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OVERVIEW
Elizabeth City loves its waterfront!

Nestled along the banks of the Pasquotank River, Elizabeth City’s location played an important role in its history as a thriving seafood, timber and shipping regional hub. The city’s direct link to the water provided the foundation for its growth and evolution as it changed from a water-based industry hub to a varied economic sector. Today, its waterfront is the meeting ground of the city’s active life. From commerce and culture to open space and institution, cityscape and landscape co-mingle along the Charles Creek and river bend creating the “Harbor of Hospitality” as a robust and quaint experience.
The Waterfront Planning Process

Creating a vision requires the steadfast determination of the community along with the guidance and knowledge of the design team. Like all great planning projects, community input and engagement is at the core of this master plan vision; the City of Elizabeth City Waterfront Master Plan is a culmination of the collaboration between local citizens and design consultants to create a vision that will propel the waterfront development forward while maintaining a sense of sustainability and place.

Design processes are iterative due to their evolving nature and layering of input. Research and analysis set the foundation for the project, presenting strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and constraints for the project site. Outlets like community engagement and public input surveys help extract the desires and concerns of the citizens, lending a voice to the mission and objectives. Benchmark meetings with the public and steering committee members ensure the design and consulting team are on course and provide a further in-depth perspective regarding the needs of the project site. Through a series of workshops, public open houses, and steering committee meetings, the design and consulting team captured the essence of Elizabeth City’s past, present, and future to create the master plan presented in this Vision Book. The waterfront planning process for Elizabeth City is a by-product of these input layers, creating a rich, vibrant, and economically and environmentally resilient plan for the City’s future as the “Harbor of Hospitality” welcomes new growth and opportunities.
THE HARBOR OF HOSPITALITY: PAST, PRESENT & FUTURE
Locals lend a hand and most share a smile. Sailboats glisten against the evening sunset. Mariners’ Wharf sets the stage for downtown’s farmer’s market, film festival, and outdoor concert series offering programming and open space activation for most of the year. The welcoming atmosphere, complimentary wi-fi and 48-hour boat docking, as well as impromptu Rose Buddies parties at the visitor’s center have contributed to the nickname, “The Harbor of Hospitality.” Elizabeth City’s waterfront is walkable to restaurants, shopping, accommodations and attractions, against the scenic backdrop of the Pasquotank River.
Historical Data

Incorporated in 1793 initially as the town of Redding, Elizabeth City has a long-standing history of shipping due to its strategic location at a narrowed bend of the Pasquotank River. Redding’s name changed to Elizabethtown in 1794 and finally to Elizabeth City in 1801. The City prospered early on as a mercantile center primarily due to its proximity to the Dismal Swamp Canal—the oldest man-made canal in the United States—before shifting into a more industrial and commercial focus. These new opportunities established Elizabeth City as a prosperous deep-water port, with a variety of industries including lumbering, shipbuilding, grain, fish and oyster processing, landmarking the city as a formidable regional economic center rivaling Norfolk, VA and Baltimore, MD at the time. The onset of the Norfolk Southern Railway rendered water-based shipping less relevant, and created a shift in trade as many waterside industries relocated to the Piedmont which impacted coastal cities’ ability to compete for trade.

World War II re-energized Elizabeth City’s industries, mainly in shipbuilding, textiles and aeronautics. The Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City was established in 1940 and became the largest US Coast Guard base in the nation, even to this day. Elizabeth City Shipyard played an integral role in ship construction for the war effort, building the largest number of subchasers for the war and setting record construction time for the SC-class vessels.

The end of the war levelled the economy in Elizabeth City, forming the service, government and agriculture-dominant industries seen today. Revival efforts in tourism and civic revitalization commenced in the late 1990s have brought increasing economic stability for downtown and the city’s six historic districts.

Elizabeth City is recognized as a regional shopping destination and its restaurant scene has been growing in recent years, offering opportunities for residents and families to enjoy both downtown Elizabeth City and the waterfront. The city is home to a variety of higher education institutions including Elizabeth City State University, the College of the Albemarle, and Mid-Atlantic Christian University.
1. Elizabeth City Waterfront
2. Old Elizabeth City Weather Tower
3. Coast Guard Air Station
4. Town Aerial
5. US Navy Blimp
6. Pasquotank County Court House
7. Elizabeth City NC Potato Festival
From Work to Recreation: The Waterfront Today

Like most other coastal cities, Elizabeth City’s waterfront provided the framework and structure for the city to commence and thrive due to its water-based shipping industry. Over the years, nearby cities grew and competed for economic prosperity, while the railroad was formed and waterside industries relocated to the interior of the State. The waterfront evolved from a single-tier industry to a multi-faceted one, offering other opportunities to enhance Elizabeth City beyond its shipping past and create a context for residents and visitors alike to shop, gather and play.

The waterfront today offers a range of amenities and a host of economic opportunities. Cultural attractions such as the Museum of the Albemarle and the Arts of the Albemarle are centrally located and pay homage to the past. An Academic institution anchors the northernmost point of the city’s waterfront, attracting young minds and new talent every year. Machelle Island and Causeway Park offer a beautiful natural ecological attraction on the other side of the harborfront and present an amenity for ecotourism. Additionally, Charles Creek and its park demonstrate flood mitigation challenges that must be planned for with sustainable interventions in the event of rising water levels.

The expansive waterfront itself is the scenic watery edge of downtown, both ripe for renewal and revitalization. There are currently eight public parks located on the downtown waterfront for citizens to enjoy for active recreation, events or relaxing. Certain key features, like the Coast Guard Park and the Elizabeth City Shipyard site offer promising redevelopment potential, while enhancements and connections to parks and open space strengthen the link between downtown and its harborfront.
Economic & Social Considerations

EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY

Elizabeth City is one of the 110 communities in North Carolina designated as a Main Street City or Associate. The National Main Street Center was established in 1980 by the National Trust for Historic Preservation to address issues facing historic downtowns. Elizabeth City Downtown, Inc. is the 501c3 non-profit that administers the program following a comprehensive four-point approach that is based on design, promotion, organization, and economic revitalization. The Main Street Program in Elizabeth City is managed by a volunteer board and board of directors and one full-time paid Executive Director. The program aims to create a healthy downtown through economic development, beautification, and restoration efforts.

The unemployment rate in Elizabeth City is 11% (ESRI Business Analyst - Elizabeth City), with the majority of its labor force in a white-collar job. A breakdown of employment by industry is shown in the chart to the right.

TOTAL POPULATION

Based on data from the 2016 Census estimates, the population of Elizabeth City was 18,025 and the median age was 32.7. Population has been declining in Elizabeth City and Pasquotank County over the last few years. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, between 2010 and 2016 Elizabeth City saw a 3.8% decline in population while Pasquotank County saw a 2% decline, primarily due to a significant drop in enrollment at ECSU.

The dominant age groups of both Elizabeth City and Pasquotank County are similar in size between geographies. There is a general sense in Elizabeth City that it is particularly attractive to many retirees, while the Census data show that those 65 and older make up a smaller portion of the population. Broken down even further, it’s important to note that 18.5% of the population is between ages 15-24. This is likely due, at least in part, to the higher education presence.
According to the American Community Survey, of those in the labor force (ages 16 and older) in Elizabeth City 74.2% worked in their county of residence and 11.3% worked outside their state of residence (VA).

Elizabeth City’s median household income is substantially lower than the county as well as the state. Based on the 2016 American Community Survey, the per capita income in Elizabeth City is $16,783 — lower than Pasquotank County and North Carolina:

- **Income (2016)**
  - **Elizabeth City:**
    - Median Age: 32.4
    - Total Population: 17,836
    - Median Household Income: $33,398
    - Per Capita Income: $16,783
  - **Pasquotank County:**
    - Median Age: 37.8
    - Total Population: 39,909
    - Median Household Income: $45,750
    - Per Capita Income: $22,187
  - **North Carolina:**
    - Median Age: 38.3
    - Total Population: 9,940,828
    - Median Household Income: $48,256
    - Per Capita Income: $28,156

**Civilian Labor**

- **Percent of population ages 16+ in work force**
  - Elizabeth City: 54.3%
  - Pasquotank County: 56%
  - North Carolina: 61.5%

**Employees and Businesses**

- **Total Business:**
  - Elizabeth City: 1,017
  - Pasquotank County: 10,870

- **Total Employees:**
  - Elizabeth City: 2,282
  - Pasquotank County: 4,361

**Education Attainment (2016)**

- **High School Grad or Higher**
  - Elizabeth City: 91.6%
  - Pasquotank County: 86.8%
  - North Carolina: 85.3%

- **Bachelor’s Degree or Higher**
  - Elizabeth City: 2.8%
  - Pasquotank County: 6.4%
  - North Carolina: 9.5%

Note: The best available data was used whenever applicable and, as a result, a discrepancy between data points may exist. Total business and employee data are based on 2017 estimates from ESRI Business Analyst, while employee commuting data is based on the 2015 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau.
E lizabeth City serves as a regional hub for residents in the surrounding counties. People will come in to town to shop, dine, and perhaps visit the Museum of the Albemarle or one of the waterfront parks. A recent branding effort has been done by Elizabeth City-Pasquotank County Tourism Development Authority to position Elizabeth City as a hub of the Albemarle region. This approach is to encourage visitors to stay longer and explore not only Elizabeth City but surrounding attractions in the area.

Historically, the largest employer has been the Coast Guard. However, in 2012, the Coast Guard made substantial reductions in staff and operations at the base. Currently, the largest employer type is in the Services industry.

A large chunk of the waterfront is part of the downtown. While some of the waterfront is technically outside the boundaries of the downtown, locals consider it to still be an extension of the area. For example, the Pelican Marina and the restaurant Paradiso on the Camden Causeway are downtown attractions. Ghost Harbor Brewing Company has opened in downtown, with another microbrewery and brewpub coming to the waterfront in 2018, adding to the economic development potential of downtown Elizabeth City.

**POPULATION GROUPINGS**

Tapestry segmentation*: Below are marketing industry descriptions of the most common demographic groups in the City of Elizabeth City. They are typically labeled with clever names.

**Tapestry is a geodemographic segmentation system that integrates consumer traits with residential characteristics to identify markets and classify US neighborhoods. Neighborhoods with the most similar characteristics are grouped together, while neighborhoods with divergent characteristics are separated. Internally homogenous, externally heterogeneous market segments depict consumers’ lifestyles and lifestages. Tapestry Segmentation combines the “who” of lifestyle demography with the “where” of local geography to create a classification model with 67 distinct, behavioral market segments.” Source: https://doc.arcgis.com/en/esri-demographics/data/tapestry-segmentation.htm

**MIDDLEBURG**

“Middleburg” residents make up 23.5% of the Elizabeth City population. They are conservative, family-oriented consumers. They prefer to buy American products and enjoy travelling in the US.

**KEY TRAITS:**

- Median age: 35.3
- Average household size: 2.73
- 66% with a high school diploma or some college
- Unemployment rate low
- Median household income: $55,000

**THE NEIGHBORHOOD:**

- Traditional values are the norm here: faith, country and family
- Prefer to buy American-made products for a good price
- Include a number of mobile homes
- Semi-rural locales within metropolitan areas

**CITY COMMONS**

“City Commons” folks make up 17.6% of the total population in Elizabeth City. This segment is one of the youngest and largest markets, made up of single-parent and single-person households. More than a third have at least spent some time in college, while almost a third have not completed high school. This profoundly impacts their circumstances. Unemployment is very high at 24%.

**KEY TRAITS:**

- Median age: 27.6
- Average household size: 2.66
- Labor force participation rate low at 54%
- Median household income: $17,000

**THE NEIGHBORHOOD:**

- Neighborhoods are older, with high vacancy rates
- Many households own one vehicle or none
- Single parents, primarily mothers, head these young households

**OLD AND NEWCOMERS**

This market makes up 17.3% of the City’s population, and features singles’ lifestyles, on a budget. The focus is more on convenience than consumerism, economy over acquisition. “Old and Newcomers” is composed of neighborhoods in transition, populated by renters who are just beginning their careers or retiring. Some are still in college; some are taking adult education classes.

**KEY TRAITS:**

- Median age: 38.5
- Average household size: 2.11
- Unemployment rate: 7.8%
- Median household income: $39,000

**THE NEIGHBORHOOD:**

- 54% of homes are renter occupied
- Predominantly single households
- Consumers are price aware and coupon clippers, but also are open to impulse buys
- 45% of housing units are single-family dwellings, 44% are multi-unit dwellings built before 1980.
THE HARBOR OF HOSPITALITY: PAST, PRESENT & FUTURE

EMPTY NESTERS
One of the oldest tapestry segments, this group makes up 9.6% of the City’s population. Empty Nesters is an older market located in cities across the country. Over one-third of householders here are aged 65 or older and dependent on low, fixed incomes, primarily Social Security. In the aftermath of the Great Recession, early retirement is now a dream for many approaching the retirement age; wages and salary income in this market are still earned. Residents live alone in low-rent buildings, located in or close to business districts that attract heavy daytime traffic.

KEY TRAITS:
Median age: 44.2 – Average household size: 1.72 – Median household income: $16,000

THE NEIGHBORHOOD:
• Many residents live alone in this older market; 19% of householders are aged 75 and older; another 17% are 65 to 74 years old.
• Multi-unit rental properties with affordable rents are predominant

HOUSING ANALYSIS
The consultant conducted a basic housing analysis to determine how much new housing the City of Elizabeth City may need to accommodate population growth. Elizabeth City grew by 8.70% between 2000 and 2010, but decreased by 3.52% between 2010 and 2016. The average rate of growth between 2000 and 2016 is 0.03%.

The UNC Carolina Population Center reports, “Of North Carolina’s 553 municipalities, 225, or about 41%, experienced population decline from 2010-2016...The northeast corridor of the state has been the hardest hit, as the top 10 municipalities with greatest percentage declines from 2010-2016 have been from Bertie, Northampton, or Washington counties.” However, the Population Center also reports that some cities, including Elizabeth City, have had modest gains from 2015-2016. Since Elizabeth City has had modest gains and is actively deploying strategies to recruit new residents, particularly retirees, the housing model uses a modest positive growth projection - the growth factor between 2000 and 2016 - 0.03%; resulting in a 2026 population of 18,573.

Given the estimated population growth (18,573), the current and projected number of households, the current and projected number of housing units, current household size, and the current vacancy rate* (see page 18), and single family residential building permit history (see Elizabeth City Housing), the City of Elizabeth City has a projected housing surplus of 694 units if Single Family Residential Development continues at a similar pace (approximately 35 units per year, post-recession). Even if Elizabeth City added no new units, it would still have a housing surplus of 344 units, meaning all new residents to Elizabeth City could “fit” in the existing housing stock. However, housing preferences of baby boomers, millennials, and other cohorts are changing – just because Elizabeth City has existing housing stock does not mean that it is the type, quality, size, or in the location that potential.

NORTH CAROLINA
4,540,697 Housing Units
3,904,999 Owned
2,499,199 Rented
86% Occupied
$165,400 Median value of owner occupied housing units
$40.1K Home value compared to Elizabeth City

ELIZABETH CITY
8,234 Housing Units
2,833 Owned
3,754 Rented
80% Occupied
$125,300 Median value of owner occupied housing units

PASQUOTANK COUNTY
16,865 Housing Units
9,137 Owned
5,366 Rented
86% Occupied
$158,800 Median value of owner occupied housing units
$33.5K Home value compared to Elizabeth City
**Projected Number of Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Households</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>2016 Est. Households - American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted Population (10 Years)*</td>
<td>18,573</td>
<td>0.3% per year to 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in Group Quarters</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>2010 Group Qtrs - Decennial Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Number in Group Quarters</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Future Population (Projected Population - Population in Group Quarters)</td>
<td>16,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household (HH) Size</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2010 Average Household (HH) Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected HHs (Average HH Size Divided by Projected Population)</td>
<td>7,101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Desired Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>See Note in Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected # Housing Units Needed for Population</td>
<td>7,741</td>
<td>(&lt;1% for seasonal use - didn’t factor in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Number of Housing Units</td>
<td>8,167</td>
<td>Used 2010 because 2016 was off (+/- 216 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Beyond Repair</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Used 1% 2010 Census - Units without complete plumbing or kitchen (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in the Pipeline (under construction, buildings approved, lots approved)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Available Units</td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated New Units per Year (Units per year multiplied by 10 years), Based on SFR Building Permits</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Average 35 Single Family Residential Units per Year, Post Recession Average, Post-recession multi-family development has been minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Available for Projected Year</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units Needed - Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>Housing Surplus in 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently, Elizabeth City has 6,561 households and 8,167 housing units, as well as a 18.1% vacancy rate. While there is no magic vacancy rate, a stable rate is around 7-8%. Very low vacancy rates (2-3%) drive up housing costs. At the other end of the spectrum, very high vacancy rates can indicate neighborhoods that are struggling. In Elizabeth’s City’s case, it’s high vacancy rate (18%) may be an indication of neighborhood decline, an indication of vacation rentals (the US Census reports that less than 1% of vacant housing units are for seasonal use), or a combination of both. While a housing study is needed to determine the likely cause of the high vacancy rate, we used a mid-range (9%) vacancy rate for our model.*
For the purposes of this study, several different geographies were compared to determine trends and opportunity for new retail development for the Waterfront area of Elizabeth City. The map below shows three geographies for the analysis, with the center point lying just south of the 158 bridge to Machelhe Island on N. Water Street. Often, market analyses will be completed by using concentric rings from the study area point, but since we don’t want to have Pasquotank River in the analysis, we used drive times instead. The 10-minute drive time captures the waterfront, downtown, and close surrounding areas (red). The 20- and 30-minute drive time (green and blue) reflect the local market that the waterfront has the potential to capitalize on.

In the 10-minute radius, the largest retail gaps are for specialty food stores and a home furnishings shop. Based on this analysis, people are coming from outside the area to visit, eat, drink and shop. The gaps become more apparent with the Primary Trade Area (PTA), the 20-minute drive time radius. In addition to specialty food stores and home furnishings, there is significant leakage in the PTA for drinking establishments and eateries. This could be an opportunity to capitalize on in the near future on the waterfront. In the Secondary Trade Area (STA) or 30-minute drive time radius, there is a lot more leakage in the following categories:

- Home furnishings (flooring, kitchenware, window treatment, houseware, bath shops)
- Boutique Clothing Stores
- Drinking establishments & eateries

While Elizabeth City can certainly capitalize on individuals living within the STA, Elizabeth City is encouraged to continue to market themselves as a regional destination where folks from the surrounding counties continue to visit to do their retail shopping, outdoor recreation, visiting historical attractions, and eating and drinking along the waterfront.
After taking a hard look at the makeup of residents in Elizabeth City and reviewing the retail demand results, it is important to be realistic about the types of changes recommended. If the City is working toward improving the quality of life for all residents in Elizabeth City, improvements to the waterfront should be focused on experience and not be cost prohibitive for residents to take part in. They should be focused on activities that residents are interested in. If, however, the City wants the waterfront to cater to visitors, such as folks stopping by on their way to vacation on the Outer Banks, there is likely more disposable income that could be spent along the waterfront for tours, shopping at local retail, and getting drinks or lunch. We recommend that a mix of the two approaches, catering to locals and tourists alike, be taken by the City.

1. Continue to attract and support local businesses to locate along the waterfront.

Vacant properties along S. Water Street should be filled so that they are occupied. This is the street most often associated with the waterfront, and when there are vacancies visitors may be inclined to think the entire waterfront is vacant. To offset this, food and drinking establishments could be excellent candidates on S. Water Street to maintain a sense of vibrancy.

2. Address Vacancies and Non-Retail Space.

Addressing waterfront vacancies and non-retail space is, in part, a relationship building exercise. Create a list of names and addresses of property owners of the vacant retail spaces. Contact property owners about the space to find out potential plans. Assess their willingness to activate vacant or non-retail space that does not currently contribute to street vitality. Some communities minimize the effect of vacancies or dead space by introducing window art programs which place photos or other eye-catching displays in the windows, or install temporary murals. Non-retail business should present a “retail face” to the street. A well-maintained business front, a colorful awning, window displays, and lighting can make an impact and maintain visual interest for the downtown visitor. From the public side, the City should make sure the public realm is well-maintained and attractive.

3. Establish water-based businesses.

Support the development of local tours of the Pasquotank River that people can sign up for when they visit. Often, visitors will drop by the tourism office and request a day-of tour. This could make a big difference during summertime, when visitors are stopping by the waterfront for a short trip or on their way to final destinations.
4. Establish continuous walking paths along the waterfront.

Complete a bicycle/pedestrian plan with a grant from NCDOT. Focus especially on the waterfront area so that recommendations will include improvements in this study area. Increased walkability and bike improvements were the most popular responses from individuals who completed the waterfront survey. Improvements would lead to numerous benefits from both residents and visitors.

5. Promote activities, events, and destinations that appeal to everyone.

This recommendation was especially popular among respondents to the survey. Since much of the City’s population desires community-building activities, we recommend that the downtown association, stakeholders, and city staff work to program more events at the waterfront. Residents of all income levels and backgrounds could enjoy activities such as festivals, cultural events, art walks, or even food trucks and live music. They do not all have to be large-scale productions, rather small-scale events centered around Elizabeth City’s strengths of history, arts, and sciences. This will also benefit summertime residents who are visiting during peak months. Visitors may initially be attracted to the event, but also stay to shop and dine in the adjoining downtown.

6. Continue to Manage for Waterfront Retail.

This study was not designed to assess the waterfront and larger downtown management practices; however, a strong retail environment depends on a well-managed waterfront and downtown. The waterfront community should continue to engage stakeholders in discussions about strategies to improve overall experience. Examples of elements to maintain the area for a strong retail environment include:

- establishing a waterfront funding mechanism, such as a business improvement district;
- cooperative retail management and promotions, such as coordinated business hours, common area maintenance, retailer location strategies, window merchandising, and customer service training;
- continuing to improve and explore retail recruitment and incentive strategies that defray the cost of construction/rehabilitation or business relocation;
- marketing, education, and coordination to develop retail clusters throughout downtown, such as clustering businesses that share customers with similar characteristics.

examples include regulatory incentives (zoning and permitting, clear development process), financial incentives (investment in public space to improve the retail environment, public investment tools such as a revolving loan fund), and design incentives (façade grants, design assistance/review); and

7. Review housing options and types in Elizabeth City and conduct a housing study.

The City should evaluate its housing options and types and determine a new housing strategy that may include infill housing near downtown and the waterfront. (See housing analysis section for more information). There is a surplus of housing except the options do not meet the needs of the current purchasers and renters.
New Bern, NC

New Bern, the county seat of Craven County is one city identified as a comparison to Elizabeth City. The waterfront city has a population of 30,101 and has fully taken advantage of their location along the Trent and Neuse Rivers. The city has a bustling waterfront with activities that range from paddle boarding tours, to history walks and art activities. These happenings are also offered at a variety of prices for visitors and residents with different budgets. Interestingly, Elizabeth City has significantly more residents living within a quarter mile of the waterfront area than New Bern (237 people vs. 170), which Elizabeth City should work to capitalize on. However, the household income between these two waterfronts is vastly different, Elizabeth City at $16,855 and New Bern at $38,997. It is important for Elizabeth City to make sure they offer activities at a range of price points for both the residents and visitors passing through or staying overnight.

Edenton, NC

Edenton, NC is a second town that was identified as a case study that Elizabeth City could learn from. Although the town is much smaller than Elizabeth City (population 4,846), Edenton has a very active series of fun events throughout the spring, summer, and fall seasons. There are also a lot of restaurants to choose from, as well as a variety of options for lodging, including bed and breakfasts, hotels, vacation rentals, and campgrounds for visitors on a budget. The town has capitalized on the waterfront as an asset for folks to recreate. These activities, shopping and dining experiences, and lodging opportunities provide great ideas for Elizabeth City to explore further.

Washington, NC

Washington, NC has a population of 9,801 and is located along the Tar and Pamlico Rivers. Elizabeth City and Washington, NC have something in common: they both have a lot of retirees living close to the waterfront (173 within a quarter-mile radius of the waterfront in Elizabeth City and 184 in Washington). Folks are either moving to these towns to retire or staying for a reason. A children’s park, boardwalk, gathering spots, the NC Estuarium, and boat slips are highlights of Washington’s waterfront. They also have a lot of opportunities for folks to recreate along the water. Providing visitors and residents of all ages with opportunities to have fun is important when Elizabeth City is working to make improvements to its waterfront.
How to Transform a Waterfront...

Innovate a waterfront rich with tradition and coastal flavour, provide new opportunities for recreation and commerce, while supporting a strong community through thoughtfully designed public spaces.

As a point of reference, the organization, Project for Public Spaces, outlines principles needed to transform a waterfront. They are not hard and fast laws, but rules of thumb drawn from years of experience working to improve urban waterfronts around the world. These ideas can serve as the framework for Elizabeth City’s efforts to create a vibrant public waterfront, and by extension, a vibrant city.

How to transform a waterfront:
- Make public goals the priority
- Create a shared community vision for the waterfront
- Create multiple destinations... both on land and in-water
- Connect the destinations
- Optimize public access
- Ensure that new development fits within the community’s vision

- Encourage 24-hour activity by limiting residential development
- Use parks to connect destinations, not as destinations unto themselves
- Design and program buildings to engage the public space
- Support multiple modes of transportation and limit vehicular access
- Integrate seasonal activities into each destination
- Make stand-alone, iconic buildings serve multiple functions
- Manage, manage, manage

"SUPPORT A STRONG COMMUNITY THROUGH THOUGHTFULLY DESIGNED PUBLIC SPACES"
Elizabeth City and its waterfront have a solid framework in place; a variety of complimentary uses string together along the banks of the Pasquotank River. With downtown at its core, Water Street connects commerce and culture with academia to the north and to the south, while open space as parks and preserve are nestled in between. This blend of activity and refuge indicates a promising master plan slated with potential.

The project area, as noted by the red overlay region on page 25, is made up of four districts — the University, the causeway of Machelhe Island, the harborfront and the Charles Creek preserve. By treating each of these districts together under the lens of one master plan, opportunities for connectivity, wayfinding and enhancements are strengthened. Analyzing the city’s amenities and shortcomings revealed opportunities and constraints indicative of the plan. Our intention is to build off what is present by proposing small scale investments and sustainably ecological interventions. This will elevate what is existing to create an attractive future for Elizabeth City.
Keeping true to the “Harbor of Hospitality,” our goal is to support what’s already there by building upon the strengths of the city and overcoming the challenges of its context. Learning from the past and looking to the future, we can understand the evolution of Elizabeth City and provide recommendations for betterment with the city’s best interest in mind.

With prime views of pristine waterfront and preserve from the entirety of Elizabeth City’s urban edge, there is great potential for enhanced and ecologically sensitive development near downtown. Machelhe Island and the Pasquotank River, to the east, offer a beautiful backdrop, a rare gem, for the city to have as natural amenities to gaze out upon. Charles Creek to the south must be treated with sustainability in mind as flood mitigation and rising water levels prove a challenge for the city’s future. Fusing stormwater engineering with landscape architecture interventions will create an engaging place to preserve and offer a spotlight opportunity to showcase the story that so many coastal towns have come to deal with as they battle rising tides.

To the north, Mid Atlantic Christian University’s collaboration with additional academic institutions demonstrates promising growth and energy. At its core, downtown Elizabeth City is ripe with opportunity for small scale investment, with projects like a new micro-brewery and the addition of Weatherly Lofts, a 45-unit planned residential development to be completed in early 2019. Strengthening the relationship of downtown to its waterfront and adding more in-water facilities will unify the district. Additionally, unifying cultural amenities, like the Museum of the Albemarle, to the harbor will create a strong celebratory space for the community as artwork, events and functions trickle out into the public realm. To the south, the shipyard, sailing center and low-lying parcels are prime areas for renewed investment, but will need to be upgraded with bulkheads, boardwalks, open space improvements, drainage and stormwater interventions to ensure the viability of future development.

Opportunities for Betterment
LEGEND

1. JW Jones Chip Mill
2. Open Space
3. Residential Condominiums
4-7. Mid Atlantic Christian University (MACU)
8. Tennis Facilities
9. Student Apartments
10. Classroom / Lodging
11. Gymnasium
12. Jennette Brothers
13. Veteran's Park
14. Trimpi & Nash LLP
15. Proposed Brewery and Brewpub
16. The Flour Girls Cafe and Bakery
17. Residential Condominiums / Apartments
18. Residential Condominiums
19. Paradisio - Italian Restaurant
20. Pelican Marina
21. Machelho Island / Causeway Park
Mid Atlantic Christian University
Primary landowner MACU, in collaboration with the College of The Albemarle and Elizabeth City State University, could bring about heightened vibrancy and new academic, athletic, residential and other related uses.

Machelhe Island / Causeway Park
Southern stretches of the Island provide opportunity for expanded marina and servicing facilities; to the north, heightened hand powered exploration of habitat zones along with preservation activities.

The Harborfront
Ripe with opportunity for small scale investment, with projects ongoing such as a new micro-brewery and loft residential uses. A deeper engagement of the water’s edge along with new in-water facilities will continue to strengthen the overall appeal of downtown and the harborfront.

Anchoring Downtown
Parcels between East Church, South Water, East Ehringhaus and South Martin Luther King Streets present a prime area for renewal and anchoring of the southern extent of downtown. Parcels, however, are low lying and require upgrades to drainage and other stormwater BMPs.
Mariners’ Wharf Park
Surface Parking
Stormwater Pump Station
Grouper’s Restaurant
Waterfront Park
Museum of the Albemarle
Elizabeth City Shipyard
Charles Creek Park
Charles Creek
Coast Guard Park / Sailing Center
New Hollywood Cemetery
Maritime Recreation Center

The sailing center, boat launch and other activities at Coast Guard Park make credible continued investment to allow this area to evolve into a primary center of maritime recreation. Investments could be linked to renewal of the Elizabeth City Shipyard.

Shipyard Renewal

Elizabeth City Shipyard is an essential redevelopment parcel, with renewal and activation of the site holding the greatest promise for transformation of the harborfront. Environmental issues will need to be addressed on the site.

Celebration Space

Strengthening the link between the Museum of the Albemarle and the harbor is valuable for several reasons, from bringing art outdoors to activating this area, creating a strong “celebration space” for community events and functions.

Charles Creek

Flood mitigation is essential along Charles Creek, with the potential for natural and engineered approaches to help protect private property and increase community resilience. Improvements should blend with park, open space and natural habitat zones.
COMMUNITY PRIORITIES
Elizabeth City’s waterfront has the potential to be a lively public destination that keeps people coming back and helps the City thrive economically. As cities and towns of all sizes across the world have revitalized waterfronts, we have come to understand the common elements that lead to economically successful waterfronts. As page 26 of this Waterfront Master Plan document outlines the Project for Public Spaces’ principles needed to transform a waterfront, these ideas can serve as the framework for Elizabeth City’s efforts to create a vibrant public waterfront, and by extension, a vibrant city.
A series of community work sessions were held over the course of several months to solicit community feedback from the citizens of Elizabeth City. Engaging local citizens, through steering committees, work sessions and surveys as part of any master planning process is vital to the success of the plan. Citizens play an enormous, important role in being able to successfully plan for the long-term future of their city, as citizens are able to provide context and knowledge, while sharing concerns and aspiring visions.

During work session #1, held on October 18th, 2017, the consultant team gave a public presentation on the Waterfront Master Plan and Charles Creek Flood Mitigation effort. The team provided an overview of how other communities are planning for both waterfront revitalization and flooding mitigation to share lessons and insight on how best to proceed. After the group was briefed, participants were engaged and prompted with their response to the question, “What are the essential outcomes from these efforts?” Participants held discussions with the consultant team and conducted planning exercises on the Existing Waterfront Development Land Use maps, providing insight as to current economic, cultural, and social opportunities present within the project area context.

There was an opportunity for those who could not attend to participate in the online survey. This supplemental tool enabled the consultant and design team to capture a greater audience from Elizabeth City, providing further detail and direction for how best to move the master plan forward.

Work session #2, held over a two-day period on January 17th-18th, 2018, dived further into the visioning process to extract as much feedback from the citizens of Elizabeth City. Eight zones – in the north: Mid-Atlantic Christian University, Machelle Island/Causeway Park, The Harborfront, and downtown; in the south: Coast Guard Park, Elizabeth City Shipyard, Celebration Space, and Charles Creek – were identified as initial priority areas for the master plan. Economic and social analysis was prepared, portraying demographics and data for how Elizabeth City’s growth relates to the County and State. From the economic analysis prepared, the following observations and gaps were identified. Each of these items help to inform the...
designations of branded districts and planning concepts for the waterfront.
- Elizabeth City is a regional destination for folks living outside the City. Consumers arrive, run errands, shop, support local restaurants and taverns, take part in cultural events, and participate in other activities. The City and its waterfront should continue to market themselves as a regional destination.
- Within the Primary Trade Area (PTA)—which equates to a 20-minute drive time from the waterfront and downtown—several gaps were identified for consideration for the planning area. These include: specialty-type (such as boutique and locally owned small businesses) stores; furnishings shops; and food and beverage establishments and taverns.
- For the Secondary Trade Area (STA)—a 30-minute drive time—there are larger commercial gaps. These include: furnishings shops; clothing stores; drinking establishments and taverns; specialty food services; and electronics. Note, that for electronics and similar stores, we don’t recommend adding these shops within Elizabeth City as Walmart likely captures sales in this category.
- Recreational boating and other water dependent leisure pursuits have positive demand, especially as residential populations within downtown and surrounding the harbor increase and seasonal visitation expands. Boat clubs are of specific interest.
- Quality waterfront residential units will expand the diversity and development mix of downtown and its waterfront. A unique, boutique hotel offering with a modicum of ballroom and related support facilities may also have merit over the long term if implemented. However, in the event a hotel is not viable, a multi-family residential project with activated ground floor commercial uses would be acceptable.
- The waterfront should:
  - Continue to attract and support local businesses (e.g., restaurants, specialty stores) along the waterfront and extending back into downtown. Market demand supports reuse of existing buildings and—over the long term—some degree of new, mixed-use construction.
  - Expand the breadth of quality waterfront and downtown residential units.
  - Work to fill vacant properties along S. Water Street to anchor the entirety of downtown and the southern edges of the harbortfront.
  - Grow a variety of recreational tours of the Pasquotank River, including those that people can sign up for the day of the event.
  - Quality waterfront residential units will expand the diversity and development mix of downtown and its waterfront. A unique, boutique hotel offering with a modicum of ballroom and related support facilities may also have merit over the long term if implemented. However, in the event a hotel is not viable, a multi-family residential project with activated ground floor commercial uses would be acceptable.

Precedent imagery and ideas such as “anchor the waterfront with an event space” to “promote access by bike, foot, or boat” were shown for citizens to weigh in and comment on their attributes. From there, participants could comment on the mission statement and core project tenets. The master plan was slowly revealed through a series of boards, walking participants through the design process. Initially, the project site area was broken down into four zones of interest, or “the districts”: University, Harberfront, Gateway, The Preserve. These districts were the foundation for the master plan vision, culminating from citizen feedback in the first work session, survey results and the consultant team’s design and research efforts. Additionally, one concept presented various flooding mitigation options for Charles Creek.

The follow on City Public Presentation held on March 5th, 2018, presented to the public the revised master plan vision. The latest vision incorporated the summation of feedback given from the previous two work sessions, specifically focusing on certain key areas and redevelopment opportunities.
Mission Statement

For Elizabeth City’s Waterfront, We Will... 

Deliver on our promise as North Carolina’s Harbor of Hospitality by providing new opportunities for recreation, boating and commercial activity while supporting a strong community through thoughtfully designed public spaces and environmental preservation areas.
Core Tenets
To achieve the Mission, we will achieve the following...

1. **Provide A Welcoming Harbor**
   ...Promote a diversity of welcoming harbor uses, anchored by commercial, recreation and marine uses, with the assemblage embodying the spirit and flavor of North Carolina's coastline.

2. **Promote Accessibility**
   ...Make it easy, safe and enjoyable to arrive, park, walk, bike, play and connect with the harborfront.

3. **Develop Targeted Renewal**
   ...Focus renewal efforts at key parcels to transform the water's edge into a contiguous, animated harborfront that sustains activity year-round.

4. **Construct a Verdant, Resilient Shore**
   ...Expand and connect natural landscape areas and habitat zones, providing new and strengthened greenways and blueways...the calling card of a renewed Elizabeth City.

5. **Celebrate Community Heritage**
   ...Promote the scale and story of Elizabeth City and the region through site architecture, landscape, wayfinding, and other elements.
THE VISION
The “Harbor of Hospitality” delivers on its promise by providing new opportunities for recreation, boating and commercial activity while supporting a strong community through thoughtfully designed public spaces and environmental preservation areas. By focusing on key areas and stating core project tenets, Elizabeth City’s waterfront enlivens itself with new possibilities. The harbor welcomes new uses while accessing the waterfront is promoted for all. Targeted redevelopment opportunities transform the water’s edge and sustainable resiliency efforts become a priority. The heritage of Elizabeth City is celebrated in the new city of Elizabeth City Waterfront Master Plan.
The Vision Fully Realized

The Elizabeth City Waterfront Master Plan delivers the promise of the “Harbor of Hospitality” by recommending new opportunities for recreation, boating and commercial activity while supporting a strong community through thoughtfully designed public spaces and environmental preservation areas. By focusing on key areas and stating core project tenets, Elizabeth City’s waterfront will enliven itself with new possibilities.

Five core project tenets outline the vision and provide the goals for the master plan’s efforts. A welcoming harbor promotes a diversity of boating and sailing uses, anchored by commercial, recreation and marine uses, with the assemblage embodying the spirit and flavor of North Carolina’s coastline.

Promoting accessibility makes it easy, safe and enjoyable for all to arrive, park, walk, bike, play and connect with the harborfront. Targeted redevelopment zones through focused renewal efforts at key parcels transform the water’s edge into a contiguous, animated harborfront that sustains activity year-round and stimulates business and other economic activity along the waterfront, in downtown, and probably throughout the region.

Preserving a verdant, resilient shore expands and connects natural landscape areas and habitat zones, providing new and strengthened greenways and blueways, more tourists, cleaner water, better fishing, more jobs, among other advantages, demonstrating a renewed Elizabeth City.

Lastly, celebrating Elizabeth City and the region’s community heritage through site architecture, landscape, wayfinding, and other elements pays homage to the past while looking to the future.
THE VISION

LEGEND
KEY SITE FEATURES

1. Nature Park / Conservation Zone
2. MACU Main Campus and Future Athletic Facilities
3. Jennette Brothers Targeted Redevelopment
4. Conservation Zone
5. Improved Park / Kayak Launch
6. Existing / Enhanced Gateway Signage
7. Harbor Beacon
8. Elizabeth City Harbor Esplanade
9. Community Pier (end of Main)
10. Waterfront Access Zone from Water Street
11. Mariners’ Wharf Park Marina
12. Water & Ehringhaus Street Targeted Redevelopment
13. Outdoor Sculpture Garden and Enhanced Connectivity to Celebration / Waterfront Park
14. Coast Guard Park / Sailing Center
15. Charles Creek Park / Playground
16. Berms / Flood Mitigation Features
17. Recreational Fishing Pier
18. Elizabeth City Shipyard Targeted Redevelopment
LEGEND
NORTH ENLARGEMENT

1. Nature Park / Conservation Zone
2. Residential Units / Student Housing
3. MACU Boat Club
4. MACU Future Development Facilities
5. MACU Waterfront Esplanade
6. MACU Main Campus Buildings
7. MACU Campus Integration Zone
8. Jennette Brothers Targeted Redevelopment
9. Waterfront Promenade
10. Conservation Zone
11. Improved Park / Kayak Launch
12. Existing / Enhanced Gateway Signage
13. Harbor Beacon (into Elizabeth City Harbor)
14. Streetscape Enhancements along N. Poindexter Street
**LEGEND**

**SOUTH ENLARGEMENT**

1. Strengthened Bike / Ped Link
2. Elizabeth City Harbor Esplanade
3. Community Pier (end of Main)
4. Transient Marina Berths
5. Streetscape Enhancements
6. Waterfront Access from Water Street
7. Mariners’ Wharf Park Enhancements
8. Mariners’ Wharf Park Marina and Boating Support Facilities
9. Water & Ehringhaus Street Targeted Redevelopment
10. Outdoor Sculpture Garden
11. Enhanced link to Celebration / Waterfront Park
12. Park, Events and Performances
13. Coast Guard Park / Sailing and Watersports Center
14. Streetscape and Infrastructure Enhancements (BMPs, bioswales, etc.)
15. Charles Creek Greenway And Trail
16. Berms and Flood Mitigation
17. Recreational Fishing Pier
18. Elizabeth City Shipyard Redevelopment Zone
19. Elizabeth City Marina
20. Waterfront Event Lawn
21. Repurposed Public & Community Event Space & Marina Services
One of Elizabeth City’s greatest assets is the entirety of its downtown cityscape directly fronts the waterfront. It’s no wonder the city is coined the “Harbor of Hospitality,” featuring an array of land uses strung together like placemaking pearls along the water’s edge. Building upon what is a solid urban framework, the master plan intends to unify the various uses to create a welcoming harbor for all.

Four typologies of uses – academic, parks and open space, marina, retail and mixed-use – are the focus of the design with the intent to fuse these uses into a cohesive plan. Each of these nodes offers unique attributes unifying the waterfront. The University, as a district, demonstrates catalytic energy and development with the growth and expansion of its research, athletics, recreation and residential uses. Machelhe Island and Charles Creek provide refuge and preservation, balancing out development pressure zones, while offering ecotourism recreation opportunities. Quintessential in North Carolina coastal town character, Elizabeth City’s marina supports recreational boating and sailing, while being near areas of live, work and play. Transient berths factor into creating a more welcoming harbor for all. Lastly, downtown’s center with retail and mixed-use is but a short walk from the harborfront, incentivizing opportunities of connection between these two main hubs of activity.
Institution
Park & Open Space
Preserve
Retail / Commercial
Cultural Attraction
Sailing Center / Recreational Boating
Recreation Marina
Fishing
2 // Promote Accessibility

Creating an interconnected network of various modes of transportation promotes accessibility for all. With an emphasis on bike and pedestrian connectivity, the Elizabeth City Waterfront Master Plan presents the city in its best light, with a variety of mobility abilities, enabling residents and visitors alike a chance to meander and move through the many attractions at their own leisure.

From the MACU campus heading south towards downtown, bike and pedestrian pathways connect the waterfront through the various uses to main frontage streets like Pointdexter and Water Street. Wandering through the core of Elizabeth City, accessibility to parks and open space, cultural attractions, art installations and amenities are offered by a multi-modal transportation network showcasing the essence of Elizabeth City.

To the south, ecological preservation with pathways nestled amongst creek beds and landscape berms provide a different scene and pace for all to slow down and connect to nature.

Textures change from paving to plank as one transitions between urban and natural contexts. The inclusion of both greenway and blueway activity offers exploration on different pathways as the network expands beyond pavement and path to include water-based hand-powered boating through creek and preserve. This dynamic interplay of experience results in a vibrant and resilient waterfront, as new discoveries present themselves through the changing city and natural landscape.
Focusing on key parcels that are slated for development stimulates strategic investment dollars to foster the greatest redevelopment opportunities. Five sites, denoted on page 53’s diagram, within the project area present a range of potential. From moderate to extensive investment dollars, this section demonstrates the thought process and analysis for varied levels of development.

Three of these five targeted renewal zones are illustrated with a light, moderate and more dramatic vision: The Elizabeth City Shipyard (A) has the potential for open space preservation and adaptive reuse to a mixed-use development revamp (see pages 52 & 53). The intersection at Water Street and Ehringhaus Street (B) could benefit from redevelopment ranging from small scale revitalization and streetscape improvements to a larger lot renewal (see pages 54 & 55). The Jennette Brothers site (C) is prime real estate, situated right on the banks of the Pasquotank River and offers various low to high development scenarios, all with the intention of promoting waterfront access through the site (see pages 56 & 57). Each of these parcels offer opportunities for connection and redevelopment to enhance the overall effectiveness and implementation of the master plan.

3 // Targeted Renewal
Elizabeth City Shipyard
Water Street & Ehringhaus Street (Chamber Site)
Jennette Brothers Site

LEGEND
A. Elizabeth City Shipyard
B. Water Street & Ehringhaus Street (Chamber Site)
C. Jennette Brothers Site

THE VISION
A. CITY OF ELIZABETH CITY SHIPYARD

For three waterfront locations, a spectrum of opportunities is available for renewal and activation. The Elizabeth City Shipyard site represents one such location.

The privately held shipyard site was once a major economic driver in the City. In its prime, the Elizabeth City Iron Works and Supply Company was a manufacturing center for sub chaser-class and other vessels, and later, served as a repair yard for small ships well into the mid-1960s. Today, due to a combination of brownfield site conditions and required investment, the Elizabeth City Shipyard property sits dormant awaiting its next life. Potential site investment can run across a spectrum of possibilities, both in terms of the amount of resources and time required to achieve desired outcomes. The degree of investment also has bearing on the volume of economic impact (job creation, local spending, property tax base) that could be derived for the community.

As shown in the accompanying figure “A”, lower investment levels could result in a renewal mix focused on open space and recreation activation along with adaptive reuse of existing sheds and other upland and in-water infrastructure. A focus on the arts and history of the site is also a community desired attribute for this zone as is the possibility of a small, business incubator space within reused sheds. Recreational boating facilities are pursued to the greatest degree possible given site contamination and other brownfield issues.

More aggressive investment and site clean-up approaches lead to more concentrated redevelopment options along the spectrum. These include a more intensive recreational approach, with an expanded number of in-water slips supported by upland investments in dry stack boat storage and commercial uses (see figure “B”). The highest investment level and likely most lengthy approach to implement (given site clean-up and permitting) involves creation of a true mixed-use development, incorporating a variety of commercial, and residential, along with a recreation marina.
Figure A
Park, Historical, Limited In-water Development, Arts, Building Reuse

Figure B
Maritime Industrial (Moderate/ Light), Marina, Ship/ Boat Industry Training, High-Dry Storage

Figure C
Mixed-Use, Commercial, Residential, Recreation Marina
B. WATER & EHRINGHAUS STREET

The grouping of properties at the intersection of Water and Ehringhaus Streets (aka Chamber of Commerce and bank sites) is a challenging renewal location. Challenges include: assembly of several small properties owned by the City and others is required to achieve any larger scale renewal effort; the location is prone to local flooding, necessitating both site and (additional) surrounding street infrastructure improvement; and the parcels are located at a transition point between the downtown and moderately valued and activated commercial and residential properties to the south.

For the vision plan, the intent is that over time, this intersection transitions into a more robust anchor for the southern portion of downtown, leveraging investment and interest to deal with localized flooding and bring about increased investment and value to surrounding parcels.

For the spectrum of potential investment, low investment levels preserve parcel sizes and focus monies to the surrounding roadway and storm water capabilities of the area to allow parcels to be more attractive for small scale, parcel-by-parcel investment (see figure “A”). At a midpoint along the spectrum, some lot assembly is encouraged as is a more aggressive reworking of E. Grice Street allows for more substantial commercial renewal to occur at E. Ehringhaus Street and S.Water Street (see figure “B”). Parcels internal to this configuration may lend themselves to small scale multi-family residential development.

Under the most aggressive renewal approach along the spectrum, land is assembled to allow for a larger scale development approach to be realized, such as a limited service hotel of 60 to 80 rooms with ground floor commercial activation or a larger, mixed-use residential development (see figure “C”). This last option would likely require a public-private partnership to advance, with the City working to assemble properties and upgrade surrounding infrastructure to ready the area for investment. Realization of this final renewal approach is expected to yield the highest economic benefit to the City over the long term.
Figure A
Preserve Existing Buildings, Lot x Lot Investment, Streetscape Improvements, Stormwater Improvements

Figure B
Larger Lot Renewal = Mixed-Use Commercial

Figure C
Larger Lot Renewal = Hospitality/Hotel
C. JENNETTE BROTHERS SITE

The Jennette Brothers site, while not a critical transformation, presents a compelling opportunity to broaden waterfront activity and engagement from one focused along the Harborfront to one that expands north of the Pasquotank River Bridge. Full or selective (and adaptive) renewal of parcels and existing buildings present the possibility for a true mix of land uses to be developed on the site, from residential units and office spaces to ground floor commercial. The vision plan contemplates options that encourage more robust access along N. Water and N. Poindexter Streets as well as the possibility for a pedestrian link under the bridge. Vessel docking parallel to the site is also suggested under each renewal approach.

Along the spectrum of investment, figure “A” calls for modest improvements to surrounding streetscape and connective elements linking the Harborfront and University districts. Over time, these public investments along with possible partnering with Jennette Brothers site owners could lead to waterside (figure “B”) and more intensive waterside and inland parcel redevelopment (figure “C”).
Figure A
Site stays as is / Industrial, Work/Walk
Around to Connect

Figure B
Some Building Redevelopment, Activation of
Edges, Possible Waterfront Access

Figure C
Full Development and
Waterfront Access
As coastal towns face the threat of rising tides, urban waterfronts must prepare for environmental future hazards and plan accordingly. The Charles Creek area of Elizabeth City is prone to flooding due to local rainfall, coastal storms, and wind tide events. The City of Elizabeth City received a grant through North Carolina Division of Coastal Management’s Planning and Management Grants Program to create a plan to mitigate flooding.

In preparing the Charles Creek Flooding Mitigation Plan, an existing conditions assessment and watershed evaluation, hydrologic/hydraulic modelling and was conducted to develop and support proposed flood mitigation alternatives in coordination with this Waterfront Master Planning effort.

Based on modeling efforts and cost analysis, the elevation or relocation of flood-prone structures and use of protective berms is one of the recommended flood mitigation alternatives. The elevation of structures provides the highest benefit-cost ratio followed by relocating structures, but the berm option also provides ancillary neighborhood connectivity and recreational benefits. A combination of flood mitigation alternatives may be used in substitute of a singular flood mitigation alternative in order to best meet the needs of the City. The revision of existing ordinances to promote the use of green infrastructure, as well as enforce specific freeboard requirements for new and existing development, would further improve resilience in Elizabeth City.

Green infrastructure is an approach to stormwater management that protects and restores the natural water cycle within the built environment. Planting trees and restoring wetlands, creating bioswales and designing stormwater systems are various green infrastructure methods. Fusing landscape architecture and stormwater mitigation, the use of protective berms and other green infrastructure improvements will promote sustainability, resilience, and betterment of Elizabeth City’s development future.

Open space can be flooded with little or no damage and provide recreation spaces when not flooded.

Conserved natural areas can be attractive not only to plants and animals, but also to tourists and residents, thereby increasing business and property values.

Preserved marshlands and swamps help protect towns by providing large areas to absorb flooding during storms.

Berms protecting nearby homes from flooding with attractive landscaping.

Naturalized stormwater detention areas can be both beautiful and serve a green infrastructure purpose.
THE VISION

KEY PLAN

Green Infrastructure (Including Low Impact Development, Rain Gardens, Bioretention Basins, Streetscape Improvements, Berming)

LEGEND

E.WARD ST
POINDEXTER ST
U.S. HWY 158W
PASQUOTANK RIVER
N. WATER ST
E.MAIN ST
KEY PLAN

1. Protective Berms
2. Flood Gate
3. Green Infrastructure (Including Low Impact Development, Rain Gardens, Bioretention Basins, Streetscape Improvements, Berming)
This analysis focused on Charles Creek and the impact of rainfall events and tide increases. The objectives of this study included:

- Determine how rainfall and coastal flooding interact within Charles Creek watershed
- Determine appropriate level of flood resilience that is achievable given site constraints
- Develop a suite of potential green and gray infrastructure to meet flood resiliency goals
- Make recommendations to existing policies and ordinances to increase flood resilience
- Investigate and document potential permitting and funding strategies

Through a series of data collection and analysis, including the examination of low-lying ground elevations in relation to wind tides, analysis of soil levels, storm surge and precipitation levels, rising river and tide levels, several flood mitigation options were proposed and analyzed to provide a range of possible outcomes and how best to address future catastrophes.

Flood mitigation options included: protective berms, flood gate and pump system, elevating structures, buying and renovating structures, green infrastructure, and policy/ordinance revisions.

Protective berms along the Charles Creek shoreline, incorporated into the landscape, would mitigate river and wind tide flooding and help to maintain current rising water standard levels. A flood gate, immediately downstream from Riverside/Shephard Street Bridge, would require additional pumping infrastructure to route Charles Creek water flows around the flood gate and into the Pasquotank River during major storms. Elevating, buying and renovating structures would safeguard future structures from storm surge damage.

Green infrastructure would reduce impervious surface area and decrease runoff to stormwater infrastructure systems. However, the soil conditions in this area are somewhat challenging and may not be adequate for this to be a stand-alone option. Policy and ordinance revisions were also recommended to be updated to reflect recent changes in stormwater systems. Lastly, funding options, like FEMA and other relevant grant programs, were researched to gather a sense of the types of dollars that are available to commence this work.

In conclusion, recommendations are:

- Elevation/relocation of structures or protective berms as the recommended flood mitigation alternatives
- Combinations of flood mitigation alternatives can be utilized
- Green infrastructure would be more of an add-on to other alternatives listed to improve existing stormwater system behavior with respect to water quantity and quality
- Update Stormwater and Flood Ordinances to better reflect 2017 stormwater rules and design guidance, and provide additional freeboard to FEMA flood elevations
EXISTING CONDITIONS

EXISTING 10 YEAR RAINFALL, 1.0' SURGE

EXISTING 25 YEAR RAINFALL, 3.0' SURGE

EXISTING 50 YEAR RAINFALL, 3.6' SURGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS: 25 YEAR EVENT, NO SURGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS: 50 YEAR EVENT, NO SURGE

WITH PROTECTIVE BERMS: 25 YEAR EVENT, 3.0' SURGE

WITH FLOOD GATE / PUMP: 50 YEAR EVENT, 3.6' SURGE

POTENTIAL FLOOD MITIGATION

25 YEAR EVENT

50 YEAR EVENT

THE VISION
Celebration of Community Heritage

Elizabethton’s past, present, and future culminate in an communal place and time where locals are proud of their heritage while welcoming their future. Four redevelopment zones of interest – university, causeway, harborfront, and the preserve – make up distinct focus areas of integration for the betterment of the Elizabeth City Waterfront Masterplan.

Each zone presents an opportunity for placemaking and communal celebration. MACU campus is a meeting ground of intellect and engaging conversations, advancing the University’s research and long-term growth of the area. Machelle Island beckons to be more than just a causeway by offering ecological preservation and ecotourism discoveries. The harborfront’s fifty acres is ideal for reinvestment opportunities, elevating the current cityscape to a mixed-use and diverse destination. Targeted redevelopment and revitalization efforts, coupled with enhanced landscaping and green infrastructure elevate downtown and the harborfront’s appearance. Wayfinding, signage and connected pathways unify the project area, and provide opportunities to celebrate the community heritage. Charles Creek’s preservation efforts are engineered to reduce flooding impacts, preserving ample area for parks and open space while demonstrating the dire need to sustain natural ecosystems.

These zones come together to create a range of integrated uses that promote a viable and sustainable vision for Elizabeth City.
THE VISION

- **UNIVERSITY**
The district supports expansion of research, athletics, recreation and residential uses. Mid Atlantic Christian University and other regional institutions of higher learning are catalytic to the long-term growth of this area.

- **CAUSEWAY**
A compelling welcome to Elizabeth City. Machelhe Island balances residential, maritime and ecological zones. Northern Machelhe Island evolves into an ecopark supporting hand powered water dependent recreation and other natural features.

- **HARBORFRONT**
Fifty acres of quintessential North Carolina Harborfront supporting recreational boating, sailing, restaurants, parks and open spaces, and residential living. Key landside and in-water investments are advanced by the public and private sector to support Elizabeth City’s mission to be the Harbor of Hospitality.

- **THE PRESERVE**
Charles Creek and floodplain are engineered to reduce flooding impacts to southern Elizabeth City. Extensive areas are preserved for park, open space and natural habitat zones.
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
The plan is an assemblage of places and spaces introduced over time to result in the transformation of the water’s edge into a dynamic, well-loved community space. As much as we wish the entirety of this transformation could occur in one narrow development window, conducting follow-up studies, identifying funding sources, timing development to market factors, permitting, design and construction all take time. What becomes essential in large scale waterfront development effort is establishing the right initial action steps that set the foundation for future efforts. Introducing flexibility into the plan is also critical. In this section, we present the overall phasing plan for the project as well as the project schedule.
The community vision assembled for Elizabeth City’s waterfront will be implemented over time. The goal of implementing a majority of the Vision Plan project efforts will occur over the next decade. Critically setting initial actions and investments will establish a foundation for later stage projects.

Our recommended phasing strategy reflects a purposeful desire to advance those initiatives that have high community value, offer good potential for funding, and set the stage for follow-up project efforts. In several cases, listed projects can be further broken down into smaller improvement efforts tailored to the city’s economic reach and the availability of grants and other public/private funding sources.

The timing of several projects rests squarely on conditions in the marketplace and the ability of the public sector to assemble a compelling public/private package on key projects and show leadership in getting the word out in the development community. There is likely no greater development effort than the one envisioned for a potential downtown hotel, illustrated for the Water and Ehringaus Street targeted redevelopment site. The upside rewards could be very sizable for Elizabeth City, but securing the right hotel deal will take creativity and perseverance.

Key private development opportunities denoted in the vision plan should also be enthusiastically supported by the government/public sector. While redevelopment of these parcels/buildings will follow private property owner wishes, the City, county and public sector should consider taking a proactive role with these owners to see what type of collaborative opportunities are available.

There are other studies and initiatives which need to be prioritized that are not depicted within the accompanying illustrations. Finally, the suggested phasing strategy presented herein has several inherent flexibilities to allow certain projects to be reprioritized and/or shuffled based on market conditions and community desire.
The following tables outline various projects and funding strategies based on the four districts. Each district is broken down into its own table, with a list of projects accompanied by a designated rating code and potential funding source.

The rating codes were deciphered as follows:

- **Community Desire (CD)** is a result of public input through community engagement, meetings, interviews and survey results.
- **Funding (F)** relates to local, state and federal grant, funding and resource opportunities available.
- **Linking (LK)** is based on Moffatt & Nichol’s assessment of the project site through research, analysis and design.

### Location Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>Harborfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>Preserve / Charles Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CD)</td>
<td>Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LK)</td>
<td>Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Source Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(FEMA HMGP)</td>
<td>FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FEMA PDM)</td>
<td>FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FEMA FMA)</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CDBG-DR)</td>
<td>HUD Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recover (CDBG-DR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CWMTF)</td>
<td>NC Clean Water Management Trust Fund (CWMTF) Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCDEQ)</td>
<td>NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) Water Resources Development Program Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CRG)</td>
<td>NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant (CRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EPA UWIG)</td>
<td>EPA Urban Waters Small Grant (EPA UWIG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EPA 205)</td>
<td>EPA Section 205(j) Grant (EPA 205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NFWF 5Star)</td>
<td>National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant (NFWF 5Star)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CWSRF)</td>
<td>Clean Waters State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NC CRFL)</td>
<td>NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant (NC CRFL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RTG)</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Grant (RTG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B&amp;WAG)</td>
<td>Public Beach &amp; Waterfront Access Grant (B&amp;WAG) (CAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NPS L&amp;WCF)</td>
<td>NPS Land &amp; Water Conservation Fund (NPS L&amp;WCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BIG)</td>
<td>Fish &amp; Wildlife Service - Wildlife &amp; Sport Fish Restoration Program Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MSD)</td>
<td>Fish &amp; Wildlife Service - Wildlife &amp; Sport Fish Restoration Program Marine Sewage Pumpout and Dump Grant (MSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCDOT BP)</td>
<td>NCDOT Bike and Pedestrian Planning Grant (NCDOT BP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TAP)</td>
<td>FHA Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NC P&amp;R)</td>
<td>NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CITY)</td>
<td>Public Sector - City of Elizabeth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(COUNTY)</td>
<td>Public Sector - Pasquotank County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PRIVATE)</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University District Improvements and Projects

University District Improvements and Projects focus on expansion of MACU’s campus and key redevelopment opportunities:

Creating a nature park at the far northwestern edge of the harborfront will link to campus and provide connectivity throughout Elizabeth City via bike and pedestrian pathways.

Constructing a Rowing Center and adding student housing will add value to the University’s campus.

Streetscape improvements along N. Pointdexter will connect to the other green infrastructure improvements occurring throughout the project site.

The Jennette Brothers site is a key target redevelopment opportunity, offering the potential for mixed-use development and wharf improvements, creating a viable destination for downtown.

Lastly, a waterfront walkway extending from the waterfront condominiums, along the MACU campus, the Jennette Brothers waterfront and under US HWY 158W, will promote accessibility by linking the entire University district to the Harborfront District and beyond.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (Code)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating*&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source (Code)&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jennette Brothers - Wharf Redevelopment</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Wharf redevelopment along Jennette Brothers site.</td>
<td>2, 3, 1</td>
<td>$1.6M - $2.4M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, CITY, PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>US HWY 158W Waterfront Walkway</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Waterfront walkway linking Jennette Brothers site to Veterans Park.</td>
<td>2, 3, 1</td>
<td>$240,000 - $360,000</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, CITY, COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University Rowing Center</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Rowing club boat house and launch (possible link to MACU, CECSU and CA).</td>
<td>2, 2, 3</td>
<td>$1.2M - $1.7M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, PRIVATE (MACU, CECSU, CA), CITY, COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Streetscape Improvements - N. Poindexter Street</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Landscape, sidewalk, crossing, lighting, wayfinding and other corridor enhancements.</td>
<td>2, 3, 3</td>
<td>$2.3M - $3.4M</td>
<td>CDBG, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jennette Brothers - Site Redevelopment</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Mixed-use development with GF commercial and residential above; waterfront promenade.</td>
<td>2, 3, 3</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>PRIVATE; Possible City / Grant Support for Public Realm Investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expanded Residential Units / Student Housing</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Residential townhomes.</td>
<td>3, 2, 3</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North University / Pasquotank River Nature Park</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Enhanced walking trails, paths, overlook areas, parking and art.</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
<td>$680,000 - $1M</td>
<td>RTG, NPS L&amp;WCF, PRIVATE (MACU), CITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Codes**
- **CD**: Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **F**: Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **LK**: Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)

**Funding Source Codes**
- **CDBG**: NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant
- **FEMA HWGP**: FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- **FEMA PDM**: FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- **FEMA PIMA**: Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- **CDBG-DR**: HUD Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery
- **CWMTF**: NC Clean Water Management Trust Fund
- **NCDEQ**: NC Department of Environmental Quality Water Resources Development Program Grant
- **RTG**: Recreational Trails Grant
- **B&WAG**: Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- **NPS L&WCF**: NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- **B&WAG**: Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- **TAP**: FHA Transportation Alternatives Program
- **NC P&R**: NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARF)
- **CITY**: Public Sector - City of Elizabeth City
- **PRIVATE**: Private Sector

**Location Codes**
- **U**: University
- **C**: Causeway
- **H**: Harborfront
- **P**: Preserve / Charles Creek

**Note:** The table above outlines the plan implementation of various projects with their respective descriptions, locations, ratings, estimated costs, and potential funding sources. Each project is evaluated based on community desire, funding reliability, and the linking nature with other efforts. The funding sources are categorized under various code names, which are referenced in the 'Potential Funding Source (Code)' column.
Causeway District // Improvements and Projects

Causeway District Improvements and Projects open up opportunities for blueway and greenway expansion efforts on the island. From kayaking to an expanded boardwalk, these projects promote ecological sustainability and educational efforts. Construction of a harbor beacon will provide a notable landmark to the waterfront and can incorporate an art installation piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (Code)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source (Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Elizabeth City Harbor Beacon</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Harbor beacon / art installation</td>
<td>1:2:3</td>
<td>$200,000 - $300,000</td>
<td>CITY, ARTS DONATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Causeway Island Kayak Trails and Launch Improvements</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Expanded kayak / SUP launch capability, access walkways, and interpretive signage.</td>
<td>3:2:3</td>
<td>$1.7M - $2.5M</td>
<td>RTG, NPS L&amp;WCF, CITY, COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Causeway Island Conservation Area Enhancements</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Blueways trail enhancements and hazard markers.</td>
<td>3:2:3</td>
<td>$1.2M - $1.9M</td>
<td>RTG, NPS L&amp;WCF, CITY, COUNTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ID, Project Name, Location, Description, Rating, Estimated Cost, Potential Funding Source (Code)

**Rating Codes**
- **CD**: Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **F**: Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **LK**: Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)

**Location Codes**
- (U): University
- (C): Causeway
- (H): Harborfront
- (P): Preserve / Charles Creek

**Funding Source Codes**
- (CRG): NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant
- (EPA LGWS): EPA Urban Waters Small Grant
- (EPA 202): EPA Section 202(j) Grant
- (NFWF): National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant
- (CWSIF): Clean Waters State Revolving Fund
- (NC CRFL): NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant
- (RTG): Recreational Trails Grant
- (SWAG): Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAAM)
- (NPS L&WCF): NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- (BIG): Fish & Wildlife Service - Wildlife & Sport Fish
- (B&WSQ): Fish & Wildlife Service - Boating Infrastructure Grant
- (CIS): Fish & Wildlife Service - Coastal Infrastructure Grant
- (NC DOD BP): NC Coastal Dune and Estuarine Protection Grant
- (FHA TAP): FHA Transportation Alternatives Program
- (NC P&R): NC Parks and Recreational Facilities Program
- (PUBLIC Funds): Public Sector - City of Elizabeth City
- (PRIVATE Funds): Private Sector
Harborfront District Improvements and Projects

Harborfront District Improvements and Projects pertain to parcels, enhancements and connections that involve the waterfront. Beautification and upgrading efforts of existing open space will promote a robust and versatile waterfront experience. Streetscape improvements along major streets and key intersections will unify downtown to its harborfront, creating a dynamic interplay of use and activity. By developing targeted renewal properties, like the Elizabeth City Shipyard and E. Ehringaus (Chambers site) / Water Street Area, investment dollars will yield a greater return by capitalizing on these land acquisition opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (Code)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating CD</th>
<th>Rating F</th>
<th>Rating LK</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source (Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recreational Boating Slips at Mariners’ Wharf Park</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Renewed and updated boating slips along Mariners Wharf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$320,000 - $480,000</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, BIG, MSD, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal - Land Acquisition</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shipyard land acquisition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CWMFT, B&amp;WAG, NC P&amp;R, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Museum of the Albemarle to Mariners Wharf Linkages</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Streetscape and pedestrian linkages between the museum and Mariners Wharf; possible sculpture garden.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.7M - $2.6M</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mariners Wharf Enhancements</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Open space, performance area and multi-use event upgrades.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.9M - 2.9M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, NPS L&amp;WCF, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Main Street and Moth Boat Park Enhancement and Community Wharf</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Enhancement of Moth Boat Park and public fishing pier and overlook development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1M - $1.5M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, NPS L&amp;WCF, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waterfront Parcel(s) Beautification - Veterans to Moth Boat Parks</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Exterior beautification efforts along waterfront facing structures from Veterans to Moth Boat Parks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>PRIVATE INVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E. Ehringhaus / Water Street Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Redevelopment of +/-4 acres of property at the corner of E. Ehringhaus and Water Street.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CITY TO SUPPORT ROW IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Rating Codes:
- CD: Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- F: Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- LK: Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)

(2) Funding Source Codes:
- FEMA HMGP: FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- FEMA PDM: FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- FEMA PAAM: Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- CDBG-DR: HUD Community Development Block Grant
- Disaster Recovery: Disaster Recovery
- CWSF: NC Clean Water Management Trust Fund
- NCDEQ: NC Department of Environmental Quality Water Resources Development Program-Grant
- NWSL: NWSL
- NWF: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Five Star Restoration Grant
- CBRF: Clean Waters State Revolving Fund
- CRG: NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant
- NPS L&WCF: NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- BIG: Fish & Wildlife Service - Wildlife & Sport Fish Restoration Program
- B&WAG: Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- NCDOT BP: NC DOT Bike and Pedestrian Planning Grant
- TAP: FHA Transportation Alternatives Program
- CRFL: NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant
- TIP: NCDOT Bike and Pedestrian Planning Grant
- H: Highway
- P: Pipeline
- C: Causeway
- H: Harborfront
- P: Preserve / Charles Creek
The Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal effort is broken up into several phases given its costly undertaking. Fortunately, there are a variety of grant and funding opportunities available to phase out the project’s intent. Additionally, restoring the Elizabeth City Milling Co. Building and incorporating streetscape improvements will unify the harborfront as a distinct district. Various green infrastructure implementations along Riverside Avenue tie into the Preserve / Charles Creek improvements and extend the flood mitigation zone beyond Charles Creek, north along the water’s edge in the form of park space and streetscape improvements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (Code)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating(^{(2)})</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source (Code)(^{(3)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal - Marina (Low Options)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Breakwater, slips, docks, and other in-water enhancements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.3M - $3.5M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, BIG, MSD, CITY, PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal - Uplands Phase 1 (Low Options)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Uplands Phase 1 improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3M - $4.6M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, CITY, PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal - Uplands Phase 2 (Low Options)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Uplands Phase 2 improvements.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1M - $1.5M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, NPS L&amp;WCF, CITY, PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Shipyard Renewal - Uplands Phase 3 (Low Options)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Uplands Phase 3 improvements.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2.7M - $4M</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG, CITY, PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Streetscape and Infrastructure Improvements - Riverside Avenue</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Infrastructure BMPs, Landscape, sidewalk, crossing, lighting, wayfinding and other corridor enhancements.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.1M - $1.7M</td>
<td>CDBG, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Streetscape Improvements - N. &amp; S. Water Street</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Landscape, sidewalk, crossing, lighting, wayfinding and other corridor enhancements.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.5M - $2.3M</td>
<td>CDBG, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elizabeth City Milling Co. Building Restoration</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Adaptive reuse of the historic Elizabeth City Milling building.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.1M - $1.6M</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Location Codes
- (U) University
- (C) Causeway
- (H) Harborfront
- (P) Riverfront / Charles Creek

\(^{(2)}\) Rating Codes
- (CD) Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- (F) Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- (LK) Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)

\(^{(3)}\) Funding Source Codes
- (CDBG) NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant
- (EPA HUD) EPA Urban Waters Small Grant
- (EPA Section 205(j) Grant) Clean Water State Revolving Fund
- (NCDEQ) NC Department of Environmental Quality Water Resources Development Program-Grant
- (NFWF 5Star) National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant
- (RTG) Recreational Trails Grant
- (B&WAG) Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- (CWSRF) Clean Waters State Revolving Fund
- (FEMA HMGP) FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- (FEMA PDM) FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- (FEMA PPA) Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- (CBG) Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery
- (CMSWRF) NC Clean Water Management Trust Fund
- (NC RFG) NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant
- (NCDOT P&R) NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant
- (NCDOT BP) NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARF)
- (RTG) Recreational Trails Grant
- (IM) Partnership for the National Trails System
- (NC P&R) NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARF)
- (FHA) Metropolitan Transportation Alternatives Program
- (NC P&R) NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARF)
- (NC P&R) NC Parks and Recreation Fund (PARF)
- (COUNTY) Public Sector - Pasquotank County
- (PRIVATE) Private Sector
- B&WAG, BIG, MSD, CITY, PRIVATE
- B&WAG, CITY, PRIVATE
- B&WAG, NPS L&WCF, CITY, PRIVATE
- B&WAG, CITY, PRIVATE
- CDBG, CITY
- CDBG, CITY
- TBD
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Preserve & Charles Creek // Improvements and Projects

The Preserve / Charles Creek Improvements and Projects range from green infrastructure improvements, like protective berms, for flood mitigation to the construction of additional amenities, like greenways and a fishing pier. Streetscape improvements along Southern Avenue will help unify the southern portion of the project site to the waterfront and downtown core, while a revitalization effort for the Charles Creek Bridge will upgrade the existing bridge with further enhancements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location (Code)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating*</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source (Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Charless Creek Flood Mitigation - Relocation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Relocation of flood prone structures</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>$3.5M - $4M</td>
<td>FEMA, HMGP, FEMA PDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charless Creek Flood Mitigation - Elevation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Elevation of flood prone structures</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>$1.6M - $2.1M</td>
<td>FEMA, HMGP, FEMA PDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Charless Creek Flood Mitigation - Berms and Flood Mitigation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Construction of berms with drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>$2.2M (Only practical to a 25yr event)</td>
<td>FEMA HMGP, FEMA PDM, FEMA PDM, FEMA PMA, CWMTF, NCDEQ, CRG, EPA UWSG, EPA 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Charles Creek Park MLK Eco Walk</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Phase 2 (southern) expansion of the MLK Eco Walk</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>$1.1M - $1.5M</td>
<td>RTG, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charles Creek Greenway and Trail Systems</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Construction of greenway and trail system</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>$3M - $4.5M</td>
<td>RTG, NCDOT BP, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City of Elizabeth City Sailing Center Enhancements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Launch area improvements; building and site beautification.</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>$400,000 - $650,000</td>
<td>B&amp;WAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charles Creek Fishing Pier</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Creation of a 30’ fishing pier at Charles Creek.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>$140,000 - $210,000</td>
<td>NC CRFL, CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Streetscape Improvements - Southern Avenue</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Landscape, sidewalk, crossing &amp;wayfinding</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>$1.1M - $1.7M</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Costs are for stand alone alternatives. A combination of these strategies may ultimately be implemented, including property acquisition.

**Rating Codes**
- **CD:** Community Desire; degree of community prioritization, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **F:** Funding; degree to which a reliable funding source has been identified, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)
- **LK:** Linking; critical nature of project to other follow-on efforts, with 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)

**Funding Source Codes**
- (CRG) NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant
- (EPA UWSG) EPA Urban Waters Small Grant
- (EPA Section 205) EPA Section 205(j) Grant
- (FMA) Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- (HMGP) FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- (HMGP) FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- (NCDOT BP) NCDOT Bike and Pedestrian Planning Grant
- (NCRFL) NC Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant
- (NFWF 5Star) National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant
- (RTG) Recreational Trails Grant
- (RTG) Recreational Trails Grant
- (B&WAG) Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- (B&WAG) Public Beach & Waterfront Access Grant (CAMA)
- (NSW) NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- (P&R) Restoration Program-Marine Sewage Pumpout and Dump Grant
- (MIS) Fish & Wildlife Service - Wildlife & Sport Fish
- (MSD) Fish & Wildlife Service - Marine Sewage Pumpout and Dump Grant
- (NCDEQ) NC Department of Environmental Quality Water Resources Development Program-Grant
- (NPS L&WCF) NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- (NPS L&WCF) NPS Land & Water Conservation Fund
- (TAP) FTA Transportation Alternatives Program
- (TAP) FTA Transportation Alternatives Program
- (CAMA) Public Sector - City of Elizabeth City
- (CAMA) Public Sector - Pasquotank County
- (NCW) Fish & Wildlife Service - Wildlife & Sport Fish
- (NCW) Fish & Wildlife Service - Wildlife & Sport Fish

**Location Codes**
- (U) University
- (C) Causeway
- (H) Harborfront
- (P) Park/Charles Creek
Other Studies, Improvements and Projects

The Other Studies, Improvements and Projects pertain to bike/ped and signage/wayfinding projects to strengthen connectivity in downtown and along the waterfront. Planning and designing facilities that cater to bike/pedestrian traffic increases access from downtown to the waterfront. Building off of “The Harbor of Hospitality” brand, it is recommended to create a comprehensive signage and wayfinding system for cohesion and identity within the overall project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Elizabeth City (CEC) Comprehensive Bike / Ped Program - Plan / Design</td>
<td>Planning and design of revitalized bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the waterfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC Comprehensive Bike / Ped Program - CAPX</td>
<td>Implementation of revitalized bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the waterfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Signage and Wayfinding - Plan / Design</td>
<td>Branding, planning and design of downtown and waterfront signage and wayfinding program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Signage and Wayfinding -</td>
<td>Implementation of downtown and waterfront signage and wayfinding program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

As presented, the Vision Plan identifies the following key projects that will help bring a renewed Elizabeth City to life. The plan and its respective tables also work to present linkages as to how projects are connected and require initial investment.

So what next steps need to happen to advance the vision? Recommendations in three categories are suggested as follows:

1. Starter projects and studies;
2. Funding and finance; and
3. Implementors and champions

These key starter projects are:

- Renewed and updated recreational boating slips at Mariners’ Wharf Park, including Moth Boat to Mariners’ Wharf Park waterfront walkway.
- Implementation of next steps for the Charles Creek Flood Mitigation Study, including: land acquisition; protective berms and flood mitigation; green infrastructure and greenways; trails and interconnected park system; beautification and amenitization improvements.
- Streetscape and pedestrian linkages between the Museum of the Albemarle and Waterfront Park, including a sculpture garden and improved wayfinding.
- Elizabeth City shipyard marina and uplands renewal, including breakwater, slips and in-water enhancements, adaptive re-use of the historic Elizabeth City Milling Co. building and landside improvements.
- Streetscape and infrastructure improvements, including infrastructure best management practices (BMPs), landscape, sidewalk, crossing, lighting, wayfinding and other corridor enhancements. The locations shown in this master plan are indicative of the general improvements and intent. Further study is required to ascertain the necessary level of improvements and propose locations for each of these improvements based on detailed analysis.
- Machelle Island conservation area enhancements, including blueways, trails enhancements, and hazard markers.
- City of Elizabeth City sailing center enhancements, including launch area improvements, building, art/mural and site beautification.
- North University/ Pasquotank River Nature Park enhanced walking trails, paths, overlook areas and parking.

In terms of funding and finance, often funding initiatives need to be a combination of City, County, grant and public/private partnerships to be most effective. An itemized list of potential funding sources is listed on each of the designated improvements and projects tables stated in the prior pages.

The implementors and champions for these efforts need to be a combination of the City, the downtown group, and possibly other key stakeholders as deemed necessary. As a precedent, Washington, NC created a harborfront alliance that has worked to implement their vision plan into action. It is our recommendation that the City of Elizabeth City would benefit from a similar alliance formation.