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PRINCIPLES AND GOALS

INTRODUCTION

The following report details the comprehensive analysis of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst campus to select an appropriate site for the construction of a new “Academic and Classroom” building. This analysis has been reviewed and discussed with DCAM and with staff from Facilities Planning and Campus Planning at UMass, Amherst.

GENERAL

The following principles and goals are those developed through site analysis and client input and interaction. These were used as the basis for design for potential site selection.

CAMPUS PLANNING PRINCIPLES

1 – Select each new building site to maximize positive impact on the campus image, sense of place and functionality
2 - Design buildings and landscapes that provide a variety of spaces for intellectual and social interaction, both large and small scale
3 - Provide architecture that respects the historical campus context and increases the spatial coherence of the campus
4 - Meet the functional needs of the users academically, spatially, and environmentally
5 - Construct sustainable buildings that are economical over their life-cycle and that support the campus and regional ecology and economy
6 - Design for programmatic and spatial adaptability over time
7 - Build for permanence by adhering to high standards of quality and maintainability in material selections, systems choices and design aesthetics

SITE PLANNING GOALS

1 – Civic Campus: Make a major contribution to the civic environment of the campus by positively interacting with and actively complementing existing buildings, spaces and programs
2 - Vibrant Campus: Increase the “vibrancy” of the campus by concentrating new student activity close to existing student magnets.
   a. Further define and strengthen the academic core
   b. Support and enhance academic and multi-disciplinary collaborations
3 - Coherent Campus: Help create and reinforce a coherent spatial structure on campus
   a. Enhance pedestrian “felt experience” of the campus
   b. Increase connectivity among campus parts and improve universal accessibility on campus
   c. Reinforce existing pedestrian flows that work well and improve major flows that do not
   d. Respect and enhance the natural environment such as the pond and its open space as a major campus resource
BUILDING DESIGN GOALS

1 - Civic: Enhance existing campus fabric with a new civic building
   a. “Whole that is more than the sum of its parts”: an individually unique building design that contributes to the larger communal order
   b. Positively interacts with and actively complements existing buildings, spaces and programs

2 - Active: Create a major programmatic destination and hub of student activity
   a. Make a building/place where people want to be

3 - Interactive: Create multiple opportunities for formal/informal intellectual and social interaction at small and large scales

4 - Sustainable: Integrate sustainable building/site design and practices in all aspects of building

5 - High-tech: Provide high-tech learning environments that support multidisciplinary teaching and research
   a. State-of-the-art instructional pedagogy
   b. Flexibility to adapt to future pedagogical change

SITE SELECTION MATRIX

A matrix was developed to assist the selection process by developing criteria for ranking the sites. The rating scale for each of the criteria categories ranged from 0 to 3, 0 indicating the category as a limitation and 3 indicating it as an opportunity. High scores places emphasis on reducing the amount of time needed to move the project, the minimizing costs.

Potential site locations were rated based on the following criteria:

Principles and Goals
   ● Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place and functionality
   ● Provide a variety of space
   ● Respect the historic campus context
   ● Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally
   ● Consider flexibility and potential expansion
   ● Increase spatial coherence of the campus
   ● Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces and programs
   ● Locate near student activities and existing student magnets
   ● Enhance pedestrian experience and increase connectivity of campus
   ● Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing
   ● Protect internal and external view sheds

Sustainability
   ● Reduce storm-water runoff
   ● Provide proper solar orientation of building
   ● Preserve specimen trees and natural features
   ● Respect the pond and its open space

Constructability
   ● Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure
   ● Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation
   ● Relocate parking only as necessary
   ● Requires no significant environmental permitting
SITE ANALYSIS

GENERAL

The campus was analyzed in respect to building use, land use, circulation, natural systems, topography. This analysis was used in conjunction with the project components, to select potential building sites for the short term (Academic and Classroom Building) and long term future sites.
Buildings evaluated in different comprehensive plans were divided into categories such as Science and Engineering, Academic Buildings, Academic / Science Buildings. The diagram begins to show district boundaries with the Engineering and Science uses located in the North and Northeast areas and the academic and recreational uses located to the West and Southwest region of campus. The diagram indicates that the core campus is beginning to shift East across North Pleasant Street to include the science district.
This analysis shows where building and programmatic use is located throughout the campus as a way to inform the site selection for the new classroom building in relation to similar or compatible programs.

The Buildings were categorized into the following:
- Academic & Research: Classrooms, Labs, Office space for Professors and TA's
- Administration / Support: Buildings used specifically for office support and department space.
- Student Life: Buildings used for student activities and student housing *
- Athletics: Buildings used for active recreation
- Parking: Buildings used as parking structures

* Buildings noted with a Star also were defined as Community Buildings
LAND USE

The current utilization of the campus is depicted in this diagram. It visually illustrates the diverse nature of the core campus and surrounding area. The residential component of student life as indicated in purple has remained on the edges of the campus with the Campus Center and Student Union shown central to the campus core. The academic areas located within the campus core spread across North Pleasant street towards the east. Surface parking is dispersed along the edges and within the campus core as a built structure. Future development should focus on maintaining the location of parking to the edge of the core as much as possible, in order to create a pedestrian friendly campus.
CIRCULATION

This diagram maps the pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes that connect the core campus (highlighted in green) and outlying area to the east with the campus ring road defined by the primary vehicular circulation in Red.

Pedestrian Circulation
The core campus includes two main north-south pedestrian pathways spanning from Massachusetts Avenue to Du Bois Library and beyond. The area directly east of North Pleasant Street is devoid of a primary north-south pedestrian connector. This area shows pedestrian flow from the eastern most existing residence halls to the core campus in an east-west orientation. As this area continues to expand and the core shifts further east, there is need for a primary north-south connector, as previously noted in the Stockbridge District Master Plan.

Vehicular Circulation
As shown in the diagram, primary vehicular circulation includes Governor’s Drive to the north, Massachusetts Avenue to the south, Commonwealth Avenue to the west, and North Pleasant Street to the east (also known as the ring road). As the core shifts further to the east and the campus becomes more pedestrian oriented, Thatcher Way/Infirmary Way may be considered the eastern most primary vehicular circulation route. The location of service drives and loading areas will need to be further evaluated for use and location, as the University strives to become a more pedestrian friendly campus.
NATURAL SYSTEMS

The following diagram includes solar orientation and existing view sheds of importance.

Existing Trees
An on-site evaluation of the actual location, species type, size and condition of existing trees will become necessary once further progress is made with site selection.

View sheds
Primary view sheds, represented in cyan, include views from the Route 116 campus exit to the campus core, the Visitor Center adjacent to Massachusetts Avenue, the Fine Arts Center, Orchard Hill to the core campus, and from the Fine Arts Center/North Pleasant Street to the Campus Pond. Views from the Route 116 exit and the Visitor Center are considered the most important gateway views into the campus and should be preserved for the foreseeable future.

Secondary views are those views from the main campus walk (which spans from Whitmore to Du Bois Library) to the open space within the core campus and the outlying valley beyond adjacent development.
TOPOGRAPHY

Topography within the campus ring road has been divided into three categories including relatively flat, moderately steep, and steep. The majority of the core campus ranges from relatively flat to moderately steep. Existing topography within the core campus permits major north-south and secondary east-west pedestrian pathways. However, diverse existing topography and building/land use within the campus area located between north Pleasant Street and Thatcher/Infirmary Way does not lend itself to a major north-south pedestrian connector. Pathways in this area follow the less steep east-west terrain.
PRELIMINARY SITE SELECTION

GENERAL

Site selection began through interaction with the Campus Vision Committee and the establishment of project components that reflected the University’s principles and goals for future development. Further evaluation through analysis studies, as shown above, indicated specific sites as potential development opportunities for the either short term allocation of the Academic Classroom Building, or long term developments for future campus buildings.

The following nine sites were initially evaluated based on their potential limitations and opportunities:

1. Whitmore Parking Lot/West
2. Parking Lot 62
3. South College
4. Draper Hall
5. Tennis Courts
6. Isenberg SOM Addition
7. Dickenson Hall
8. Pond
9. Fine Arts / ISOM

The goal of the site selection was to find the most appropriate site to support the 150,000 gross square foot Academic and Classroom building within in the inner-core of the Amherst campus. The site would need to be large enough to support this program, but it was also decided that the proximity of this building should be near other active learning programs and activities on the campus. It was decided that the scale and prominence of this building justified a prime site where the building could support and showcase the new learning activities within. The process of identifying the sites emphasized the importance of timing.
for ease of construction and speed of implementation to meet the schedule and demand for classroom and department spaces on the campus.

All possible sites that fit the criteria for the new Academic and Classroom building were studied throughout the inner core of the campus. These criteria identified the main principles and goals for the site selection including, sustainability and constructability. In the first site selection process, nine sites fitted the main criteria and were presented to the UMass Planning and Facilities leadership. These sites were discussed and critiqued to determine which made the most sense for the new building. A total of nine sites were identified in the first phase of analysis. Through an intensive analysis, ultimately three sites emerged as viable prospects for the new building: North, and East Pond, (adjacent to the Student Union) and the Fine Arts, Adjacent to ISOM).

Further study has since followed to narrow the potential site selection for the proposed academic building down to three sites:

1. North Pond
2. East Pond
3. Fine Arts / ISOM
PRINCIPLES & GOALS

• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 2
• Provide a variety of spaces 2
• Respect the historic campus context 3
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 2
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 3
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 2
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 1
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 1
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 2
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
• Protect internal & external view sheds 3

SUSTAINABILITY

• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 1
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 3
• Respect open space 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY

• Select site that has no existing structures or significant infrastructure 3
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 3
• Relocate parking only as necessary 0
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 3

TOTAL 41

GENERAL COMMENTS:

This site was considered too far from other academic uses and it was decided that it should be reserved for a later use. This site was considered a valuable future “gateway site”
**PRINCIPLES & GOALS**

1. Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality
2. Provide a variety of spaces
3. Respect the historic campus context
4. Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally
5. Consider flexibility & potential expansion
6. Increase spatial coherence of the campus
7. Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs
8. Locate near student activities & existing student magnets
9. Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus
10. Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing
11. Protect internal & external view sheds

**SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Reduce storm water runoff
2. Provide proper solar orientation of building
3. Preserve specimen trees and natural features
4. Respect open space

**CONSTRUCTABILITY**

1. Select site that has no existing structures or significant infrastructure
2. Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation
3. Relocate parking only as necessary
4. Requires no significant environmental permitting

**TOTAL**

43

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

This site was originally favored but was ultimately rejected as a viable site because it was outside of the primary campus core and relocating the highly used parking for lot 62 was not favorable.
### Site Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Academic Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1.4 Acres +/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Capacity</th>
<th>Addition Option - 9 Story Building 150,000 GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Possible addition to existing Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principles & Goals
- Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality
- Provide a variety of spaces
- Respect the historic campus context
- Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally
- Consider flexibility & potential expansion
- Increase spatial coherence of the campus
- Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs
- Locate near student activities & existing student magnets
- Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus
- Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing
- Protect internal & external view sheds

### Sustainability
- Reduce storm water runoff
- Provide proper solar orientation of building
- Preserve specimen trees and natural features
- Respect open space

### Constructability
- Select site that has no existing structures or significant infrastructure
- Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation
- Relocate parking only as necessary
- Requires no significant environmental permitting

### General Comments:
Although this site is close to the center of academic activities such as the Du Bois Library there are numerous challenges of making a new building program fit with the existing South College Building. The scale of the new building would also over shadow the existing building. Significant alteration or perhaps demolition to create a site of adequate scale would entail lengthy study and negotiation with the Massachusetts Historic Commision making this site unfavorable with the time constraints of the current project.
PRINCIPLES & GOALS

• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 2
• Provide a variety of spaces 2
• Respect the historic campus context 3
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 2
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 3
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 2
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 2
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 1
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 2
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
• Protect internal & external view sheds 3

SUSTAINABILITY

• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 1
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 3
• Respect open space 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY

• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 1
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 1
• Relocate parking only as necessary 3
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 3

TOTAL 41

GENERAL COMMENTS:
For similar reasons to the (addition to South College) a new building would require the demolition of South College which is not favorable.
SITE OPTION 4 - DRAPER

SITE OPTION 4-(PRELIMINARY)

Site Data

Current Use: Science/Academic Building
Area: 2.4 Acres +/-
Site Capacity: 5-7 Story Building
150,000 GSF
Utilities: Steam, Abandoned Steam, Electrical, duct bank

PRINCIPLES & GOALS

• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 2
• Provide a variety of spaces 2
• Respect the historic campus context 2
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 2
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 2
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 2
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 2
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 2
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 2
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
• Protect internal & external view sheds 3

SUSTAINABILITY

• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 1
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 2
• Respect open space 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY

• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 1
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 1
• Relocate parking only as necessary 3
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 3

TOTAL 39

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Although this site is well located within the academic center there is not sufficient land for the building program requirements. This option consisted of removing the addition to Draper and creating a new Building but the site proved too small for an appropriately scaled massing.
SITE OPTION 5 - TENNIS COURTS

SITE OPTION 5 - (PRELIMINARY)

PRINCIPLES & GOALS

• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality
• Provide a variety of spaces
• Respect the historic campus context
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing
• Protect internal & external view sheds

SUSTAINABILITY

• Reduce storm water runoff
• Provide proper solar orientation of building
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features
• Respect open space

CONSTRUCTABILITY

• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure)
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation
• Relocate parking only as necessary
• Requires no significant environmental permitting

TOTAL

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Although this is a “pad ready” site it was considered just outside the academic core. Pedestrian connections to the new building from the core were considered too difficult to resolve given the main access road is a service road that students would have to cross.
PRINCIPLES & GOALS
• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 2
• Provide a variety of spaces 2
• Respect the historic campus context 3
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 2
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 2
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 2
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 2
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 1
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 2
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 2
• Protect internal & external view sheds 3
SUSTAINABILITY
• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 1
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 3
• Respect open space 3
CONSTRUCTABILITY
• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 3
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 3
• Relocate parking only as necessary 3
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 3
TOTAL 43

GENERAL COMMENTS:
This site was analysed primarily as an addition to ISOM to meet the school of management’s needs not as a site for the new Academic and Classroom building.
Site Data

Current Use: Open Space
Area: 2 Acres +/-
Site Capacity: 4-story Building
Utilities: Steam, Electric, Storm water, Sewer

PRINCIPLES & GOALS

• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 2
• Provide a variety of spaces 2
• Respect the historic campus context 3
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 3
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 2
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 2
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 3
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 3
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 3
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
• Protect internal & external view sheds 2

SUSTAINABILITY

• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 2
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 3
• Respect open space 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY

• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 0
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 2
• Relocate parking only as necessary 1
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 3

TOTAL 42

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Although this site offers a lot of potential, the constraints in timing for the new building and the required demolition of Dickinson Hall (a currently and future resource) to allow for enough site area proved this site to be unfavorable.
PRINCIPLES & GOALS

- Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality: 3
- Provide a variety of spaces: 3
- Respect the historic campus context: 3
- Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally: 3
- Consider flexibility & potential expansion: 1
- Increase spatial coherence of the campus: 3
- Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs: 3
- Locate near student activities & existing student magnets: 3
- Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus: 3
- Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing: 3
- Protect internal & external view sheds: 3

SUSTAINABILITY

- Reduce storm water runoff: 1
- Provide proper solar orientation of building: 3
- Preserve specimen trees and natural features: 1
- Respect open space: 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY

- Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure): 2
- Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation: 3
- Relocate parking only as necessary: 3
- Requires no significant environmental permitting: 0

TOTAL: 47

GENERAL COMMENTS:

This site offers the most potential and met all of the criteria for a new Academic and Classroom building except for the fact that it is not pad ready as there are regulatory issues due to its proximity to the pond. This site was chosen for further consideration. In the next phase of analysis cost implications of moving and replacing utilities will be studied as well as all issues relating to the pond delineation.
PRINCIPLES & GOALS
• Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 3
• Provide a variety of spaces 3
• Respect the historic campus context 1
• Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 3
• Consider flexibility & potential expansion 3
• Increase spatial coherence of the campus 3
• Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 3
• Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 3
• Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 2
• Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
• Protect internal & external view sheds 3

SUSTAINABILITY
• Reduce storm water runoff 1
• Provide proper solar orientation of building 1
• Preserve specimen trees and natural features 2
• Respect open space 3

CONSTRUCTABILITY
• Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 2
• Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 3
• Relocate parking only as necessary 3
• Requires no significant environmental permitting 0

TOTAL 45

GENERAL COMMENTS:
This site offers the most potential and met all of the criteria for a new Academic and Classroom building except for the fact that it is not pad ready as there are regulatory issues due to its proximity to the pond. This site was chosen for further consideration. Site utilities will also be studied in future analysis. This site is not as favorable as the North Pond site because of the building orientation and the views that will be blocked from Morrill Science Center.
**PRINCIPLES & GOALS**

- Maximize positive impact on campus image, sense of place & functionality 3
- Provide a variety of spaces 3
- Respect the historic campus context 3
- Meet the functional needs of the user, academically, spatially, environmentally 3
- Consider flexibility & potential expansion 3
- Increase spatial coherence of the campus 3
- Provide civic environment with complimentary buildings, spaces & programs 3
- Locate near student activities & existing student magnets 2
- Enhance pedestrian experience & increase connectivity of campus 3
- Accommodate program needs with appropriate massing 3
- Protect internal & external view sheds 3

**SUSTAINABILITY**

- Reduce storm water runoff 1
- Provide proper solar orientation of building 3
- Preserve specimen trees and natural features 3
- Respect open space 3

**CONSTRUCTABILITY**

- Select site that is “pad ready” (no existing structures or significant infrastructure) 3
- Renovate only sound structures with no significant historic designation 3
- Relocate parking only as necessary 3
- Requires no significant environmental permitting 3

**TOTAL** 53

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

This site was highly favorable for the Academic and Classroom building and does not have the regulatory issues mentioned in the North and East pond site. The addition to ISOM was also considered in this initial study and will be explored in more detail in the next phase of study.
NEXT STEPS

The three viable sites for furthering the new building study are as follows: North, and East Pond, (adjacent to the Student Union) and the Fine Arts, Adjacent to ISOM)

For both pond sites to be considered, further study requires a detailed wetland report and meetings with the Amherst Conservation Commission, Massachusetts Historic Commission and MEPA. The Fine Arts site will also be studied as an alternative. The program for the Academic and Classroom building will be based on the outcome of the classroom and department study all of which impact the schedule for the classroom building study.