The Ohio University Eastern Campus Master Plan is a study initiated by the University in order to analyze existing campus conditions and recommend growth for the University’s 175 acres. The study was conducted between May 2002 and October 2003 and involved a series of discussions and design charettes with University staff, which resulted in the plans and images presented in this document. It is the goal of this master planning process to examine the best use of the land based upon the goals established by the project committee.
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The initial step in the master planning process involved a study of the existing campus, analyzing the character of the land in relation to the University and the surrounding community. Circulation patterns, landscape features, and architectural style are among the components identified and analyzed during this process.
Campus Core Buildings
There are currently 2 buildings that accommodate the curriculum for 1,200 students at Ohio University, Eastern Campus. Shannon Hall, located at the south side of the property, off of U.S Route 40 currently houses the administrative and academic functions of the University. The Ney Center, located directly north of Shannon Hall, is a multipurpose facility that is used by both the University and the surrounding community for recreation and as an entertainment venue.

A third building in the campus core, the Applied Technology Building is situated between Shannon Hall and the Ney Center and is currently used by the Belmont Technical School.

Outlying Buildings
Several university-owned structures lie outside of the campus core and are concentrated in two groupings: one to the south-west along Route 40 and another to the south-east along Route 331. Among those along Route 40 are several historic structures. The Brick Tavern House (Lentz Tavern) was a historic stopping point along Route 40, the old National Road. In the future, the University may restore the building for use as a museum with possible conference and guest rooms. The Great Western School, a former one-room schoolhouse has been restored and is utilized for summer educational programs for grade school students. Stepped back from Route 40, is an old barn and outbuildings, and a newer one story home that currently serves as a residence.

On the south-east corner of the site, a nature center building and greenhouse are currently utilized by Belmont Technical College. The buildings stand at the entrance to a small recreational area whose main features are a small lake and a historic covered bridge that was moved to this location in the early 1970’s from a neighboring county.
Campus Structure
The existing campus is characterized by its natural beauty and preservation of historic attributes. Scattered throughout the premises are historic elements that contribute to the unique image of the Ohio University Eastern Campus. The campus core buildings (Shannon Hall, Ney Center & Applied Technology), are perceived as being separate from other elements on campus both by proximity and by architectural style. The physical campus is bisected by an existing utility corridor that serves as a natural barrier, as it is undevelopable.

Topography and Views
The structure of campus is primarily driven by the form of the land, with the campus core situated atop a ridge overlooking the surrounding community. Slopes of 25% or more have been identified and declared undevelopable as a result of the cost of construction and the associated implications of the character of the land. Steep slopes account for 10-15% of the entire site and are located at the rear of the site, which is the least desired for development.

Circulation and Parking
Existing vehicular circulation throughout campus captures views to and from the University. Meandering drives wind up hills to the center of campus. The main drive through campus that connects the south entrance to State Route 331 to the east disconnects at the largest parking lot. Cars must navigate through the lot without a clear route marked by curbing, line striping or signage. Visibility to the continuation of the road beyond is blocked by parked cars. Pedestrian circulation within campus is very practical, connecting the three buildings on campus. Due to the rural nature of the surrounding community development, pedestrian routes to and from campus do not exist. Parking is scattered at strategic locations to take advantage of building locations and topography. The existing parking facilities are able to accommodate the current campus demand, including visitors to the Ney Center.

Green Space
Rolling hills, dense woodlands, and an abundance of green space are the elements that define the image of the campus. It boasts a natural beauty that can only be characteristic of the rural setting in which it is placed. The campus does not feature a formal green space, commonly found at other academic institutions, however the three central buildings begin to define a flat green lawn area that could be developed into a formal quadrangle through future building edges, walks and plantings.
Based upon the structure and function of the University, guidelines were developed to take advantage of opportunities presented on campus. Discussions among the Project Committee regarding the future campus concept helped identify a preliminary program for the site. Conceptual land use diagrams assisted in the visualization of this program within the context of the site. The goal of this phase of the process was to determine the "greatest and best use of the land" for expansion and development, given the program requirements and the result of the site analysis.
Consolidation, centralization and connectivity are the three ideals that drive the concept for the evolution of the campus. As the University expands and develops its currently solitary property, certain development strategies have been investigated and should be implemented in the future. Land use types were discussed and identified for compatible uses, in terms of physical location and programmatic relationship. The following list was identified as recommended land use types to be considered for development:

- Campus Expansion
- Commercial
- Senior Living
- Agricultural
- Recreational
- Historic Preservation
- Light Industrial
- Student Housing
The land use types listed have varied implications on the land and have differing priorities regarding location on the campus parcel. For example, commercial development places a higher value on property on the eastern border of the site, due to the access to a major commercial corridor. The land uses have all been carefully examined and discussed to ensure that they are beneficial to both the University and to the adjacent Belmont Community.

The four concepts shown were developed to graphically depict the potential relationships between these land use types. The diagrams were also used to examine programmatic links, shown by red arrows, that may be beneficial to the academic mission of the University. Development sites have been identified as a result of the site analysis conducted. These diagrams are eminently sensitive to the surrounding landscape, including views, wetlands, slopes and existing vegetation.
The four conceptual land use diagrams on the previous pages were further refined to just two basic concepts shown above. Based on discussions with the project committee, Concepts 1 & 2 better reflect the potential value of the land as it benefits the University and the community. Both concepts were identified as potentially successful land use integration strategies.

**Concept 1**

This concept incorporates a student housing district atop the ridge where the campus core is located. The student housing district would serve as a link between a recreation center and the campus core. It was discussed that the recreation aspect of campus would serve as a community amenity, incorporating the idea that this parcel of land would benefit the community as well as the University. To the east, light industrial land is shown along State Route 331. Presence along this corridor would minimize the amount of traffic, particularly truck traffic within the parcel that could be detrimental to the image of the campus.

Just to the south of the light industrial parcel, a piece of land was set aside for Belmont Technical School. Retail development was discussed at the eastern edge along State Route 331. Location along the commercial corridor presents a great opportunity for this type of development. The southeast portion of the site was set aside for a senior living community. It was discussed that this type of development could have some programmatic links to the University.

The western portion of the site is set aside for conservation and historic preservation. The views of this area to and from the University were identified as critical assets that would be compromised by development. It was determined that the University also owns some property to the south, across U.S Route 40, which would present the opportunity for commercial, possibly including retail, and/or service development.
There are several similarities between Concepts 1 and 2, in regard to the placement of land uses (basic locations of recreation, retail, and light industrial). One option that was discussed was an extended light industrial district, anchored at the south end by office space. Although the amount of light industrial and office space would be driven by the market conditions, it was worth investigating the amount of light industrial that could be incorporated into the site, given the guidelines set. Student housing was relocated to the south of the property. The idea behind this relocation was the opportunity for an exit strategy, should the housing not succeed. The housing could then become private community housing. The western portion of the site also changed slightly, as senior living was incorporated into the area with a scattering of historic structures.
master plan

Following the land use strategy analysis, several master planning exercises were performed to document the discussions and recommendations for growth. The plans evolved over a course of three meetings with University officials. Based upon their recommendations and input, a final master plan was developed.
Draft Master Plan B
(Based on Concept 2)
1. Ney Center (existing)
2. Shannon Hall (existing)
3. Belmont Tech Building (existing)
4. Academic Hall
5. Natatorium
6. Amphitheater
7. Recreation Complex
8. Student/ Community Housing
9. Senior Living (apartments)
10. Senior Assisted Living Facility
11. Senior Living (townhouses)
12. Senior Community Center
13. Light Industrial/Office Space
14. Community Retail
15. Nature Center (existing)
16. Retail/ Commercial Center
17. Emergency Medical Services
18. Historic Preservation (existing)