This is the East Carolina University Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan Alternatives Scenario presentation. This workbook reviews the campus alternative scenarios first presented on campus on November 30 and December 1, 2010. It first summarizes the work that led up to the alternatives and then compares these alternate future paths. The campus master planners are seeking your input at this critical stage in the project.
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“The purpose of this comprehensive plan is to create a plan that will anticipate the future by considering facility needs generated by the University’s Mission Statement, Strategic Plan and corresponding Academic Program”
Three Key Themes were introduced very early on in the process as an overall guide in the planning process. These have been guiding our decision-making while crafting the alternatives and they should be considered while viewing and testing the alternatives.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The Key Themes were then expanded into Master Planning Principles to help further guide the planning process.
The consultant team had generated some strategic questions for ECU that needed clarification. ECU took on these issues and provided a response referred to as Institutional Directive Considerations. This list was developed by the Academic Council and was reviewed by Vice Chancellors for discussion with the Deans, Directors, etc. This above list was used along with the campus Strategic Review and other consultant reports to begin our master plan alternatives process.
This schedule shows the overall process by the consultant team. Currently, the consultant team is in the final stages of the alternative scenarios phase. After this task a preferred concept will be developed.
Before arriving at the alternative scenarios stage, the master plan team analyzed current and future academic space needs. The space analysis first considered how existing space was being used then the team estimated the amount of space needed on campus in the future based on growing student enrollment, changes in teaching methods, requests from academic program leads, and national and state benchmarks.
After the space capacity and facility assessments were complete, a Capital Project Plan was drafted containing items that are essential to meeting the needs of the future. High priority items are listed here for the Health Sciences Campus.
After the space capacity and facility assessments were complete, a Capital Project Plan was drafted containing items that are essential to meeting the needs of the future. High priority items are listed here for the Main Campus.
A campus alternative is a mix of many ideas which are intended to spur discussion and debate. While some ideas may seem radical, they are a test or a “what if?” approach. This process also helps the master plan team identify and confirm that all possible opportunities have been explored. The alternatives are not stand-alone, many elements can be interchangeable, therefore the preferred alternative may be a collection of ideas from each. One alternative is not a particular recommendation and none provide the final answer.
An overview of the regional context of the ECU campus is illustrated in regards to the 4 largest components of the campus: North Recreational Complex, the West Research Campus, the Health Sciences Campus and the Main Campus. The master plan team studied in detail these large campus components to confirm that the existing use was the best use for these areas.
• A previous Master Plan is in place and currently Phase 1 is complete
• Future plans meet the needs of recreational demand for the campus

The North Recreation Complex has an existing master plan that has partially been implemented. The consultant team has reviewed this plan and think it adequately serves the current and future recreational needs of ECU.
West Research Campus is currently used for academic field studies and research. Because most of the land is occupied by regulated wetlands and is not served by utilities, building large structures would be problematic and expensive. We recommend that for the life of this master plan, the West Research Campus be used for outdoor academics and research.
An overview of the regional context of the ECU campus is illustrated in regards to the 4 largest components of the campus: North Recreational Complex, the West Research Campus, the Health Sciences Campus and the Main Campus. The master plan team studied in detail these large campus components to confirm that the existing use was the best and future uses for these areas.
We looked at the Health Science Campus within its context while still understanding that it is important to consider strengthening the relationship between HSC and Main Campus.
We looked at the Main Campus within its context while still understanding that it is important to consider strengthening the relationship between with the HSC and Downtown Greenville. ECU has the opportunity to become an economic engine in the revitalization of the Downtown area.
Task 4:
Physical Planning
Alternative Scenarios
HEALTH SCIENCES CAMPUS
Concurrently during the Capital Projects process, the master plan team performed a thorough site inventory and analysis of the Health Sciences Campus. These maps helped drive the alternative scenarios process in regards to community context, natural features, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and campus structure. These maps can be reviewed in detail on the campus master plan site: www.ecu.edu/masterplan
Some common factors apply to all of the alternative scenarios for the Health Sciences Campus, and may not be clearly illustrated in the plans at this time. It is the intention of the master plan team to address these commonalities and issues in each plan. Upon the final plan, these commonalities will be more apparently addressed through graphic representation and in the final report for this project.
After the completion of the site inventory and analysis task, a framework plan was completed to show the opportunities for future campus growth. Considerations were made in regards to sacred open spaces, environmentally sensitive areas, existing property, off-campus locations and re-use opportunities.
A product of the Capital Project Plan was a list of future building facilities to define the future physical needs of campus. Shown graphically here are the existing facilities of the Health Sciences Campus on the left, while the right side shows the additional facilities needed to support the future needs of campus. The team used these blocks as “puzzle pieces” to develop different scenarios.
The master plan team created four alternative land use scenarios for the Health Sciences Campus. These “bubble diagram” illustrations show a comparative overview of each. The primary movable pieces are the Ambulatory Care and Ancillary Service components and the Medical Education facility. Academic, Institution, and Research zones became less mobile in the process due to existing established districts within this campus.

1. “Live Within Your Means” illustrates a scenario where all of the future growth is handled within the existing property boundaries of the campus.

2. The “Moye Village” scenario shows an extension of the Moye Building complex to the east of Moye Boulevard, on the county-owned property.

3. In the “Partner With PCMH” scenario, the Ambulatory and Ancillary components move south of Heart Boulevard for an more direct adjacency to PCMH.

4. In the last scheme, “Institution Zone Density”, the Ambulatory and Ancillary components move into a central location between the Family Medicine and Cardiovascular Institute.

In the following diagrams (next pages) show the above bubble diagrams and a corresponding “block” diagram, which illustrates more specifically the building block components of each scenario.
Scenario 1, “Live Within Your Means” explores a land use arrangement for future facilities built on land currently owned by ECU. In this alternative, Ambulatory Care/outpatient clinics and Ancillary Services (including diagnostics, imaging, and treatment) would be located along Moye Boulevard, north of PCMH and the Heart Institute. This would allow consolidation of the multiple outpatient clinics and treatment centers in the area to one central location for easy patient access, with a new ‘front door’ on Moye Boulevard, between the hospital and a proposed Veterans Administration hospital on Moye north of 5th Street.

A new Medical Education Facility for the School of Medicine and a Student Services building could be located between the current health sciences campus and the new Ambulatory Care centers, creating a link between education and clinical care. The School of Public Health may be located within the new Medical Education Facility, or as part of the re-use of the Brody Building. The Student Support Building will house food service, meeting rooms, wellness programs and a fitness center for students on the Health Sciences Campus. Research expansion will occur near the Warren Life Sciences building, and the Brody Building will be re-used for additional research and offices. The existing Family Medicine and Cardiovascular Institute and their ambulatory care functions would remain and have adjacent expansion space.
This diagram provides more detail and shows an idea of the building sizes that might be needed to meet future needs, assuming a 3 to 4 story building height. This diagram also notes key pedestrian linkages (shown in the orange arrows) needed to help pedestrian movement between facilities. In this alternative, a portion of the existing Service drive east of the Medical Library would be closed to through traffic to enhance pedestrian movement across campus. Potential parking garage locations are shown as preliminary ideas to serve new development.

Beyond 10 years, it is assumed that the existing clinical programs located east of Moye Boulevard could be absorbed into the Ambulatory Care center west of Moye.
Scenario 2, “Moye Village” takes the concept of a consolidated Ambulatory Care / Ancillary Services and locates it east of Moye Boulevard, in association with the existing clinical facilities currently built. This would require ECU to purchase the former County hospital site for expansion and construction. The Medical Education Facility would shift further east to a new location at 5th Street and Moye Boulevard, and the Student Services Building could have a location on the existing pond on campus. Future research, institutional expansion, and the re-use of Brody for office and research remain the same as scenario 1.
Purchasing the county hospital site would allow ECU expansion room to build ambulatory care clinics more incrementally and at a lower density. However, building smaller facilities incrementally would require more redundancy in ancillary services for each building, and could result in the need for additional square footage beyond the current program demand. Clinical buildings are shown arranged around a central green or campus quadrangle space, with a pedestrian connection back to the existing Health Sciences Education campus. The walking distance would be about 12-15 minutes between these two functions in this scenario.
Scenario 3, “Partner with Pitt County Memorial Hospital” (PCMH) proposes a combined Ambulatory Care and Ancillary Services district south of Heart Boulevard in the southwest of campus, on land owned by Pitt County. This brings future outpatient clinical functions closer to Family Medicine and the Cardiovascular Institute, and creates a new front door off of Arlington. As hospitals face ways to gain efficiency in operating costs, and respond to changes from health care reform, there may be a need for PCMH to build more ambulatory care facilities. Partnering with PCMH could result in a greater cost sharing and savings for ECU.

In this scenario, the proposed Medical Education Building could be located between the Cardiovascular Institute and the Medical Library, close to research, Health Sciences education, and the future outpatient clinical environment. The Student Services building would be located at the center of the large Health Sciences Education quadrangle, as a centerpiece for student life. North-south pedestrian walks would link the district together. Research expansion and the re-use of Brody remain as proposed in earlier schemes.
This view suggests a potential configuration of building footprints for Ambulatory Care south of Heart Boulevard. In this scenario, ambulatory care buildings are in closer relationship to research, the hospital, and existing outpatient clinics in Family Medicine and the Cardiovascular Institute. A central campus green and pedestrian walkway could help connect all functions on the Health Sciences campus, and to the west entrance of the hospital.
Scenario 4, “Institution Zone Density” explores the possibility of a more compact health sciences education campus physically integrated with an ambulatory care environment. In this alternative, future uses are shown on land owned by ECU. Ambulatory Care and Ancillary Services are shown between Family Medicine and the Cardiovascular Institute north of Heart Boulevard. The Medical Education facility would be located again between the Cardiovascular Institute and the Medical Library.

This scenario also explores the possibility of developing a ‘Millennial Campus’ of private sector research located at the Health Sciences campus, west of MacGregor Downs Road, to facilitate partnerships between ECU and private companies working on biomedical research.
Ambulatory Care facilities in this scenario would create a more compact and walkable outpatient clinical setting, with all facilities within a 5 minute walk of each other. The existing Family Medicine building could act as the main receiving and registration to orient patients. Buildings would need to be taller, approximately 5-6 stories tall, in order to fit the program onto this site.

The Medical Education facility and Student Services building are located central to research, educational, and outpatient functions. Research expansion remains near the Warren Life Sciences, and the Brody building could be re-used as a combined public and private research facility. Development of a new Millennial Campus to the west would have to take existing wetlands into account when planning future facilities.
The master plan team created four alternative scenarios for the Health Sciences Campus. These “building block” illustrations show a comparative overview of each. Note the major moving pieces for consideration:

**Ambulatory Care and Ancillary Services:**
1. Should these facilities be located on the west side of Moye within the campus boundary (on ECU owned property)?
2. Should these facilities be located east of the campus boundary, as an extension of the existing Moye clinical buildings?
3. Should these facilities be located on the south side of Heart Boulevard, off-campus, developed as a partnership with PCMH?
4. Should these facilities be located within the existing Institutes zone on campus?

**Medical Education:**
1. Should the new Medical Education Building be an extension north of the existing academic zone and front 5th street?
2. Should the new Medical Education Building be located on the west side of Moye Boulevard, where future academics could expand to the south?
3. Should the new Medical Education Building be located more central to the existing Health Sciences campus, close to the Cardiovascular Institute?

**Student Services:**
1. Should Student Services be central to the Academic portion of campus?
2. Or central to the entire campus?

**Millennial Campus:**
1. Should the Millennial Campus be located at the Health Sciences Campus?
2. Would the reassignment of Brody to include a tech-transfer program be acceptable here?
Task 4:
Physical Planning
Alternative Scenarios
MAIN CAMPUS
Concurrently during the Capital Projects process, the master plan team performed a thorough site inventory and analysis of the Main Campus. These maps helped drive the alternative scenarios process in regards to community context, natural features, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and campus structure. These maps can be reviewed in detail on the campus master plan site: www.ecu.edu/masterplan
Some common factors apply to all of the alternative scenarios, and may not be clearly illustrated in the plans at this time. It is the intention of the master plan team to address these commonalities and issues in each plan. Upon the final plan, these commonalities will be more apparently addressed through graphic representation and in the final report for this project.
After the completion of the site inventory and analysis task, a framework plan was completed to show the opportunities for future campus growth. Considerations were made in regards to sacred open spaces, environmentally sensitive areas, existing property, off-campus locations and re-use opportunities.

A pattern of land use in the academic core of Main Campus became apparent to the consultant team through the analysis phase that has guided our development of alternatives. Main Campus is divided into two primary zones:

1. The west half that is primarily student service based (Union, Library, Recreation Center, Student Health, Residential, Dining) and is characterized by iconic open spaces and smaller-scaled architecture.

2. The east half that is where most students spent the majority of their academic life and is characterized by post-war building-boom architecture, a higher density, and very limited open space. This part of campus has very nearly reached its carrying capacity for new buildings.

As we look to expand academic programs and new academic buildings, we will no longer be able to accommodate them in the east part of the campus and so we will have to look elsewhere.
A product of the Capital Project Plan was a list of future building facilities to define the future physical needs of campus. Shown graphically here are the existing facilities of the Main Campus on the left, while the right side shows the additional facilities needed to support the future needs of campus. The team used these blocks as “puzzle pieces” to develop different scenarios.
The master plan team created three alternative scenarios for the Main Campus. These “bubble diagram” illustrations show a comparative overview of each. The primary movable pieces are the Academic (expansion), Residential (expansion), Millennial Campus and Facilities components. The pieces that become more stationary are the Athletic, established Residential, established Academic areas and the HHP campus. These areas are less mobile due to their existing districts on campus. In all scenarios, parking is removed from the central open areas of campus to create a pedestrian core.

1. “Go North” illustrates a scenario where future Academic components are incorporated into the downtown fabric of campus. A new Residential component would be established just to the south of this area. A Millennial Campus would be developed in the Warehouse District.

2. The “Campus Density” scenario shows an increased concentration of Academics within the existing east Academic Zone. New Residential opportunities would be located in existing Residential areas within the campus boundary. The Millennial Campus would be developed within the Reade Street Corridor. Facilities and Support Services would located in the Warehouse District.

3. In the “Go West” scenario, the Academic expansion would occur in the Warehouse District. Residential expansion could be paired with mixed use in the downtown area. The Millennial Campus in this scheme is located on the Health Sciences Campus.

In the following diagrams (next pages) show the above bubble diagrams and a corresponding “block” diagram, which illustrates more specifically the building block components of each scenario.
Scenario 1, “Go North” explores the main concept of adding additional academic growth within ECU property off of the Reade Street Corridor in the campus Downtown District. The Reade Street property has the advantage of being connected to the Main Campus as well as the downtown Greenville area and would accommodate academic growth for campus as well as spur economic growth and vitality to downtown.

This district would also include a residential component off of ECU property just south of Reade Circle. This residential development would be a public/private partnership that would be beneficial to the ECU community. This idea would enhance the downtown Greenville area by adding an additional student and faculty population here and could spur new opportunities for mixed use (restaurants, shops, etc.) in this area. Health and Human Performance expansion will move forward in the South Academic District. The Millennial Campus component would be located within the Warehouse District and provide a link to the Health Sciences Campus. Police, facilities and related university support would be located centrally on campus just north of the railroad tracks.
Main Campus Scenario 1. Go North

1. Demolition of Christenbury Gym
2. Reconfiguration of Howell to allow for a Biosciences addition
3. New Academic A building off of Reade Street
4. Mixed use (retail and hotel/conference) with Performing Arts Center also located on Reade Street
5. Residential expansion opportunity with public-private development
6. Expansion of Student Recreation Center
7. Mendenhall reassignment to classroom/office
8. New Student Union north of Jayne/mall
9. New Alumni Center off of 10th Street
10. Demolition of Delek Residence Hall
11. Slay Hall returned to housing
12. Millennial Campus development in Warehouse District
13. IHP expansion in South Academic District
14. Facilities/Police located in Central Support District
15. Basketball Practice addition on Minges Coliseum
16. A parking deck is constructed in the south of Mendenhall
17. Additional parking decks can be located north of College Hill and along Reade Street

This diagram provides more detail and shows an idea of the building sizes and placement that might be needed to meet future needs. This diagram also notes key pedestrian linkages (shown in the orange arrows) needed to help pedestrian movement between facilities. In this alternative, Founders Drive that currently bisects the center of the campus core would be mostly eliminated from central campus; this would allow a continuous green space and pedestrian walks to connect the east (academic) to the west (student services) campus districts. A clearer and safer pedestrian link would be utilized to the new academic area in the downtown district. Parking decks are illustrated to show possible locations as surface lots are removed from the pedestrian core of campus and also for new buildings. The new Student Center is located off of the circle drive, along with a new transit hub, to create a more distinct entrance to campus. A Visual and Performing Arts Center along with a Hotel and Conference Center are incorporated along the Reade Street corridor, capitalizing on a link to the Tar River, downtown, and campus.
Scenario 2, “Campus Density,” explores the main concept of adding additional academic growth within the existing academic core and student services areas. Most new residential housing would be placed within the College Hill area. The Millennial Campus would be located within the Reade Street Corridor in the Downtown District. This idea would enhance the downtown Greenville area by adding an additional student and faculty population here and could spur new opportunities for mixed use (restaurants, shops, small businesses, etc.) in this area. Health and Human Performance expansion will move forward in the South Academic District. Public Safety, Facilities Operations, and other “back-of-house” (non academic) functions would be located within the Warehouse District.
This diagram provides more detail and shows an idea of the building sizes and placement that might be needed to meet future needs. This diagram also notes key pedestrian linkages (shown in the orange arrows) needed to help pedestrian movement between facilities. In this alternative, Founders Drive that currently bisects the center of the campus core would be mostly eliminated from central campus; this would allow a continuous green space and pedestrian walks to connect the east (academic) to the west (student services) campus districts. A clearer and safer pedestrian link would be utilized to the Millennial Campus in the Downtown District. Parking decks are illustrated to show possible locations as surface lots are removed from the pedestrian core of campus and also for new buildings. In this scenario, the Visual and Performing Arts Center is located along the circle drive off of 10th Street, while the new Student Center moves north of Mendenhall creating two distinct open spaces that surround the building. A new academic building is also added along the circle drive, further defining this entrance to campus.
Scenario 3, “Go West” explores the main concept of adding additional academic growth in the Warehouse District. If a new academic neighborhood is paced in the warehouse district, the linkage back to the main campus becomes critical and must be strengthened. The placement of academics here would create a linkage between the Main and Health Sciences Campuses. Most new residential housing would occur within the Downtown District along with the relocation of campus police. Due to the location of a dense student population here, this could spur opportunities for mixed use in this area. In this scheme, the Millennial Campus would be located on the Health Sciences Campus (see Health Sciences Scenario 4). Health and Human Performance expansion will move forward in the South Academic District.
This diagram provides more detail and shows an idea of the building sizes and placement that might be needed to meet future needs. This diagram also notes key pedestrian linkages (shown in the orange arrows) needed to help pedestrian movement between facilities. Parking decks are illustrated to show possible locations as surface lots may be eliminated for new buildings.

A key concept in this alternative looks at the opportunities to create a new gateway into campus at the corner of 10th Street and Charles. A parking deck west of Charles with a visitor center and office space incorporated into it, and a new streetscape along 10th would assist in bridging the gap between the warehouse district and the new gateway. A new Student Union and future campus expansion could be located here, creating a stronger presence in the community with a new face into the Greenville community fabric. Acquiring this land is also an important step in creating the link between the campus core and the warehouse district where new academic development and a Visual and Performing Arts Center are located.
The master plan team created three alternative scenarios for the Main Campus. These “building block” illustrations show a comparative overview of each. Note the major moving pieces for consideration:

Academics:
1. Should a new academic district be created in the downtown district?
2. Should academics be consolidated on the main part of campus in the existing academic district?
3. Should a new academic district be established in the Warehouse district, possibly creating an “academic link” to the Health Sciences Campus?

Residential:
1. Should a new residential district be established off-campus through a public-private partnership?
2. After the Belk Residential Hall demolition, should a residential hall be rebuilt in this location?
3. Would residential establishment in the Reade Street corridor be a good economic driver for the downtown area?

Millennial Campus:
1. Should the Millennial Campus be part of a downtown district with a hotel/conference center?
2. Should the Millennial Campus be separate from Main Campus in the Warehouse District?
3. Should the Millennial Campus be located at the Health Sciences Campus?
Next Steps

- Campus community to review and respond to alternatives workbook
- Comments received until January 10, 2011
- SG/JJR to prepare a preferred concept by mid-February, 2011
Email: masterplan@ecu.edu

Website: www.ecu.edu/masterplan