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The Antique Boat Museum in Clayton, NY is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to the collection, preservation, exhibition and interpretation of boats and the boating history of North America and especially the St. Lawrence River (figure 1). This capstone project focused on the development of a campus master plan for the museum. The museum currently consists of a collection of buildings spread over 4.5-acres of waterfront property within the Village of Clayton and overlooks the St. Lawrence River and the Thousand Islands region. This project considered three related topics, including: existing site issues associated with the campus, potential future developments and expansions of the museum, and the relationship of the museum to the community. These topics were addressed through a campus master planning process that explored various spatial organizations of programming and campus components.

This project was identified in October of 2005 when the Antique Boat Museum contacted the Center for Community Design Research (CCDR) at SUNY-ESF with a request for design assistance in developing a master landscaping plan for their campus. In recent years the museum has developed its existing properties and expanded its land holdings at a rapid pace and has done so without a long-term plan for development. As a major tourist draw and important economic and cultural amenity for the area, how the museum continues to develop has implications not only for itself but also for the Village of Clayton. Recognizing the museum’s need for a broader, more comprehensive planning framework for its future,
Associate Director of the CCDR, Maren King, and SUNY-ESF Faculty of Landscape Architecture Associate Professor Dr. Robin Hoffman, persuaded the museum to consider developing a master plan for its campus that goes beyond simple landscaping solutions and looks at the continued growth and expansion of the campus as a whole.

The goal of this research design study was to explore the development of a campus master plan for the Antique Boat Museum that addresses the necessary operations and functions of the museum, its goals for the future, while respecting and fostering positive relationships with the community. This project was intended to be a service-learning project for the author and an educational experience for the museum staff and its trustees in terms of fostering an understanding of a campus master planning process and the benefits and value of long-term planning efforts.

From preliminary investigations and conversations with the museum it was apparent that there were several existing site issues associated with the campus and a number of unknowns about the museum’s future and that of its immediate context. In order to understand these complex issues and to ensure that planning and design decisions were based on accurate analysis, appropriate programming, and viable design alternatives, this study utilized a collaborative planning and design process. In this case, collaboration took the form of a close working relationship between the author and Antique Boat Museum staff (the Client) to explore design issues, alternatives, and the museum’s goals for the future.

What follows is a capstone report that describes the process and products of this project. It begins with a background on the study area including the Village of Clayton and the Antique Boat Museum itself. The background provides the basis for a formulated project problem statement. A literature review explores, among other topics, campus planning and design concepts, collaborative and participatory methods, and current principles related to waterfront and mixed-use development. Overall project goals and objectives are then offered which informed the project methods, which are outlined as tasks. A summary of each of the sequential planning and design steps is provided with emphasis on the outcomes of the final composite master plan. The report concludes with planning recommendations and a project review.
CLAYTON, NY

The Antique Boat Museum is located in the Village of Clayton in Jefferson County in the Thousand Islands region of New York (figure 2). The relatively flat topography of Clayton and its configuration as a 1.6 square-mile peninsula extending into the St. Lawrence made it an ideal site for accessing and establishing trade along the St. Lawrence River (figure 3). The village and its grid of streets were laid out by James LeRay in 1822 and quickly grew into a bustling port town (Harwood 1985). The Clayton-Watertown Road (State Route 12), completed in 1824, and the arrival of the railroad in 1873 also greatly contributed to Clayton’s establishment as a major center of commerce. Industries initially included schooner shipbuilding and lumber rafting and later the village served as a center for agricultural goods and tourists accessing the emerging resorts of the Thousands Islands.

By the 1840’s, steamships full of tourists were a common sight on the St. Lawrence. Clayton became an important center for coal refueling and as a departure point for tourists in search of the scenic beauty and recreational opportunities of the Thousand Islands region. With the arrival of the railroad and its easy connections to major northeast population centers the tourism industry boomed. Hotels, shops, and warehouses developed along Riverside Drive catering to the summer tourist population (figure 4). During the summer months of the 1890’s there were up to eleven trains arriving per day with hourly departures of regularly scheduled steamboats (Harwood 1985). However, with the advent of the automobile and personal watercraft, activity on the Clayton waterfront diminished and the tourism economy declined. In 1959, the St. Lawrence Seaway opened allowing larger long-distance diesel powered freight ships to operate on the river. This further cut into the economic base of Clayton as its role as a refueling and freight center diminished.
Today, Clayton is working to return to its roots and once again establish itself as a vibrant commercial and tourist center. Drawing on its rich heritage and picturesque waterfront setting the village of roughly 2,000 permanent residents is seeking to revitalize its economy and identity. Clayton currently markets itself as the “Gateway to Thousand Islands” and as the cultural center of the region. This refers to its numerous museums in the community, including the Antique Boat Museum, Thousand Islands Museum, and the Handweaving & Arts Center. Additional cultural offerings include the recently restored turn of the century Clayton Opera House, a summer waterfront concert series, and non-profits such as Save the River!, which is dedicated to the ecological protection of the St. Lawrence.

To support the revitalization of the community, the 1986 Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) is currently being updated to provide a comprehensive plan for the integration of Clayton’s waterfront, its commercial areas, and future development. A significant component of the revised LWRP is the 8-acre Frink America property located at the east end of Clayton’s commercial district (figure 4). Formerly the site of the train and ferry terminal and more recently a snowplow-manufacturing site, the substantial waterfront property is being considered for its redevelopment potential, which could include a hotel, retail shops, waterfront open space, a ferry terminal and a community parking structure. Another significant component of the LWRP is the development of the RiverWalk. The RiverWalk seeks to provide a pedestrian corridor along the waterfront linking public spaces, commercial establishments, and cultural sites and uses the Frink America property at the eastern end and the Antique Boat Museum to the west as anchors. It is anticipated that this will delineate a cohesive and inviting waterfront district for tourists and an organized structure for reinvestment in Clayton.

Figure 4: Map of the Village of Clayton.
THE ANTIQUE BOAT MUSEUM

The Antique Boat Museum is located on Mary Street on the west side of Clayton near the mouth of French Creek (figures 4 and 5). The waterfront museum consists of 9 buildings spread across a 4.5-acre campus overlooking French Creek Bay and the St. Lawrence River. As stated on its Web site, the Antique Boat Museum’s mission is to “collect, preserve, exhibit and interpret boats and other objects related to the history of boating in North America and to enhance public understanding and appreciation of the contribution of the St. Lawrence River region to North America’s boating history.” The museum is a 501(c)3 non-profit, tax exempt, private institution under the control of a board of trustees and managed by an executive director.

Museum History

The history of the Antique Boat Museum began with the creation of Clayton’s Thousand Islands Museum in the early 1960’s, which is dedicated to celebrating the rich cultural heritage of the region. In 1964, a small group of wooden boat enthusiasts within the Thousand Islands Museum held a showing of antique boats on Clayton’s village dock, which is purported as being the first event of its kind in the world. The event was supported by the village and became an annual occurrence that grew in popularity. Core enthusiasts began to recognize the need for a means of preserving the many aging wooden boats of the region. The Thousand Islands Museum, already overwhelmed with regional artifacts of every sort, could not take-in or exhibit more than a few small wooden skiffs. By 1968, the Antique Boat Auxiliary was formed to focus on the growing annual Antique Boat Show and encourage the preservation of antique boats and memorabilia. By the early 1970’s, the Auxiliary began to secure waterfront property along Mary Street to house a growing collection of donated boats and provide a permanent site for its now famous Antique Boat Show (figure 7).
In 1974, the Auxiliary, which at that point had become the Thousand Islands Shipyard Museum, acquired the Otis Brooks Lumber Yard on Mary Street. The former lumberyard was established shortly after the Civil War to supply local demands for milled lumber and other building materials. The location’s accessible docks and deep water allowed easy delivery of milled products to local ship repair yards and to island home building sites throughout the region. The only visible remnants of the lumber operation are the Rivershed and Stone Building (figure 8 and 9). The Rivershed was used as a drying and storage shed for lumber and is currently used for special events, facility rental, children’s classes, and periodically as the site a “living exhibit” where local fisherman reenact fisherman of the past while cooking their days catch for onlookers. The Stone Building was the site of steam production to power the mill. Later, steam production at the Stone Building provided the first source of electricity to the Village of Clayton. Throughout the 1970’s the Shipyard Museum continued to expand its collections and acquire more property to the south of Mary Street. In 1986, the museum was given an absolute charter from the New York State Department of Education as the Thousand Islands Shipyard Museum. In 1990, the museum’s name was changed to the Antique Boat Museum.

Today, the Antique Boat Museum attracts over 35,000 visitors annually from May to October. Admission is charged and activities include galleries filled with an impressive number of antique boats, exhibits, and interpretation on boating history and culture. There is a theatre, a museum store, an archival library, classroom facilities, boat building classes, and guided tours. The Museum’s 1,300 ft. shoreline with over 2,000 linear ft. of dockage
space supports an active waterfront with in-water exhibits of antique boats including the 106 ft. Gilded-Age house boat *La Duchesse*. Visitors to the museum can receive sailing lessons, free use of rowboats, and regularly scheduled antique boat “thrill” rides that tour nearby islands and secluded coves. The museum promotes the rental of its facilities and idyllic waterside setting for special events, including weddings. The Antique Boat Show continues to attract large crowds annually the first weekend in August and has continued to set the standard by which other boat shows are measured.

The museum employs 12 full time year-round staff and 38 part-time seasonal employees making it one of the largest employers in the village. A small army of summer volunteers assists in museum tours, boat renovations, and special events. It currently has more than 250 boats in its permanent collection and 29,000 sq. feet of exhibit space and 33,000 sq. feet of public program, collections storage, archives, library, and administrative space. The museum also owns a ¾ acre surface parking lot on Riverside Drive with 76 spaces that it offers as a free community parking lot throughout the year except during the Antique Boat Show (figure 11). Additionally, there are two separate offsite storage facilities with a combined storage space of 20,000 sq. feet.

The current context of the museum campus is a mix of land use types. At the eastern terminus of Mary Street is the Village of Clayton public dock and the only public boat ramp in the village. Adjoining this site to the south along Theresa Street is the privately owned Islander Marina & Lodge, which has an extensive network of docks and on water storage facilities. The marina, along with the public dock/ramp, generates a considerable amount of water traffic in the French Creek Bay area. The Islander currently has plans to develop its properties to include a 3-story 48-room boutique hotel named the Hotel St. Laurents. The remainder of land use types adjoining the museum consists primarily of single family detached residential (both rentals and owner occupied) with the exception of the Harbor Inn and Restaurant located at the corner of Mary Street and Alexandria Street.
MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT

Since the 1960’s, the museum has grown from a small annual boat show to become the largest repository and exhibitor of fresh water boats in North America. Development and expansions of the museum along Mary Street have been an almost continual occurrence, however, over the past 10-years the pace and scale of development has greatly increased. In just the last 6-years the museum’s net assets have more than tripled and total assets doubled. The museum has undergone major capital expansions to “consolidate its real estate holdings and construct buildings and infrastructure worthy of its collection and programs” (Antique Boat Museum Strategic Plan Renewal, 2006-2010). This has included the construction of two new buildings on the campus, including the 26,000 sq. ft. Haxall Building, which now serves as the headquarters for the museum and the Gold Cup Building, which provides 6,000 sq. ft. of dedicated exhibit space to antique racing boats (figures 12 and 13). A third building, the Andrew McNally Yacht House is currently under construction and will provide permanent winter storage for the La Duchesse houseboat and covered dock space for other in-water exhibits (figure 14).

The second component of the museum’s most recent developments has been the expansion of its real estate holdings. Over the past 6-years the museum has acquired 9 residential properties along Riverside Drive, Mary Street, and Alexandria Street (figure 15). These properties were purchased as they became available and were seen as an opportunity for securing the future of the museum campus. The benefits of consolidation can be seen in terms of the total length of waterfront property along Riverside Drive that the museum now owns. With the exception of one property whose owner is a member and is sympathetic to the plans of the museum, the Antique Boat Museum now controls all of the property along the harbor that directly fronts the existing campus.
This allows for control of the area, the ability to safeguard the established campus environment, and provides opportunities for potential future expansions. The museum currently manages these residential holdings as investment rental properties; however, they have expressed an interest in developing the area and potentially expanding the museum.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Over its 40-year history the Antique Boat Museum in Clayton, NY has grown from humble beginnings to become the largest repository and exhibitor of fresh water boats in North America with an expansive waterfront campus. Located within the fabric of Clayton, the museum has emerged as an important component of the village impacting both its economy and identity. As a significant visitor draw the museum compliments Clayton’s tourism heritage and can be considered a tremendous asset for the community in its current efforts to revitalize the village waterfront. How the museum develops in the future will have impacts not only itself, but on the village as well. To date, development and expansions at the museum campus have not followed any documented planning scheme. This has resulted in development proceeding in an ad hoc fashion with new expansions and building construction occurring to meet immediate museum needs and without full consideration of wider implications. As the Antique Boat Museum looks to the future they have identified the need for a long-term plan—a master plan—for the physical organization of the campus which can guide future development decisions in a more directed manner, ensure the best utilization of museum resources, and foster positive relationships with the community.
The following literature review examined the pertinent sources that assisted in the planning and design process. Topics included campus planning, collaborative methods, and the various types of development that were anticipated at the museum such as waterfront development and mixed-use development.

**CAMPUS PLANNING & DESIGN**

To approach the planning and design of the Antique Boat Museum campus it was helpful to understand the qualities and components of a campus landscape and current campus planning and design approaches. Traditionally, campus planning has developed as a practice specifically devoted to the physical planning of institutions of higher learning—colleges and universities—however, as we shall see, the campus landscape and the ideals associated with it are applicable and have been co-opted by other institution types. More importantly, these approaches have similarities and applications to the campus of the Antique Boat Museum.

**The American Campus**

To understand what a campus is and how to approach a campus in terms of planning and design it is helpful to trace its origins. The first colonial American universities emulated the medieval universities Oxford and Cambridge in England. Both Oxford and Cambridge used a collegiate system of university education where students and teachers lived and studied in close communal quarters. This “collegial” environment necessitated a variety of buildings to include classrooms, dining halls, dormitories, a chapel and recreation facilities to house the university as a self-sustaining community (Turner 1984). The organization of these buildings was based on the enclosed quadrangle of medieval monasteries, which were also the sites of an earlier medieval education system involving guilds of masters and scholars (Dober, 1963). The configuration was a defensive measure for the monasteries that afforded protection to the scholars from local town’s people. Later, collegiate universities adopted this
pattern and combined it with connected buildings to enclose a central quadrangle to provide a safe, chaste, and controlled environment for learning apart from the outside world (Turner, 1984).

The first American universities also emulated the collegiate system of education (and continue to do so today), but broke with the traditions of Oxford and Cambridge in several key ways. Unlike European predecessors, the American universities were often dispersed or developed in rural or wilderness settings, or were originally on the outside edges of the city. As a result, “The romantic notion of a college in nature, removed from the corrupting forces of the city, became an American ideal” (Turner, 1984). American universities also did away with the cloistered quadrangle and instead sited separate buildings in an open landscape with an overall organization that was articulated outward towards either the local community or nature. Due to this arrangement American universities needed to develop more fully as communities unto themselves, or as “academical villages” (Turner, 1984). The ability to plan and control the development of an entire community can be seen as one of the major factors contributing to the overall sense of place inherent to American campuses. The net result of these differences resulted in a distinct American landscape comprised of buildings, grounds and spaces set in an open and often rural-like setting that were unified and imbued with the ideals of a university.

**Campus Qualities**

The term “campus” means field in Latin and was first used to describe the grounds of an American university in 1770. “Campus” was used to describe the open, rural-like setting of Princeton University (Turner, 1984). Usage of the term quickly grew to include not only the grounds of a college but also its buildings and the tangible sense of place, or genus loci, that characterizes American universities. As such, campus does not refer simply to the space between buildings but the totality of a university landscape. It is the embodiment of the collegiate spirit of a university. A campus will often reflect the ideals of an institution and is the physical manifestation of its philosophies, traditions, and purposes (SUNY, 1987). Dober (2000) offers a contemporary definition of the campus landscape as “buildings and grounds integrated into a green precinct that is pleasant to see, well defined physically and with a specific sense of place, and productive in encouraging serendipitous and synergistic interaction among those sharing the site.” This definition illustrates three primary qualities associated with a campus landscape, including a pleasant aesthetic, a clear image, and a functional setting.
The college campus and the strong qualities it projects have become embedded in American psyche and culture. Other institutions types seeking to align themselves with the ideals and imagery associated with the college campus have purposely developed their physical settings in a “campus-like” manner (Dober, 2000). Research centers, medical centers, office and production complexes, retirement communities, performing-arts centers, housing for the elderly and retired, government complexes, and boarding schools have been developed to emulate the qualities inherent to the American college campus. The Antique Boat Museum, with its collection of buildings and outdoor spaces supporting an institutional mission, can be considered a campus in the general sense. More importantly, the museum shares characteristics with colleges and universities in terms of forming relationships with its constituents. Recruiting new students and establishing long-term relationships with alumni is essential for the continued financial success of a university. The college campus, as the physical manifestation of an institution’s philosophies, traditions, and purposes, typically reflects these qualities with a clear and memorable image and acts as a vehicle for attracting and establishing loyal alumni (SUNY, 1987). The Antique Boat Museum relies heavily on donors for financial support and is interested in fostering lasting relationships with visitors to become life-long benefactors. Understanding planning and design concepts of the university campus and how the aesthetic quality, image, and function of a campus are developed and enhanced aided in the creation of a campus master plan for the Antique Boat Museum.

**Campus Planning**

As stated previously, the American collegiate system of education, where students and teachers worked and lived together, necessitated significant infrastructure and supporting buildings to house an academic community. Because the development of entire academic communities fell under single ownership with a focused mission, universities have been able to pursue and realize innovative urban planning schemes that have resulted in distinct landscapes with clear images and a sense of purpose. Since the 1800’s, campus planning has been performed by architects who developed master plans, or development frameworks, for the layout and design of campus programs. American campus planning has gone through several phases of favored architectural styles and campus organization schemes reflecting changing attitudes and ideals in higher education and/or new planning theory (Turner, 1984). Consistent throughout these stylistic changes was a commitment to campus form and coherent spatial organization. Campus master plans were the primary vehicle for guiding development, which were intended to create a “general unity of effect” and produce “visual
harmony and order” to reflect the ideals of an institution (Dober, 1963). Campus master plans were ambitious in terms of specifying an overall design form and architectural style. By the post World War II era, American campuses were experiencing higher enrollments, increasing population densities, and urban problems such as congestion and conflicting land uses. With rapid expansions came uncertainty about how institutions would grow and change in the future rendering the traditional static master plan obsolete.

In “Campus Planning,” Richard Dober (1963), outlines a new planning approach for colleges and universities that emphasizes the process of planning rather than on producing a definitive form. This process-oriented planning approach uses traditional methods of campus planning, such as program development based on institutional objectives, and comprehensive site inventory and analysis; however, it accepts the realities of an unpredictable future and stresses the need for flexibility in long-range campus plans. To comprehend the complexities of the modern campus and how an institution’s objectives and programs could best be accommodated in a future state, Dober uses the idea of planning modules. Modules represent the various distinct components that make up a campus environment and include such entities as instructional facilities, libraries, housing, and parking and circulation. Breaking the campus down into distinct modules allows for easier comprehension of the complex system and the ability to test and refine alternative programs and designs.

Dober (1963) further describes this planning and design process as an iterative chess game, where the campus is a chessboard and the modules are chess pieces: “Each move has consequences for all other pieces, and there are several strategies in planning which can be pursued with equal success. For this reason, through constant testing, adjustment, and feedback, the program from which the module is derived will itself be refined as preliminary agreements are reached on such decisions as the location of roads and the connections between one building and another.” The outcomes of this type of process are dependent on the time-scale and scope of the project being considered. For long-range planning, the resultant campus plan would indicate potential locations of various land uses, whereas more immediate planning efforts would detail the physical organization and articulation of the modules. Module planning is also helpful when institutions lack in depth understanding of their future programming needs. Dober (1963) states, “Planning modules make it possible to break down the total space requirements into smaller increments. This allows some elements to be programmed in detail, and others to remain as good guesses.”
The development of a more fluid campus planning process was a response to the inadequacies of the traditional master plan and reflected the reality of complex and unpredictable future outlooks. An important facet of process-oriented planning as described by Dober is the need for good input. Dober (1992) uses an institution’s educational objectives to thoroughly program future building needs, but he also advocates the use of participatory planning steps that involve multiple interests. Engaging stakeholders is a means by which future development goals are established and serve as campus plan guidelines for growth. In this way the process of establishing guidelines that set the tone and direction of future development is privileged over any preconceived formal plan. Dober (1992) states, “Whatever type of campus plan is being developed, the plan’s legitimacy and longevity is directly related to achieving: (a) campus-wide understanding of the physical characteristics of the area under study, (b) general agreement as what improvements should be represented in the plan; and (c) confirmation of their location and sequence of development.”

Dober (1992) describes this type of planning as “collaborative” and involving a series of meetings where there is a “give and take” in reviewing design studies and “understandings.” Gold (1980) describes the process as design professionals acting as “resource persons to translate human values into alternatives that people…can consider and revise.” Understanding the intricacies of working with stakeholders in a collaborative planning and design process is the focus of a later section of the literature review.

The purpose of campus planning is to provide an overall structure to a site. It involves the “location of the physical components which constitute a campus (buildings, landscapes, infrastructure) in order to achieve a physical pattern which is functional and attractive; with forms that are appropriate for the institution’s purpose, size, resources, and organization; positioned to reflect the best aspects of the particular site, locale, and environs; with an overall design that is complete as possible; but amendable and adjustable to new conditions” (Dober, 1992). For existing institutions that have never undergone a planning process it involves the establishment of planning guidelines, which serve to inform subsequent planning and design decisions. Also sometimes called a planning agenda, goals and objectives, strategic plan, or vision; planning guidelines are a series of statements which provide an effective means of regulating development without specifying a rigid final form (SUNY, 1987).
In “Campus Design,” Dober (1992) provides an extensive listing of the benefits of campus planning for institutions of higher learning. Benefits of campus planning that are relevant to the Antique Boat Museum include:

- To help define the physical resources required to sustain and/or advance the institution’s missions, goals, objectives and priorities.
- To describe and dimension physical improvements in general terms so as to have a reasonable sense of purpose, size, and probable cost.
- To determine and coordinate the location of existing and future campus improvements so as to achieve a functional, attractive, and comprehensive campus design.
- To have a well-conceived physical framework for making day-to-day physical development decisions—a framework flexible enough to accommodate changing circumstances and conditions not foreseeable at the time the plan was formulated.
- To document, for those outside the institution (donors, foundations, government, friends, accreditation agencies, and others), that the institution physical resources in hand, and those to be acquired, are well managed.
- To provide the institution with a sense of place that proclaims the College’s purposes, distinction, and domain.

**Campus Design**

The line between planning and design can be difficult to draw. Dober (1992) differentiates the two by describing campus planning as the development of an overall physical structure to a site, which serves as a framework for various design efforts to work within. Obviously there are important design considerations inherent to planning the organization of land uses on a site, including: unity, variety, balance, proportion, hierarchy, and spatial definition. The important point is that planning guidelines and land use frameworks established in the planning process serve to inform and unify design decisions. Campus design is the conceptualization of planning guidelines and involves the definition of various campus components to establish the character and experience of a campus (Dober, 1992). Principles relating to campus identity, coherence, and congruence are also used to further unify and guide design decisions (SUNY, 1987). These principles as well as campus components relevant to the Antique Boat Museum are briefly described below.
Circulation: Movement through the campus environment is a key planning consideration that is articulated through the design of vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems. The experience of a campus begins outside the campus with signage that directs visitors to institutional gateways and/or parking areas. Within the campus, pedestrian paths connect buildings and space and their layout is important in terms of unifying, coordinating, and orchestrating a sequence of visual experiences that aid in experiencing place (Dober, 1992). Clear and concise signage is a key component of circulation systems that aids in efficient campus way-finding and the development of a sense of place through consistent signage standards (SUNY, 1987).

Special Needs: The Antique Boat Museum has existing issues with accessibility in terms access and movement between buildings and the waterfront. Provisions for parking and convenient and appropriately dimensioned access are necessary components of a modern campus.

Parking: The experience of visiting an institution is greatly affected by provisions for automobile parking. An appropriately designed system of parking aids in the function and clarity of a campus. Design considerations for parking facilities include: offering a variety of parking opportunities, convenient distribution of parking facilities, appropriate signage to direct visitors to parking locations, and locating and designing lots so as not to detract from the campus landscape (SUNY, 1987). Additionally, entrances and exits should be well defined to reduce conflicts with street traffic and pedestrian systems.

Buildings: Architecture is perhaps the most influential component of a campus. Buildings effect the circulation patterns, scale, micro-climate, and experience of a campus (SUNY, 1987). Locating new buildings within a campus can provide opportunities to address issues associated with an existing organization of buildings by defining space. The architectural style of a campus’s collection of buildings has important implications for creating the identity of an institution. Approaches to architectural style at American Universities have ranged from strict uniformity (e.g. all roofs at Stanford University must be clad in red tile) to no architectural guidelines allowing for great diversity in style and form. Where there is less uniformity in building styles, a unifying landscape, building composition (i.e.- consistent setbacks), and/or consistent building materials will provide visual continuity and create a sense of place (Dober, 1992).
Vegetation: Plant material is an important component of a campus in terms creating beauty and enhancing the image of a campus. Trees, shrubs, perennials, annuals, and ground covers can reinforce and clarify circulation routes, soften or enhance edges, delineate space, and provide important micro-climate influences (SUNY, 1987). The iconic lawn of American campuses is a powerful aesthetic element, but also provides continuity, flexibility, and multi-use of open spaces. The lawns of the Antique Boat Museum provide an important setting for special events.

Edges: In urban areas, campus edges play a crucial role in the relationship between institutions and communities. In “Between Campus and Community: A Study of Landscape Edges,” Doble (1986) traces the evolution of university and community relations and examines a planning and design approach to the campus edge that offers positive benefits to both campus and community. Campus edges can perform in two distinct ways—aiding the image of an institution or acting as a boundary between different land-uses. Edges can mark and strengthen the image of an institution and/or act as a boundary allowing for “harmonious interrelationship among different groups” (Doble, 1986).

Waterfront: The waterfront plays a major role in the campus landscape of the Antique Boat Museum. In “Remaking the Urban Waterfront,” the natural boundary between land and water is not viewed as a thin line, but expanded to include a broader zone of overlap between land and water (Urban Land Institute, 2004). In this way, the benefits of water assets are expanded. Principles of waterfront design include: avoiding building construction directly on the “thin line,” ensuring visual access, and designing multiple opportunities for physically accessing waterfront zones. “The well-designed waterfront heightens the sensory experience and enhances the natural enjoyable features of the environment” and results in a distinctive setting that provides significant advantages for an institution’s or city’s competitiveness in its region (Urban Land Institute, 2004).

COLLABORATION

Contemporary planning efforts will often include stakeholders in the planning and design process. Hammersley (2002) describes master planning as “not about drawing abstractions onto a blank canvas, but about working with real stakeholders and with the resources at hand.” Participatory design is a means by which stakeholders have direct involvement in the process of planning and design decisions. The focus of this section of the literature review is to understand the dynamics of planning and designing with stakeholders.
and methods of participatory design that can aid in conducting a collaborative campus master plan process.

**Participatory Design**

Engaging stakeholders in the process of planning and design has been shown to be a positive influence that generates new insights and knowledge resulting in more informed and successful outcomes (Sanoff, 2000). Participatory design is a means of attaining up to date information relative to a project site and enables an understanding of the values and place-based experience of those people affected by planning and design decisions. Benefits also accrue in a second realm. As Luck (2003) points out “participatory design is more than a collection of design methods to influence built form, it also has a human dimension.” The human involves a transformation for both stakeholders and designers. Sanoff (2000) describes the individual learning that is brought about by increased awareness of a problem. This aspect of participatory design is relevant to this project in terms of heightening the awareness of the Antique Boat Museum about its properties and the benefits and value of long-term planning efforts.

The transformation of designers in participatory design processes is outlined by Schneekloth and Shibley (1995). They offer a reevaluation of the traditional role of the designer as an outside “expert” in the design process and instead describe the designer as a collaborator who facilitates and enables “others in the various acts of placemaking even while offering expertise in such discrete acts as planning, design, scientific inquiry, representation, construction, deconstruction and maintenance” (1995). Sanoff (2000) offers a similar description of this collaborative designer-client dynamic—“The solution will come out of the exchanges between two; the professional states opinions, provides technical information, and discusses consequences of various alternatives, just as citizens [insert “client” here] state their opinions and contribute their expertise.” The traditional role of “expert” designer is transformed to that of a collaborator whose design expertise enables others to engage in planning and design decisions.

There are a wide variety of participatory design processes and methods that often need to be tailored to address the unique circumstances of a project. For the purposes of this project a vision-driven participatory process was adopted to develop a campus master plan for the Antique Boat Museum. A vision-driven process is one in which an overarching vision, developed through the collaboration of designers and stakeholders, controls the planning and
design process (Kelly, 2000). A vision-driven participatory process closely resembles what Dober (1992) recommends for campus planning in instances when an existing institution lacks established planning guidelines.

**Vision**

The foundation of a vision-driven process is a vision statement that represents the collective view for an institution’s future. Vision statements are broad, but specific to the institution and describe the institution in the distant future (Kelly, 2000). On its Web site, the Alliance for Nonprofit Management states that a vision statement “should be realistic and credible, well articulated and easily understood, appropriate, ambitious, and responsive to change. It should orient the group’s energies and serve as a guide to action. It should be consistent with the organization’s values.” A vision-driven participatory planning process “The vision drives the plan, and everything revolves around and reacts to that” (Kelly, 2000). A campus vision statement with associated planning goals can act as a flexible overarching referent by which to gauge the appropriateness of future planning and design decisions that affect the physical makeup of an institution.

**Collaborative Methods**

Participatory planning and design involves an iterative process where insight and understanding are developed through the exchange of ideas (Schneekloth, 1995). A working session is a typical setting for collaborative participation to occur and involves facilitated dialogue to explore planning and design issues. As discussed, an important outcome of collaborative planning and design is the individual learning that is brought about by increased awareness of a problem. “Learning occurs best when the process is clear, communicable, open, and encourages dialogue, debate, and collaboration” (Sanoff, 2000). Transparency in a collaborative planning and process allows for collective understanding of the basis for planning and design decisions. Clear communication, including dialogue and graphics, is essential. To ensure transparency there must also be a means for accurately recording the outcomes of working sessions (dialogue, drawings, etc.) so that nothing is missed and a means of analyzing the data to discover themes, and areas of consensus or disagreement. A
The final component that ensures transparency in collaborative planning and design is a process of confirmation, where the analyzed outcomes from previous working sessions are presented to the client for their review and comment.

**MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT**

The Antique Boat Museum is interested in the development of their investment properties along Riverside Drive as mixed/multi-use development, potentially including retail, gallery space, offices, and/or top-floor residential units. The Urban Land Institute (1976) defines mixed-use development as a “combination of three or more revenue producing uses—retail, office, residential, and recreation—that in well-planned projects are mutually beneficial.” Clayton’s revised LWRP allows for and encourages this type of development, which seeks to enrich and energize areas with intensive land-use. An important design issue associated with projects that include mixed-use and cultural institutions includes the provision of people-oriented spaces and easy pedestrian access (Snedcof, 1985).

Snedcof (1985) documents how economic realities have forced many cultural institutions to seek out additional forms of revenue. As a result, profit-oriented ventures are an increasing component of cultural institution’s business models. The catalytic nature of cultural institution such as the Antique Boat Museum within their communities has been well documented (Evan, 2001). “They have attracted developers, small businesses, and allied artistic enterprises…They have meant a tremendous upgrading of property values, more people downtown, more tax revenue for the city. The arts in America are big business” (NY Times, 1983). By participating in the real estate development process, the Antique Boat Museum could recapture some of the “financial benefits that their presence conferred upon communities” (Snedcof, 1985).
The following section outlines the methods used to approach and execute this project. The process began with preliminary investigations into the Antique Boat Museum and the Village of Clayton. This helped reveal the scope of the project, identify relevant research areas, and formulate the project problem statement. The preliminary investigations and literature review of relevant research areas helped craft appropriate methods for approaching the project. Overarching goals and objectives were then formulated to serve as a guide for devising more specific tasks.

**GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

**Goal 1:** Develop a campus master plan for the Antique Boat Museum that meets its operational needs and goals for the future while fostering a positive relationship with the community.

- Inventory and analyze site and contextual conditions.
- Facilitate the development of a vision statement for the campus with museum staff.
- Facilitate the development of a program for the campus with museum staff that gives expression to their vision.
- Generate design alternatives and receive feedback from the client.
- Develop a final campus master plan.
- Produce illustrative graphics and a final planning document.
- Establish a foundation for future planning work at the Antique Boat Museum.

**Goal 2:** Conduct a collaborative planning and design process.

- Facilitate meetings and working sessions with museum staff to explore their goals for the future, programming needs, and design alternatives.
- Summarize the outcomes of working sessions and document in a transparent and understandable manner.
- Confirm the outcomes of working sessions with the client.
- Engender an understanding and appreciation for the value and benefit of campus planning.
Goal 3: Gain an understanding of specialized planning and design issues.
   a. Research the techniques and approaches of campus planning and design.
   b. Research existing literature on collaborative design methods and theory.
   c. Research and understand important issues relating to the relationship of institutions and community.
   d. Research and analyze precedents and case studies relating to mixed-use development and waterfront development.

Goal 4: Learn new computer applications and improve and expand digital graphic abilities.
   a. Learn and utilize desktop publishing software (InDesign) for the generation and layout of a campus master plan document including text and graphics.
   b. Develop a 3-D digital model (SketchUp) of the project site for use as a scaled wire frame model for use in generating hand drawn illustrative perspectives.
   c. Produce illustrative graphics that can serve the multiple purposes of planning reference, educational graphic, and marketing graphic.

TASKS

The following is a description of the various tasks that were performed to achieve the project goals and objectives. The outcomes of each of these tasks are evident or directly discussed in the following section entitled “Results.”

Digital Applications
1. Generated a SketchUp model of the campus and appropriate context as a tool for testing planning scenarios and graphics production.
2. Learned Adobe InDesign.

Plan for Planning
2. Held an introductory meeting with relevant members of the Antique Boat Museum staff to:
   a. Introduced and familiarized everyone with a master planning process, including scope, intent, and outcomes.
   b. Scheduled a sequence of working sessions and established a means for
receiving feedback and revisions, including:
Visioning
Inventory/Analysis/Program Development
Design Alternatives Review
Composite Master Plan
3. Pre-planned all working sessions, including: agendas, expected outcomes, and necessary materials.

**Working Session #1: “Visioning”**

1. Facilitated a vision plan working session with Antique Boat Museum staff and trustees to explore existing site conditions and their values, purpose, and aspirations for the future. Workshop activities included:
   a. Facilitated discussions.
   b. Written questionnaires.
2. Recorded all responses with a designated recorder and meeting minutes and summarized information by categorizing comments into general themes.
3. Formulated an Antique Boat Museum campus draft vision statement and campus planning goals for implementing the vision.
4. Presented to the client:
   a. Summary of what was heard during the vision plan working session.
   b. Draft vision statement and goals.
5. Received feedback to the draft vision statement and goals and made revisions.

**Inventory**

1. Developed an accurate base map of the project area.
   a. Assembled and formatted existing files (CAD, aerials, and GIS) into a base file.
   b. Supplemented base file with field observations and measurements.
2. Inventoried existing site conditions using observations, interviews with museum staff, and consulting various documents.
   a. *Natural*: hydrology (water level fluctuations), topography, vegetation, wetlands, winds, river ice, flood zones, soils.
   b. *Physical*: mass-space, views, utilities, building space use, building heights, water access, circulation, event spaces, pedestrian connections, parking.
c. *Cultural*: zoning, area land-use, community planning efforts (LWRP), contextual architectural style.

### Site Analysis

1. Analyzed existing site conditions.
   a. Summarized inventory data in a series of overlays on a consistent and accurate base map.
   b. Identified opportunities and site issues.

2. Conducted additional analysis as needed in conjunction with outcomes from working sessions, including: *Visioning*, *Program Development*, and *Design Alternatives Review*.

### Working Session #2: “Inventory, Analysis, and Program Development”

1. Facilitated a working session with museum staff to review existing site conditions revealed through site inventory and analysis and establish campus programming needs, including activity types, and potential locations.
   a. Presented the results of *Inventory* and *Site Analysis* and received feedback.
   b. Utilized the results of the *Inventory* and *Site Analysis* to facilitate discussions on program elements and potential activity locations.
   c. Identified necessary supporting elements and special concerns for each activity type.
   d. Attempted to understand programmatic needs of future development.

2. Recorded and documented working session outcomes with a recorder and meeting notes.

### Design Concept, Strategies and Alternatives

1. Utilized the outcomes of the *Visioning* and *Inventory/Analysis/Program Development* working sessions to generate a general design concept for the site.

2. Developed 3 preliminary schematic design alternatives for the site representing a range of potential development options.

3. Refined schematic alternatives with greater detail.

4. Produced a rough study plan with accompanying design strategy description for each design alternative.
Working Session #3: “Design Alternatives Review”

1. Facilitated a working session with museum staff to review preliminary design alternatives.
   a. Presented a summary of the outcomes from the Inventory/Analysis/Program Development working session and received feedback.
   b. Presented 3 design alternatives for the campus master plan with supporting descriptions and proposed new building information.
   c. Facilitated discussions exploring the consequences (opportunities and constraints) of the various development scenarios.

2. Recorded and documented working session outcomes.

Composite Campus Master Plan

1. Synthesized feedback to alternatives and refined design into a composite master plan.
2. Rendered the final plan graphics.
   a. Illustrative
   b. Schematic
3. Produced illustrative section elevations.
4. Updated the digital site model to reflect the final plan.
5. Generated illustrative hand drawn perspectives from SketchUp wire-frame model.
As outlined, this study followed a typical planning and design process, including: site inventory and analysis, program development, design concepts and strategies, design alternatives, and the synthesis of a final composite design. To account for the fact that the Antique Boat Museum has never formally undergone a long-term plan for their properties, the planning and design was initiated with a visioning process. The outcomes of each planning and design step are described below. The scope of planning included all existing museum properties and potential expansions as well as consideration of additional acquisitions of property.

A significant component of the planning and design process was the collaboration or close working relationship between the author and museum staff to develop a campus master plan for the Antique Boat Museum. Collaboration with museum staff occurred during three working sessions, including: Visioning, Inventory/Analysis/Program Development, and Design Alternatives. Museum staff members involved in this process included: Charlotte Brooks (Director of Events), Rebecca Hopfinger (Director of Development & Curator of Special Exhibits), Alan Hutchinson (Business Manager), John MacLean (Executive Director), and John Summers (Chief Curator). Additionally, the following museum trustees took part in the Visioning working session: Bud Ames, Ian Tatlock, and trustee chairman, Edward McNally.

Working sessions were preplanned, structured, and facilitated to ensure productive results. The working sessions involved the exchange of information and expertise to explore the various working session topics. The author provided technical planning and design information in the form of analysis, relevant case studies, and planning and design concepts. The client provided valuable site information, place-based experience, desired goals for the future, and feedback to design alternatives. An important component of the collaboration was the recurrent procedure of reporting results from prior working sessions and confirming results. This ensured a collective understanding of the basis of planning and design decisions.

RESULTS

Figure 16: A typical working session.
As noted previously, a vision statement represents the collective view for an institution’s future. The formulation of a vision statement for the Antique Boat Museum was based on several sources. Primary input came from the October 6, 2006 Visioning working session (see Appendix A). The format for this meeting included an open group dialogue that was loosely structured by a list of prepared questions and topic areas. The discussion along with a written questionnaire sought to identify the values of the museum and their desires for the future. Additional input was found in various Antique Boat Museum literature such as the Campaign for the Museum and Antique Boat Museum Draft Strategic Plan Renewal 2006-2010. From these sources, 4 distinct themes were identified, which included: supporting the museum’s mission, providing a broad-based and enjoyable visitor experience, capitalizing on the museum’s unique waterfront setting, and continuing to be a positive influence on the surrounding community of Clayton.

A draft vision statement and planning goals were initially presented to the client and with feedback several minor revisions were made. The final vision and planning goals are general in wording yet specific to the Antique Boat Museum.

**Antique Boat Museum Campus Vision Statement:**

“The Antique Boat Museum campus will be a river oriented and experiential destination that fosters its mission (to collect, preserve, exhibit and interpret boats and other objects related to the history of boating in North America and to enhance public understanding and appreciation of the contributions of the St. Lawrence River region to North America’s boating history), while providing a cohesive environment that is inviting and emblematic of the institution’s commitment to quality.”

**Campus Planning Goals:**

1. To support and help fulfill the museum’s curatorial, interpretive and educational mission.
2. To take advantage of the spectacular waterfront setting of the Antique Boat Museum.
3. To develop a broad-based visitor experience that engages and that communicates clearly stewardship, authenticity, and depth and range of experience.
4. To continue to create value in the community and strengthen connections between the Antique Boat Museum campus and the Village of Clayton.
A preliminary inventory of existing site conditions was conducted and then presented to the client at the *Inventory, Analysis, and Program Development* working session held on February 9, 2007. Discussions on each of the various inventory topics allowed for collective identification and understanding of existing site issues. The dialogue and feedback also provided a means for checking the accuracy of inventory content and determining if any important factors were overlooked.
inventory

A. Antique Boat Museum Cam
B. Dock Rental
C. Residential Rental Property
D. Surface Parking Lot

MUSEUM PROPERTIES
inventory
inventory

ZONING
Based on the inventory of existing site conditions and feedback received at the February 9, 2007 *Inventory, Analysis, and Program Development* working session, a composite site analysis of existing site issues was produced (figure 17). Additionally, a list identifying specific campus planning and design issues was formulated.

**Campus Planning and Design Issues:**

- The sense of entry/arrival to the museum needs to be improved to better coordinate automobile, boat, and pedestrian arrival.
- The ability to clearly identify and comprehend the museum campus needs to be addressed to improve campus readability and overall sense of cohesion.
- The interior museum campus perimeter needs to be secured and controlled for the protection of exhibits and collection of visitor admissions.
- The massive scale of the Mary Street right-of-way needs to be addressed to create cohesion for the north and south sides of the campus.
- Accessibility at the museum needs improvement to allow easy access to buildings, the waterfront, and across open spaces.
- Unobstructed service access to the Yacht House overhead lift, Dodge exhibit space, waterfront docks/slips, and catering areas needs to be maintained.
- The dissimilar scale and style of museum buildings relative to the fabric of the Village of Clayton should be considered in new building developments.
- Campus open spaces provide important programming space during summer events and should therefore remain as open or flexible space.
- A covenant, or “gentlemen’s agreement,” written in the deed of sale for the Mary Street parking lot prohibits any development that substantially diminishes the view of the St. Lawrence River from Mary Street.
During the course of reviewing Antique Boat Museum literature and from discussions with staff and trustees a list of future museum programming needs was compiled. The program list was presented to the client at the March 15, 2007 Design Alternatives working session for review and feedback. These program elements were used to develop design alternatives. The revised program is outlined below.

**Campus Program Elements:**

- Provide mixed or **multi-use development** along Riverside Drive to possibly include: museum exhibit/gift shop space, bakery, brewpub, offices, and life-tenancy apartments.
- Incorporate the RiverWalk into the fabric of the museum campus.
- Provide **parking** opportunities for museum visitors.
- Augment the La Duchesse experience with a **tour waiting area** and planting beds.
- Site a **children’s activity center** on the main campus (north of Mary Street).
- Provide an **event rental facility** with a catering and food preparation area and visitor bathrooms.
- Plan for the replacement of the **Dodge Launch Building** (existing: 8370 sq. ft.).
- Provide **interior building flex space** for visiting exhibits, events, or gift shop expansion.
- Plan for the renovation or replacement of the **Rivershed**.
With the completed site analysis and program list, a design concept was developed for the campus. The developed concept seeks to address the museum’s existing issues associated with way-finding and sense of arrival and entry while considering the RiverWalk and parking program elements. The concept focuses on the approach, circulation, and gathering of museum visitors by creating a common central precinct or assembly space for the entry to the museum (figure 18). Feeding the entry space are the RiverWalk and a pedestrian route from a new surface parking lot sited to the south of Mary Street. This parking location was chosen for its relatively flat topography and removal from significant river views.

The central gathering space could serve multiple functions and program needs while also creating a common entry experience for museum visitors arriving either by car or on foot from elsewhere in Clayton. The central space would serve to announce the entry to the museum and act as a meeting point or waiting area for visitors. Ideally, a central precinct would be proximate to museum information desks, admissions, and gift shops and curbside drop off areas. Additionally, the space would provide seating areas and subtle opportunities for children to occupy themselves in a safe setting. The space could hold events and temporary exhibits to further animate what should be a dynamic space. Directly linking this space would be pedestrian routes to parking areas and the RiverWalk.
Based on the outcomes of the site analysis and programming, a list of general design strategies was developed. The strategies served as helpful guidelines during the development of design alternatives.

**Design Strategies:**

- Modify and enhance the Mary Street streetscape to unify the north and south sides of the campus.
- Site and arrange new buildings to strengthen campus open spaces.
- Design and program campus open space to allow for flexibility and events.
- Retain and enhance views to the river.
- Develop museum edges and entry features to communicate a clear sense of arrival.
- Develop a riverside promenade along the extent of the museum waterfront to provide an engaging riverside experience that also allows service access to waterfront exhibits and slips.
- Articulate new buildings along Riverside Drive to mediate between the dissimilar architecture of museum buildings (scale and type) and those of the surrounding community.
- Utilize ADA accessible surfaces and a logical network of pedestrian paths between buildings and the waterfront.
PLANNING STRATEGIES:
- Replace the Dodge building on existing site and incorporate admissions and ramping within the building to get visitors to riverside grade.
- SiteMixed-use at Riverside and Mary on a terrace (~5' above waterfront) to provide river/campus views.
- Retain 732 Riverside Dr (great views) and renovate to be a residence for visiting boat builders, educators, artists, scholars, etc.
- Open views along Riverside Dr.
- Re-grade the auction site in and develop as a public open space.
- Provide parking to the south and treat residential edge.

DESIGN BENEFITS/ISSUES:
- Design creates strong public gathering spaces, but not in close proximity to admissions or gift shops.
- The terrace and re-graded auction site use a grade change (and planting beds) to create a museum perimeter without the need for fencing.
- The terrace creates possible storage space below.
- The only service access to the new Dodge building and Yacht House are from the west gate. (The pedestrian ramp at the auction site could be designed to accept vehicles.)
- Parking location is not obvious (directional signs would be required), difficult to locate, and forces the visitor to “loop.”

NEW BUILDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Sq Ft/Story</th>
<th># Stories</th>
<th>Total Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dodge</td>
<td>8075</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mixed Use</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mixed Use</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mixed Use</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Design Alternative A
PLANNING STRATEGIES:

- Site a new Dodge building at the auction site to create a strong central precinct.
- Develop a multi-level community park to the north along Riverside Dr to compensate for lost (“gentleman”) views.
- Develop MKD at Mary and Riverside on a terrace (~5’ above waterfront).
- Relocate the Rivershed to a community/public location (e.g. Frink).
- Install hardscape and large planting pots in space between Skiff Livery Stone Building and Hissall to create a flexible outdoor space or courtyard.
- Site a small pergola in conjunction with seating at the La Duchesse tour site.
- Provide a dedicated museum boat ramp.
- Acquire 2 parcels on Theresa St for a continuous stretch of parking (~50 spaces).
- Expand the workshop and install rain gardens to treat parking lot stormwater.

DESIGN BENEFITS/ISSUES:

- This scheme creates a strong public central precinct which can act as a gathering space for all age groups and is in close proximity to admissions and the gift shop.
- Grade changes (and plantings) at central precinct and terraced MKD allows for open views into campus and a defensible perimeter without fencing.
- Boat ramp location is in a pedestrian location which would be a strong conflict during the Boat Show.
- Parking is screened and not obvious (directional wayfinding would be necessary).
- Public park would be a major amenity along the River Walk.

NEW BUILDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building &amp; Name</th>
<th>Sq. Ft/Story</th>
<th># Stories</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop (expansion)</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dodge</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mixed Use</td>
<td>4750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mixed Use</td>
<td>5020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mixed Use</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Design Alternative B
PLANNING STRATEGIES:

- Museum building (Dodge replacement) is placed at corner of Riverside and Mary.
- MPD is sited at the “community” parking lot site.
- Live-work condos along riverside use grade change for 1st floor walkout to river (storage/exhibits/ flex space). 2nd floor offices at street level and 3rd floor apartments.
- Public overlook park to compensate for loss of gentleman’s agreement view.
- Parking is made more visible and central.
- The workshop is moved to the waterfront in conjunction with a second floor “flex” exhibit space.
- All buildings except the Gold Cup are within a gated perimeter north of Mary St.
- The Rivershed is replaced by a similar structure with amenities including bathrooms, food prep space, and retractable siding.

DESIGN BENEFITS/ISSUES:

- Parking scheme and the Dodge building at the corner makes for a strong sense of arrival and obvious wayfinding.
- Parking is larger and more central, but presence can be offset with screening and landscape elements.
- Condo units limit views into campus from Riverside Dr.
- Workshop along waterfront adds to the “working” waterfront idea of the LWRF and classes are more readily seen.
- This scheme allows for a cohesive and secure campus perimeter north of Mary St, but leaves the Gold Cup isolated to the south.
- This scheme does not have a public, central precinct.

NEW BUILDINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Sq Ft/Story</th>
<th># Stories</th>
<th>Total Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New Riverside</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workshop/Flex</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dodge</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6. Condos</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5400 per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8. Mixed-Use</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17100 per</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a list of general planning strategies and a concept to organize building programming, open space, and circulation routes to a central precinct, a series of preliminary schematic design alternatives were developed for the site. Three schematic designs were further refined and represented a logical range of potential development options for the campus based on the overall concept. The design alternatives were presented to the client at the March 15, 2007 Design Alternatives working session as design schemes A, B, and C (figures 19-21). Each design alternative was outlined with specific planning strategies, a list of design benefits and issues, and proposed new building information. Feedback to the alternatives generated a clear sense of the museum’s preferences for various development options and organizations (see Appendix B). The primary findings are outlined below.

**Design Preferences**

*Dodge Launch Building:* The most significant finding from the dialogue on design alternatives was their preference for locating a new Dodge Launch Building in its existing location. Other schemes (B and C) sited new buildings in the Mary Street parking lot, however, the museum did not feel the covenant associated with the property could be violated. Scheme A, showing a new Dodge Building in its existing location, uses the Mary Street parking lot as the default location for a central open space.

*Parking:* The alternatives provided a range of options for parking on the south side of Mary Street. They expressed a preference for parking that was less visible to the arrival experience at Mary Street (schemes A and B) and enthusiasm for the inclusion of rain gardens to treat surface parking runoff.

*South of Mary Street:* Out of discussions, it was revealed that plans had been developed in the past for a museum store associated with the existing Gold Cup Building and an all-purpose exhibit building attached further to the east. They expressed a desire to incorporate similar developments in the master plan, which represents a significant choice to fully develop the south side of the Mary Street campus. (Discussions did touch on the possibility of directing all new development to the north of Mary Street to create a cohesive and more easily controlled campus perimeter.)
**Investment Properties:** There was expressed interest for full development of the investment properties along Riverside Drive. Schemes A and B explored the options of developing portions of these properties as public open space to compensate for development of the Mary Street Parking lot and lost views across the deed restricted property. Feedback revealed that the museum considers the investment properties to be too valuable an asset to be allocated as a public park. They expressed a desire for full development of the investment properties to include beer gardens, terraced restaurants, bookshops, clothing stores, bakeries, and views out to the river and into the museum campus. A public RiverWalk would link these spaces to create a dynamic pedestrian experience. Additionally, they preferred the mixed-use development associated with scheme C, which includes development of the surface parking lot at Jane Street.

**Rivershed:** The design alternatives provided a range of options for the Rivershed, including: renovation, replacement, or removal. The museum expressed interest in a Rivershed replacement as outlined in scheme C to include restrooms and food preparation areas.

**Campus Perimeter:** The alternatives presented a range of development options for expansion of the museum along the eastern harbor. For instance, scheme C includes a majority of the eastern harbor within the paid admissions perimeter of the museum. Expansion of the museum along the harbor would allow for additional dock space and potentially more in-water exhibit space. It was revealed the museum is comfortable with the extent of the current museum waterfront and does not foresee the need for additional dock or exhibit space.

**Harbor Layout:** The museum expressed a clear interest in seeing the harbor more fully developed than was evident in any of the design alternatives. This was especially the case for the northeast portion of the harbor where there was interest in the observation deck associated with scheme B. Additionally, it was revealed they did not need a dedicated museum boat ramp, as demand is limited.
"The Antique Boat Museum campus will be a river-oriented and experiential destination that fosters its mission (to collect, preserve, exhibit, and interpret boats and other objects related to the history of boating in North America and to enhance public understanding and appreciation of the contributions of the St. Lawrence River region to North America’s boating history), while providing a cohesive environment that is inviting and emblematic of the institution’s commitment to quality."

Figure 22: Composite Campus Master Plan
Based on feedback to the design alternatives, a composite master plan was developed (figure 22). The composite master plan represents a synthesis of preferred development options and adherence to the general planning strategies. Figure 23 is a site plan of the existing conditions of the site and is provided as an easy reference. This section presents and describes the composite campus master plan by outlining the major components of the design.

**DESIGN COMPONENTS**

*Mary Street Streetscape*: The enhancement of Mary Street is meant to serve two primary purposes. It is intended to reduce the large scale of the existing right-of-way, and link the north and south sides of the campus. Proposed enhancements include reducing the street width from 50 ft. to 40 ft. to provide larger sidewalks and planting spaces for a high pedestrian environment (figure 25). Large brick or stamped concrete crosswalks announce and delineate the museum district and link the north and south sides of the campus. Landscape elements, such as banners, light poles, trash receptacles, and benches would be incorporated throughout the streetscape to provide a sense of rhythm, continuity, and pedestrian-scaled textures to the experience of the street (figure 26).

Figure 25: *Existing and proposed section-elevations at Mary Street.*
**Dodge Launch Building:** A central piece of the design is a new Dodge Launch Building. The building is programmed to include admissions, exhibit space for the existing collection, and additional offices, archive, and classroom space on the third floor. An internal ramp would bring visitors from street level to the exhibit floor, which is a grade change of approximately 4 ft. An annex connects to the Haxall Building allowing for free movement between the two buildings. The space created between the Haxall and Launch could be an intimate sculpture court and/or a small outdoor exhibit space, which is then directly linked with the existing Haxall porch. A street front arcade would mimic the Haxall entry and provide shaded views.
into the museum and exhibit floor (figure 27). The arcade leads visitors toward the primary museum entrance on the east side of the building. The small outdoor plaza and adjoining open space act as the common entry point for all museum visitors. It is proposed that the existing Launch Building structure be reused at one of the museum’s off-site storage locations for collections storage.

**Parking:** A proposed surface parking lot of 53 spaces with planted medians requires the acquisition of 2 new residential parcels on Theresa Street. The development of the parking area could proceed in phases, as depicted in design alternatives scheme A and B, as properties and resources become available (figures 44 and 45). Directly associated with the parking lot are a system of rain gardens to treat stormwater runoff. In addition to the environmental benefits and demonstration of the museum’s commitment to stewardship of the river, the rain gardens are incorporated as an attractive landscape amenity associated with the entry plaza and gift shop breeze-through (figure 28). The surface parking would function as event space for vendors during the Antique Boat Show.

*Figure 28: View of the rain gardens, plaza and breeze-through.*
La Duchesse Tour Waiting Area: Figures 29 and 30 illustrate proposed landscape enhancements to augment the experience of the La Duschesse. A stone seating wall matching the limestone of the Stone Building and associated planting beds provide small gathering areas and a variety of seating arrangements. The subspaces created by the seating wall and planting beds could receive interpretive installations describing the La Duchesse and/or in-water exhibits docked directly adjacent to the seating areas.

Figure 29: Looking west from within the Yacht House.

Figure 30: Aerial view of the La Duchesse pier.
Rivershed: As noted earlier, the Rivershed plays a central role in many of the museum’s operations, including: special events, children’s classes, and as a rental facility. Since the existing structure will require significant renovation and lacks some amenities that would be useful to the Antique Boat Museum, a new Rivershed is proposed that is similar in style and layout to the existing structure, but would include restrooms, a catering and food preparation area, retractable siding for inclement weather, and potentially an indoor *La Duchesse* waiting area (figure ). Looking directly onto the *La Duchesse*, the waiting area could also include interpretive exhibits on the houseboat for those visitors unable to take the tour. To provide more open space on the site, the new Rivershed would be relocated to the north and aligned with the existing walkway. The existing Rivershed structure, as the traditional site for community Shore Dinners put on by the local Fishing Guide Association, is proposed to be relocated offsite to a community location on the Clayton waterfront.

![Figure 31: View of the museum harbor, observation deck, and new Rivershed.](image)

Rental Hut and East Gate: A modest structure is proposed for the eastern gate of the museum perimeter, which would be staffed to provide museum visitors assistance with small boat rentals. The site could also act as admissions to the museum for people arriving via the RiverWalk (figure ). A low stone wall announces the arrival to the museum.
Museum Store and Flex Building: A new Museum Store connected to the existing Gold Cup Building and a “flex” building represent significant developments on the south side of Mary Street. The Museum Store is devoted retail space and would provide admissions and access to the Gold Cup Building. The flex building includes space for temporary exhibits or events, a boatbuilding shop for classes and exhibits, an engine shop, and the museum’s workshop. An overhead structure or pergola connects the Museum Store and flex building creating an open breeze-through between the buildings (figure 28). The breeze-through connects two small plazas with seating areas that function as gathering/waiting areas or as temporary outdoor exhibit sites. In an effort to respect the fabric of adjoining residential buildings, the façade of the flex building is articulated to reflect the scale of the surrounding buildings.

Riverside Drive Streetscape: The streetscape associated with the mixed-use development along Riverside Drive includes street trees, planting beds, and paving treatments. Brick or stamped concrete sidewalks and crosswalks delineate the path of the RiverWalk. Street trees help soften the mass of the mixed-use buildings, and together with planting beds, create a high quality pedestrian environment.
Mixed-Use Development: The proposed mixed-use developments for the museum investment properties and surface parking lot on Riverside Drive represent a major component of the master plan. The four mixed-use buildings to the west of Riverside Drive have to deal with grade changes from 12 to 5 feet. Two separate terraces are used to provide common first floor elevations for adjacent buildings. The topography associated with buildings 3 and 4 allows for a first floor walkout to the river and second floor street access (figures 33 and 34). Parking is provided for buildings 5 and 6 and is sited adjacent to commercial parking areas. The architectural style of the mixed-use buildings should mimic similar 3 and 4 story buildings of Clayton.
Public Open Spaces: The campus master plan delineates several public open spaces. The former Mary Street parking lot site is developed as the central precinct and entry to the museum. A hardscaped plaza adjacent to the new Dodge Launch Building provides seating and gathering areas, access to curbside drop-off, and potential temporary outdoor exhibit space. The adjoining open green provides a transition between the museum and mixed-use developments of Riverside Drive and is programmed for museum events such as the Antique Boat Show Auction. Views are retained across this space honoring the “gentlemen’s agreement” (figure 35). Additional public open spaces located at Riverside Drive and Jane Street act as transition areas to buffer mixed-use developments from adjoining single-family residential housing. Linked to these spaces by a pedestrian ramp is a waterside picnic area with access to an observation deck (figure 36).

Architecture: Figure 35 provides a description of proposed new buildings. As discussed previously, the scale, mass, and style of new architecture should respond to the architectural fabric of Clayton. Larger buildings, such as the flex space building, is articulated to appear smaller and provide continuity with the scale of adjoining residential buildings.
**Figure 36:** View of the harbor, overlook, and observation deck.

**Figure 37:** Proposed new building data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building #/Name</th>
<th>Sq. Ft./Story</th>
<th># Stories</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rivershed</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>education, food prep, restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Shop</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>gift shop, admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Space</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>workshop, classrooms, exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge Launch</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>exhibits, admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Hut</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>small boat rentals, admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use 1</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>offices, retail, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use 2</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>offices, retail, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>2-3000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>retail, restaurants, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>retail, offices, apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Village Dock:** Despite the fact that the village dock building is modest in size, it occupies a major focal point for the Mary Street viewshed. Figure 38 demonstrates the prominence of this building and its associated dumpster. Although not on museum property it is proposed that the museum advocate for a dumpster enclosure to offset the visual prominence given this unfortunate, though important, trash collection site. Given its high visibility, the enclosure could be incorporated into an art piece that celebrates the river or acts as an abstract weather station for boaters (figure 39).

**Campus Edges:** There are 2 locations where proposed museum land-use directly abuts residential property, to the south of the surface parking lot and to the north of the overlook park and its associated pedestrian ramp. Privacy fencing and attractive landscape planting along these edges work to clearly delineate boundaries, limit movement, and mitigate adjoining land-use conflicts. The boundary of the main museum campus (i.e.- north of Mary Street) is controlled and secured by gates and fencing. The plan makes use of changes in grade, planting beds, and wrought iron fencing to create a controlled museum perimeter with an open feeling (figure 32).

**Way-finding:** A designed system of way-finding signs was not developed as part of this master plan. Rather, larger design moves and landscape cues were explored to enhance way-finding and a sense of arrival to the museum. For visitors arriving by automobile, the master plan includes design proposals beginning on the primary entry road into the village (James Street). Moving the existing museum directional sign located at the northwest corner of James and Mary Street to the southeast side would increase visibility and decrease the likelihood of visitors confusing the Antique and Classic Boat Society building for the Antique Boat Museum. Figure 40 shows the ideal location for the sign as 50 ft. before the intersection allowing for reasonable reaction time. Bump-outs at Riverside Drive and James Street provide spaces for planting beds that frame either directional signage or visual elements (figure 41). For example, sculptural pieces that work to signal the presence of the Antique Boat Museum. A similar bump-out
also occurs at the northwest corner of Riverside Drive and Mary Street to provide space for a similar installation.

**Pedestrian Circulation:** Figure 24 outlines the improved pedestrian circulation and accessibility of the campus. Hardscaped paths and ramps provide access to buildings, the waterfront, and across open spaces. The breeze-through is an important pedestrian route linking the south and north sides of campus. The RiverWalk provides access to public beer gardens, terraced restaurants, small retail, offices, and pedestrian alleyways. The RiverWalk is incorporated into the museum central precinct and provides wider connections to the Clayton waterfront, other cultural institutions, and potentially French Creek Bay to the south. Additionally, the boardwalk along the western waterfront of the campus is extended south to the fence at the village dock. A gate incorporated into the fence would allow direct access to the dock during the Antique Boat Show.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Future Planning

During the course of this project a list of future planning recommendations was compiled. The recommendations are meant to help the museum advance their planning and design efforts as they work with consultants in the future.

- Develop a clearer understanding of future building programming needs. The square footage and programming for a majority of the proposed new buildings in the composite master plan represent a best guess or best fit given site conditions. Additional square footage could be developed with higher density development, or less square footage could occur via lower density development. Future plans will necessitate a more detailed understanding of the spatial needs or desires of the museum articulated as specific square footage needs. This will also influence the potential need for additional property acquisitions.
- Conduct a market analysis to determine what the plausible development schemes are for the investment properties and to establish the appropriate mixed-use programming.
- Retain a professional landscape architecture firm for further detailed planning and design.
- Retain a surveyor to complete a detailed site survey of all museum landholdings (have landscape architecture firm specify the scope and data requirements).
- Conduct a more comprehensive visitor survey to identify desired site amenities and experiential needs of museum visitors. These can be translated directly into design programming elements for future planning efforts.
- Potentially align with the other cultural institutions of Clayton to advocate for support from the village for a coordinated system of signage that advertises and directs visitors to cultural sites. This could be a means of creating positive benefits for all while also strengthening Clayton’s role as the cultural center of the Thousand Islands Region.

Conclusion
**Immediate Steps**

The following list includes potential steps the Antique Boat Museum can take immediately to improve their campus.

- Retain a landscape architecture firm to design the planting beds and seating wall associated with the *La Duchesse* pier and tour waiting area.
- Retain a landscape architecture firm to design the plaza and planting areas between the Stone Building and the Skiff Livery Building.
- Begin discussions with the village concerning the relocation of the Rivershed to a community location, such as the Frink America property.
- Begin discussions with the village concerning the village dock dumpster. Advocate for a dumpster enclosure and potentially a commissioned art element associated with the dock building.
- Publicize the ability to visit the Antique Boat Museum by boat. Develop web-based resources notifying visitors of available museum visitor dock space. Provide GPS coordinates and on-water approach photos of the museum waterfront highlighting the location of available visitor dockage. Also, kindly remind boat guests of the importance of visiting the museum admissions desk.

**PROJECT REVIEW**

The overall goals and objectives of this project were met. The composite master plan represents a plausible scheme that is rooted in the goals and values of the museum. The campus vision statement, campus planning goals, and planning strategies can act as a general framework for future planning and development decisions by the museum. As noted, there is an obvious need for further refinement of the museum’s programming requirements. The outcomes of a more defined program may result in a master plan that looks significantly different than the composite master plan presented here, however, the framework established by this process can ensure that any future planning decisions are based on the values of the museum.

As stated, this project was intended to be a service-learning project and an educational experience for the museum staff and its trustees in terms of fostering an understanding of a campus master planning process and the benefits and value of long-term planning efforts. Unfortunately, the final presentation of this project to the museum will not occur until after this report is finished. Based on the responses and productive results at the various working
sessions it can be said that the planning process was a positive experience for the museum. They are more familiar with the master planning process and perhaps their campus and community as well. In terms of the collaborative process, the group size of 6 (including myself) proved to be a manageable number. Everyone was engaged and participating in the working session discussions and we were able to stay on topic.

Reviewing my methods there are a few key areas where the project might have been strengthened. In hindsight, the presentation of design alternatives could have been improved by supplementing the base plans with concept diagrams illustrating the main gesture of each scheme. Additionally, rough axonometric sketches or aerial perspectives would have helped in communicating to the client the spatial implications of each alternative. In terms of my design process, more time could have been allocated for exploring the character and experiential qualities of the museum versus the overall organization of the design. The organization of programming and buildings is vitally important, but is perhaps the most likely to change as the result of market analysis and further program refinement. The character of the museum and the collective face of the small details that makeup and communicate what the place is about are more permanent qualities that could have been more fully developed during this process. Visiting more museums sites and waterfronts, especially along the St. Lawrence River, would have been helpful in terms of exploring character studies. Not being able to experience the museum during its summer operation, especially during one of its large events, was an unfortunate reality. Overall, this project was rewarding and a tremendous learning experience at many levels.
References


mission.http://www.allianceonline.org/FAQ/strategic_planning/what_s_in_vision_statement.faq (11.05.06)


Antique Boat Museum Meeting Notes
Meeting Date: October 5, 2006
Location: Antique Boat Museum Education Room (Clayton, NY)
Attendees: John MacLean, Rebecca, John Summers, Charlotte, Ted McNally, Bud Ames, Alan Hutchinson, Dan McCormick, Terri Luckett, Tim Toland

⊙ Existing Properties
  ⊙ East Line Road: 10 acre site, removed from Campus, conforms to land use
  ⊙ Storage Facilities: Removed from campus, currently does not conform to land use in that area
  ⊙ Rental Docks: 20 rentals, park in lot on Riverside Dr. parking lot
  ⊙ Riverside Dr. Parking Lot: has access to James St. (should take advantage of)
  ⊙ Riverside Dr Rental Properties: being rented, income generation
  ⊙ Campus Parking: Letterform agreement (not necessarily a restrictive covenant) to not obstruct river view. Consensus is to consider it available for development

⊙ Surrounding Context/Relationships
  ⊙ Generally good relationship with neighbors
    - Property values of area going up
  ⊙ Small (but vocal) opposition
    - Concern about removal of properties from tax role
    - Feel this group doesn’t realize/value contribution ABM provides
  ⊙ Larger (quieter) support
    - Plans of adjacent land owner to south on Theresa Drive (Sam Riverly)
      - 48 room boutique hotel w/ 4 star kitchen for hotel catering (not a public restaurant)
      - Charlotte has article on plan that has been created
      - Planning on parking under structure (site falls away so grading will allow for)
      - May acquire property across street for additional surface parking (staff)
      - Will maintain marina and corner building
      - Conference center for 200-300 people
      - Renderings show similar architectural style to ABM
  ⊙ Boat show community response
    - Depends on who you ask
    - Fills community with vehicles
    - A few times a year

⊙ Strengths of the Campus
  ⊙ The River
    - Physical access is key attraction
    - Docks on west side of campus are available (left in year round)
      - Family sailing on Wednesdays in July/August
      - Skiffs available with Admission
      - Children’s sailing program
    - Need to build upon/expand on interaction with river
  ⊙ Beautiful facilities/buildings
    - Want to maintain the integrity of building/character
      - River vernacular
      - Existing pole barn facility may be redeveloped to match newer character

⊙ Weaknesses of the Campus
  ⊙ Lots of shoreline that is good for powerboat access, but not for canoe/kayak/riverboat access
  ⊙ Dock/waterfront on west side is very exposed…hard to get into/access with smaller craft
− Perhaps move to protected cove?
○ Acquisition of Theresa St. properties would help to complete rectangle on south side of Mary St.
○ Separation of properties across Mary St. presents difficulties
  − Campus doesn’t feel unified
  − Traffic conflicts
  − Compromises circulation/experience of visitors accessing various buildings (need to rely on PA system)
  − Can be confusing
  − Road is public ROW therefore needs to keep open
  − When road was redone, were not allowed to put in pavers (snow plow issues)
○ Visibility of campus from James St. needs to be improved
  − Don’t know campus is there
  − Look down street and see marina or docks
  − Need to sell the town on signage to promote/direct people to ABM
○ Campus signage in general
  − Need to differentiate between ACBS (Antique and Classic Boat Society) and ABM (has confused people)
  − Wayfinding on campus is difficult
  − Village of Clayton allows signage/murals on the side of buildings without permit
○ East Shore
  − How to develop?
  − John M has idea, Ted has other ideas
  − Need to make sure what gets done doesn’t preclude future growth
○ Parking
  − Community doesn’t realize ABM owns Riverside Dr. Parking Lot
  − ABM generous with its use
  − Parking issues in entire village during the summer (even when no events going on)
  − Only one handicapped space in front of building
○ Handicapped accessibility issues in general
  − Not everything is elegantly designed

○ Other
○ River Shed
  ○ Both strength and a weakness
  ○ Great views. Nice on a beautiful day
  ○ Exposed in bad weather
  ○ Not historic
  ○ Condition questionable
  ○ Could possibly redevelop, though need to be sensitive about it
  ○ Old Stone Shop only Historic building
○ Skiff Livery
  ○ Rental income
    − Space rental and boat use
    − Popular building

○ Visitor Experience
○ Tour starts with attempt to find ABM while driving down Street
  − People stop at Gold Cup usually
○ Sometimes difficult to find front door (users have tried other doors)
○ Once in a tour route is suggested, not always adhered to
  − Exhibits not always setup to require the experience be choreographed
  − People can wander
○ Mainly want to let people know what is available
  − Every half hour there is a tour of La Duchesse
  − Docents guide tour of boat
○ Would like to have them start in theater with orientation
  − Haven’t done tracking studies (planning on doing next summer)
  − Wink (admissions person) hears many complaints…talk to her (Dan to follow up)
○ Gold Cup building not always open
− Hard to staff (use volunteers, docents, paid staff)
− Can be a problem for people coming specifically to see boats there (raceboats are popular)
− Has concession stand, but building too large to have one person do both concessions and tour

No surveillance cameras…depend on eyes
− Varies with quality/experience of volunteers
− Heavily depend on honor system
   − People arrive at different locations (front door, docks)
   − No way to track everyone
− Night time security issue (some problems)
   − Know people on campus at night (not always malicious)
− No dogs allowed

How would they like people to experience
○ Have fun
○ Learn something
○ Establish long term relationship based on
   − Programming
   − Extensiveness of collection (get them to keep coming back or donate)

Does campus support this?
○ Staffing issues make difficult
   − Significant reliance on volunteers now
○ Signage needs to improve
○ Some inconsistencies in architecture need to be worked on
○ Most people leave satisfied (wow factor of boats)
○ The ability to display a large percentage of the collection distinguishes this museum from their peer museums

Future Plans
○ Don’t know what plans are for parking lot area
○ Dodge building could be in play (for redevelopment)
○ Discussion of developing south side of Mary Street
   − Property acquisitions would help make lot more rectangular
○ Don’t have immediate programming need at this point
   − Yacht House is last “required” element
○ Idea for a landscape plan was initiated to focus on around flag pole/yacht
   − Realized that was going to be difficult
○ There are a number of non-profit organizations in town
   − ABM is seen as a leader
   − Community (politicians especially) are seeing non-profits as an economic generator in community and region
○ Riverside Dr. Properties
   − Mixed/multi-use facilities?
      − Street level shops
      − Access to riverfront
      − Residential condos above that would revert to ABM when owner dies/sells
   − Concern about creating use that gets in way of future needs
      − Not sure what future needs are at this point
○ Clayton Riverwalk
   − Would like to tie into campus
   − Not sure how to move through campus

Functions and Priorities
○ Collect/exhibit/preserve/educate
   − Goes to mission statement
○ Other things (rentals/management) not as important…now
   − Though the priorities may/can change
○ Acquisitions were opportunistic/protective actions
○ Part of master plan goal is to illustrate the potential of the property…what can they do with what they
have. What is the best use of the properties? How much can they develop/build/use

- **Canada Expansion**
  - Shouldn’t impact this campus
  - Add US Customs service
  - Would hopefully add to visitor counts
  - Canadian Campus would hopefully draw off of Canadian highway traffic and then get people to cross the border

- **Quality of the visitor experience**
  - Increase the length of stay therefore increase revenue
    - Relationship between length of stay and distance traveled (told by consultant that on average length of stay=twice distance traveled)
  - Need to improve group experience (i.e. how/where do they enter?)
  - Want to cater to men, woman and kids
    - Not just “boys and their toys”
    - No existing major programs for kids
    - Starting to answer this
    - This is a potential avenue for expansion of the campus/programming
  - Children’s Activity Area (outdoor)
    - Not a playground (insurance)
      - Boat related activities (i.e. knot tying)
    - Coordinate with indoor activities

- **Sustainability**
  - Wished there was more incorporated into this building but most likely won’t build another year round facility
  - Hadn’t thought about on site opportunities
    - Would like to be a leader in the community on this issue
    - Definitely interested in the potential…need to research and incorporate ideas

- **Explain Engaged and Vital**
  - Engage with other institutions
    - ESF, schools, other institutions
    - Expand programs
  - Why do it?
    - Symbiotic/synergistic relationship
    - Better product created by partnership
    - Opportunity created by existence of other non-profits in area
    - Benefits all
    - Want to attract people to the region in general
    - Education
      - Important to region
      - Gives back to community and maintains local craft
      - Gives people incentive to support museum

- **Relationship of Clayton**
  - Responsibility to village may be too strong a word…
  - Feel they are a member of the community
    - Responsibility is to work WITH the community
  - Leadership and participatory role with community
  - Want community to take ownership of ABM as well
  - Proposed projects (hotel, ABM) will greatly benefit this side of town
    - Some discussion of impact on rest of town
    - The town could support two boutique hotels

- **Lessons/Observations from Other institutions**
  - Business development models
Others museums have developed a “party space” that separates the collection from caterers and party users but adds to rental revenue.

- Could add to rental income
- Would protect collection
- Pressure to have event space is growing in the area and ABM could take advantage of

Contact Grater Architects (p. 686.2993) for more base info

- Bill and Patty
- Architects should have info they used for buildings
- John M. to draft letter stating it's ok to release info
I. General Comments

This is a great first attempt at assembling all the information we have shared with you in creating a cohesive plan. I have some general comments and then we have some very specific responses which we would like to share with you. We appreciate the three various scenarios, but we would rather see a chronological scenario that spans five to ten years. Something like, considering the Museum’s limited resources, the most cost effective changes for Year One would be: x, y and z. Year two would be a, b and c.

Although we said that the Dodge Launch Building is not inviolate, that does not mean that we should replace it immediately. The Museum is in a financial position that our next buildings need to be revenue positive.

Finally from a mega view, I am not certain that the goal of the Museum’s Master plan should be to create views from the roads to the river and the Museum. That is designing the Museum’s campus from the outside in. I would rather we design the campus from the inside out. If the Museum is resolute in providing a public river walk along its eastern perimeter, than there will be wonderful river and campus vistas for pedestrians. If designed correctly this River walk could give access to public beer gardens, terraced restaurants as well as access to bookshops, clothing stores, bakeries etc. The entire harbor perimeter would have the feel of a walk through a garden with lovely river, harbor and campus vistas.

The riverfront property on Riverside Drive is too expensive and valuable waterfront property to be allocated as a public park. The Museum cannot afford not to utilize such an asset. I would rather have all of Riverside Drive developed with view sheds and access sites to Riverwalk that serve as magnets that pull people out of their cars and off the street down to the Riverwalk, which provides public access to unencumbered views.
II. Specific Comments from Team Meeting, March 21, 2007

John Summers, Rebecca Hopfinger, Charlotte Brooks, Alan Hutchinson and I met on March 21, 2007 to review your three schemes. We made the following conclusions

1) We like the parking lot on the South Side of Mary in Scheme A as Phase I parking. We like the parking lot in Scheme B as Phase II.
2) We also like the concept of Rain Water Garden in Phase II.
3) Not in any of the Schemes, we would like to see on the South Side of Mary Street to the north of the Parking lot a plan to phase in two structures that are constructed to the east of the Gold Cup Building and are linked. In Phase I we would construct a Museum Store directly across the street from the opening between the Haxall and Dodge Launch Buildings. This building would be designed to be an inviting entry to the South Side of Mary Street. It would be linked to the Gold Cup Building.
4) Phase II we would construct an all purpose Exhibit Building to the east of the Museum store. The footprint would extend over and replace the existing Work Shop and provide a transitional end at Alexandria Street.
5) Across the street we like Scheme A and the creation of the Event Space for existing Mary Street Parking lot.
6) Not specific to any plan, we like your suggestion of a different surface on Mary Street which might be similar to hard surfaces on Museum Campus.
7) We like the idea of a welcome archway
8) We like the version of Rivershed treatment in Scheme C as a later phased project.
9) We like the version of Riverside Drive Development in Scheme C. We like the multi-use structures on the west side of the Community parking lot. We also like the suggested parking. Perhaps the Dodge Building is a multi-use structure, that might be part Museum, part commercial.
10) We like the Observation Deck in Scheme B. It would be nice to have it be a by-way from the River-walk.
11) The rental docks in Scheme C on the east side of the harbor could be shortened by 10 to 20 feet at their western ends.

III. Specific suggested changes to introductory language.

1) Under third bullet delete “quality” and instead write, “that communicates clearly stewardship…”
2) Fifth bullet. Delete “replace Dodge Launch Building” and replace with something more attenuated such as “consider eventual long term replacement for Dodge Launch Building.”
3) Seventh Bullet. Lack of dedicated ramp an issue. I am not certain this is an issue for us.