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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PLANNING CONTEXT

Beginning the Second Century

In 1993 Southern Connecticut State University completed a two-year process designed to articulate its mission, define its academic program, and set goals for the future. The document that summarizes this two-year process, *Beginning the Second Century: Priority Goals for a Dynamic University - a Strategic Plan*, has been approved by the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University system.

At the same time that the University was defining its Strategic Plan, it was also preparing a Master Plan to guide the physical improvements and identify the capital resources necessary to effect its academic direction. This report is a summary of the University’s Master Plan and the participatory planning process that involved faculty, staff, students, and administration.

The Master Plan is an overall strategy for realizing the physical setting to support the University’s mission, goals, and objectives. The Plan provides a framework and establishes priorities so that decisions regarding facility improvements will fit within a broad context and can be made in a sensible, predictive, and timely fashion.

The University’s intentions and aspirations for the future are described in the Strategic Plan, given physical definition in the Master Plan, and quantified in the *Program for the Master Plan*, a separate study designed to show the physical and programmatic implications of the Strategic Plan.

*Beginning the Second Century* describes a vision for Southern Connecticut State University as “A model 21st Century University for Connecticut, advancing the quality of accessible, inclusive and responsive public higher education.” The University clearly defines a program for improvement and growth:

“Our Strategic Plan is a comprehensive document, but it is purposely not complete. We understand that planning is an ongoing function, especially in such changeable times. The strength of this document will therefore rest in its capacity to guide us in continuous planning and implementation over the coming years. We fully expect to see modifications in detail as we respond to new circumstances and opportunities. But our vision and mission, and the role and scope of our programs, will anchor our efforts.”
PLANNING PROCESS

From its inception, the planning process at Southern Connecticut State University was participatory and collegial. University administrators, deans, department chairs, faculty, staff, students, and Connecticut State University representatives were interviewed. Each group then reviewed progress reports and participated in many open and productive work sessions.

The Master Plan process identified and quantified needs, evaluated alternatives to meet those needs, and refined the best alternatives for the Master Plan. See Diagram 1, Master Plan Process.

Prior to initiation of the master plan, the site had been surveyed and mapped, building floor plans had been computerized, and the facility inventory updated. The ensuing planning effort incorporated this background material as well as the goals, values, and aspirations articulated in the University's Strategic Plan.

The Master Plan integrates three studies: the *Existing Facilities Condition Survey*, *Campus Analysis*, and the *Program for the Master Plan*. These studies were designed to ascertain building and site issues and concerns that should be addressed, and programmatic requirements that should be identified and quantified, both for current and future campus needs.

The information developed by the studies was used to generate alternative solutions to meet the University's needs. These alternatives included site development opportunities and possible projects for building renovations, building additions, and new construction. The alternatives were presented in a series of interactive meetings designed to encourage comment and to provide an opportunity for those affected by the outcome to participate in shaping the Plan.

On the basis of the review sessions, a Master Plan concept was accepted by the University and the Board of Trustees. Subsequently the projects represented in the Plan and summarized in this report were prioritized by the University for phased implementation.

---

1 See separate document, DeCarlo and Doll, 1992-1993
2 See pages 13-43
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FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

The master planning process verified the lack of available space at Southern Connecticut State University, a fact already clearly apparent to SCSU faculty, students, and staff. Analysis demonstrated that there is insufficient space to adequately support even the current programs. Over time, this situation will adversely affect student and faculty retention; University morale; and quality of teaching, learning, and research. The University has significantly less space per student than its peer institutions, and less space per student than comparable universities of similar enrollments.

Table 1 shows the amount of existing SCSU space, the amount of space required for the current enrollment and programs using appropriate space standards, and the amount of space that will be required when the enrollment reaches the 10,515 FTE students projected by the Strategic Plan.

The primary need for additional space is not caused by enrollment growth, although increasing enrollment does require more space; significant additional space is required to bring existing facilities up to standard for the current enrollment and program offerings.

The space projections listed in Table 1 are guided by the University’s Strategic Plan and based on requirements identified through meetings with faculty, administrators, and staff. The needs were quantified in the Program for the Master Plan, and conform to space allocation standards appropriate for the University’s enrollment, programs, and mission. The required amounts, configuration, and distribution of space were used to produce the reallocation alternatives and new building footprints that are shown in the Master Plan, summarized in the Overview that follows, and are the basis for construction and project cost estimates for implementation.

Table 1 - University Space Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing NASF</th>
<th>Required NASF for Current Enrollment of 9,129 FTE Students</th>
<th>Required NASF for Future Enrollment of 10,515 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Support</td>
<td>450,400</td>
<td>809,700</td>
<td>941,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/Athletics/Recreation</td>
<td>190,500</td>
<td>183,900</td>
<td>198,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>389,900</td>
<td>387,600</td>
<td>497,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,030,800</td>
<td>1,381,200</td>
<td>1,637,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Master Plan articulates points of view concerning the campus environs, land use, circulation, parking, building use, landscape, campus design concepts and components, and implementation costs and sequence. The Plan identifies sites for new construction and enhanced landscape development, and describes the continuing use or reuse of existing facilities to achieve a functional and attractive physical environment and an appropriate sense of place.

The Master Plan, described in more detail in a later section of this report, is summarized below by brief descriptions of key building and campus projects. See Drawing 1 for project locations.

A. Faculty offices, classrooms, and academic support space are located in new space added to Engleman Hall. Academic and administrative activities which are currently in overcrowded quarters in Engleman are relocated to the new space, and the existing space is renovated for continued academic use. The new construction includes a new main entrance to Engleman from the west, opening onto the Academic Green, a major campus green space also fronting Buley Library.

B. Physical Plant is consolidated in new facilities on Farnham Avenue, and the present site is cleared for construction of a new Student Center. A building containing offices, shops, and warehouse with an adjacent service yard can be sited at the new location, screened from view by landscaping. The new construction supplants the existing Physical Plant buildings as well as all temporary storage areas, which can then be removed from the space inventory.

C. Buley Library is renovated and expanded to provide the required space for collections, seating, and technical services. The addition is positioned to help define a new, landscaped entrance to the campus at Fitch Street. The combination of new and renovated space provides the necessary resources for the Library as the University moves into the 21st Century and embraces computerized systems, electronic communications, and multimedia technology.

D. A new Student Center is constructed on the Physical Plant site, at the intersection of Fitch and Crescent Streets. This is a strategic site for it allows the Student Center to be in close proximity to student dining and the residential precinct of the campus, as well as in close proximity to the center of the academic campus, the Library, and the enhanced Academic Green. It is a symbolically important site adjacent the bridge over Fitch Street, the gateway to this University area.

The Student Center provides space for the bookstore, Post Office, food service, student activities, meeting rooms, and support functions.

E. Seabury Hall is in such poor physical condition that the cost to remedy its deficiencies exceeds the cost of new construction; and the cost to make the building handicapped accessible would be prohibitive. Seabury is demolished and the site cleared for the construction of a student services and administration building, and related parking deck.

The student services and administration building provides a one-stop access to student-related offices such as Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and Student Affairs. Administrative offices, presently dispersed in Engleman and other academic buildings, are consolidated. A parking deck is constructed near the Crescent Street entrance to the campus for visitors, students and families visiting Admissions, and as a general parking resource. The ground floor of the parking deck could be designed for active uses to enliven this facility at the pedestrian level, while improving security.

F. Renovations in Connecticut Hall will improve kitchen, serving, and function spaces within this core building.

G. Davis Hall is expanded with a new building to provide additional instruction and clinic space for the School of Professional Studies. This location, on the campus periphery, is well-suited for these functions.

H. The Physical Education and recreation activities currently in Pelz Gym are relocated to new space constructed as an addition to Moore Fieldhouse. All Physical Education, Athletics, and recreation facilities, for men and for women, are consolidated at the Fieldhouse, providing equal access and support.
L. Earl Hall, shown by the Existing Facilities Condition Survey to be costly to renovate, is demolished. The site is used for an academic building for such programs as Business and Graduate Studies. The new building will be designed to shape the eastern edge of the Academic Green, the campus green fronting Engleman Hall and Buley Library.

J. The existing Student Center, inadequate for its present use, is renovated for conference or academic and related activities. The existing dining/snack bar space continues in use.

K. Additional space is provided at Connecticut Hall to supplement the dining and conference functions and to provide additional student activities space. Food preparation space will be augmented with this expansion. A parking deck is constructed on the site directly adjacent to the south, to serve both Connecticut Hall and the new Student Center.

M. Student housing is constructed to form a quadrangle and identifiable community focus with Chase, Farnham, and Wilkinson Halls. Future sites for residential use have been selected so that the new units will create other campus open spaces and housing communities for students. New family-style housing will be provided as needed, although the existing townhouse apartments at the North Campus Residence Complex can be adapted to serve that purpose to meet early needs.

N. Beyond the facility projects that directly address the programmatic needs engendered by the goals of the Strategic Plan, the campus landscape is enhanced and extended to unify, beautify, and signify that Southern Connecticut State University is, in fact, a distinctive institution of higher education. The project areas, described later in this report, include: the Academic Green, Alumni Walk and a concentric east campus walkway, a north campus walkway connecting residential and student life activity areas, campus gateways, and a residential quadrangle.

O. A critical component of this Plan for SCSU's future is to provide more efficient and safe access to campus. Several measures are proposed here including: widening Fitch Street, provision of enhanced entrances, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility regulations, a new signage system, improved lighting, and emergency communications throughout campus.

P. In addition to the parking deck locations described above, adjacent the student services and administration building and next to Connecticut Hall, two other sites for decks are identified: one along Fitch Street and the other along Wintergreen Avenue. Although all four parking decks are critical to campus development, the Fitch Street deck is given the highest priority.
MASTER PLAN OVERVIEW
An integral component of all planning within the Connecticut State University system is the development of a strategic plan and the program for its implementation. Accordingly, the direction of the Master Plan for Southern Connecticut State University was established by the goals and objectives set forth in the University's Strategic Plan and the elements were quantified by the Program for the Master Plan.

Southern Connecticut State University's vision and mission is to be a comprehensive, teaching-focused institution serving Connecticut's population, with an emphasis on continuously improving the programs offered. The Strategic Plan to the Year 2001, Beginning the Second Century: Priority Goals for a Dynamic University, describes the challenges facing the University, the goals set to meet those challenges, and the direction required to attain those goals.

Thirteen goals constitute the Strategic Plan. The implicit set of facility actions engendered by each goal directs the Master Plan.

1. Advance General Education and the Success of Undergraduate Students.

Master Plan Action: Add new and improve existing classrooms; add new and enhance existing labs and support space; provide current teaching technologies in teaching spaces.

2. Continuously Enrich Graduate Programs and Resources.

Master Plan Action: Add new and enhance existing facilities for graduate programs.

3. Review and Refocus the Missions and Organization of the Academic Schools.

Master Plan Action: Reorganize facilities to consolidate Academic Schools as defined.


Master Plan Action: Provide technological resources, for use by both students and faculty.

5. Support and Integrate a Research Agenda Appropriate to a Teaching University.

Master Plan Action: Add new and improve existing student and faculty research space appropriate to the University's mission.

6. Develop a Fully Networked Library for the New Information Age.

Master Plan Action: Add collection, reader, and staff space; add equipment with networked wiring and hardware.


Master Plan Action: Dedicate campus space and program resources for work with partner institutions.


Master Plan Action: Maintain first-rate, attractive facilities for all students, traditional and non-traditional.
9. Provide Student Services that Advance Educational and Personal Growth.

Master Plan Action: Add facilities responsive to social needs and to support achievement of both education and career goals.

10. Renew Our Campus by Implementing the Master Facilities Plan.

Master Plan Action: Develop phasing strategy for Master Plan implementation.

11. Expand the Growth of External Funds and Resources.

Master Plan Action: Provide space to support programs or initiatives funded by grants, loans, gifts, or partnerships.


Master Plan Action: Reorganize facilities for efficient inter-departmental relationships.

13. Promote Continuous Quality Improvement Throughout the University

Master Plan Action: Review facility assignment and condition to maintain a responsive, quality institution.

An overall development program – a definition of space requirements for each campus function – is as important to each institution in the Connecticut State University system as is a strategic plan. The program is designed to help CSU and the campus administrators develop and effect plans for renovations and new construction. The objective of the programming is to make projections that are both responsive to the strategic plans and academic offerings at each campus, and responsible in terms of normative space standards appropriate for state-funded institutions of higher education. The Program for the Master Plan at SCSU, published as a separate document, is briefly described here.

Programming at SCSU involved a study of all background documentation concerning Southern’s strategic goals and objectives; an analysis of the ways space is used to support the activities on campus; and extensive interviews with those faculty and staff responsible for activities and programs at Southern. This information was used to modify the existing CSU space allocation model so that it more clearly reflects the particular programs at SCSU.

The Program Model

The resulting space Model consists of seven spreadsheets incorporating specific categories of quantitative information routinely tracked at the SCSU campus. This data is factored by normative space standards, and other variables, to predict space requirements in a comprehensive, rigorous way, responding to SCSU’s specific situation.

The Model is designed to be easily revised or manipulated so that decision-makers can adjust it to changing circumstances to predict differing outcomes, using differing variables. This feature will prove useful in exploring alternative scenarios, such as changes in enrollment levels. It will also facilitate periodic reviews and updating of the Master Plan.

Existing and Future Facility Needs

Southern Connecticut State University’s existing building inventory consists of forty-one buildings totaling 1,030,778 net assignable square feet (NASF). Academic and support activities are located in twenty-six buildings. Of these, six are temporary structures which will be removed from the inventory when replacement space is available. There are three athletic facilities and twelve student residence buildings.

The Model was used to project the amount of space required both for existing programs and enrollments and for the future projected enrollment of 10,515 students.
## EXISTING AND PROJECTED UNIVERSITY SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Existing NASF</th>
<th>Required NASF for Current Enrollment of 9,129 FTE Students</th>
<th>Required NASF for Future Enrollment of 10,515 FTE Students</th>
<th>Percent Increase over Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC AND SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Auditorium</td>
<td>71,117</td>
<td>123,645</td>
<td>135,966</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Schools (excluding School of Health PE space)</td>
<td>189,565</td>
<td>245,423</td>
<td>299,041</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>50,917</td>
<td>155,331</td>
<td>163,988</td>
<td>222.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Support</td>
<td>80,476</td>
<td>125,424</td>
<td>144,081</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Center/Bookstore</td>
<td>20,487</td>
<td>100,419</td>
<td>125,665</td>
<td>513.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>37,883</td>
<td>59,483</td>
<td>73,083</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Academic and Support</td>
<td>450,445</td>
<td>809,725</td>
<td>941,824</td>
<td>109.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/School of Health Athletics</td>
<td>185,084</td>
<td>182,630</td>
<td>196,482</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Athletics</td>
<td>190,448</td>
<td>183,830</td>
<td>198,392</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Residences</td>
<td>389,885</td>
<td>387,635</td>
<td>497,565</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,030,778</td>
<td>1,381,190</td>
<td>1,637,781</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the amount of space by user group that is currently available at SCSU and, based on the Model, the amount that should be available for the current enrollment and programs and for the projected enrollment of 10,515. The existing 450,455 NASF of academic and support space is 56 percent of the 809,725 NASF required for the University's current enrollment, and 48 percent of the space that will be required when enrollment reaches 10,515 FTE students.

The amount of space designated for Physical Education, Athletics, recreation, and student housing is slightly above projections for current enrollments. However, the athletic space is split between two locations. It should be consolidated for efficiency of operations and to provide equivalent facilities for all. Student housing is similarly deficient in the quality of the space.

Accommodating the future enrollment of 10,515 students will require almost twice the amount of current space assigned to academic and supporting functions; a 4 percent increase in space for Physical Education, Athletics, and recreation; and a 28 percent increase in student housing space.

One particularly salient example of the academic space deficiency is the inadequate number and size of faculty offices. At most institutions a faculty office is assigned to an individual faculty member and is the primary site for student and faculty interchange, contact and discussion among peers, study and research, and the carrying out of professorial assignments and tasks outside the scheduled teaching environment. Normative space standards suggest a minimum range of 120 to 150 NASF for a typical, individual faculty office. At Southern, shockingly, 63 percent of all faculty offices are smaller than 100 NASF, and 48 percent of the faculty share offices. The average allocation of office space per faculty is less than 89 NASF.

Comparisons with peer institutions were used to assess the amounts of space available at SCSU relative to similar situations elsewhere. The peer group included such institutions as Bridgewater State University; Salem State University; University of Connecticut; University of Vermont; Trenton State College; and Eastern, Western, and Central Connecticut State Universities, as well as the average of 20 similar institutions assessed in the last national survey.

As can be seen in the Program for the Master Plan, SCSU has significantly less space per faculty member and per student than all the Universities in the peer group.
An analysis of the Southern Connecticut State University campus as a whole, an integral part of the Master Plan study, was carried out concurrently with the Existing Facilities Condition Survey, departmental interviews, and development of the Program for the Master Plan.

The following section records the campus site analysis completed during the Master Plan study. Each drawing is a distillation of a particular type of information overlaid on a map of the campus. The combination of these overlays describes the Southern Connecticut State University campus in the autumn and winter of 1992-1993, or perhaps as it would appear in an aerial snapshot taken then. Locations of buildings, streets, parking lots, and landscapes are readily identifiable elements of this analysis.

Of course, not all of the information overlaid on the campus represents something visible, nor even readily perceptible. Political realities, such as land ownership or zoning, and social or organizational activity patterns, such as the institution's scheduled use of the buildings, are parts of the whole picture. These ideas and elements are recorded here along with the consultant team's impressions and observations.

This set of analytic drawings was presented to campus constituencies as a part of the planning activities, in order to simultaneously record facts and factors influencing the future development of the site and to raise those facts and issues to a common level of understanding among all the campus representatives and the entire consultant team who worked together to generate the 1993 Southern Connecticut State University Master Plan.
URBAN CONTEXT

The Southern Connecticut State University campus context is shown on Drawing 2. Situated on the boundary between the cities of New Haven and Hamden, Connecticut, the greater portion of campus acreage falls within New Haven. The campus lies northwest of downtown New Haven approximately two miles, as the crow flies, from the central green and City Hall, or a commuting distance of nearly two and three-quarters miles from central New Haven via Elm Street, Whalley Avenue, and Fitch Street.

The campus is accessible from Connecticut Route 15/Wilbur Cross Parkway, from either Interchange 59 to the west or Interchange 60 to the north, each roughly equidistant from the campus along city thoroughfares.

The University's campus is surrounded chiefly by residential areas. Four other post-secondary institutions lie within a three mile radius from the campus - Quinnipiac College, Albertus Magnus College, Yale University, and the University of New Haven.

The regional geographic feature that distinguishes the campus is its location on the axis between East Rock and West Rock, rock escarpments which rise more than 300 feet above sea level, dominating the basin occupied by the city of New Haven. The SCSU campus itself is slightly more than 50 feet above sea level. West Rock forms the horizon west of the campus, being little more than two-tenths of a mile away from the core campus. West Rock Park lies at the western boundary of SCSU property. City park land borders the campus to the south.
Drawing 3 shows the existing zoning in the area surrounding SCSU. The majority of the University’s acreage is subject to New Haven’s zoning regulations. Much of the campus lies within the RM-1 zone (residential, multiple occupancy, low/middle density). Land bounding the campus on the west and east is zoned for park land. Land northwest of Fitch Street and northeast of Wintergreen Avenue, including land occupied by the University’s athletic complex, is zoned for cemetery use.

Campus acreage under the jurisdiction of Hamden zoning is categorized differently than University land in New Haven. The tract north of the athletic complex and west of Pine Rock Avenue is zoned as a Controlled Development District and includes such diverse uses as the Hamden landfill, a former gravel pit, and park land. Single family residential zoning and multiple occupancy zoning border University land at the east.

Commercial districts lie southwest of the campus at the intersection of Fitch and Blake Streets and east of the campus along Dixwell Avenue.
UNIVERSITY PROPERTY

Southern Connecticut State University occupies a site totaling 164 acres, as seen in Drawing 4. The New Haven portion of the tract is 146.2 acres and the Hamden portion is 17.8 acres. Easements and special conditions are noted by the drawing inset.

University property is segmented by three streets. Fitch Street is at the northwest of the main campus or academic core and divides it from all other sectors. This triangular tract is bordered on the south by Crescent Street and on the east by the Jackie Robinson Middle School. Property in this sector is contiguous, with the exception of an isolated house lot straddling the New Haven-Hamden line along Prescott Street.

Beaverdale Memorial Park, a cemetery across Fitch Street from the academic sector, separates the University's northern acreage from the main part of the campus. This north tract is accessible from Wintergreen Avenue on the southwest and Pine Rock Avenue on the east. Athletic facilities occupy the southwestern portion of this northern tract, student housing its eastern area.

Southwest of Wintergreen Avenue are two tracts of land separated by Farnham Avenue. The western tract is bounded by the Army Reserve training facility on Wintergreen Avenue at the northwest, park land to the west, and a residential area to the southwest across Wintergreen Brook. The eastern tract is bounded by Farnham Avenue on the northwest, a residential area across Beaver Brook to the southwest, Fitch Street to the southeast, and Wintergreen Avenue to the northeast.

The Campus land pattern is fragmented. Fitch Street, in particular, is a barrier to free pedestrian movement across the campus. The pedestrian bridge adjacent Connecticut Hall which spans Fitch Street near the intersection of Wintergreen Avenue helps to ameliorate the situation but, recognizably, the University campus is comprised of distinct areas separated by public streets.
1. Storm and sanitary sewer easement (15') in favor of the City of New Haven is recorded in volume 212, page 133 of the New Haven Land Records.

2. Area is subject to a 50' right-of-way in favor of the State of Connecticut, as recorded in volume 726, page 834 of the Hamden Land Records.

3. Limits of area fenced and occupied by the State of Connecticut, with apparent encroachment on land now or formerly of the Town of Hamden.

4. Limits of area fenced and occupied by the State of Connecticut with apparent encroachment on land now or formerly of the Southern Connecticut State University Foundation, Inc.

5. Apparent driveway encroachment on land now or formerly of the City of New Haven.

6. The easterly 5' of property is subject to a sewer easement in favor of the Town of Hamden, as recorded by volume 11, page 494 of the Hamden Land Records

7. Apparent driveway encroachment on land now or formerly of James M. Rosa et al.

8. Apparent driveway encroachment.

9. Total site area: 164.0
   New Haven area: 146.2
   Hamden area: 17.8
DISTRICT CIRCULATION

Vehicular access to the campus is chiefly from two major district arteries, Whalley Avenue southwest of the campus and Dixwell Avenue east of the campus. From these streets, traffic bound for SCSU will typically follow either Crescent Street or Fitch Street, both of which carry a significant amount of through traffic. A lesser, though not insignificant, amount of through traffic is carried to Fitch Street by Wintergreen Avenue. All other streets bordering University property are primarily local access routes.

Three major entrances to the core campus are along Fitch, and one from Crescent. The remaining gateway of any significance is Farnham Avenue at the intersection of Wintergreen Avenue. Although there are vehicular entries to campus facilities directly from Farnham and Wintergreen, and even Fitch Street, all are subsidiary in nature. The major points of entry noted on Drawing 5 are signed or have attended gatehouses.

The critical frontage for the University, in terms of traffic volume, general access, and highest public visibility, is the portion of Fitch Street between the southern approach at the intersection of Crescent Street north and the northern approach at the intersection of Pine Rock Avenue. The greatest number of campus pedestrian crossings of Fitch Street occur within this segment of the street. Also within this road segment, the pedestrian bridge near the intersection of Wintergreen Avenue helps to focus attention on the campus, acting as a de facto gate structure marking passage through the University area, while imbuing the area with an industrial appearance.
Drawing 6 highlights significant features of the immediate campus environs. The drawing shows that the SCSU campus lies within a chiefly residential sector of the cities of New Haven and Hamden. Residential areas lie to the southwest, southeast, and north of University lands. The immediate abutting land use to the west is West Rock Park. An Army Reserve training facility adjoins the campus next to West Rock Park on Wintergreen Avenue, as does the B’nai Jacob Memorial Park. The Hamden landfill and Tilcon, a construction materials concern, flank the abutting residential area at the campus’s northern edge.

To the east, and dominating the vista across the pond from the University’s academic facilities, is the City of New Haven’s Jackie Robinson Middle School.

However, the neighboring land use having the most significant impact on campus development, as well as a dominant visual impact, is the Beaverdale Memorial Park. Occupying a tract along Fitch Street, it is a metaphoric wedge driven into the University’s land holdings. The cemetery is not a land use that is readily relocated and as such is recognized in the campus planning effort as a condition to be accepted and accommodated in any development scheme. The University should pursue discussions with the Cemetery’s Trustees to improve the edge conditions of the park through landscape planting and lighting. In other communities, beautifully landscaped cemeteries are places for informal walks, bird watching, and quiet reflection.
Building.

PREDOMINANT BUILDING USE

Drawing 7 depicts the existing SCSU campus, showing the existing buildings, coded by predominant use. The Building Inventory summarizes the use and size of each building.

Buley Library (11), shown in purple, lies at the core of the campus. Neighboring academic facilities, in red, include Earl Hall (13), Engleman Hall (9), Seabury Hall (7), the temporary buildings (10) adjacent to Engleman, Morrill Hall (6), Jennings Hall (5), and Davis Hall (1) to the east. Other buildings used in the main for instruction or faculty offices are Lang Social Work House (17) and Orlando Health Sciences Building (18) on Farnham Avenue, as well as two other temporary buildings (25,34) along Wintergreen Avenue.

Administrative activities are designated in blue and appear at four locations: Schwartz Hall (16) on Fitch Street, the Campus Police offices (3) at the Power Plant (4), Engleman Hall, and Seabury Hall.

Special use facilities are located by the bright green color; these are Connecticut Hall (15), Schwartz Hall, and the Lyman Center for the Performing Arts (12).

Campus life activities locations are shown in dark green. Central to all campus life is Connecticut Hall at the corner of Wintergreen Avenue and Fitch Street, with dining and other campus center functions. The Student Center (8) next to Engleman and Engleman itself both provide spaces for campus social activities. Granoff Student Health Center (26) is located on Wintergreen Avenue in the student housing area and provides the setting for vital campus life supporting activities.

Student Housing falls in two areas of the campus, located by the yellow-colored buildings. To the east of Wintergreen and Farnham Avenues are: Neff Hall (24), Hickerson Hall (23), Chase Hall (22), Wilkinson Hall (21), Farnham Hall (20), and the recently constructed Brownell Hall (19). Schwartz Hall in this sector provides student living space in addition to administrative space. The remaining student housing area is the North Campus Residence Complex (35-39), which includes four low-rise apartment structures and a mid-rise apartment building, the boomerang shape on the map.

Physical Education, Athletics, and recreation activities are housed in buildings colored brown. There are two such buildings, Moore Fieldhouse (27) on Wintergreen and Pelz Gymnasium (2) on Fitch Street between Jennings and Davis Halls. Additional campus buildings are Physical Plant structures shown scattered about the site in gray, and one life tenancy residence on Farnham Street in a light orange color.

In all, forty-one structures, both permanent and temporary, were used on the campus in the Autumn of 1992 to accommodate all University activities.

The blue star adjacent Moore Fieldhouse marks the site for a temporary structure scheduled to be erected to provide staging space for the University when the library is vacated for renovation. This facility can be used later as other buildings are renovated and require staging space.
Drawing 8 illustrates the broad range of topographic elevations that characterize the campus. Darker colors on the drawing indicate low-lying elevations and the lighter tones indicate high ground.

Elevations across the campus range from 10 feet above sea level at the lower parking lots along Wintergreen Brook, to 190 feet along the escarpment bordering the Hamden landfill. The change in elevation across University property is the equivalent of fifteen stories, or 180 feet. Most of the University's development has been undertaken on a broad shelf of land ranging in elevation from 50 feet to 70 feet. Only Schwartz Hall, Brownell Hall, and two Physical Plant storage facilities occupy sites at the lower elevations.

University facilities have been carefully arranged within the topography, particularly in the academic core sector. Academic buildings have been sited to form a crescent along the crest of the slope fronting the University's pond and the lagoon to the east. This natural bowl in the land form has been used as a focal campus open space; it is shown at the right of the drawing.

The change in topography works to great advantage in connecting the sectors separated by Fitch Street. The SCSU pedestrian bridge successfully links the academic to the residential and athletic/recreation sectors without impeding vehicular traffic along Fitch. Further, the bridge creates a gateway marking the University district, a feature that is particularly effective when approaching the campus along Fitch Street from the south, advancing upslope.
CAMPUS LANDSCAPES

The overview of existing campus landscapes is shown on Drawing 9. What is readily apparent is that the perception of the University area as a coherent campus is constrained by the presence of the Beaverdale Memorial Park in the midst of University land. While it does not contribute to the University’s sense of place in typically collegiate imagery, this cemetery is, however, a pleasant green space, and thus a potential asset as a neighboring land use.

The dominant campus open space is the bowl formed by the falling topography facing the lagoon at the eastern edge of the core campus. The crescent formed by the academic buildings arrayed at the crest of the slope frames a vast and potentially dramatic open space. Within the sweep of this area are practice and intramural play fields as well as a small pond, a focal water feature. Other significant open areas are the active recreation spaces concentrated around the athletic facilities at the northwestern reaches of the campus.

A survey of this drawing reveals very few mature stands of trees across the campus. Most mature specimens are located along the brooks at lower topographic elevations or at higher elevations toward the escarpment at the University’s northwestern edge. The academic core area has few mature or nearly mature trees. This may seem odd on a forty year old campus, but is readily explained by an historic event. A tornado touched down on the academic campus in 1989 and destroyed the established plantings. Since that time the University has actively replanted the area through successful programs of dedicated tree plantings, e.g., Alumni Walk.

Recent plantings along Fitch Street reinforce and mark portions of the campus boundaries with greenery. Boundary plantings at other locations are either, as yet, absent or in dire need of replacement; as is the case along Wintergreen Avenue where overly-mature, diseased specimens make a shabby and unkempt appearance.

Specimen trees and significant stands in the student residential quadrangle and on University properties along Farnham Avenue are valuable assets, well worth preservation.
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Drawing Legend
Drawing 10 illustrates the patterns of land use across the SCSU campus.

Academic facilities, shown by the red area, are clustered chiefly in the sector bounded by Fitch Street and Crescent Street fronting Beaver Ponds Park. Satellite facilities used for academic programs occupy residential structures along Farnham Avenue and temporary buildings along Wintergreen Avenue. The Academic sector is complemented with the library function, shown in purple, and a special use facility, the Lyman Center for the Performing Arts, a bright green. Physical Plant functions, shown in gray, are also located in this area.

Of the campus life facilities, indicated in dark green, Connecticut Hall accommodates campus center and dining hall functions and occupies a linchpin site at the pedestrian bridge linking the academic sector with other facilities west of Fitch Street. The Granoff Health Center on Wintergreen Avenue and the Student Center in the academic core sector complete the array of campus life facilities.

Two land uses dominate the drawing. The first of these includes athletic and recreation facilities and fields, shown in brown, which by their nature are land-intensive activities. These include the unobtrusive fields in the academic sector, and the Moore Fieldhouse, the tennis courts and ball field, and Dow Field at the northern portion of the campus.

The second dominating land use is, of course, parking, another land-intensive activity by definition, but one that is considerably less appealing in design effect than athletic open spaces. Parking lots define the perimeters of campus sectors along Fitch Street, Crescent Street, Farnham Avenue, and Wintergreen Avenue. Parking reservoirs are colored tan on the drawing.

The balance of campus land is devoted to green space and student housing, shown respectively in pale green and light yellow. The drawing shows four significantly-scaled open spaces: the broad open slopes surrounding the campus pond to the east, the focal open space fronting Buley Library, and two less-formal green spaces in the residential area west of Farnham Avenue. Residential areas are scattered in the western portion of the campus along Fitch Street, and between Wintergreen Avenue and Farnham Avenue, and at the northernmost portion of the campus along Pine Rock Avenue.
CAMPUS ROADS & PARKING

The system of campus roads and parking facilities is portrayed in Drawing 11. Arterial streets are colored orange, local access streets, yellow, and campus roads and lots, red.

There are 3,673 parking spaces on campus. This represents an area of between 29 and 34 acres of paved surface. This means about one-fifth of the entire University property is dedicated to vehicular storage. This is not unreasonable, given that all parking is on grade and considering that the institution serves a student body with a large proportion of part-time, commuting students.

Parking lots are segregated as faculty-staff facilities and student facilities. Lots 1, 2, 5, and 12 in the academic sector are reserved for faculty, staff, and visitor use. Commuting students coming to classes in this area currently park in lots 7, 9, and 8, all more than a five-minute walk from Buley Library. Although these lots are already served by campus transfer buses, this use pattern suggests a strengthening of campus walkway connections between remote lots and the academic core sector (as well as an intensification of bus service at peak hours), re-emphasizing the importance of the pedestrian bridge connection between the academic core and the western sectors. Existing campus bus stops are marked on the drawing by triangular symbols.

Special parking facilities and locations are indicated; these include spaces for the handicapped, motorcycle parking, and bicycle storage bins. Building service points are marked by the green circles. In any campus plan proposals for construction of new facilities or renewal of existing areas, access and accessibility are key concerns, in response to ADA requirements for the handicapped as well as to ensure optimal conditions for ease of day-to-day service and for wholly adequate life safety and emergency vehicle access.

There are 40 parking spaces per 100 full-time equivalent students, a figure which approaches the median of a sampling of other universities. However, parking spaces will be removed to make way for new academic and related buildings. These parking spaces must be replaced. In addition, the supply of commuter parking spaces should be increased, as commuter lots are full to overflowing at peak hours. Students are forced to park on the street, often in no-parking zones, in order to get to classes on time.

Master plan proposals supplement the number of spaces in convenient locations, wherever possible.
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Drawing 12 records the pattern of pedestrian movement across the SCSU campus. Paved surfaces dedicated to pedestrians are shown in solid red. Walkways shared by pedestrians and vehicles are shown in the striped pattern. Unpaved paths created as shortcuts by students are shown as dotted lines.

The pattern shown on the drawing reflects the pedestrian's experience of the campus, segmented and fragmented. The pattern of walks on this map is not at all as contiguous as the vehicular pattern shown on Drawing 11. Students regularly walk, at their own peril, through parking lots or on unpaved paths, often muddy, to reach their destinations. A particularly glaring example of the inadequacy of SCSU walks is seen along Wintergreen Avenue; Moore Fieldhouse and commuter Lot 7 are not accessible to pedestrians by any paved surface, other than Wintergreen Avenue itself. All other areas are served at least by modest city sidewalks along streets. In addition, there is no direct, paved connection between the Fieldhouse and the North Campus Residence Complex. Provision of a direct walkway, skirting the athletic fields, would make trips to Moore safe and convenient for foot traffic.

A second lapse in the walkway system results from a distinctive, though challenging, topography. Davis Hall is not directly accessible to pedestrians on the campus side. Passage around or through the Pelz Gym building needs to be improved and is addressed in the Master Plan. Another problem area is observed on site: a secondary, but popular, path to Pelz and Jennings Hall traverses the parking lot between the Power Plant and Jennings. This situation too is addressed in the Master Plan.

The circles drawn on the map are centered on Buley Library, as the heart of an institution of learning. These are gauged by an average walking speed of three miles per hour to represent five and ten minute walking distances from Buley across the campus. All of the campus is well within a ten-minute walk from Buley. The smaller circle, though, represents a ten-minute walk across its diameter. Hence a commuting student who parks in Lot 9 has at least a ten-minute walk to reach a class in Pelz Gym, and more to reach Davis Hall; this condition may at times prove challenging. Core facilities – Library, dining hall, Student Center – are all conveniently and appropriately located within the inner circle. Campus plan proposals seek to concentrate activities in this area and to enhance pedestrian movement to the outer reaches of the campus.
FACULTY/STAFF LOCATIONS

The location of faculty offices and administrative offices reflects the predominant functional uses assigned to the campus buildings by Drawing 7. However, the University does have faculty and staff accommodated in a variety of locations, including residence halls, a pattern which indicates a space shortage on the campus.

Engleman Hall, as shown on the adjacent Drawing 13, is clearly at the crossroads of all campus activity. There are 100 faculty and 131 staff occupying offices in the building. The concentration of staff at the Physical Plant complex on Fitch Street shows the number of staff assigned to that building as well as Physical Plant personnel (custodians, grounds staff, etc.) assigned to other locations.

The next most dense concentrations of faculty offices are at Seabury Hall, seemingly a small residence hall from the outside, and Davis Hall at the easternmost portion of the campus.

Buley Library and Chase Hall, a residence, house significant numbers of staff work stations, respectively, 31 and 27.

What is interesting to note is that only 389 faculty occupy office space on campus while there are an existing total of 538.9 full-time equivalent faculty (FTE). Clearly the supply of faculty workspaces will need to increase to accommodate the current number of faculty, especially in view of a projected increase to 679.2 FTE faculty when enrollments reach the 10,515 FTE projection. Similarly, counts for academic and administrative staff are anticipated to increase by 25 percent overall, also indicating the need for additional space.
Drawing 14 shows the design capacities of SCSU student residence halls in the fall of 1992. The total capacity of 2,218 beds existed on campus. Housing is confined to two main areas on the campus. The western sector is generally within five minutes walking distance of the academic campus. This area, west of Wintergreen Avenue and Fitch Street, includes the following facilities: Neff Hall, Hickerson Hall, Chase Hall, Wilkinson Hall, Farnham Hall, and Brownell Hall on the west side of Farnham Avenue, and Schwartz Hall to the east of Farnham Avenue along Fitch Street. A total of 1,638 residents are housed in this sector.

The second residential sector is the North Campus Residence Complex, housing 580 students. This area is more than a five-minute walk from the academic core of the campus.

An estimated 2,878 campus residents will require housing when enrollments reach 10,515 FTE. This implies that dormitory-style structures must be sited on the campus to house the increased population. Clearly, given the limited amount of developable land in the area, a building form that will accommodate greater densities of students is needed to address student housing growth. Whether these are to be typical dormitory-type, suite, or apartment units will be determined by detailed study prior to design and construction of the new facilities.
Drawing 15

**CAPITAL INVESTMENT/REPLACEMENT VALUE**

Drawing 15 graphically summarizes the results of the recent facilities survey of the campus completed by the firm of DeCarlo and Doll. The capital investment figures (project costs) required for the University’s buildings are listed on Table 4 below. These numbers are compared with the estimated project costs from the same study for replacing the buildings with equivalent new space. This comparison suggests that some buildings are not economical reinvestments, and replacement may be more prudent.

Lang House, Granoff Health Center, and Schwartz Hall, all in the 50-plus percent category, occupy peripheral locations on campus where pressures on land use are less intense. These three buildings are also needed to meet on-going activities, at least until the next campus planning cycle; consequently, they are recommended for continued use.

The two structures in the academic core sector that are of marginal economic value are Earl Hall and Seabury Hall; reinvestment values for both exceed 70 percent of the cost of new construction. Given the established programmatic needs for improved facilities and a core site which is not likely to be expanded by property acquisition, the value of these two building sites is intensified. Thus, the existing structures are recommended for replacement by new facilities, and their sites to be reused for new construction.

The remainder of the campus building inventory will continue to be improved as currently scheduled by the University.

---

**Table 4 - Investment/Replacement Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING NAME</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>CAPITAL INVESTMENT COST (in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>INVESTMENT/REPLACEMENT VALUE (in dollars)</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT COST (in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE (in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>INVESTMENT/REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Davis Hall</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pelz Gym</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Power Plant</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>90.95</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>211.06</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jennings Hall</td>
<td>133,400</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>202.39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Morrill Hall</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>113.98</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seabury Hall</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>176.08</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Center</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Engleman Hall</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Buley Library</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lyman Center</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>84.10</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>122.00</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Earl Hall</td>
<td>41,923</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>82.87</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Plant Maintenance</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Connecticut Hall</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>91.47</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>142.98</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Schwartz Hall</td>
<td>85,700</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>86.58</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lang House</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>65.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>91.98</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Orlando House</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>91.82</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Brownell Hall</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Farnham Hall</td>
<td>55,600</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>110.79</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Wilkinson Hall</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Chase Hall</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hickerson Hall</td>
<td>52,900</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>42.68</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Neff Hall</td>
<td>50,853</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Granoff Hall</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>125.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Moore Fieldhouse</td>
<td>116,200</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. No. Residential Complex</td>
<td>221,600</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drawing 15
CAPITAL INVESTMENT/REPLACEMENT VALUE
Drawing 16 is a graphic annotation of significant design features of the Southern Connecticut State University campus. These elements are reviewed in the following paragraphs from the broad perspective, and then from the fine-grained focus of the campus design.

The most readily apparent feature of the campus is its division into segments by city streets. Fitch Street and Crescent Street are shown in solid orange, denoting dense traffic patterns. Farnham, Wintergreen, and Pine Rock Avenues are less heavily traveled, but are nonetheless geographic impediments to pedestrian movement across the campus.

As indicated by the hatched pattern areas, steep topography forms the physical setting of the campus. To the south and west of the campus, the land falls away toward streams and to lower land elevations. To the north and northwest, West Rock Park rises above the main campus, forming a panoramic backdrop.

Within the campus itself, the land elevation recedes toward the southeast around the pond and the marsh beyond to form a topographic bowl around which the academic core buildings have been built. This design device has tremendous potential, as it visually organizes and arrays academic buildings and the campus around a dramatic land form. Views across this area are as significant to forming an image of the campus as those toward the rising elevation of West Rock Park.

Two focal open spaces and one structure are figurative in any impressionistic summary of the campus. The triangular open space fronting Buley Library comes as close as any open area on the campus to being a campus-scaled green space. It is demarcated by buildings along its sides and entered chiefly from the triangle apexes; however, the sense of this area as a space, at least as the pedestrian experiences it, is somewhat amorphous. A stronger impression can be reinforced with plantings and a clearer organization of the walkway system. Provision of additional main building entryways fronting this space will also enhance its image and importance as a campus feature.

The second campus open space of note is the nascent quadrangle formed by the dormitories (Chase, Wilkinson, and Farnham), the temporary classroom structures, and the Granoff Student Health Center along Wintergreen Avenue. A grove of trees to the southeastern side of this space graces its appearance. The northeastern edge of the space is intruded upon by parking which, if removed along with the temporary structures, would greatly enhance this open space.

The one structure on campus which attracts public notice by virtually all passersby is the bridge link over Fitch Street between the academic core and the residential area. It forms the symbolic visual gateway to the University area. The bridge is also a strong element in the pedestrian network of the campus, connecting the academic core with other sectors of the campus. Another significant segment of the campus walkway system is the tree-lined walk on the slope descending from the academic buildings toward the pond to the east. This is a feature worthy of extension and enhancement in future campus development.

By and large, the campus lacks delineation; edges are not marked. Walls or tree plantings along all streets and property lines are two examples of improvements that would contribute to a sense of place. Campus architecture is modest in its expression; distinctive building façades are outlined on the drawing with dark red. Significant architectural features are chiefly limited to building entryways. Red brick is the dominant building material.

An opportunity for the aesthetic enhancement of the campus has already been recognized by the placement on the grounds of artwork or significant historic artifacts. Among these are sculptures adjacent Brownell Hall and Engleman Hall and the Founders Gate between Lyman Auditorium and Engleman. The campus plan proposals will strive to create additional locations where more artwork can be worked into the fabric of the SCSU campus.
One obvious purpose of the Master Plan is to site the building projects identified by the program study as necessary to support the continued functioning of the University's academic and campus life activities. However, of equal importance is the opportunity presented by a roster of new construction projects for Southern Connecticut State University to strengthen its physical image – its sense of place – which serves and symbolizes the institution's purposes and domain.

In the main, the existing campus does not readily communicate the unity of greenery and buildings which are associated with distinctive campus designs. There is no architecture of landmark status. The campus boundaries and configuration are visually weak and difficult to perceive. For the uninitiated, the point of arrival, the transition from vehicle to campus walks, and the stroll to an eventual campus destination can be puzzling. If there is an overarching campus design concept, it is not immediately perceptible.

However, many of the elements which could be used to forge a strong campus design now exist, and these are incorporated with projected future development in the Master Plan to produce a sense of place to be uniquely associated with Southern Connecticut State University.

There are three campus design zones – Environ, Macro-Campus, and Precincts – which constitute the University campus and its surrounds. The development and treatment of these zones are key to the SCSU campus design.

In general, the Environ and major campus land uses forming the Macro-Campus are expected to remain stable. Design actions that can strengthen sense of place are:

- Provision of signage for all the roads leading to the University campus, using distinctive graphics;
- Channeling the views and vistas from campus approaches to the open spaces and heights of the inner campus by defining and enhancing major campus elements;
- Emphasizing points of arrival to the campus; and
- Connecting all components of the campus sectors to develop a singular campus.

The Macro-Campus is composed of the inherently distinctive land uses within the campus boundaries. These areas include: the core campus east of Fitch Street, the predominantly residential sector west of Fitch Street, the athletic and recreation area north of Wintergreen Avenue, and the student housing at the north campus boundary.

The physical character of the environ surrounding SCSU does not provide these visual clues.

Differentiated and dramatic as some elements surrounding the campus might be, the context surrounding the immediate campus is bland and unanimated. With the exception of the topographic heights at the distant northwestern edge and the ponds and marshes to the east, the physical definition of the campus environment appears tentative and unstructured.

The Precincts are those areas of the campus itself which are distinctive. Once identified, the Precincts can be strengthened to further define the campus design and sense of place.
The Master Plan identifies six campus Precincts that are unique to SCSU. The Precincts are identified on Drawing 17, numbered clockwise from east to west.

Precinct 1: The Fields
Dedicated open space and recreation fields, dramatic in extent and configuration, remain and are enhanced.

Precinct 2: Academic Core
The part of the campus containing most of the University's academic and administrative buildings, as well as the Library and Student Center. The buildings and related landscapes, and extensive parking are arranged parallel to Crescent Street to the south and Fitch Street to the northwest. The overlook to open spaces, recreation fields, and the pond is visually impressive.

Precinct 3: Campus Support and Services
This is a predominantly student support area containing the main University dining hall and student residences, as well as several small buildings housing academic and administrative units and Physical Plant operations facilities. It is connected to Precinct 2 by the University bridge, which carries pedestrians over the intersection of two heavily trafficked streets.

Precinct 4: Main Campus Residences
This area continues in use predominantly for student residences with a significant amount of parking.

Precinct 5: Athletic and Recreation
The Master Plan reinforces existing facilities for Athletics and recreation activities, and the parking needed to support those activities.

Precinct 6: North Campus Residences
This area continues to serve as a secondary enclave for student residences.

The Precincts are connected to each other both physically and visually. Their boundaries, approaches, and connections are clarified and reinforced with plantings, walks, signage, and thematic architectural expression and use of materials. The development of these Precincts, as seen in the overall context of the campus Environs and the broader Macro-Campus view, constitutes the Master Plan.
1. DEDICATED OPEN SPACE/REC  
2. ACADEMIC PRECINCT  
3. HOUSING & DINING  
4. HOUSING  
5. THROUGH STREETS  
6. ATHLETICS & RECREATION  
7. HOUSING  
8. CEMETERY  
9. THROUGH STREETS
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

The coordinated orchestration of campus design features, existing and potential, will yield an extraordinary sense of place. This becomes particularly apparent with improved campus entrances, better defined road and walkway systems, and the self-evident contrasts between built and landscaped areas.

Marking and linking the intersecting edges of the Precincts and the boundaries of the SCSU campus are seam landscapes, consistent, identifiable linear landscapes of shade trees, broad walkways, lighting, and outdoor furniture. At the public boundaries of the campus, edge landscapes will need to be developed in coordination with the respective city governments. The general effect will be a boulevard landscape along Farnham and Wintergreen Avenues. A new landscaped walkway to link the North Campus Residences with the Campus Support and Services Precincts, is proposed to draw the campus together, conceptually and perceptually, along the southeastern edge of the Athletic and Recreation Precinct, adjacent the cemetery property.

The development of two other seam landscapes are internal. These are developed between the Fields Precinct and the Academic Core by an extension and enhancement of the existing Alumni Walk and an auxiliary walkway running concentrically to the curve of the Alumni Walk connecting facilities of the Academic Core. These two special campus walks offer opportunities for gathering spaces along their courses at gateway entry points or at open spaces created between intensively used buildings. The north and south ends of the two walkways meet and terminate in specially designed outdoor sitting areas, with views of the natural open spaces to the south and east, the skyline of New Haven to the east, and the topographic heights of West Rock ridge toward the northwest.

The wooded edges of the campus, to the west and southwest, are preserved.

Gateway Landscapes

The arrival areas to the campus are given special attention as gateway landscapes.

The bridge between the Support and Services Precinct and the Academic Core is used to strengthen the campus’s image. Lighting improvements and signage consistent with other campus signs are two ways to reinforce the effect of this campus gateway. Plaza landscapes are developed at both ends of the bridge as campus gathering spaces.

Two other major entrances are envisioned as primary gateways to mark and celebrate arrival on the campus. The Crescent Street entry near Lyman Center and the Fitch Street entry at the intersection of Pine Rock Avenue are designated and differentiated with special construction and landscaping: distinctive trees, shrubbery, and flowering plants; signage; focal lighting; selected pavings, etc. The extensions of these gateways, as they intersect the Alumni Walk and the auxiliary walk, offer opportunities for plazas or gathering spaces and additional campus artwork or memorials. The extension of the pedestrian gateway to the Academic Core from the bridge is also developed along similar gateway design themes. Appropriate campus design features might include flags, banners, lights, large sculptures, and significant plantings.

Focal Open Spaces

The existing campus does not have a clear sense of defined space. There are landscaped green areas, but not clearly formed campus-scaled spaces. The possible exception is the visual expanse of the Fields Precinct.

The Master Plan proposes to preserve and enhance the Fields Precinct as an expansive tract of active-use greenery. Selected improvements might include an aeration spray or water jet to make the pond water surface more visually interesting and to improve the water quality. Additional plantings could be added to the perimeters of the area, particularly northeast edges of the Precinct.
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

PROJECT LIST
A  RENOVATE AND EXPAND ENGLEMAN HALL
B  NEW PHYSICAL PLANT BUILDING
C  BULEY LIBRARY ADDITION
D  NEW STUDENT CENTER
E  NEW STUDENT SERVICES/ADMINISTRATIVE/PARKING
F  CONNECTICUT HALL RENOVATIONS
G  DAVIS HALL ADDITION
H  MOORE FIELDHOUSE ADDITION
I  PELCZ HALL RENOVATIONS
J  OLD STUDENT CENTER RENOVATIONS
K  CONNECTICUT HALL ADDITION
L  NEW ACADEMIC BUILDING
M  NEW STUDENT HOUSING
The main campus open space is already half-formed, the triangular open space fronting Buley Library. The Master Plan proposes strengthening this landscape – the Academic Green – as an active-focus space by opening up new building entries onto it, including the new entrance to be constructed for Engleman Hall. The bridge gateway and Student Center plaza lead into the Academic Green from the west, the expanded Buley Library forms its northern side, Engleman its eastern, and a new academic facility completes its southwestern side. Realignment of walkways crossing the space coupled with a cohesive planting plan reinforces the character of the Green as a campus open space.

The second campus open space of note, also half-formed, is the Residential Quadrangle shaped by Farnham, Wilkinson, and Chase Halls. The replacement of temporary buildings with new residential construction at the eastern corner of this nascent quad completes its formation as a campus space. Again, clarification of the walkway system throughout the space and selective plantings to extend the existing tree cover reinforces its character. The identification of two future construction sites for residence halls to the southwest of the residential quad illustrates the opportunity to create another campus space of different character, this one with a recreation area the size of a football field as its focus.

The Master Plan locates new buildings in the Academic Core to create outdoor spaces smaller in scale than the Fields and the Academic Green. These potential green spaces are located on Drawing 18, Master Plan Concept, as indicated by the green dots. These are opportunities to create quiet, contemplative areas on the campus.

**Building Projects**

The Master Plan Concept drawing diagrams the broad concepts underlying the Master Plan. It also lists construction and renovation projects, developed in response to facilities needs identified by the Program for the Master Plan. The exact sequence of construction will be determined by funding opportunities. However, the University has identified its four highest-priority projects, A through D below. Projects E through P have not been prioritized.

A. The renovation and expansion of Engleman Hall, the University’s keystone academic building, is first on the list. The Program calls for an addition of 69,200 GSF, most of which is shown on the slope toward the pond, with direct access from Alumni Walk. A "step-down" building profile improves the scale of the existing building and articulates the proposed landscape areas on either side while maximizing views to the pond and fields and marsh beyond. An outdoor gathering place, a terrace or plaza, enlivens Alumni Walk. New construction also includes a new entrance fronting the Academic Green. Sequenced renovation of the existing facility revitalizes this important campus resource.

B. A site for a new Physical Plant operations facility consolidates functions now scattered in several structures and clears the existing plant operations site, by the bridge on Fitch Street, for a new building. A site on Farnham Avenue is indicated. This location permits construction of a two-level building and a dedicated parking area and maintenance yard, tucked into the topography and screened from neighboring buildings by existing, mature tree cover. Total new building area is 89,100 GSF.

C. Buley Library is expanded to the northeast, to form one side of the proposed campus gateway from Fitch Street. The new arrival plaza at the gateway creates a pleasant setting for the new library construction. An addition of 135,430 GSF provides an increase of stack and reader space, bringing the Library up to the Association of College and Research Libraries space standards for an institution the size of SCSU. The front steps of Buley Library could be redesigned during reconstruction to incorporate a terraced sitting area facing the Academic Green.
D. The site made available by the relocation of Physical Plant operations is designated for a new Student Center building. A facility of 168,000 GSF is arranged on three levels with its main entry at the upper level opening onto a plaza at the Academic Core end of the Fitch Street bridge. Building service is also provided at the upper level from the parking lot behind Lyman Center.

The building's design should take advantage of the steep topography to reflect a landmark building. Thus the "front door" would be at an upper level, with an obvious path connection to the Academic Green and the adjacent bridge. Along Fitch Street a distinctive new building strengthens the public image of the University. The area around the bridge is developed more extensively as a landscaped gathering space, perhaps with a set of connected pergolas on the bridge itself.

E. A new student services and administration building is constructed after the demolition of Seabury Hall, a building that the Existing Facilities Condition Survey has shown to be too costly to renovate. Offices serving students, such as Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and Student Affairs, are then conveniently centralized, freeing space for reassignment in academic facilities such as Engleman Hall. This project will add an estimated 67,000 usable square feet (NASF) to the SCSU building inventory.

F. Existing space in Connecticut Hall is renovated to make necessary improvements to service facilities, including serving lines, kitchen organization, entrance to and egress from the main student dining rooms, as well as faculty, special, and the President’s dining areas.

G. Davis Hall is expanded for the professional schools and their clinics. An additional 63,100 GSF is designated for the site, comprised of instructional space, faculty offices, and clinics. The landscape surrounds of the new construction extend to Alumni Walk, physically connecting Davis, at last, to the Academic Core.

H. Moore Fieldhouse is extended to focus all athletics and recreational activities in one campus Precinct, alleviating some of the duplication of services required by operation of two facilities in separate locations. As well as realizing economies in operation, this proposal rationalizes the campus land use pattern by making an additional site available in the Academic Core for much needed academic facilities.

I. Pelz Hall is renovated after the construction of the Fieldhouse extension. The Master Plan proposes academic reuse for Art, and Music if possible, as well as some large-scale general classroom spaces. Some 45,000 NASF of usable space are realized with this reuse, a significant increase over the 26,000 NASF available in Earl Hall where these departments are located at this writing.

The Master Plan suggests that when this project is designed, the University consider an atrium solution, that is, a concourse developed through the renovated Pelz so that Alumni Walk can be connected at a consistent topographic elevation by going through the building. If this solution is not feasible, the project's landscape surrounds must incorporate a bridging exterior walkway along the building's southeastern façade, or else be developed to include a pedestrian walkway solution (which is handicapped accessible) to descend and then reascend the grade change on the outside of Pelz in order to connect Davis Hall to the rest of the Academic Core.

J. The dining facility within the existing Student Center will continue in use as a convenient snack bar. The remainder of the building will be renovated for conference and academic use.

K. Connecticut Hall dining facilities and meeting rooms are supplemented with new space, both to provide expanded activities space, with additional conferencing capability, and also to expand the food preparation facilities.

L. A new academic building is shown in the Master Plan on the site of Earl Hall; its occupants are likely to be the School of Business and the Graduate Studies Program. Earl Hall is demolished after Pelz is renovated and occupied. The Master Plan proposes a new building that creates a strong edge to the Academic Green while shaping the courtyard or plaza at the main entrance to the new Student Center building at the eastern end of the bridge. Multiple entrances are required to enliven both campus spaces; this is an architectural opportunity to give distinctive identities by having separately designed portals for each academic unit housed there.
M. This site is designated as the first-choice location for new student housing. Two residence halls are envisioned, joined to form an L-shaped structure, thus giving form to the residential quadrangle as a campus open space.

Additional sites are indicated in the concept drawing for future housing development. These new constructions would also form new campus open spaces. Townhouses in the North Campus Residence Complex are suggested for reuse for accommodating student families; sites for additional units are shown in the Illustrative Master Plan drawing.

P. Parking facilities are improved. Grade lots are landscaped and reorganized and lighted for efficient and safe use. Four parking structures are proposed: the first accessible from Fitch Street, an early step in the campus gateway development; the second accessible from the Crescent Street gateway, developed along with the student services and administration building; the third accessible from Wintergreen Avenue, providing a reservoir of parking convenient to Moore Fieldhouse; and the fourth accessible from Farnham Avenue, providing parking adjacent the improved dining and conference facilities of Connecticut Hall. In sum, the Master Plan proposes a net increase of 422 conveniently available parking spaces on the SCSU campus.
ILLUSTRATIVE MASTER PLAN

A rendered air view expresses all of the ideas discussed above, collected from on-campus interviews, discussions, and review sessions, to present a vision of the Southern Connecticut State University campus as it might appear upon completion of the projects described by the Program and included in the Master Plan.

This is an illustrative concept drawing. It shows buildings of the size prescribed by the Program for the Master Plan and campus landscapes as conceived by the Master Plan. The architects for each of the construction projects will determine final building form and position on each site. The University, too, will influence the final physical resolution of the Master Plan, as projects may need to be redirected in response to changing academic and programmatic requirements. Funding opportunities will also be a factor in the realization of the Master Plan, both in sizing and sequencing.

The image, presented as the Illustrative Plan, draws upon existing strengths of the campus’s physical setting and extends them to form a distinctive and unique sense of place for SCSU.
MASTER PLAN PHASING

The anticipated phasing of the Master Plan is encapsulated in Diagram 2, opposite. It is carried out until the year 2006, when the last of the projects included in the Plan are expected to be ready for occupancy.

Demolition of Earl Hall and construction of a new academic building on its site are scheduled for the third phase, as is the completion of new student housing facilities.

The highest priority projects are designated for Phase 1 - the renovation and expansion of Engleman Hall, the renovation and addition to Buley Library, and preparation for the construction of the new Student Center. Projects supporting these high-priority items include the relocation of Physical Plant to a new facility and the construction of the first of four parking decks on the campus. The last of the Phase 1 projects is the Student Center, its construction is expected to begin by January 1998.

Phase 2 projects include construction of the student services and administration building and its parking deck at the Crescent Street gateway, as well as the extension of Davis Hall and Moore Fieldhouse. The renovation of Connecticut Hall and construction of a third parking deck on Wintergreen Avenue are expected to be completed by the end of this phase in the year 2002.

Projects beginning in the second phase, to be completed in the third, are the renovation and reuse of Pelz Gymnasium, the renovation of the existing Student Center, the addition to Connecticut Hall, and construction of the fourth parking deck at Farnham Avenue.
Diagram 2 - Master Plan Phasing

PHASE ONE

- JULY 94
- JAN 95
- JULY 95
- JAN 96
- JULY 96
- JAN 97
- JULY 97
- JAN 98

A - RENOVATE & EXPAND ENGLISH HALL

C - BULB LIBRARY ADDITION

SHABURY HALL

B - PHYSICAL PLANT

Pitch St. Parking Garage

PHASE TWO

- JULY 98
- JAN 99
- JULY 99
- JAN 2000
- JULY 2000
- JAN 2001
- JULY 2001
- JAN 2002

G - DAVIS ADDITION

D - NEW STUDENT CENTER

F - RENOVATE CT. HALL

J - RENOVATE OLD STUDENT CENTER

I - RENOVATE PILZ

K - CT. HALL ADDITION

L - NEW ACAD. BUILDING

M - STUDENT HOUSING

WINTHORPE PARKING GARAGE

FARNHAM AVE. PARKING GARAGE

PHASE THREE

- JULY 2002
- JAN 2003
- JULY 2003
- JAN 2004
- JULY 2004
- JAN 2005
- JULY 2005
- JAN 2006

- JULY 2006

- JAN 2007

Design
Construction
Demolition
IMPLEMENTATION, COSTS, AND PRIORITIES

Table 5, Project Summary Table, lists each of the construction, renovation, and demolition projects and the associated costs in 1993 dollars. Although the projects are grouped to indicate related projects, the list does not reflect University priorities nor sequence of improvements.

Construction costs include new construction, addition, and renovation costs beyond those identified by the Existing Facilities Conditions Survey.

The associated landscape costs include such improvements as paths, walkways, and on-grade parking improvements; lighting, emergency telephones, and related utilities; outdoor furniture and seating; and formal and informal landscape planting, including trees, shrubs, flowers, and lawns. These costs were developed in consultation with John G. Crowe Associates, Inc., Landscape Architects.

Not all of the campus improvements can be achieved at once. This is inevitable because of the realities of financial resources, the necessity of sequencing projects to enable the University to continue in operation, and the complexity of the tasks. In view of this, the University has identified the highest priorities for facility improvement and campus development as:

- The addition of academic space to Engleman Hall and the renovation of the existing building; addition and renovation will provide appropriate space for faculty offices, classrooms and seminar spaces, and related academic support space;

- The construction of a new Student Center, a project requiring the prior relocation of Physical Plant operations to a new facility;

- The construction of the Library addition and renovation of the existing Library.
# PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NEW CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>RENOVATION</th>
<th>DEMOLITION</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL CONST. COST*</th>
<th>SURVEY COST*</th>
<th>TELECOM*</th>
<th>TOTAL CONST. COST*</th>
<th>ASSOC. LANDSCAPING*</th>
<th>TOTAL COST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Construct Engleman Addition</td>
<td>Renovate Engleman</td>
<td>69,200</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$.55</td>
<td>$9.13</td>
<td>$.82</td>
<td>$9.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Construct Physical Plant Bldg.</td>
<td>89,100</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$.22</td>
<td>$5.83</td>
<td>$.22</td>
<td>$6.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Construct Library Addition</td>
<td>Demolish Seabury</td>
<td>135,430</td>
<td>$22.07</td>
<td>$1.08</td>
<td>$23.15</td>
<td>$.58</td>
<td>$23.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Construct Student Center</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>$21.34</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$22.68</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$23.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Construct Student Services/Admin. Bldg. &amp; Parking Deck</td>
<td>265,100</td>
<td>$17.96</td>
<td>$.90</td>
<td>$18.86</td>
<td>$.71</td>
<td>$19.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Renovate Connecticut Hall</td>
<td>20,230</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$.08</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Construct Davis Addition</td>
<td>63,100</td>
<td>$8.52</td>
<td>$.50</td>
<td>$9.02</td>
<td>$.28</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Parking Deck, Wintergreen Ave.</td>
<td>227,520</td>
<td>$7.28</td>
<td>$.11</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
<td>$.20</td>
<td>$7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Construct Moore Addition</td>
<td>86,400</td>
<td>$11.32</td>
<td>$.26</td>
<td>$11.58</td>
<td>$.28</td>
<td>$11.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Parking Deck, Farnham Ave.</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>$3.22</td>
<td>$.05</td>
<td>$3.27</td>
<td>$.12</td>
<td>$3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Renovate Peltz for Art and Music</td>
<td>Demolish Earl</td>
<td>68,060</td>
<td>$4.49</td>
<td>$.15</td>
<td>$.54</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$.99</td>
<td>$6.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Renovate Existing Student Center</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>$1.07</td>
<td>$.02</td>
<td>$.17</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Construct Connecticut Hall Addition</td>
<td>60,800</td>
<td>$7.72</td>
<td>$.49</td>
<td>$8.21</td>
<td>$.25</td>
<td>$8.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Construct Additional Student Housing</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>$23.76</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$26.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$166.69</strong></td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td><strong>$9.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$178.04</strong></td>
<td>$6.65</td>
<td><strong>$184.69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* in millions, rounded.
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