

West Campus Village Concept Review

DECEMBER 4, 2017

Steve Baker '84 MAR '88

Jon Alvarez, MIT Director of Campus Planning

Purpose of Tonight's Session:

2

- ▶ Share early thinking on Village concepts
- ▶ Discuss possible sites and integration into West Campus planning effort
- ▶ Solicit feedback to refine plan
- ▶ Early thoughts on ownership models

Tonight's Work Builds On:

- ▶ FSILG alum task force - summer 2015
- ▶ Phase I work, which includes input from 150 students
 - ▶ Two student design workshops
 - ▶ Student surveys
 - ▶ ILG, Panhel, IFC leadership
- ▶ Input from West Campus master planning study

Understanding Needs

4

MIT

- Beds must be fully utilized
- Max capacity of land must be achieved in terms of height
- Buildings must be well maintained and provide a safe, healthy environment
- Built by MIT to meet campus residence standards

FSILGs

- Assurance that MIT is making a long term commitment and cannot repurpose facilities
- Want freedom in customizing within architectural theme
- Want ability to manage house as part of leadership development experience
- Want freedom from excessive oversight

Emerging plans for West Campus

5

**Tomorrow's West Campus:
a vibrant destination offering...**

- **Housing**
- **Athletics, Recreation & Fitness**
- **Retail / Program space**
- **Underground Parking**
- **Other TBD (planning underway!)**



Site Selection

6

Advantages

- Street visibility for individual FSILGs
- Possible good fit for 8-10 FSILGs
- Integrated with “residential ring” planning concept for West Campus
- Access to amenities planned for the West Campus and vertex
- Access to Grand Junction bike path
- Right zoning for townhouses or similar building types

Disadvantages

- Narrow plot precludes quad design; minimal common outdoor space

Student Requests

7

- ▶ Townhouse-style buildings; separate entries
- ▶ No shared spaces within townhouses
- ▶ FSILG control over interior design and layout
- ▶ Individual house kitchens, dining spaces and common rooms
- ▶ Private outdoor space
- ▶ No required dining plan
- ▶ MIT cannot place students in empty beds / no flexible occupancy spaces
- ▶ Ability to operate as we do now

Village Amenity Suggestions

8

- ▶ Meeting spaces for Sororities
- ▶ Retail space
- ▶ Athletic / recreational facilities
- ▶ Maker space
- ▶ Shared utilities – IT, Security, HVAC
- ▶ Underground parking, Zip Cars, bicycles, storage

House Design Suggestions

9

- ▶ Townhouse-style design; separate, distinct entrances
- ▶ 35-50 beds in a 6-story structure
 - ▶ Bedrooms on upper floors
 - ▶ Living | dining | common spaces on lower floors
- ▶ Roof decks
- ▶ Space for graduate tutors
- ▶ Ability to isolate upper floors to allow boarders?

Preliminary Ownership Models

10

“Green Hall” Model

MIT owns and maintains facility

Students billed individually based on room rating

No FSILG management
Or budget responsibility

MIT Buildout

MIT owns and maintains facility

FSILG pays MIT monthly rent, self budgets and assumes some occupancy risk

FSILG manages internal budget

Shell and Core

MIT owns and maintains exterior

FSILG pays for, owns and maintains interior finishes

FSILG pays management fee for exterior, systems maintenance

FSILG responsible for upkeep and maintenance of interior

FSILG assumes greater occupancy risk

Discussion Areas

11

Siting

Kitchen and Dining requirements

How will empty beds be filled?

Common program elements

Faculty Head of House for the Village

Desired amenities

Ownership models

Next Steps

12

Continue to refine and receive feedback on village design concepts

- ▶ Need chapter input (advisory group)
- ▶ Solicit more student input (survey)

Begin to understand high-level cost and budgeting

Participate in West Campus planning efforts