues raised by Section 3.

- a. Test land other than Reserve and Protected Landscape, for environmental constraints, to determine buildability, before considering redrawing of land area maps. Complete this test with map overlays illustrating environmental, academic programs, college/social programs, and circulation routes and atmospheres.

- b. Evaluate reality of proposed infill sites, considering
 - Foundation cost
 - Site size
 - Visibility and access from other buildings, and resulting impact on design flexibility.
 - availability or impact on infrastructure
 - 1. Compare cost premiums for building in north (e.g., new infrastructure) to building on infill sites (e.g. foundations in Karst area).
 - 2. Compare circulation impacts for building in north (distance) to building infill (pedestrian convenience).[Deciding to locate certain facilities off campus will also have circulation impacts.]
 - 3. Study the cultures of the campus and their interlocking components. (and components that people want to separate)

5. Key Programmatic and Qualitative Issues

Make tangible the explicit character of UCSC, these specific qualities that people feel are special and important. List why and how these are special and how these qualities can be expressed in different ways on-campus and in ways that the campus has not experienced.

"Qualitative" Analysis

- what's working and should be reinforced or repeated?
- what's not working and needs to be fixed or avoided?

develop evaluation criteria for:

environmental constraints
on-campus/off-campus siting
alternative campus layouts

- on a campuswide scale, this might compare development to the north vs. development in the meadows or ?
- in a smaller area of campus (e.g., the campus core or Science Hill) this might compare various building density, scale, and height alternative

6. Other Important Considerations

- a. There are strong feelings that the original vision of UCSC, as defined in the 1963 LRDP, is very important to people; but remembering that the "environmentally respecting vision" of 1963 was supposedly able to handle a much larger capacity than what we have become is sometimes neglected. How "urban" do we want to become? What assumptions are written into our analysis of the environment? How will planning after 2020 be handled, based on our density and size? What aspects of the 1963 LRDP excite people (and us as a working group) and why?
- b. Implications of the college system in shaping th
- c. e land and environment
- d. Identify the unifying concept that we are trying to achieve through specifying the shape of land-use and the environment. Set goals and objectives for land-use that will fulfill and make real our vision.
- e. Clarify what land-use designations mean to planners vs. what it means to everyone else -- Language and diagrams.
- f. Think of as many different ways to do the same thing for organizing space while respecting place. We want to make a place that is useable, comfortable, stimulating, exciting, personalizeable, special to people and has a strong character of history and depth.