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Summary of Committee Activities:
The November 14th Committee Meeting #2 consisted of:
  a) A brief discussion of emerging trends regarding campus character and placemaking
  b) A breakout session consisting of three smaller groups: Each group discussed two overall themes from Committee Meeting #1 and organized their discussion into Positive, Negative, and Future topic items
  c) A presentation to the committee summarizing each group’s discussion

GROUP 1 considered themes A and B below in their discussion:
  A. Technology plays an increasingly significant role in how the campus is utilized by students and faculty.
  B. The in-between spaces and pedestrian connections play a significant role in placemaking and creating campus character.

  ➢ GROUP 1 Topic Discussion Results
  Positive
  • Student and faculty work – when showcased
  • Gathering spaces (temporary and permanent)
  • Hiking trails and local/regional weather
  • Views and vistas
  • Flexibility of outdoor space
**Negative**
- Increased use of technology means less eye contact
- Poor architectural aesthetics (Example – building 5)
- Losing the “loop”
- A lack of “sense of place” – neighborhood and downtown
- Safety and accessibility
- Campus circulation conflicts, parking, and circulation maintenance
- Lack of branding as a “place”
- Showcasing student and faculty work – need more
- Lack of natural light in secondary spaces

**Ideas for the Future**
- Tours to showcase work
- Preserve/protect current open space
- Additional gathering spaces (i.e. “coffee nodes”)
- Incorporate underground parking and possibly circulation
- Add additional floors to campus housing on Grand Avenue
- Identify and maintain existing vistas, views, and open space
- Create “Learn By Doing” brand in open space
- Enhance the ground floor pedestrian experience

**GROUP 2 considered themes D and E below in their discussion:**

**D.** Split campus vs. academic districts vs. polycentric activity areas with central hub.

**E.** The character of the surrounding City and County areas play a significant role in defining Cal Poly’s character and sense of place.

➢ **GROUP 2 Topic Discussion Results**

**Positive**
- Campus topography
- Natural ambience
- Presence of the surrounding hills
- Dexter Lawn

**Negative**
- Accessibility issues, too many “maze-like” areas
- “Up the hill” means administration
- There is a need to “domesticate” cars
- Prepare better for bikes
- Parking structures and service areas are too visible
- Library looks like a prison!

**Ideas for the Future**
- Circulation: Mass transit – incorporate electric trolleys
- Circulation: Add a parking structure along Highland Drive
- Land Use: Implement a second hub adjacent to, and including, the Kennedy Library – elements to incorporate include:
  - A transit hub
  - Increased lawn area with moveable chairs, food carts, and additional shade trees
  - A small amphitheater with a central plaza/fountain element
  - Utilize library’s rooftop terraces and add a restaurant on top of the library
  - Open up the library towards the new lawn/plaza area for increased utilization
- Connectivity: Connect “upper” and “lower” campus hubs through the Dexter Lawn area (landscaped terraces, water element, etc.)
• Connectivity: Increase campus-wide connectivity and make campus more user friendly at all levels

GROUP 3 considered themes F and G below in their discussion:

F. The on-campus residential focus will play an important role in future placemaking.
G. The local community’s interaction with Cal Poly is an important consideration for campus placemaking.

➢ GROUP 3 Topic Discussion Results

Positive
• Current “placemaking” buildings” - assets
  o The Rec Center
  o Kennedy Library
  o Sporting venues
  o Poly Canyon
  o Arboretum
  o Campus Market

Negative
• The University Union is not hitting the mark
• No recognizable food and drink offerings
• Parking is difficult, expensive, and inconvenient
• Campus is generally not “accessible” to the community at large (i.e. physically and socially)

Ideas for the Future
• Bring back students currently living off-campus in San Luis Obispo – don’t just house current/new students – The City is currently “pulling” students off-campus
• Provide more entertainment and food offerings on-campus to compete with those located off-campus
• Provide additional housing near the baseball stadium
• Provide an on-campus facility/space for off-campus people to come and meet – a nice space for faculty or alumni to gather or meet