Stepping the buildings down into the canyon is favorable. May make the place feel larger than it really is.

Feels like a 1950s concept due to the dividing of housing and academics (the city and the burbs. Better to mix the two. Some others agree… but not all.

Is there a chance that the integrated model would actually ‘quell’ the party atmosphere of groups of dorms.

In order to draw students to live on campus, it needs to be vibrant.

Design for millennials. They are more interested in experiences, than stuff.

56 acre scheme is pretty maxed out without partnership spaces. Smaller scheme may require greater flexibility of spaces and uses.

56 acre scheme has a nice, limited amount of roads and traffic.

Not crazy about housing on century drive, and have real safety concerns for peds here. Not crazy to see dorm windows from Century drive – academic windows would be better – multiple participants agree.

Great location for community access. Community should get to use some facilities.

All of these large/tall dorms will be challenging for students who are seeking quiet places to reflect.

Good location for FIELD – Convenient for public. Lowered field will keep light and sound impacts lower.

The idea of future water recycling, in addition to onsite stormwater mgt is very positive.

Its odd that the small schemes and the large schemes all are trying to accommodate 3k – 5k students. Why is that?

How might people walk from the campus to the Old Mill District?

Notate how high above median grade each bldg. will be. Also more sections.

On this site we need to pay attention to views of bldgs. From above – green roofs, etc.

Will fraternity houses be near the bars?
A: OSU is not planning to charter fraternities and sororities.

Like the name, and the notion of village feel.

Like the name, and the notion of village feel.

For the bldgs. In the canyon, we should make sure they orient their focus to the plaza.

Community should get to use some facilities.

Stepping the buildings down into the canyon is favorable. May make the place feel larger than it really is.
Integrated Terraces

RE: U Village: is there a strategy to hold this area for future use?

The layout is too linear…relative to the other 56…likes those spaces better

Rec amenities don’t feel like they should have a major community aspect – not sure they would be used that way…

…and there is a quality to the linear that is attractive…

Make sure the program is embracing DL.

Set back blgs. On edge…taller away from them.

RE: Parking – students should use underground parking

Fields may be a better use of the lower areas.

Parks and Rec uses might be best at rink site.
Utilize grade change and incorporate natural features. Use traffic calming within the campus. Consider mixed use buildings; upper division housing?, ELC?

Like green spine. Like bike connection here; separated from cars. Some agree; some think makes sense here – less evening use.

Put PV on buildings instead of large fields. May appear industrial; use land for other purpose; integrate PV as a learning opportunity.

Consider sun angles and drainage. Consider mixed use buildings; upper division housing?, ELC?

Wellness Ctr. too internal to site, not as accessible; but good accessible to rec fields.

Fields on edge may protect n'hood, but lights are a concern. Like terraces. Like bike connection here; separated from cars.

Housing on this side is inconvenient, far from grocery stores, other retail. Good for streets to follow topography, not be “straight shots”.

Pros and cons to rec fields in the pit – could be more integrated. Buildings and parking lots preclude vegetation.

This district feels disconnected; shouldn’t be an independent commercial area. Good to connect to street grid to east. Integrate housing. Like green spine. Like bike connection here; separated from cars.

Don’t need more schools in this area. Some agree; some think makes sense here – less evening use.

Put PV on buildings instead of large fields. May appear industrial; use land for other purpose; integrate PV as a learning opportunity.

Like terraces. Like bike connection here; separated from cars. Some agree; some think makes sense here – less evening use.
Academic Housing Campus Life Field Plaza/Path Parking

Like three clusters of housing

Neighborhoods are too segregated to the outskirts of campus

Save more of the woods

Rec fields may not be a good neighbor due to lights and sound

More integrated uses on research park

Could intersections be roundabouts
Like the openness of rec and open space in the pit. Also less light leakage and noise. Friendly to surrounding neighborhoods.

Vehicular ped/bike flow better overall in this scheme.

Future growth

Like wellness and other amenities in this area. Close to academics center.

Housing ok here. Housing in the woods. Try to save the trees.

This concept allows phasing of development better than other schemes.

Most buildings toward east which is closer to part of city that is already developed. May be a problem for traffic imbalance though.

Like the way it is clustered and mixture of activities. Good distribution of parking in university village area.

BPRD is important future acquisition or partnership for growth

We need to manage traffic on 14th thru campus to not be impactful to ped/bikes

Like 15th street extension

Prefer this n-s open space plan with no cars down spine.

Big problem: drives traffic onto 14th street.

Like the mix of uses in the university village

Do not like thru car traffic impact thru campus

Future growth and move recreation northward.

Where does campus grow?
University Community Neighborhood

- Preferred entrance over Chandler
- Right turn only?
- Over parking?
- Limit Use? Why use?
- Bus Pullout? Right turn only?
- Short street length
- Conflict Point?
- Parking for Rec Center and Fields???
- Best use of site when lower site development cost?
- Transit Hub Option 2

Academic
Housing
Campus Life
Field
Plaza/Path
Parking