Master Planning Council: May 2013

- Student Housing Planning & Related Survey: Gay Perez
- Battle Building/Clark Park Landscape Plan: Mary Hughes
- Current Land Use Planning; UVA Redevelopment Zones: David Neuman
Enhancing the Student Experience through Residential Living

Student Housing Strategic Planning:
- Brailsford and Dunlavey survey overview
- Initial Findings and Discussion
- Next Steps
## Percentage of Students Living On-Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Classification</th>
<th>Enrolled Population</th>
<th>Percentage Living On Grounds</th>
<th>Current Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6,454</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,293</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42% of all undergraduates live on Grounds
## On Grounds Occupancy

### Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Beds</th>
<th>Total Residents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6142</td>
<td>6115</td>
<td>99.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Beds</th>
<th>Total Residents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6142</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td>96.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupancy Trends On Grounds Housing

- First Year (3222-3390)
- Upper Class (2953-2522)
- Graduate (491-376)
Brailsford & Dunlavey

- National Housing Consultant
- Survey development
- Conducted multiple focus groups & interviews
- Study Phase I to answer the following questions
  - Is there unmet demand for on-Grounds Housing?
  - What factors do students apply in their decision on where to live after their first year?
  - What are students looking for in their living space?
Student Survey Results

- **Survey Response Metrics**
  - Surveys Distributed: 9,000
  - Total Respondents: 2,507
  - Email Response Rate: 27.86%
  - Total Complete: 2,353
  - Percent Complete: 93.86%
*Added from B&D presentation*

**Student Survey Results**

- High satisfaction levels with current living situations
- Existing demand from Graduate students for low-density, private housing
- 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year students desire high-density apartment housing
- Location & walkability are greater factors than total cost of rent & utilities
Student Survey Results: On & Off Grounds

How Would you Describe your Current Living Condition?

- Very satisfactory: 45%
- Moderately satisfactory: 43%
- Slightly satisfactory: 9%
- Unsatisfactory: 3%

Your Best Years are Here...
On & Off Grounds Triangulation

Student Housing Inventory
- Green = On-Grounds Housing
- Orange = Off-Grounds Housing

Student Satisfaction Levels
- Unsatisfied
- Very Unsatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
Student Housing Continuum
On-Grounds Housing

UVA On-Grounds Supply vs. National Housing Spectrum

- Traditional: UVA 70%, National 25%
- Suite: UVA 6%, National 45%
- Apartment: UVA 24%, National 30%

Your Best Years are Here...
What do our student prefer?

2nd, 3rd & 4th Years - Preferred Living Choice

- 4BR / 2BA Apartment (single): 37%
- Traditional (single): 13%
- 2BR / 1BA Apartment (single): 7%
- 3BR / 2BA Apartment (single): 7%
- Semi-Suite (single): 6%
- 1BR / 1BA Apartment (single): 6%
- Pod (single): 5%
- 2BR / 1BA Suite (single): 5%
- Pod (double): 4%
- Traditional (double): 4%
- 2BR / 1BA Suite (double): 3%
- Semi-Suite (double): 2%
## Decision Making Factors

### Undergraduate

1. Proximity to Grounds (15 min walk)
2. Ability to Choose Roommate
3. Private Bedroom
4. Cost/Utilities

### Graduate

1. Kitchen Facilities
2. Cost/Utilities
3. Private Bedroom
4. Proximity to Grounds (15 min walk)
Student Survey Results

If UVa Built New Housing, Which Physical Features Would be most Important to You?

- Convenient location: 82%
- In-unit full kitchen: 57%
- Private (single occupancy) bedroom: 50%
- On-site parking: 37%
- Washer and dryer in the living unit: 33%
- Convenient on-site laundry facilities: 31%
- Private bathroom: 29%
- In-unit temperature controls: 27%
- Easy access to UTS stops: 26%
- Living room: 24%
Student Survey Results

If UNC-Chapel Hill Built New Housing, Which Physical Features Would be most Important to You?

- Convenient location: 57%
- In-room wireless internet access: 47%
- In-unit full kitchen: 45%
- Private (single) bedroom: 44%
- On-site parking: 41%
- Private bathroom: 31%
- In-unit washer and dryer: 23%
- In-unit temperature controls: 23%
- Living room: 22%
- Convenient on-site laundry facilities: 22%
Application Process for Returning Students

Returning students applying for on-Grounds housing that received their first choice

- Increased number of 6 and 4 person units for groups to stay together
- Increased the number of students that received their first choice
First Year Experience

• Focus
  – Transition to an academically rigorous environment
  – Peer support through low student : staff ratio
  – Relationship building and community engagement
  – Self-governance and accountability
  – Association Councils and leadership opportunities
  – Academic advising with Associate Dean
Upper Class Experience

- Continued engagement in the student experience
- Additional leadership opportunities through Association Councils, Resident Staff Promotion Process, Student Organizations
- Choice in the type of residential accommodations
- Interactive community space for outside the classroom learning
- Focus on enhanced career and academic guidance
Is There Unmet Demand?

- Total maximum potential demand for 7,733 beds
  - $500+ price filter applied for off-Grounds respondents
  - Full-time undergraduate students only
  - 1st year demand fixed based on current residency requirement
Graduate Student Demand

- Total maximum potential demand for 3,072 beds
  - $500+ price filter applied for off-Grounds respondents
  - Full-time graduate students only
- 400 existing graduate beds (Range, Copeley, University Gardens)
- Potential demand of 2,672 new beds
- 66% of graduate students prefer 1BR / 1BA configuration
Next Steps

- Finalize Phase I with B&D
- Phase II: Aligned with UVa's strategic planning
- Maximize choice
- Further enhance the student residential experience
University Gateway | Clark Park and Battle Building Forecourt
Battle Building | Art
David H. Turner,
Black Bear and Cubs
Clark Park | Enhancements

Civic quality
- provide an inviting and safe city destination
- provide evergreen gateway with Clark Park and Battle Building forecourt.

Accessibility
- provide stair entry through the wall along JPA
- provide paths for inclement weather and disabled
- provide paths for lingering within as well as passing through the park.

Use
- enhance park as a forecourt to the new Battle Building from the west
- provide lighting for night time
- provide lighting for the sculpture
- provide benches for comfort, rest, lingering and socializing
- provide interpretation of statue — historic and contemporary.
Clark Park | Recommended Design
## Clark Park | Plantings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogwood</td>
<td>Loblolly Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbud</td>
<td>Shortleaf Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clark Park | Perspective walking down Main Street
Current Land Use Planning; UVA Redevelopment Zones
2008 Grounds Plan: BOV Approved Redevelopment Zones
Existing & Proposed Program Development
Review uses, facilities condition index, code issues, existing leases and development of program for each proposed stakeholder/use
Planning Team

Site Information
Analyze opportunities /constraints of land systems, historic preservation/archeology issues, infrastructure systems, transportation, context and leasing structure suitability
Office of the Architect

Evaluation Criteria
UVa Siting Criteria
LEED Neighborhood Development
Envision Sustainable Infrastructure ASLA
Sustainable Sites, Living Building Challenge
OAU, FM, EHS, P & T

Plan Alternatives
Alternatives evaluation includes multiple scenarios, site context, feasibility, financing structure, fiscal impact and phasing of uses
Team

Selected Alternative and Final Plan
Office of the Architect

Planning Process Diagram
Districts Under Study
Emmet-Ivy Corridor
Ivy Road-29/250 Bypass Area
Suitability Analysis

Existing Site Layers

- Existing Forest Canopy
- Slope Condition
- Solar Exposure
- Utility Easements
- Building Footprints
- Distance to Internal Roads

Guideline Layers

- Riparian Buffer (50')
- Critical Slope Buffer (>25%)
- Building Setback (50')
- Circulation

Ivy Road-29/250 Bypass Area
Suitability Analysis

Ivy Road-29/250 Bypass Area
Brandon Monroe Area Plan
- Land use suitability, infrastructure and transportation analysis
- Steering Committee Meeting #1
- Develop data for worksession #1 presentation
- Develop Planning Vision: Consultant
- Planning Worksession #1: Constituent presentations
- Develop alternative scenarios for use/density
- Steering Committee Meeting #2
- Refine alternative scenarios for Worksession #2
- Planning Session 2: Present plan options
- Develop preferred alternative and phasing
- Develop report and deliverables

Ivy Road-29/250 Bypass Area Plan
- Existing/Proposed Program Development (1)
- Develop site suitability/infrastructure/transportation analysis (2)
- Establish Planning Team, project leaders & partners
- Establish Evaluation Criteria (3)
- Develop alternative scenarios for the site (4)
- Evaluate alternative scenarios with project leaders
- Evaluate alternative scenarios with planning team
- Develop final alternative and final plan
- Evaluate phasing and delivery of projects

Ivy Corridor Area Plan
- Existing/Proposed Program Development (1)
- Develop site suitability/infrastructure/transportation analysis (2)
- Establish Planning Team, project leaders & partners
- Establish Evaluation Criteria (3)
- Develop alternative scenarios for the site (4)
- Evaluate alternative scenarios with project leaders
- Evaluate alternative scenarios with planning team
- Develop final alternative and final plan
- Evaluate phasing and delivery of projects

Next Steps