Implementation

North Campus, perhaps more than other UCSD neighborhoods, will provide common open space, and protect “views”. The potential of the site is to create a “campus” and not simply enable development. However, funding constraints may allow only development of facilities; thus realization of a campus environment and its open space may be problematic.

The future of North Campus will depend upon the commitment of faculty, administration, staff, students and design professionals. The quality of the campus, as a physical and cultural place, will depend upon that commitment being sustained and nourished.

**FUNDING OPEN SPACE**

Most funding which is currently available for projects is earmarked for usable building space. Alternative sources of funding are not readily available. The following are some of the possibilities. Options for contribution from facility development projects on development sites include assigning a percentage of construction cost, or assessing impact fees based on the development capacity of the site being developed. This could be accomplished by simply augmenting the landscape budget for each project as appropriate.

**Individual Projects**

The facilities that will benefit most from development of an open-space framework are those that will be developed on sites directly adjacent to the larger spaces. UCSD should attempt to establish a method by which projects would contribute in a way similar to “developer impact fees” to an open-space development program.
Campus Funds

Because open space projects enormously benefit the university as a whole, campus funds may also be considered to finance open space projects.

Fund raising

Proposed open-space projects might be supported by private fund raising. These projects could include artworks or landscape features that could be named after individual or organizational contributors.

PHASING OF FACILITIES AND OPEN SPACE

A phasing plan for North Campus is highly conjectural given uncertainties regarding future programmatic and financial circumstances. The academic program for North Campus is undefined; parking programmed for the area may possibly be reduced given increasing emphasis on alternative transportation modes; the housing program goal of developing 2800 beds is problematic given UCSD's relatively high housing fees and the projected cost; and the need for a satellite utility plant is questionable. Nevertheless, some general guidelines can be outlined.

North Campus should be developed primarily from south to north and open space parcels should be developed in a coordinated way with adjacent facilities. The general phasing concept is to initially create College A in the Academic Grove district (the south neighborhood) and then to later frame the Wedge open space with facilities immediately along its north edge. The entry drive relocation, improvements to ridge walk, implementation of the ridge walk terminus at northpoint and the tennis complex (if it is the selected alternative for northpoint) could occur independent of the schedule for other facilities. These ideas are shown for clarity in separate illustrations for Facilities (Figure 44) and Open Space (Figure 45). The phases indicated in the two diagrams should be concurrent.

Development of early phases should occur at planned densities even if they are reduced scope. It would be premature to assume that the eventual build-out will be reduced, and spreading out initial development at lower density could backfire. This approach may create a reserve of undeveloped land near the north entry which can be reassigned if the program does change. The reserve would logically occur primarily on land currently assigned to residential use because the residential component of the program is most likely to change in the future.
Academic Development

With the Social Sciences building and planned expansions to the I of A, Supercomputer and IRPS, no further academic development is envisioned in the Academic Grove district (College A). New academic development would occur north of the highpoint wedge, probably along ridge walk.

Housing

New undergraduate housing in North Campus would probably not occur until College A is established; then it should be located in the College A (Academic Grove) district. The initial increment of housing could include the quad on site 12, the Food Services on site 11 and pedestrian areas and connections to ridge walk. During design of (undergraduate) housing on site 13 (Figure 12), adjacent to IRPS, the impact of noise on IRPS should be carefully evaluated. If as a result of this evaluation it is determined that noise impacts from undergraduate housing may negatively impact IRPS, then the east side of this site should be reserved for graduate housing. If an International House (which includes 200 beds each of graduate and undergraduate apartments) is approved, this site is an excellent candidate for that facility. In this event the graduate apartments should be planned for the eastern portion of the site.

The North Campus program calls for 400 graduate housing beds. Options for siting this housing are: 1) In the Torrey Pines district on site 16 (Figure 12) or, 2) Partially in the Torrey Pines district and partially on site 13 west of IRPS. (In the latter scenario the capacity of College A to accommodate undergraduate housing is slightly diminished.) It is possible that graduate housing may be funded before new undergraduate housing in this area of campus.

Some regard the Master Plan study goal of housing 50% of the ultimate student population on campus as overly ambitious from a fiscal point-of-view and that a more realistic scenario would be for UCSD to seek to house approximately 35% of all students in campus facilities. This raises the issue of appropriate density at which to construct individual housing projects as they are funded. To preserve the option of achieving the Master Plan study housing goal, all housing should be constructed at the density recommended herein (average 2.8 FAR). However, housing development should be phased in a manner that permits the two neighborhoods to appear “finished” with only 35% of the planned housing (1680 instead of 2400 undergraduate beds; 280 instead of 400 graduate housing beds) constructed.
As discussed earlier, the strategy for handling the lower housing program of 1960 beds is to develop this housing to the south and near the wedge, leaving the north portions of sites 14 and 16 (Figure 12) undeveloped as reserve areas. This would achieve the goal of creating the image of two completed neighborhoods with a reduced housing program while also providing flexibility to expand the Academic program into site 16 or to use parts of the reserve for currently unprogrammed open space or support uses.

Parking

Three major parking structures are planned for North Campus; it is likely that at least two and perhaps all three of these structures will not occur until after the turn of the century. The garage east of the future Social Sciences building should be the first constructed of these three, the garage between North Torrey Pines Road and Scholars Drive in the Academic Grove district should be next, with the North Point garage, if necessary, last of the three.

Temporary Uses

As ultimate build-out of North Campus is likely to occur over a very long period of time - perhaps decades - use of North Campus lands for temporary, low cost facilities is not inappropriate. The UCSD Campus/Community Planning Committee recently approved a construction of a throwing field on North Point as a temporary facility. Other potential appropriate temporary uses include surface parking, tennis courts and other similar relatively inexpensive investments.