

**HOUSING AND STUDENT LIFE  
SECTION 1 - HOUSING.**

**1. The 1988 LRDP:**

a. The campus housing goals:

- 70 percent of undergraduate students
- 50 percent of graduate students
- 25 percent of faculty
- 50 percent of new staff recruited from outside Santa Cruz County

b. The LRDP further states:

- As many as 1000 students will be enrolled in each College
- The Campus will grow in increments of Residential Colleges
- (page 31, 1988 LRDP defines a residential college: "combining classrooms, offices, housing, and other facilities").
- Housing within the College will be provided for as many as 750 students.
- "Since the cost and marketability of future campus housing units cannot be presently evaluated, it cannot be stated with certainty at this time that the housing goals can be fully realized" (page 31, 1988 LRDP, footnote 25 – which states: "for example, the successful provision of new on-campus housing depends on the costs of constructing such housing – which must ultimately be paid for by student renters – and the prevailing rents of off-campus housing").
- The Colleges and Graduate Housing would be developed in the "college arc" an area that occupies land to the east, north and west of the Campus Core.
- Housing goals were established by the City-University Housing Task Force

**2. Existing Conditions:**

a. By fall 2004, the campus the campus is project to house:

- 52.49% of Undergraduates
- 14.34% of Graduates
- 23.61% of Faculty
- 27.56% of Net New Staff From Outside SC County

***(Appendix A, Enrollment and Housing growth since 1989)***

b. There are currently 10 undergraduate Colleges. College enrollment range from approximately 1200 students enrolled per college to 1500 students enrolled per college.

***(Appendix B, 2002-2003 Enrollment Distribution by College)***

- c. Other Housing Support Services and Initiatives.
  - Slug Partnership Program (1996-1999 student housing in local hotels)
  - University Town Center (10 year master lease of 54 student apartments/108 student beds – started in 1999)
  - UCSC Inn (10 year master lease of 276 student beds, dining and conference facilities – started in 2001)
  -
- d. Cooperative efforts with City of Santa Cruz:
  - City/University Housing Task Force (2001). Formed jointly by City Council and Chancellor Greenwood to address joint planning of university housing. Includes staff of CUHS, Planning Director and staff.
  - City has approved the construction of SRO units, many of which are suitable as student rentals. In addition, the City Council has amended the accessory dwelling ordinance and provided owners with designs for ADUs. It is expected that the increase in legal ADUs will provide safe and suitable housing for students.
  - University planning staff have assisted the City with the update of the Housing Element of the City General Plan, which has subsequently been approved by the State of California. The General Plan update through 2020 is being planned to coincide with the campus LRDP.
- e. The university has recently purchased 64 apartments near the campus entrance that will provide short term housing for faculty and staff. An additional fifty on-campus apartments have been renovated and sold to faculty and staff of the University.

### 3. Key Physical Issues:

- a. A 1998 study indicated that 4,831 additional student beds would be needed to meet 1988 Housing goals. 3,260 would be constructed in existing colleges and Colleges 11 & 12. Estimated 416 units could be built on non-College housing sites (1,661 beds). Study of existing Inclusion Areas (A-E) could accommodate 838 units of housing. Additional College Infill sites could accommodate 390 units. Plan did not take into consideration environmental and other site limitations (including lack of infrastructure), academic needs, and emergency vehicle access and egress that might reduce the number of units.

#### (Appendix C: Lyndon/Buchanan Housing Capacity Study (1999))

- b. The Growth and Stewardship Committee hired a consultant team identify opportunities and constraints for new housing in the North Campus and housing infill site. A more comprehensive assessment was made of environmental constraints, infrastructure needs, and the needs for pedestrian and vehicle circulation.

#### (Appendix D: Growth and Stewardship Program (November 2001))

- c. Since the 1988 LRDP, several plant and animal species have been found on the campus that have federal protection by US Fish and Wildlife. The protection of these species on or near housing sites has influenced (Ranch View Terrace faculty and staff housing) and will continue to influence both campus academic and housing growth.

#### **4. Issues, Challenges and Possible Considerations.**

- a. Adequate demand must be substantiated to produce campus housing. Currently, the local market has had a dip in the occupancy rates and the development of new units during the next several years' promises to produce an increase in the inventory of off campus supply. Additionally, the approval of new city ordinances that govern ADUs may change the ADU market.
- b. What impacts will the off campus market have on the university's need to articulate demand in advance of new construction? How will the University and City strike the sensitive balance between all market sectors?
- c. What opportunities will the City, County and University identify for joint projects that meet the housing needs of the entire community? How will we develop projects that effectively connect with the master transportation plan, the City Housing Element and City Redevelopment goals?
- d. How will University goals and land use best intersect with City and County housing goals? Where might third party projects on and off campus be integrated as a strategy for meeting both the University and local community needs for accessible and affordable housing? How will units built by third party (on or off campus) and units built as joint partnerships with the City be counted towards the University housing goals?
- e. How will the University develop the new beds that will be required to meet established housing goals and integrate the increased debt capacity? How will this issue be balanced with our need to stay within comparable local market costs and within student budgets? How will construction costs be integrated into setting housing goals?
- f. How will we integrate the findings of the Sedway demand analysis (2002) that articulates findings regarding faculty, staff and student housing needs? How will we give consideration to UC system wide and national trends in student housing demand? In particular, how will we integrate upper class student interest in more independent (ie., non-parental, non-university) housing opportunities?

#### **(Appendix E: Sedway Analysis Report (2003))**

- g. How will we identify achievable Housing Goals for 2006-2020 based on 2002 HOUSING AND STUDENT LIFE WHITE PAPER

- analysis? How will these goals be influenced by the overall enrollment goals for the university?
- h. When housing communities are developed for families, faculty, staff graduate students – how will child care services be integrated in support of the community?
  - i. Will we carry the concept of a graduate college forward? If so, what would the physical, intellectual and financial considerations be?
  - j. How will we analyze and integrate dining services as a component of campus growth? In its' traditional sense for undergraduate residential students and for non-traditional dining services in support of the larger university community?
  - k. Will the campus continue to carry the concept of a "camper park" into the future?
  - l. How will university housing goals impact off campus communities in respect to community relations, street parking, single family housing unit utilization and unit density?
  - m. How will parking be addressed as a component of on campus housing? Current policies are restrictive for students that live on campus. New housing construction does not equate to new parking. This is particularly problematic when projects include housing for faculty and staff. This situation has direct impact on communities that are adjacent to the campus.
  - n. If the North Campus is to be developed and utilized to support the University's housing goals, what financial mitigations could be developed and implemented to support this development?
  - o. Will the campus continue to integrate new growth by new colleges or will the University expand the carrying capacities for the current 10 Colleges? If so, what is the maximum capacity for a UCSC College? Will the "college" be the growth model or will we look to consider other residential community configurations? (i.e. family housing, graduate housing communities, student apartments, mixed use communities).

## **SECTION 2 – STUDENT LIFE.**

### **1. The 1988 LRDP**

- a. The Program elements from the 1988 LRDP specific to Student Life (and academic support services) included:
  - Physical Education and Sports – central physical education instruction facilities were proposed, as were distributed court and field facilities for both casual recreation and intramural competition. Additionally, adequate court and field facilities for team practice and competition.
  - Student Services – several functions would require additional space including; student services administration, student activity offices, a student center, bookstore expansion and a graduate student center.
  - Child Care Services was to be developed at the base of campus at the South entrance was considered a part of Campus and Community Support.

## 2. Existing Conditions

- a. Since the completion of the 1988 LRDP, the campus has developed and Delivered the following Student Services facilities:
  - Bay Tree Building including a bookstore, student services offices and conference rooms and the Graduate Commons with retail dining facility
  - Sports and recreation facilities including an Olympic-size swimming pool, locker rooms, wellness center, outdoor playing fields at Oakes College and East Field House, basketball and tennis courts at College Eight and the East Field House, a Wellness Center, and OPERS administrative offices
  - The University Center with dining and meeting room facilities
  - A Student Center (which evolved into a Learning Support Center when the Student Center/Student Union functions moved to the old Bookstore
  - College Nine and College Ten Student Facilities Space
- b. A 2002 feasibility study recommended the development of the following Additional student life facilities:
  - A new, expanded Student Union
  - Improvements to the Quarry Amphitheater
  - A recreation/events center with capacity of up to 5,000An expanded, remodeled Student Health Center
  - Additional recreational fields

### (Appendix F: Student Life Facilities Feasibility Study (2002))

## 3. Key Physical Issues

- a. Space located adjacent to the Campus Core and to the Colleges is limited. Space for athletic fields is particularly hard to identify in light of the physical topography of the campus.
- b. Possible expansion space exists on the north campus but construction costs would be exponential in light of development and infrastructure costs.

## 4. Issues, Challenges and Possible Considerations

- a. Bookstore, recreation, dining and meal service, retail service, child care service and student life expansion space? How do we project this based on enrollment goals?
- b. What are the “community support space” needs for campus expansion? Event Center, Conference and Visitors Center, etc. What additional analysis might be required to fully identify the needs of the broader community?
- c. Student facilities and program space expansion is dependent upon student fee increases that are triggered either by a student referendum or increases to the Registration Fee. How would the program for campus expansion be influenced by this funding approach and where might there be opportunities to collaborate with other expansion projects and/or alternative funding opportunities?

- d. Projections for space development for student life has traditionally been conservative which has defaulted to the development of some space that operations and services outgrew within the first few years of operations. How does the campus develop and fund projects that can grow as the campus grows?
- e. What types of programs and services are not working for students in respect to land use and campus planning? Pathways, meeting space, way-finding, transportation, lighting, parking, housing types, housing choices, green building, sustainability, etc.
- f. How do we integrate planning for housing and student life in a way that considers both enrollment goals and research program goals? Equally, how do we integrate planning in respect to plans for the campus proper, off campus adjacencies, off campus university owned properties and off campus leased properties?
- g. In a report by the Office of the President System-wide Task Force on Child Care – a recommendation accepted by President Atkinson was that Child Care should be a programmatic consideration for all new UC construction. How does this recommendation influence planning at UCSC?

**(Appendix G: UC Report on Child Care (2000))**

**HSLWG White Paper Summary Notes:**

- ❑ Future charts and projections as well as current data inserts should be consistent in respect to year of comparisons, variables, etc.
- ❑ Time needs to be focused on developing and integrating LRDP language that adjusts nomenclature. How do we select language from the past, language that is currently being utilized as well as language that needs to be taken into the next generation of the LRDP. For example, the distinction between “Colleges” and “Residential Colleges”, Campus Housing and University Housing, Student Services and Academic Support Services, etc.
- ❑ It will be necessary to prioritize the questions in some type of order so that the higher priority questions have the most time for analysis, discussion and recommendation development.
- ❑ The HSLWG White Paper should offer concrete recommendations for issues and items that may be nebulous. For example, should there be additional colleges or not, should there be a graduate college or not, should there be playing fields developed centrally or developed in small increments around colleges, should there be an event center, etc.
- ❑ Recommendations should be developed in broad terms rather than building specific detail.
- ❑ We need to test scenarios for various enrollment levels as recommendations may vary based upon different FTE models.