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INTRODUCTION

“The halls of academe are crumbling. Buildings, grounds, and utilities of higher education are in a dilapidated condition, endangering life and property. The vitality of the higher education enterprise in this country is in jeopardy.”

The historic significance of many American academic campuses is undeniable, as the canon of campus architecture represents the evolution of architectural taste from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries. However, preservation planning strategies to protect historically significant campus fabric are not often included as part of campus master planning efforts at many academic institutions. Campus planning practices in the United States are as varied as the diverse academic institutions at which they are employed, offering few models of campus preservation planning for colleges and universities to follow. Though there are many examples of academic institutions that developed out of carefully composed campus master plans, it was more common for academic institutions to evolve over time without consistent campus planning. As a result of incoherent planning practices, many academic campuses developed as disordered systems of disconnected buildings and landscapes, largely due to the lack of recognition of the relationships between new designs and historic fabric.

Wesleyan University, founded in Middletown, Connecticut in 1831, is a typical example of a campus that evolved out of inconsistent planning practices; expanding from its hill-top campus core over time with little attention to the institution’s significant historic fabric or its relevance to the contemporary campus experience. Several attempts were made throughout Wesleyan’s history to develop the campus according to master plans, however, none of these plans achieved the objective of unifying the campus. This trend continues today at Wesleyan with a recent campus redevelopment campaign that proposes to add several large-scale buildings to the Wesleyan campus that when completed, will offer little connection with historic fabric; thereby continuing the tradition of incoherent campus development seen at Wesleyan and many other campuses in the United States.

However, one area of the Wesleyan campus is an exception to the campus’s otherwise disjointed evolution. The Center for the Arts (CFA) complex at Wesleyan is a unique example of responsiveness to historic fabric in new design and will be studied as a model for campus preservation planning. Built by noted architect Kevin Roche in 1973, the CFA is a separate and inward facing landscape, constituting an arts village that some have called a “sacred space” within the larger university campus. This thesis will investigate Wesleyan University’s Center for the Arts as a case study in preservation planning at historic universities in order to provide an example of late-twentieth century campus design that responded to historic fabric. This analysis is meant to
promote awareness of the potential for Wesleyan and other academic institutions to require the integration of new designs with historic fabric as part of contemporary campus redevelopment efforts.

Chapter One of the thesis introduces the evolution of campus planning at American academic institutions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the move towards more comprehensive campus planning strategies and policies specific to historic preservation. This campus planning framework is necessary to understand how the evolution of campus planning at Wesleyan followed major national trends in the twentieth century, proving that the Wesleyan is not a unique example of a disjointed campus that evolved due to inadequate campus planning.

Chapter Two analyzes two distinct periods in the CFA’s development that represent significant milestones in university-wide planning initiatives. The first period of analysis, from the CFA’s inception in 1961 to its completion in 1973, will be evaluated to determine how Roche’s design for the complex was an appropriate response to historic campus fabric in the context of the University’s 1964 Campus Master Plan. The second period of analysis will examine the CFA in its contemporary context to resolve if the complex should be treated as a historic resource and if Roche’s sensitive approach to historic fabric in his design for the Center for the Arts should serve as a campus preservation planning model to guide future development at Wesleyan University.
Chapter Three evaluates preservation planning strategies and approaches to historic fabric at three example universities. The campuses of Scripps College, the University of Virginia, and the University of Oregon were selected for analysis because these academic institutions have developed exemplary strategies for managing historic fabric in response to several fundamental campus preservation challenges. This analysis is included to provide a context for the discussion of recommended preservation planning strategies at Wesleyan University in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four utilizes the various campus preservation strategies identified at example academic institutions in developing recommendations for preservation planning at Wesleyan. The University's 2002 Campus Master Plan, developed by Ayers Saint Gross of Baltimore, MD, will be analyzed to determine the plan's approach to historic fabric and how campus preservation can be incorporated into ongoing campus planning initiatives at Wesleyan. The preservation strategies employed at the example campuses discussed in Chapter Three will guide the recommendations for addressing parallel challenges associated with the relationship of historic fabric and new design at Wesleyan.

Through the analysis of Wesleyan University and the Center for the Arts, this thesis will suggest that it is necessary and possible to incorporate historic preservation strategies as part of contemporary campus planning initiatives in order to encourage the retention of historic fabric where appropriate while also promoting new and innovative campus designs.
CHAPTER 1: CAMPUS PLANNING AND HISTORIC FABRIC

“All campuses, if they are not already historic, will become historic.”

Academic institutions are the stewards of some of America’s most significant historic buildings and landscapes created in the last two centuries. These institutions see their role as stewards of historic fabric as both a privilege and a burden. While historic buildings (and less often landscapes) are often celebrated at American colleges and universities and have contributed substantially to the formation of a definable campus character, these resources are vulnerable to erosion if not destruction as campuses evolve over time. These losses are largely due to the lack of historic preservation planning efforts on these campuses to recognize and act on the principle that historic fabric is crucial to campus vitality and identity. However, since the 1960s, there has been an increasing awareness at academic institutions about the importance of treating the campus as an interconnected system which requires comprehensive campus master planning practices to reconcile historic campus resources and new development.

Christine Taylor Thompson, a preservationist and campus planner at the University of Oregon, studied the evolution of early campus planning at several west coast academic institutions and observed that, “to some extent, the history

---

2 Frank Edgerton Martin, “Campus Orientation: From Tree Service to Campus Planning” Landscape Architecture 91(2) (February 2001): 85.
of preservation planning on campuses is as old as campus planning. Historic preservation has not always been recognized as a formal practice, but the idea of maintaining the context of the existing setting was a major factor in many early campus planning efforts.”\(^3\) Despite the recognition of the importance of retaining campus character, up until the mid-twentieth century most campus plans responded to historic fabric only in deciding whether new buildings would or would not continue the stylistic traditions of the existing campus.

As decisions were made on a project-by-project basis about the fate of historic fabric on American campuses in the twentieth century, some campuses developed preservation planning strategies in efforts to include preservation policies as part of a more comprehensive campus master planning process. The following summary is intended to frame this evolution of campus planning in the twentieth century towards a more comprehensive approach to reconcile historic fabric and new design. This discussion will establish the circumstances affecting campus planning in the United States in the twentieth century to show how campus planners at Wesleyan were influenced by national trends in their response to historic fabric and new design.

\(^3\) Christine Taylor, “Planning for the Preservation of the Campus Plan” (Master’s Thesis, University of Oregon, 1990), 69.
Early Campus Planning

The focus on architectural style is evident in the major architectural history literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In *College Architecture in America*, the authors articulate that, “there is no art in which this country has made more rapid strides than architecture, and our institutions of learning should embody this national progress…”\(^4\) Early records of campus design focused on remarkable examples of individual buildings as related to national trends in architectural style. Though some individual campus buildings were recognized for their architectural significance, administrative attempts to preserve campuses as a whole did not evolve until the mid-twentieth century.\(^5\)

One of the major works specifically dedicated to the history of American campus architecture was Montgomery Schuyler’s “Architecture of America Series” featured in the *Architectural Record* from 1909 to 1912. Schuyler’s article on “Brown, Bowdoin, Trinity and Wesleyan,” which appeared in the *Architectural Record* in 1911, describes the significant historic buildings that served as physical evidence of the institutional development of these campuses. Schuyler described the origins of the Wesleyan campus in two institutional buildings that formerly housed a military school in the early nineteenth century. He encouraged

---

\(^4\) Charles Klauder and Herbert C. Wise, *College Architecture in America* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1929), 3. This was one of the first books to analyze campus design specifically.

\(^5\) In the early twentieth century, campus architecture was included in universal discussions of architectural style in major works by the architectural historians of the period. There are many examples of such scholars, including Fiske Kimball who contributed greatly as an architect and writer to the field of architectural history. His works include *A History of Architecture* (1918), *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies* (1922), and *American Architecture* (1928).
uniformity in architectural style at Wesleyan, specifically in the continuation of the
Gothic traditions of the campus’s early buildings. Schuyler praised the
University’s reconstruction of North College, one of the original Military Academy
buildings that had burned, describing the reconstructed building as follows:

in fact, the new North College is the old, only artisticized, while still
resembling itself sufficiently to maintain its sentimental attraction to those
who had known it in its meaner estate, and carried out more thoroughly in
durable material and with far better workmanship than were at the
command of the original builders.⁶

Schuyler’s widely read articles show clear evidence of early twentieth century
attitudes about how academic institutions were characterized largely by their
adherence to architectural styles and models.

Academic institutions relied on traditional architectural models like the
archetypal quad at Harvard and the Yale Row, the later being the style in which
Wesleyan developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Figures
1 and 2).⁷ Though the reconstruction of North College at Wesleyan would not be
so readily accepted as an effort in historic preservation today, the idea of
maintaining the nostalgic quality of the academic campus through the retention of
historic fabric according to stylistic traditions was crucial in developing the notion
that historic fabric should be maintained to ensure this connection for future

---

⁷ These models are described in several works including: Jen Frederick Larson and Archie MacInnes Palmer, Architectural Planning of the American College (New York, 1933) and Paul Venable Turner, Campus: An American Planning Tradition (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1987). Turner is one of the most influential writers on campus planning in the United States and this is his best known work on the topic.
generations. However, there were few planning strategies in place prior to the 1930s to the treatment of existing campus fabric.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, campus plans were used as mechanisms for projecting growth patterns of academic institutions as it became necessary to guide the expansion of the existing campus framework.\(^8\) As institutions whose main mission is education, colleges and universities have always aimed to build cutting edge facilities. This has often led to conflicts over what to do with existing fabric when deciding how to incorporate new designs into historic fabric.

By the 1930s, the need for strategies to guide campus growth was clearly articulated in such works as *College Architecture in America* by Charles Klauder and Herbert Wise. In *College Architecture in America*, the authors discussed the increasing necessity for more comprehensive planning at academic institutions that went beyond the location of individual building sites to consider the whole campus as an interconnected system of historic and contemporary fabric. The authors called for campus plans that would provide “a scheme of disposition of present buildings and designated sites for future ones, so conceived as to coordinate all and render them an integrated whole while permitting expansion of

\(^8\) It is important to note that many American colleges and universities were created through large-scale campus planning efforts, but at some institutions, the character of these early plans were lost over time through additions. However, an equal number of academic institutions, including Wesleyan University, were founded without master plans. Wesleyan was founded in two buildings that previously housed a military school and over time buildings were individually added to the campus. Therefore, Wesleyan never had one major design campaign to which it had to respond or for all future development to be compared with.
any separate unit." Despite the importance of these early campus plans in encouraging a more comprehensive process of campus planning for growth, they did little more than provide a map of how the campus would appear if various projects were completed. Henry Bacon’s 1913 plan for Wesleyan University is one such example of a scheme that included an ambitious map outlining the proposed redevelopment of the campus (Figure 3). However, this plan was accompanied by only a three page document to substantiate the proposed projects. Such plans did not establish a set of principles to guide the expansion of the campus over time and as a result, when the circumstances of the academic institution changed, proposed projects were often abandoned and these plans became obsolete as a result of these changes.

**Campus Master Plans**

In 1933, Jens Frederick Larson and Archie MacInnes Palmer published *Architectural Planning of the American College*, an anthology of campus planning and architecture. The authors noted that though much was written on campus architecture in the early twentieth century, there was a shortage of written material available specifically about campus planning. Larson and Palmer called for studies to evaluate the potential needs of universities into the twentieth

---

9 Klauder and Wise, 23.
10 *Board of Trustees Report-Committee on Buildings and Grounds*, (1913), Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
11 This book was created out of information gathered by the Architectural Advisory Service of the Association of American Colleges from 1915 to 1933.
century and beyond. However, Larson and Palmer continued in the tradition of evaluating campuses based on their adhered to architectural style precedents showing their limited analysis of the campus only for its aesthetic qualities. However, they also called for better organization and connection of campus buildings by declaring that, “many a college has suffered architectural ruin through the practice of erecting individual buildings without regard to the total effect produced upon the campus, or to the larger purposes of the institution.”

This notion of considering the entire campus context was crucial in formulating a design response to existing fabric in planning the academic campus, which would later inform the development of campus preservation planning in the late twentieth century.

The new emphasis on integrated planning at academic institutions encouraged university officials to evaluate existing building and landscape fabric in order to make more conscious decisions about the identity and appearance of the campus as embodied through its design evolution over time. Larson and Palmer’s *Architectural Planning of the American College* was influential in its recognition of the importance of campus context, but it should be noted that they were not advocating for the preservation of historic fabric, though their methods

---

12 Larson and Palmer, 45.
did account for historic fabric as part of a response to the entire campus
context.\textsuperscript{13}

By the middle of the twentieth century, major changes in the role of educational institutions required different methods of campus planning than those employed in the past. Paul Venable Turner described these changes in the educational system as follows:

The complexity of the modern educational institution, in a state of constant change, thus required an equally complex and fluid process of planning. The physical results of this process were inevitably different from earlier campus designs, with their strong formal clarity. To have such clarity would have falsified the nature of the American university of the postwar period- and institution complex, dynamic, and unpredictable.\textsuperscript{14}

By this time, the appearance and function of earlier campus designs were pressured to change in response to enrollment increases that occurred in the second half of the twentieth century. After World War II, funding opportunities were made available to war veterans, which led to unprecedented increases in student population size at American colleges and universities. Enrollments increased again in the 1960s and 1970s as academic institutions began recruiting women and minority students in order to diversify their student populations.\textsuperscript{15}

As post-war expansion pressured universities to grow rapidly in the mid to late twentieth century to accommodate for technological as well as pedagogical

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Turner, 266.
\textsuperscript{15} Turner, 249.
change, historic fabric on academic campuses was often targeted for renovation or building sites for new projects. Up until the 1960s, there were few protocols in place at academic institutions to dictate how historic fabric should be treated. Historic fabric was only addressed when it obstructed campus expansion endeavors, and academic institutions were forced to respond to existing resources. As a result, historic buildings and landscapes have often seen as a barrier to new development and facility upgrades, introducing another layer of complexity to the already burdened process of expanding the academic campus.¹⁶

Many outside of the historic preservation field view historic preservation as a way of restricting options for change in the future, but in fact most contemporary preservationists would argue that freezing an institution at a certain period in time is not the way to preserve its character. Simply preventing future development would mean that academic institutions could not compete for students who have come to expect up-to-date facilities. Historic preservation, when practiced well, can provide a means for evaluating existing fabric to more sensitively determine the best way to allow for campus growth, and consciously prioritizing the significance of campus resources to inform which of these resources must be protected and which may be altered as new facility needs arise.

Campus Master Plans as Mechanisms for Guiding Expansion

The form of campus architecture began to change after World War II as new and innovative “modern” designs replaced earlier reliance on stylistic models to inform the form of new buildings (Figures 4 and 5). In 1946, Henry L. Kamphoefner stated in the *American Institute of Architects Journal* that:

> if our campus architecture is to keep pace with a changing society it must be dynamic...by and large the architecture of our campus has been static. It has clung to false and little understood tradition and expression of the past while trying to solve contemporary problems.17

Changing attitudes about the relevance of historic campus fabric and the lack of free building sites within historic campus cores led to the development of many campus designs that clashed with existing fabric. However, some postwar architects did create innovate new designs while still sensitively responding to historic context.

On many campuses, land at the periphery became equally limited in supply, and by the 1950s, many academic institutions purchased properties in surrounding neighborhoods, which were then converted into institutional facilities. Community concerns over the expansion of academic institutions into surrounding neighborhoods were heard well into the late twentieth century. For example, at George Washington University, a local resident proclaimed that, “we used to say GWU was a small university in the middle of a nice neighborhood…now we’re a small neighborhood on the perimeter of a large

---

This practice led to changes in the relationship of academic institutions and their surrounding communities as they permeated residential neighborhoods and incorporated newly acquired buildings into their institutional landscapes. The diffusion of the campus boundaries led academic institutions to need to respond to surrounding neighborhoods and historic fabric which the institutions themselves had not created. The inclusion of historic private residences as part of an institutional campus helped encourage evaluation of future preservation strategies as these academic institutions were faced with how to respond to all of its historic fabric in new designs.

More comprehensive campus planning strategies were required to integrate historic resources into campus development initiatives. It was not until the 1960s that such comprehensive campus planning approaches were established widely at academic institutions. Richard Dober’s work *Campus Planning* was one of the first to call for the need to create a more holistic campus planning approach that addressed the connection of new designs to historic fabric. Dober suggested ways to control campus development to ensure that the functional goals of contemporary projects would be “aesthetically expressed with least compromise to the past, the present, and the future.”

---

18 Russell, 38.
19 Christine Taylor Thompson, (University of Oregon, Planning Associate), interview with author, March 8, 2006.
20 Richard Dober, *Campus Planning* (Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1963), foreword. In the last half century, Dober has been one of the most prolific writers on campus planning and has published many books related to the subject from the 1960s to the present. Dober presented his
“If, symbolically style was the embodiment of the past, then the plan was an honest search for a future…” and that “it is a plan that offers hope for continuity within change, and a viable campus design.”\(^{21}\) The emphasis of Dober and his contemporaries on the potential of the campus master plan as a tool for guiding the growth of the campus in response to historic fabric was crucial in the late twentieth century in the evolution of campus planning strategies.

One of the major criticisms of campus master plans up until the late twentieth century was their reliance on “fixed-image maps,” which anticipated what campuses would look like a decade or more in the future when large scale projects were completed (Figures 6, 7 and 8).\(^{22}\) These maps were updated each time new projects were undertaken and a visit to any university’s archives will show that not only were these “fixed-image maps” frequently used to visually represent proposed growth patterns, they also proved to be of little use over time because they did not account for unpredictable factors that influenced the actual outcome of campus development projects.\(^{23}\) This approach to campus planning ideas in a guidebook format, intended for use by university physical plant departments and administrators. His works were important for bringing about awareness of these issues, but his books did not provide in-depth analysis about how his ideas can be practically achieved. His other works include *Campus Design* (1992), *Campus Landscape* (2000), and *Campus Heritage* (2005).

---

\(^{21}\) Dober, *Campus Planning*, 34.

\(^{22}\) Christopher Alexander, *The Oregon Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 38. This book was the last in a series of three including *The Timeless Way of Buildings* and *A Pattern Language*, which described the experimental planning process followed at the University of Oregon, and the resulting campus master plan.

\(^{23}\) Thompson interview.
created buildings according to the taste of current leaders and such buildings were not part of a continuum of comprehensive campus design and planning. These campus plans lacked accompanying policy documents outlining principles to guide the proposed development. 24 The “fixed-image map” approach to campus planning only addressed immediate campus expansion concerns on a project by project basis, and failed to establish a process that could be used and adapted to account for the changing needs of academic institutions as they attempted to unify new designs and historic fabric.25

This sort of planning occurred at Wesleyan University beginning in 1957 with the drafting of a Long Range Campus Plan to make recommendations about future development and educational programs of the College.26 Rapid financial growth in the 1950s and 1960s enabled Wesleyan to recruit a diverse student body and eventually the college began a conscious campaign in 1962 to redefine itself as a “little university.”27 In 1964, Wesleyan developed its first major campus master plan document since Bacon’s 1913 scheme (Figures 9 and 10). This new plan was similar to the Bacon plan in that it described a series of planned development projects that would be undertaken at the University to expand its facilities and included a map of what the University would look like once these

24 Alexander, 38.
25 Alexander, 1.
26 Minutes of the Board of Trustees (January 1957):,237, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
27 Potts, xvi.
projects were completed. In contrast to the Bacon plan, many of the projects of the 1964 master plan were actually constructed on the Wesleyan campus, making this plan influential in shaping the physical and ideological development of the institution through the twentieth century. However, Wesleyan’s 1964 master plan was still a proscribed map of what the university “should” look like in the future and still did not establish campus planning policies for addressing the existing campus beyond immediate developmental concerns.

**The Oregon Experiment: A Comprehensive Approach to Campus Master Planning**

One of the first institutions to posit a specific strategy for implementing guiding policies for their campus master planning process was the University of Oregon with the publication of *The Oregon Experiment* in 1973.28 Christopher Alexander and a team of planners from the University of Oregon evaluated the often problematic juxtaposition of campus development projects with existing fabric, including historic resources. The resulting work defined a systematic approach for establishing campus-wide planning principles to guide all future development. *The Oregon Experiment* was utilized as the official master plan for the University of Oregon and was also intended to establish a set of guidelines that could be adapted by planners at other institutions according to their individual needs and circumstances. *The Oregon Experiment* emphasized that,

28 Alexander, 2.
“the plan for the campus is a process rather than a *fixed-image map.*” This concept was crucial a crucial step toward including campus preservation policies in campus planning through the identification of stakeholders objectives for campus expansion. The *Oregon Experiment* encouraged an analysis of the existing campus and the establishment of a comprehensive campus planning approach that considered the campus as a whole through a set of values and principles determined by campus stakeholders, who were beginning to recognize the importance of explicitly encouraging the sensitive integration of historic campus fabric as part of planning for new development. The campus planning process established in the *Oregon Experiment* is still followed today at the University of Oregon and the institution’s new 2005 *Campus Master Plan* emphasizes historic preservation by utilizing the University’s 1914 Ellis Lawrence as a model for future campus development.30

The effect of *The Oregon Experiment* was the development of a campus plan that went beyond the ineffective tradition of producing a transient document that would not hold up to the realities of institutional ownership and development. The new University of Oregon master plan combined the visual mapping of the campus with written guidelines dictating the larger institutional goals and principles, “intended to coordinate the many hundreds of otherwise independent
acts of building."³¹ This was crucial in encouraging historic preservation on the campus because it forced campus planners and stakeholders to consider new projects in relation to past planning efforts and the relationship of new design to existing fabric. *The Oregon Experiment* was meant to be amended so that it would apply to other institutions; however, it was crucial that the work was presented as a specific case study in order to show how the principles of the approach would play out according to the specific circumstances of one academic institution. Alexander specified that “as a book on practice it is more clear, and more convincing, because it is so firmly anchored in the specific details of the University of Oregon.”³² The interdisciplinary approach to campus planning described in *The Oregon Experiment* fulfilled “the need for a new design approach that integrates the grand vision of the original campus plan with current pragmatic requirements on today’s campus.”³³ This comprehensive approach has been incorporated into campus planning strategies at many academic institutions since the 1970s and has challenged campus planners to establish their own strategies for responding to historic fabric by focusing on the entire campus as an interconnected system.

³¹ Alexander, 9.
³² Alexander, 7.
The Campus Plan as an Approach to Historic Fabric

Writings on campus planning in the late twentieth century followed in encouraging the comprehensive approach advocated for The Oregon Experiment. In Campus: An American Planning Tradition Paul Venable Turner emphasized the "new interest in historical traditions of campus planning reflect the growth of the architectural preservation movement in America..."34 Universities have always played an important role in the retention of our architectural heritage, because of the associations between academia and notions of tangible tradition and longevity. However, the historic preservation movement in America increased public awareness about historic resources and articulated the role of institutions as stewards of some of the country's most significant historic resources.35

By the late twentieth century, this increasing awareness of the value of historic resources led to a greater understanding of the need for academic institutions to account for historic fabric when dealing with issues of expansion and change. The amount of literature on campus planning has grown in recent years, as the newest generation of practitioners focuses on meeting the increasing pace of changing needs for new facilities and upgrades to existing buildings. In recent years, campus planners have articulated the further need to

34 Turner, 301. This work records the development of the American campus from its early British influenced designs of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the post modern designs of the twentieth century. It formally surveys the development of American institutions of higher learning as a distinct architectural form.

35 Turner, 301.
apply specific campus planning strategies to reconcile historic assets, future needs, and the complexities of the administrative process at academic institutions. Richard Thompson and David C. Martin are among several contemporary writers addressing the importance of the campus landscape and how historic preservation can be used as a tool to achieve holistic campuses. In an article titled "Campus Architecture is Now Campus Planning" that appeared in *Architecture California* in 1999, they called for a "new design approach that integrates the grand vision of the original campus plan with current pragmatic requirements on today's campus."36

Recent planning efforts, including Scripps College’s evaluation of its historic landscape and its significant contribution to the contemporary campus experience have gone beyond the planning of individual building sites to consider the entire campus as an organic unit, including historic fabric as a major component of campus identity.37 However, Scripps is unusual in this level of consideration of historic resources as a crucial factor in planning; more commonly, historic preservation has not found a comfortable position in the campus planning process at most academic institutions. The harmonious integration of historic and new buildings remains a challenge, despite the recognition of the significance of historic fabric by academic institutions.38

---

36 Thompson and Martin, 20.
37 These campus planning efforts were funded by the Getty Foundation through its Campus Heritage Program.
38 Cooperman.
Therefore, example campuses such as Scripps should become models to show how preservation planning can be utilized as part of a comprehensive campus planning process that considers historic resources as well as new designs as part of an institution’s ever-evolving legacy.

**The Getty Campus Heritage Program**

In 2002, the Getty Foundation began a grant program to “assist colleges and universities in the United States to manage and preserve the integrity of their significant historic buildings, sites, and landscapes.” Since its inception, the Campus Heritage Program has given more than seven million dollars to over fifty college and universities. Recognizing that academic institutions have some of the country’s best examples of institutional design, the Getty program was developed to provide funding options for preservation planning endeavors at historic campuses. Preservation is often a complicated mission at colleges and universities where tight budgets and administrative objectives focus on new development in advancing the educational value of these institutions. Campus Heritage Grants are meant for use in establishing campus preservation planning

---

40 Ibid.
principles that can be applied campus-wide for the protection of historic resources as a means of defining campus identity through historic fabric.41

One of the main difficulties of campus preservation, which programs such as the Getty Campus Heritage Initiative seek to reconcile, is the reality that historic preservation will never be the main concern of academic institutions. Many academic institutions are aware that their campuses have historic resources, but this recognition alone does not prevent historic fabric from succumbing to development pressures. This issue was addressed specifically in a proposal for historic preservation planning for Bryn Mawr College which states that “the reason for this seeming paradox is simple but powerful: the central mission of any educational institution is education, not historic preservation. Preservation is only one of the many values that school must accommodate.”42 This understanding is at the heart of every academic institution, though not always so explicitly stated. Preservation efforts will only succeed if preservation strategies are coordinated with educational concerns in recognition that the educational mission of the university trumps all other concerns.

The Getty Campus Heritage Program marks an important shift in the relationship between campus planning and historic preservation by providing a catalyst through more funding opportunities that encourage preservation planning

41 In some cases, more focused projects are supported through these grants, including landscape preservation planning initiatives.
42 Cooperman.
at academic institutions. Such initiatives as the Getty Campus Heritage Program have placed greater emphasis on including campus preservation as a part of academic institutions’ comprehensive campus-wide planning strategies. A number of academic institutions have developed specific campus preservation plans through the use of Getty Campus Heritage Program grants and these plans articulate the necessity to harmoniously integrate new buildings with historic fabric.

For preservation purposes, the most successful campus plan both articulate the importance of developing preservation strategies and incorporate them, requiring designers and administrators to respond appropriately to historic fabric while still encouraging architectural innovation. The recent increase in the number of academic institutions developing campus preservation planning policies has proven that these institutions are beginning to recognize that historic preservation can serve as a tool to help guide the growth and development of an institution and its public character as a responsible steward of both its historic and contemporary fabric.
CHAPTER 2: WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY’S CENTER FOR THE ARTS: CASE STUDY IN CAMPUS PRESERVATION PLANNING

Wesleyan University is located in Middletown, Connecticut and was founded in 1831. Throughout the institution’s 175-year history, several attempts were made to develop a guiding master plan for the campus, however, few of the University’s twentieth-century campus development projects integrated the significant historic fabric of the Wesleyan campus with new designs as they accumulated over time. Planning approaches were developed and discarded as they proved ineffective at creating a unified and holistic campus through master plans. The Wesleyan campus today remains fragmented as a result of disconnected individual building campaigns that failed to respond to existing fabric. However, one complex at Wesleyan developed out of a major campus planning campaign at the University in the 1960s and successfully integrated new buildings with historic nineteenth-century houses located adjacent to its site.

Wesleyan’s Center for the Arts (CFA) is a rare example of a late modernist design that responded to the scale and form of historic fabric as a means of unifying new buildings within the existing campus. The CFA is a separate and inward facing landscape, constituting an arts village that some have called a

---

“sacred space” within the larger university campus.44 Built by the noted architecture firm of Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates in 1973, the CFA complex is comprised of eleven buildings to house Wesleyan’s departments of Music, Art and Art History, Dance and Theater.45

Today, the CFA complex is considered by some as a significant historic resource, both as an example of innovative twentieth-century design and as a model of the successful response to historic fabric in new design. The Center for the Arts complex was chosen as a case study in campus preservation planning because it is a unique example of responsive campus design at Wesleyan and offers the opportunity to analyze many interesting preservation challenges that have evolved due to the complexity of the Wesleyan University campus and adjacent neighborhoods.

**Development of the Wesleyan Campus and Campus Planning: 1831-1964**

The Wesleyan campus did not develop according to a carefully controlled planning scheme like that of Harvard University and other model academic institutions of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Richard Dober
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44 It is uncertain who first referred to the CFA as a “sacred space”, however this phrase has been used by many at Wesleyan to describe the CFA’s unique qualities. Clare Cooper Marcus describes “sacred” campus spaces as those that “should never be built over or visually encroached upon by neighboring buildings” Clare Cooper Marcus, “Outdoor Spaces for Living and Learning,” *Landscape Architecture* 77(2) (1987): 60.

describes the universality of the Harvard model as follows, “the informal arrangement of trees and grass in Harvard Yard is arguably the oldest campus landscape design theme in the United States-respected, imitated, emulated nationwide.”46 Wesleyan developed in a much more accumulative fashion, which was not unique, as many colleges and universities “were, and still are, built from the very beginning on a piece-meal one-building-at-a-time basis as the need arises. The best of these have controlling master plans, but most do not.”47 The Wesleyan campus developed out of two pre-existing institutional buildings, a Lyceum and Dormitory, constructed in 1824-25 for Captain Alden Partridge’s American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy.48 The Military Academy buildings were situated on a prominent hill above High Street and new buildings were added to this hill-top site in subsequent periods following the college row model as developed at Yale University (see Figure 1). The campus is set within several residential neighborhoods, which consist of groupings of nineteenth-century houses.49

In 1913 Henry Bacon developed a Beaux Arts inspired quadrangle master plan for the University that attempted to bring order to the Wesleyan campus
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48 Potts, 11.
49 Wesleyan purchased several of the 19th century houses in the surrounding neighborhoods of campus over the years to accommodate campus growth and preserve the historic character and residential scale of the campus.
through the addition of a series of buildings around Andrus Field.\(^{50}\) This plan called for a dormitory, library, chemical laboratory and college union as the most urgently needed facilities (see Figure 3). The first three of these buildings were constructed (named Clark Hall, the Olin Library and Harriman Hall), but plans for the college union and other proposed buildings were unfulfilled.\(^{51}\) Bacon responded to existing campus fabric in his relation of new buildings to the existing College Row, however his axial Beaux-Arts plan was difficult to execute within the existing campus framework. Pre-existing buildings like the Fayerweather Gymnasium (1894) did not correspond to Bacon’s axial arrangement, and since most of his plan was never achieved, the result was the insertion of unconnected twentieth-century buildings that did not relate to the scale and arrangement of the campus’s historic fabric (see Figure 3). Bacon’s 1913 master plan had limited impact in shaping the Wesleyan campus because he died in 1924 before much of his plan was fulfilled, leaving the task to his successors. Despite the lack of physical evidence of the influence of Bacon’s plan, the spirit of ambitious master planning that Bacon encouraged at Wesleyan was crucial in developing the notion that the university could shape its future and

\(^{50}\) Phillip Parsons, a consultant hired by President Douglas J. Bennet to assess and make recommendations for the campus in 1997, characterized Bacon as, “Wesleyan’s only true ‘master planner’ and for a number of years its principal architect.” (Phillip Parsons “Wesleyan University: Master Planning Process- Phase I” May 17, 1997). Note that Andrus Field dates to 1898.

\(^{51}\) Bacon’s college union was meant to “serve the college community as a centre of social democratic life,” however, such a facility has yet to be built at Wesleyan. Wesleyan University, “1913 Board of Trustees Report”. Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives, campus planning folder.
strive to integrate historic fabric with new designs to achieve hierarchy and order of the campus.\textsuperscript{52}

In 1925, the firm of McKim, Mead and White were commissioned to do a campus study for Wesleyan. They proposed for the completion of several of the buildings designed by Bacon, and also designs for several new buildings for the campus including an athletic building on the north end of College Row nicknamed “The Cage”, recently demolished as part of contemporary development projects (Figure 11). McKim, Mead and White are well known for their significant design commissions of the early twentieth century including their successful addition of several buildings to Thomas Jefferson’s majestic Lawn at the University of Virginia among others. At The University of Virginia, the firm worked within a clearly organized campus framework, but at Wesleyan they were forced to build within an already fragmented assemblage of buildings and their designs did not make any great contribution to the unification of the campus fabric.\textsuperscript{53}

Despite the drafting of many campus master plans throughout its 175-year existence, Wesleyan University has never fully implemented these plans, largely a result of the changing financial and administrative circumstances that is not un-

\textsuperscript{52} This notion is evident in contemporary planning efforts in progress at Wesleyan today, evidence of the history of the University’s struggle to integrate historic fabric with new designs.

common at academic institutions. Out of the various planning efforts at Wesleyan, three main themes have emerged: the need for a clear campus center, the lack of connections between the campus buildings, and the inadequate campus landscape. By the mid-twentieth century, campus planners were forced to respond to changes in the educational system and facility requirements for college and university campuses as a result of the post-war enrollment influx at academic institutions in the United States.

**The 1964 Campus Master Plan and the Development of the Center for the Arts Project**

The constant cycle of partially fulfilled campus plans had led to a problematic accumulation of unconnected buildings on the Wesleyan campus by the mid-twentieth century. In the 1960s, a new campus planning campaign was begun at Wesleyan to strengthen the University’s liberal arts programming and facilities. The Wesleyan Board of Trustees argued that “unless the liberal arts institutions respond to these fundamental changes in our society, they will be forced to lower their standards for both students and faculty.” Therefore, in 1964 the University embarked on an ambitious campaign to enrich the campus through a series of new building projects.

---

56 Wesleyan University, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, (October 13, 1962), 12. Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
In the early 1960s, Wesleyan’s endowment under President Victor Butterfield, who served as President of the University from 1943 to 1967, was the highest it had ever been and by this time it had already been established that the University was in need of several new buildings including: dormitories, a science building, student union, creative arts building, humanities cluster, upgrades to the Olin Library, a winter recreation facility and physical education facilities.\(^{57}\) The Administration’s 1962 Long Range Plan and resulting 1964 Campus Master Plan (see Figure 9) investigated the educational situation at Wesleyan in order to determine, “what we seek, where we have come, and where we should go.”\(^{58}\)

Because of its plentiful economic resources at the inception of the planning of the arts center, the University was able to encourage an innovative design with every conceivable amenity and advanced technological apparatus for arts education.\(^{59}\)

This plan did not unify the campus and instead created several new facilities at scattered sites on the campus (see Figure 8). However, out of this plan, a design for one self-centered area of campus offered Wesleyan’s first major response to historic fabric.

The Center for the Arts, completed in 1973 and designed by Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates, successfully located new buildings within the historic campus, marking an important shift in Wesleyan’s vision for campus

\(^{57}\) Wesleyan University, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, October 13, 1962, 13, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives. Hereafter MBT.


\(^{59}\) MBT, April 8, 1967, 52.
development in the late twentieth century. This complex materialized during the era of post-war expansion experienced at many college campuses in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. As arts programs grew at institutions of higher learning during this period, so did the understanding of the specialized facility requirements for such disciplines, and new buildings were planned for the arts departments as part of Wesleyan’s 1964 master plan.60

Several themes emerged as architects began to consider the form that the University’s new creative arts facilities should take. One of the most important issues raised was the question of the relationship between the arts center and the university and Middletown communities. During this period, new interest in Wesleyan’s arts, theater and related programs was evidenced by increases in course enrollments, a high quality and innovative arts faculty, and more universally understood recognition of the importance of the arts as a crucial part of a liberal arts education.61 Public access was provided to the University through the arts university performances and gallery shows, requiring the creative arts center complex to be one of the most publicly accessible areas of

60 Facilities were also planned for the humanities, sciences and physical education departments. Wesleyan University. MBT, October 13, 1962, 13.
61 Wesleyan President Colin Campbell speaking on the CFA project in “Wesleyan Looks to Arts Center” unknown article source (November 17, 1971), newspaper article scrapbook on the CFA, Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates Archives. When designed, the CFA was meant to provide facilities for 1000 students. By the time the CFA was completed in 1973, the number of arts students had already increased, due to the rapid expansion of the Wesleyan campus and enrollment in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, the CFA serves almost 3,000 students, and few upgrades have been made to the facility over the years to account for this increase.
Wesleyan’s campus. Creative arts departments perform a prominent role in facilitating the relationship between academic institutions and their respective communities because they welcome the public to the university, permeating the boundaries between these institutions and the communities of which they are a part.

The students and faculty at Wesleyan articulated the need for better arts facilities as early as the 1940s and began a multi-decade campaign to encourage campus administrators to approve their requests for such a building. In 1945, the faculty of the arts, music and theater departments petitioned the University about the inadequacy of existing arts facilities on campus, which were scattered across a variety of ill equipped buildings, including the desolate Class of ’92 Theater.

The appeal for a “Creative Arts Center” at Wesleyan matured through the 1950s and 1960s as faculty persisted in promoting their need for the facility. In 1957, under President Butterfield (Wesleyan University President from 1943-1967), the Wesleyan Board of Trustees established a Long Range Planning Committee to make recommendations about future development and academic programming at the University, including a creative arts center.

62 Today, many community members attend performances at the World Music Hall, Theater, Crowell Concert Hall, Cinema, Davison Art Center (housed in a historic building adjacent to the CFA site), and the Ezra and Cecile Zilkha Gallery. Pam Tatge, (Wesleyan University, Center for the Arts Director) interview with author, October 25, 2005, Middletown, CT.
63 The only other department at a university with equal public access is the athletics department. Tatge interview.
Early proposals for the facility placed all departments in a single building. However from the very beginning there was opposition to this proposal. In 1945, a memo from Joseph Daltry to Henry-Russell Hitchcock, stated, “I’ve gathered…that you are opposed to housing the department of art in the same building as that which houses music and the theatre.”65 In this memo, Daltry went on to establish a list of priorities for the proposed facility including buildings for the fine arts, music, a little theater to seat 300 persons and an auditorium with a capacity for 1,200 persons. As planning began for a facility to meet these needs, opposition grew among faculty members and administrators about whether the departments could be effectively housed in a single building.

The first official design proposed for the creative arts center was presented before 1964 by Clarke and Rapuano, consulting landscape architects for Wesleyan at this time.66 They placed all of the departments in a single building facing Washington Terrace as required by the preliminary program studies conducted by a faculty committee. This design arbitrarily addressed existing historic fabric and made little attempt to connect the new building with its historic site (Figure 12). Locating the arts center in a single massive building along Washington Terrace would have made the arts center a bold imposition on the historic fabric of the site. Clarke and Rapuano’s design placed the arts
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65 Memo from Joseph Daltry to Henry-Russell Hitchcock. August 30, 1945, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives. Hitchcock was a noted architectural historian and professor at Wesleyan at this time.

66 Rapuano had been working with campus officials on several development projects at Wesleyan, including the Foss Hill Dormitories.
center away from the adjacent campus without connecting the building as part of a progressive journey from College Row across Wyllys Avenue. Interestingly, even though Clarke and Rapuano’s design was not chosen for the creative arts center, they were influential in the selection of an architect for the project and in approving the final designs, “to assure the consistency of the new building with the rest of campus.”

In March of 1965, John Martin, a professor of art and architecture at Wesleyan, articulated in an article in the *Wesleyan Argus*, the University’s student newspaper, that the departments of music, arts and theater should be housed “under the same roof.” In this article, Martin described the ideological building as follows: “Each of the departments would be enclosed in a separate wing with the central core of the building serving as a connection. The core would contain a lobby, common library and administrative offices, as well as a main exhibition area.” This program proposed by Martin is significant because it set a framework in which the designers of the creative arts center were required to respond.

In 1965 Kevin Roche of Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates was commissioned to draft a proposal to show a creative arts building might be

---

68 “New Creative Arts Center In Planning Stage; Will Contain Music, Art, Theater Departments.” *Wesleyan Argus* March 16, 1965, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
69 Ibid.
incorporated into the existing campus (Figure 13).\textsuperscript{70} It was stipulated in the correspondence of the Wesleyan Board of Trustees that if Roche provided a satisfactory design for the center that they would hire him to complete plans and specifications for the arts center.\textsuperscript{71} Roche’s designs were unanimously selected by the Board of Trustees in 1965, beginning the almost decade long development of the Center for the Arts.\textsuperscript{72}

\textbf{The Context of Roche’s Design}

In order to comprehend fully the innovative design Roche proposed for Wesleyan, it is important to take a moment to consider his background and the development of his approach to architectural program. Roche achieved acclaim as an architect under Eero Saarinen and upon his death in 1961, Roche and partner John Dinkeloo completed twelve of Saarinen’s unfinished projects.\textsuperscript{73} The successful completion of these projects secured Roche-Dinkeloo’s reputation as a master design firm in the 1960s. For the CFA project, Roche was the primary designer and liaison between the firm and the University.

\textsuperscript{70} Kevin Roche and John Dinkeloo took over Eero Saarinen’s firm upon his death in 1961. Roche and Dinkeloo finished the ten major projects already begun by Saarinen and upon completion of these projects, began their own firm in 1966. Their firm continues today as Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates in Hamden, Connecticut.

\textsuperscript{71} MBT, December 4, 1965, 266.

\textsuperscript{72} “Kevin Roche of Eero Saarinen Firm Will Design Arts Center” Wesleyan Argus (Dec. 3, 1965).

\textsuperscript{73} These designs included such pivotal architectural works as the TWA Terminal at JFK International Airport, the John Deere and Company Headquarters, the St. Louis Arch, and the CBS Headquarters.
One of the defining characteristics of Roche’s work is his careful attention to the context in which his buildings are located. In an interview in the 1980s, he responded to this aspect of his design process when he said:

You begin to realize how the thing is shaped in part by the circumstances. In many cases, what you end up doing is just guiding a building through the forces which form it. You don’t personally form the whole thing because you are not providing the money, you are not providing the labor, you’re simply providing a certain amount of direction.74

Roche’s designs contrast with his late modernist contemporaries, who often designed massive buildings with little regard to the importance of site context and the client.75 Roche utilized the simplicity of modern architectural forms, but rendered these in such a way that unified his buildings within their site context. The successful execution of the CFA design showed how campus buildings could be created with sensitivity to historic fabric instead of creating mega-structures that had little relation to existing site context, which was common practice in the 1960s and 1970s.76

It is important to note that Roche designed two other university arts centers before he was commissioned for the Center for the Arts at Wesleyan. These projects include the Fine Arts Center at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst completed in 1969 and the Power Center for the Performing Arts at the

75 “Kevin Roche Wins Pritzker Prize in Architecture” New York Times (April 15, 1982), Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
76 Turner, 276.
University of Michigan in 1971.\textsuperscript{77} Despite the similar function of these buildings their designs vary greatly, due to Roche’s specific response to the programmatic concerns of their sponsoring institutions. When asked how the Center for the Arts project at Wesleyan related to his other arts center designs, Roche said that it was difficult to compare them because the programs of the centers were completely different and required the creation of unique facilities.

At the University of Massachusetts Fine Arts Center, the building was meant to serve as an entryway into the campus and Roche designed a large-scale building to give the arts center a strong presence. The University of Michigan’s Power Centre for the Performing Arts was built next to a historically significant park area. The program for the arts center required that Roche preserve this park and the resulting design utilized one of the building’s exterior walls to contain this open space.\textsuperscript{78} Roche agreed that the more technological aspects of theater design and the aesthetics associated with these specialized buildings were related for these three projects, but the CFA was the only of these designs shaped in response to historic fabric.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{77} Roche also completed the Denver Center for the Performing Arts in 1980.
\textsuperscript{78} “Sacred Groves: Three University Fine Arts Centers,” \textit{Architectural Forum} (March 1974): 71.
\textsuperscript{79} Kevin Roche, (CFA architect, Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates), in discussion with the author, February, 16, 2006, Hamden, Connecticut.
The Center for the Arts: Design

Roche was given very specific program requirements for the Center for the Arts complex according to the principles articulated by the faculty committee in 1965. These requirements called for the creation of buildings for very specific functions including separate department facilities, a common library, and a central core for the arts center. Roche’s original design for the Center for the Arts was a series of 16 connected buildings to house various music, arts, and theater facilities (Figure 14), including the World Music Hall, which now provides rehearsal and performance space for Wesleyan’s Gamelan Orchestra (Figure 15).

Roche’s design placed the arts, music and theater departments in separate buildings connected through thoughtful landscape features. This was interesting because the program for the center had delineated that the arts departments should be housed in a single building ever since the earliest planning for the center in the 1940s. Roche instead followed the unpopular suggestion of Hitchcock, who first proposed in the 1940s that the arts departments be housed in separate buildings. Roche wanted students to

---

80 The specifics of this program are described in a previous section, see footnote 85. “New Creative Arts Center In Planning Stage; Will Contain Music, Art, Theater Departments.” Wesleyan Argus March 16, 1965, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
81 Wesleyan purchased its Indonesian gamelan in 1964 from the New York Worlds Fair. This series of instruments is played by an orchestra and housed in the World Music Hall. (James Repass, “Bids Are Let for Construction of the 16 Building Arts Center” Wesleyan Argus (September 25, 1969): 1). Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
82 Memo from Joseph Daltry to Henry-Russell Hitchcock. August 30, 1945, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
interact within an enclosed complex of buildings where movement and interaction
between departments was encouraged by a connected arrangement of buildings
and landscape elements.83 This design, which responded to the historic
buildings and tress on the site, was accepted by the University after a series of
iterations, and construction of the Center for the Arts began in 1970.

The period of financial security that Wesleyan experienced in the early
1960s quickly came to an end once President Edwin D. Etherington took office in
1967, and by the time Roche’s designs were approved, changes in the CFA’s
program were already being discussed to cut costs associated with the project,
which were originally estimated at $7 million and climbed to $11.8 million by the
time the complex was completed in 1973.84 All large scale university
development projects were halted at Wesleyan shortly after the CFA was
completed, marking the end of this ambitious building campaign of the 1960s and
1970s.85

The development of the final CFA plan was subject to a long and
complicated compromise between Roche and the university, involving a series of
iterations that changed many significant aspects of his original design. This
editing process continued up until the CFA was completed in 1973, and the
extent of the cuts to his plan resulted in the loss of much of the density that

83 Roche interview.
Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates Archives.
85 No plans for major building campaigns were proposed until the late twentieth century.
characterized Roche’s cohesive complex of buildings and open space (Figure 16).

The most significant change imposed on Roche was the cumulative decision to cut five of his original sixteen proposed buildings. In 1969 the Arts Library, the most prominent building designed for the CFA, was deleted from the plan, drastically changing the overall configuration of his design by eliminating the central focus and density of the inward looking complex. Other buildings removed from the program included the Music Lecture Room, Experimental Theater, and the Music of India building.86 These buildings were designed in careful relation to the existing site and played off the proportions of several nearby historic buildings.

The finished complex, completed in 1973, included the following buildings: Rehearsal Hall, Recital Hall, Word Music Hall, Music Studios, Theater and Dance Studios, Theater, Studios for Painting and Drawing, Studios for Sculpture and Design, Art Lecture and Cinema, Graphics and Film Workshops, and Gallery (Figure 17). Despite the changes imposed upon Roche’s design as a result of financial changes that took place while the Center was being constructed, the CFA still embodies a sensitive responsive to historic fabric.

86 “Trustees Pare Proposed Wesleyan Arts Center,” Wesleyan Argus (April 14, 1970), Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
The Center for the Arts: A Response to Historic Fabric

One of the reasons Roche designed the CFA as a complex instead of a single building was his feeling that it would not be appropriate to place a large building in what were essentially the backyards and gardens of the nineteenth-century houses on the site. Roche had to respond to these historic buildings because he was required to keep several of the historic buildings on the site already in use as University facilities. At the Center for the Arts, Roche designed monolithic stone buildings that fit within the context of the site without overwhelming the pre-existing historic neighborhood setting. This aspect of the CFA design was praised in major architecture journals of the period including a 1975 *Architectural Record* article that described:

The elegant classical proportions of the old houses, lining the street around the campus, suggested reticence, not assertion and, as a result, this concrete limestone cluster of buildings...muses quietly within view of the antebellum beauty of old time architects.

The CFA is set back from High Street behind the Davison Arts Center, which makes its stark form less intrusive within its residential-scale site.

The Center for the Arts was meant to be the destination of the progression from Wesleyan’s historic campus core to the inward facing “village for the arts.”

---

87 A few vacant nineteenth-century houses were cleared before work began on the CFA in order to make room for the planned creative arts center. “Arts Center Clearance Starts Here” The Middletown Press (July 21, 1970), Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates Archives.


89 Mitchell, 8.
Bill Holder, a 1975 Wesleyan graduate, described this aspect of the CFA design in an article appearing in the *Wesleyan University Alumnus*’ commemorative issue on the Center for the Arts in 1984. In this article Holder stated that, “To walk across the street from brownstone and ivied College Row and enter the Center is to step into a peaceful, natural environment that envelopes and transports the visitor far from the bustle of nearby streets.”90 Though the CFA complex was related to the rest of the Wesleyan campus geographically, Roche deliberately separated the complex from the historic campus through a series of walls that he created to contain the CFA and the massing of the buildings along Wyllys Avenue to form a barrier between the CFA and the rest of the Wesleyan campus.91 The separation of the CFA from the rest of the Wesleyan campus is interesting in that Roche responded to the historic fabric of the residential neighborhood on the site, but did not necessarily design the CFA as a direct response to the institutional historic fabric of the Wesleyan campus. However, Roche did clearly respond to the nineteenth-century residential fabric of the immediate CFA site (Figure 18).

The relationship between Wesleyan and its surrounding neighborhoods involves a complicated compromise that has been negotiated over the years of

---

90 Bill Holder, “The Center Celebrates its 10th” *Wesleyan University Alumnus* (Fall 1984): 2, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.

91 Pam Tatge, current CFA director, quoted in Celeste Fowles, “CFA Design Sparks Praise, Curiosity, Criticism.” *Wesleyan Argus* Feb 18, 2000, Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives. Also information about Roche’s intent with the inclusion of containing walls from interview with author, February, 16, 2006, Hamden, Connecticut.
the institution’s development. As Wesleyan acquired surrounding residential buildings beginning in the 1950s, the University was challenged to respond not only to its institutional historic fabric, but also to the historic fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods which the University had not created. Roche was able to provide a perspective outside of the institution and advocated for the retention of the historic features associated with the community, specifically many of the historic trees associated with these nineteenth-century houses.

**Roche’s Response to Historic Landscape Fabric**

Roche’s attention to existing trees is clearly shown in his 1969 plan for the CFA site that marks which trees were to be removed, which were to remain on the site, and which were to have fencing installed in order to protect them as historic resources (Figures 19, 20 and 21). Roche protected many of the historic trees on the CFA site, instead of simply leveling the landscape to make way for his new buildings. This forged a lasting connection with the neighborhood in which the CFA was built, and this relationship is still evident today as the incorporation of these historic trees with the CFA buildings offers a nostalgic reminder of the past residential use of the site.

The pre-existing trees and open space that Roche so carefully preserved became defining features of the Center. A 1973 article from the *Wesleyan University Alumnus* magazine articulated that, “slowly the idea dawns that the

---

huge limestone blocks, which had looked so cold, forbidding, defensive, when
the center was being built, were not meant to dominate but accentuate the
beauty of the trees. Essentially, through his contextual design, Roche called
attention to the important historic fabric by allowing for the preservation of historic
buildings and trees not only for their significance as historic resources, but also
because he believed they were crucial to establishing the responsive character of
his design.93

In 1973/75 Roche submitted a detailed landscape plan for the CFA
including a scheme for a series of pathways as well as planting plans. If carried
out this plan would have further enclosed the complex from the North Field
adjacent to the site and the nearby historic Wesleyan Campus (Figure 22). A
1973 memo from John Martin to Nils Frederickson, Wesleyan’s Chief campus
planner at this time, noted that though no funding was available to implement this
plan, it might be an opportunity for fundraising.94 However, despite Martin’s
optimism, this plan was never fulfilled. The lack of landscaping as part of the
CFA complex was one of the major shortcomings of the project. Without the
intended landscape elements, the courtyard space and connections between
buildings are not fully realized and the lack of these features leaves the CFA with
a slightly disjointed and unfinished feel. When the CFA was built, there was little
recognition of the potential for landscaping to unify such complexes. Instead, the

93 Roche interview.
University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
CFA buildings must rely on the existing nineteenth-century trees and landscape features to enrich the complex.

**The Center for the Arts: Is it a Historic Resource?**

The Center for the Arts should be understood as a significant historic resource at Wesleyan because of its role in shaping Wesleyan’s evolution as an academic institution. This inward facing complex of buildings set within a historic site, functions today as an independent example of responsive design within the greater Wesleyan campus. However, the CFA’s detached relationship with the rest of Wesleyan’s campus fabric has led to it being disregarded in current campus development projects. Roche’s design for the CFA has the potential to serve as a model for campus preservation planning for its unique sensitivity to historic fabric, however, this is not possible until the complex is understood and valued as a significant historic campus resource.

In a *New York Times* article from December 1973, architectural critic Paul Goldberger described the significance of Roche’s design for the CFA as follows:

> Best known for such large scale extravaganzas of glass and structure as the Ford Foundation building in New York, has created a complex of buildings that is neither large in scale nor dazzling in structure…but it is one of the finest pieces of campus architecture of the last several years.  

This article goes on to discuss the position of the CFA within its contemporary architectural context, stating that, “The small buildings are also a refreshing

---

change from the banal, all-purpose cultural centers that both universities and communities have erected all too-easily as monuments to themselves over the last decade. 96 Though the CFA has been celebrated in the late twentieth century as a remarkable example of Kevin Roche’s work, it remains today in an interesting state; not fully understood as historically significant because it is only thirty years old, despite its significant contribution in shaping the experience of the Wesleyan campus. Partially due to the fact that the Center is not yet fully appreciated as a historic resource, several maintenance problems have accumulated at the CFA, requiring action by the University to ensure that the buildings are not compromised.

One of the most devastating shortcomings of the Center for the Arts is that it has not been maintained over the years, since much of the effect of the Center’s monolithic stone buildings rely on the maintenance of their appearance as clean, sleek forms. 97 More programmatic concerns are also evident: very few of the buildings are ADA accessible, many of the mechanical systems are in need of upgrades and signs of decay are beginning to show. Visitors to the CFA have voiced concerns about the accessibility of the site, including the poor lighting, inefficient signage to indicate where the various buildings are located, and the difficulty in navigating the site overall. Minimal upgrades to the CFA’s

96 Ibid.
97 This quality of the CFA design has been articulated in many articles appearing in architecture journals including “Sacred Groves: Three University Fine Arts Centers” Architectural Forum (March 1974):
outdoor lighting, signage and furniture could make the area a much more inviting space to the public and Wesleyan students.

Taking a tour of the CFA on a rainy day shows the visual markers of the buildings’ many physical ailments, including severe water penetration problems (Figure 23). The lack of funding for adequate maintenance has led to far worse problems at the CFA (and other campus buildings) than can be addressed by the reactive approach of developing solutions to problems associated with historic buildings as they arise. One must question the allocation of university funds in light of the massive development projects currently underway on the Wesleyan campus. These new projects point to the fact that existing buildings at Wesleyan, like many other institutions, are easily forgotten as major building campaigns are undertaken to fulfill programmatic needs, instead of maintaining and adapting existing buildings to meet facility needs. Many universities suffer from problems of building maintenance and policies must be set in place to consider the possibility of maintaining and adapt older campus buildings instead of demolishing or neglecting them. Instead, the adaptation of existing buildings should be considered as a more sustainable solution to space issues as well as a means of preserving these buildings while still meeting contemporary programmatic needs.

Though the preservation of buildings like the Center for the Arts, which are highly specialized, would require a difficult and expensive process, the consideration of such strategies is part of responsible stewardship of significant
historic fabric, including the CFA itself and the nineteenth century landscape fabric that was incorporated into the complex. The most irresponsible decision an institution can make as stewards of historic fabric is to disregard a building because of its problems and demolish or change that building before it has been given the chance to survive with required maintenance. The disposable approach to buildings that is often seen today is lowering the integrity of campus architecture and overall character. While not all buildings should be preserved, unless measures are taken to ensure the protection of campus buildings through routine maintenance and the establishment of historic preservation policies, in thirty years the facilities built today will suffer the same fate as the CFA as they are disregarded in order to make way for new construction, despite the increasing recognition of post-war campus designs as valuable and significant historic resources.

The Center for the Arts: Model of the Response to Historic Fabric in New Design

Wesleyan University embodies many of the common difficulties of campus development and historic fabric that have challenged planning officials at academic institutions in the last century. The preservation of campus fabric is often considered secondary to the need for updated facilities as the campus expands to fulfill the increasing needs of incoming students. However, attention to the progressive accumulation of historic fabric on academic campuses often
comes too late and the lack of preservation planning policies for these campuses often leads to the loss of historic fabric.

Roche’s design for the CFA created a model of responsive design and historic fabric in one small corner of the fragmented Wesleyan campus, and surely should have been utilized as a model for development projects at Wesleyan in the late twentieth century. However, the University began to experience financial problems during the construction of the CFA, and budget cuts prevented any major design projects until the beginning of the twenty-first century. Roche’s design is relevant today as the University embarks on its first major building campaign since the 1970s, and the CFA should be recognized for its responsive design and historic significance as a major campus design of the late twentieth century.

Roche’s consideration of historic landscape elements and relationship to site context makes the Center for the Arts an example of a complex well integrated with historic campus fabric while maintaining its own identity as a as an innovative modernist design of the late twentieth century. Sam Stephenson articulated this quality of the CFA project in his introduction to Kevin Roche Architect where he described the complex as “a cluster of small buildings sensitively interspersed in an existing grove of trees. The beautiful 19th century site and buildings on this small campus, far from being spoiled by the new
buildings, have been enhanced by the stark simplicity of their stone cubic forms.\footnote{Sam Stephenson for the Architectural Association of Ireland. “Kevin Roche Architect: The Work of Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates.” (1983): 8.}

The trend of campus architecture in the 1960s and 1970s was to enclose campuses off from their surroundings with little consideration to how the various buildings were connected with each other and to the rest of the campus. Kevin Roche’s design for the CFA proposed an innovative approach to the question of how to build new campus facilities away from the campus core by making his buildings their own separated entities. Thomas Gaines discussed this aspect of the CFA design as follows, “At Wesleyan University, Kevin Roche’s CFA- a campus within a campus- defines its northern edge with severe Indiana limestone boxes. The subtle proportions of the crisp white forms make it work…”\footnote{Thomas A. Gaines, The Campus as a Work of Art. (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1991): 41.} Though the CFA complex is sometimes criticized for being physically separated from the rest of campus, Roche created for the CFA the type of cohesion that Wesleyan had ineffectively been trying to establish on campus since the first planning efforts under Henry Bacon in 1913.

Though much of the Wesleyan campus still suffers from partially realized campus planning and little regard for the importance of the connections between the buildings on campus, the CFA represents a small enclave of successful campus design at Wesleyan. The CFA buildings were designed to serve as a
backdrop against which art works by students and faculty housed in the complex would be created and displayed. Students and faculty members have always interacted with the buildings in the creation of artworks. The new arts facility was meant to encourage improved arts programs at Wesleyan and “the buildings themselves set a new high standard against which all the activities at the center are tacitly measured.”

Alison Gomer, a former Wesleyan student described her experience with the CFA as follows:

There is something really beautiful about the stark, grayish cooler of the buildings contrasting with the color and creativity of projects happening inside. In my drawing and architecture classes, I had to use the buildings in assignments about perspective and proportion, and it was really nice to site in the shade of one of the trees in the CFA on a warm day and draw the buildings.

Roche’s design not only responded to historic fabric, but also created a new interactive and enclosed arts precinct within the greater Wesleyan campus. The design process that Roche posed for the CFA project utilized historic fabric to influence the form and placement of his buildings, reconciling the relationship of the institutional complex within its historically residential site.

Since its completion 23 years ago, the Center for the Arts at Wesleyan has had its share of physical and ideological problems. However, the complex today is a thriving contemporary gathering space where students intimately interact with the buildings and landscape as they participate in Wesleyan’s
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100 Mitchell, 6.
101 Alison Gomer, email correspondence with author, April 12, 2006.
creative arts programs. The CFA is an unusual example of innovative and sensitive campus design from an age not generally associated with such designs, and should be studied further in order to establish its historic significance and preserve the complex as an important campus resource and model for future development.
CHAPTER 3: EXAMPLE CAMPUS PRESERVATION PLANNING STRATEGIES

“The focus and intensity of this review of our built and natural heritage has allowed us to gain greater appreciation of the important resources that are entrusted to our long-term stewardship. As a result, we believe we are in a better position to confront the challenge of preserving our diverse physical campus while at the same time meeting the changing needs of our community.”

Historic fabric is being increasingly recognized as an important element in portraying not only the sense of tradition and venerability of individual academic institutions, but also the reality of one’s participation of those institutions in a grand academic enterprise. With this recognition comes a charge for academic institutions to establish campus preservation practices as responsible stewards of historic fabric that serves the greater mission of these institutions. In this chapter, example campuses will be discussed to illustrate important aspects of campus historic preservation planning in the United States and its place within comprehensive campus master planning processes at academic institutions. The policies and campus planning techniques employed by the example academic institutions will be used in formulating recommendations for preservation planning at Wesleyan University in Chapter Four.

One problem with applying historic preservation principles to campuses lies in the misunderstanding that in order to get what they want universities must build brand new facilities, instead of adapting existing buildings to meet new program requirements. Proposals to preserve historic campus resources are often ill received by campus administrators and those involved in the design of new campus buildings, because they view historic preservation as a means of limiting their options to change existing resources to meet new facility demands. However, historic preservation can be a tool to encourage the owners of historic resources to be more responsible stewards through incentives and regulations, not to prevent new development.

There is certainly no single strategy for encouraging campus administrators and others to accept preservation as a viable campus planning tool. As more institutions develop successful campus preservation planning strategies, they can be used as models to encourage the adoption of similar planning strategies at other academic institutions. To facilitate this process, the Getty Campus Heritage Program provides economic incentives for educating campus stakeholders about the advantages of preservation planning, thereby encouraging academic institutions to consider historic resources as significant contributors to the overall campus experience. The Getty Campus Heritage Program has stimulated the adoption of policies to ensure effective stewardship of historic resources at many academic institutions; encouraging campus
planners to include historic preservation as part of more comprehensive campus planning efforts.

Preservation planning projects funded through the Campus Heritage Program at Scripps College, the University of Virginia, and the University of Oregon will be discussed in this chapter in order to present some of the major principles of campus preservation at American academic institutions. These institutions are remarkable because they have developed specific historic preservation policies and solutions for their campuses in response to universal problems associated with the relationship between campus planning and historic fabric. Though the specific circumstances of each campus are unique, an understanding of the major principles identified in these example campuses is useful in informing recommendations for campus preservation planning strategies at other academic institutions, including Wesleyan University.¹⁰³

**Scripps College- Inventory of Historic Campus Resources**

Scripps College, located in Claremont, California, was designed according to the vision of Ellen Browning Scripps by Gordon Kaufmann and landscape architect Edward Huntsman-Trout in 1926. Eric Haskell writes in an article in the college’s alumni magazine, “their dynamic collaboration produced an academic

¹⁰³ The campuses that are included have been verified as successful models by Robert Melnick, Program Officer, Getty Campus Heritage Program.
Eden whose scale was residential and whose hallmark was elegant simplicity.”¹⁰⁴

The tradition of this design is still strongly felt at the college in the recognition of historic buildings and landscapes as essential components of the overall campus experience. In 2002, Scripps College received a $130,000 Getty Campus Heritage Grant to fund the *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint*, a campus stewardship master plan developed to guide the preservation of the College’s historic fabric.¹⁰⁵

The *Blueprint* Committee, formed to guide the development of the plan, acknowledged the difficulty of drafting a specialized master plan because the committee was required to “focus on the tension between historic preservation on the one hand and the evolving mission of the College on the other.”¹⁰⁶ This tension has been a recurring theme at colleges and universities across the United States as academic institutions seek to reconcile responsible stewardship practices for their aging resources with the realities of the demanding facility needs for institutions of higher education. In 2004, the *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* was completed and includes an extensive inventory of historic resources associated with the College as well as a set of standards and policies for the treatment of historic campus resources. The *Blueprint* is used to guide future development according to the founding

¹⁰⁶ Scripps College Blueprint Committee and Historic Resources Group, *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* (April 2004), 1.
principles of Scripps’ 1926 design and utilizes its extensive inventory for many
campus preservation planning projects and related endeavors.

The main objective of the *Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* project
was to gain a better understanding of the college’s landscape, focusing on, “how
it enhances the campus and leverages the architecture.”\textsuperscript{107} An extensive
inventory of campus resources was completed and now serves as a valuable
database to be consulted in considering the effects of future development
projects on the historic buildings and landscapes of the Scripps campus.
Developing this inventory of existing resources was the first crucial step in
achieving a comprehensive understanding of the character, condition and
significance of the contemporary Scripps campus. It was necessary to first
develop an understanding of the campus resources in order to determine what
areas of the campus can be expanded and which buildings can be adapted
without jeopardizing significant historic fabric.

Misunderstandings about the history of buildings and landscapes at
academic institutions commonly result from inadequate education about campus
history beyond anecdotal accounts of the experiences of past generations. In
order to understand historic fabric and consider it in campus development
projects, institutions must have a basis of accurate documentation of the
campus’s historic fabric in the form of an inventory of existing resources. Such a

\textsuperscript{107} *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint*, 1.
survey ensures that all contemporary and future campus stakeholders, including the community, administrators, faculty, students and staff members, are aware of what resources the campus holds. Inventories offer a means of compiling information about campus buildings and landscapes in an easily understood, authoritative and accessible form to serve a variety of purposes. Inventories can be used to provide factual information about campus buildings at committee meetings, to serve as quick reference for administrators in consideration of new building sites, to aid students in researching individual landscape elements for thesis and related documentation, and many others. Once a framework of existing resources is established, then this information can be used to further an understanding of campus history and identity as embodied through its historic fabric.

The policies in the *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* were established by analyzing and prioritizing historic campus resources based on the inventory conducted. The policies defined in the *Blueprint* are intended to be used as flexible principles to guide campus growth and encourage historic preservation of those landscape and architectural elements that epitomize the campus character at Scripps. This plan consciously breaks from the “fixed-image mapping” approach to campus planning commonly followed in the early twentieth century, by allowing a more flexible application of guiding historic preservation policies to account for the degree of unpredictability in all campus planning processes. The following excerpt from the preface of the *Blueprint*
clearly expresses the campus preservation mission of the Blueprint Committee and is worthy of noting at length:

The Committee therefore offers this report and its recommendations for approval in concept and design intent. No board of trustees can or should bind its successors. This is a matter of institutional integrity. But this report is intended to voice a charge to present and future trustees, faculty, and staff to honor the historic nature of the College’s landscape and architecture and continue developing the campus in the spirit of Gordon Kauffman and Edward Huntsman-Trout who carried out the vision of Ellen Brown Scripps and the early trustees.108

The Scripps Landscape and Architectural Blueprint is evidence of the historic preservation policies that can be created once campus resources have been identified through and extensive inventory of historic resources.

The University of Oregon- Campus Preservation: An Integral Component of Campus Master Planning

The University of Oregon dates to as early as 1876, however, a recent inventory and analysis of the campus determined that the most significant period of development began in 1914 with Ellis Lawrence’s open-space framework plan for the University.109 Recent planning efforts at the University of Oregon have resulted in the development of several new campus planning documents specifically targeted to clarify policies for the treatment of historic campus resources in all major campus development decisions, specifically those resources associated with Ellis Lawrence’s 1914 plan for the University. In 2005,

108 Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint, 2.
109 Ibid.
the University completed its new guiding Campus Master Plan following the Oregon Experiment approach established at the University in the 1970s. This plan is meant to encourage “a process rather than a fixed-image map” to allow for responses to “unpredicted changes” that are guaranteed to occur at the University over time.110 This new plan’s continuation of the campus planning process established in The Oregon Experiment indicates that this comprehensive planning approach is still relevant to the contemporary and future planning objectives of the institution.

In 2005, the University received a $190,000 Getty Campus Heritage grant to complete a campus heritage landscape plan. The Getty grant was specifically used to conduct a cultural resources survey of open spaces and associated buildings, develop landscape preservation guidelines, formulate a series of design scenarios and educate stakeholders about their role in the campus planning process as part of the creation of the Campus Heritage Landscape Plan.111 This document, which is nearly complete, will build on the 2005 Campus Master Plan by providing more detailed information on the campus’s characteristic open-space landscape framework. It is necessary to evaluate the possibility of preserving Lawrence’s open-space framework because the campus is constantly pressured to infill these spaces as it continues to expand.

110 University of Oregon 2005 Campus Master Plan, 2.
111 University of Oregon, Campus Heritage Landscape Plan, project description, November 14, 2005.
The significance of Lawrence’s open-space framework is recognized in the 2005 Campus Master Plan and emphasized as an important feature of the campus landscape. This recognition shows evidence of the campus’s deeply rooted historic preservation tradition; however, rather than using vague terms like “historic preservation” the plan details specific components such as the campus’s “open-space framework.” All planning documents for the University of Oregon are written with careful attention to language, so that even though historic preservation is not necessarily labeled as a separate component of the University’s development projects, it is still recognized as an underlying influence in all efforts. This careful attention to language is important in establishing historic preservation as an intrinsic value at the University of Oregon; inseparable from other goals of campus planning at the institution. Some sections of the 2005 Campus Master Plan do address historic preservation explicitly. For example, one policy on architectural style and historic preservation states that, “the University’s historic buildings and landscapes, which are important defining features of the campus, are artifacts of the cultural heritage of the community, the state, and the nation.” Attention to the language used in planning documents shows that at the University of Oregon campus planners do not treat historic preservation as a “separate mode” but instead link it to the objectives of their
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112 University of Oregon 2005 Campus Master Plan, 8.
master planning process, thereby making historic preservation an underlying component of all campus development efforts.\textsuperscript{113}

\textit{The University of Virginia - Historic Fabric: Value as a Model for Future Campus Development}

Historic buildings and landscapes are essential in shaping the sense of place associated with academic institutions. Therefore, historic fabric is an important aspect of the experience of an academic campus both for those inside the institution and those outside. Historic fabric provides the appropriate setting for solemn academic ceremonies, but must also serve the practical lectures, student meetings and quiet personal moments of contemplation or study. Most institutions are conscious of their historic resources, but few recognize the value of historic buildings and landscapes beyond their use as marketing tools associated with institutional identity.

There is a substantial gap at academic institutions between awareness of historic resources and an understanding of the significance of historic fabric and the proper care required to maintain the value of these campus resources. The majority of campus administrators, facility planners, faculty and students are occupied with educational pursuits and the first priority of these campus stakeholders is not, nor should it be, historic preservation. Therefore, preservationists outside academic institutions are left the task of disseminating

\textsuperscript{113} Thompson interview.
information and advocating for the significance of historic resources as related to past and contemporary campus experiences.

The University of Virginia has been charged with the preservation of its nationally significant landscape and architectural resources since the early years of the campus, designed by Thomas Jefferson in 1817 (Figure 24).114 The inward facing university quad form, traditional at many European academic institutions, was adapted as a model for many American institutions in the nineteenth century but given a more open and flexible form.115 Jefferson’s Lawn at the University of Virginia is one such example of the adaptation of European campus models. At the University of Virginia, Jefferson left and open vista to the south end of his quadrangle-inspired Lawn to symbolize the University’s potential to extend into its surrounding communities in the future.

The University of Virginia Lawn is one of the most widely celebrated campus landscapes in the world, and is one of the only historic resources in the United States included on the UNESCO World Heritage List.116 The unquestionable significance of the Lawn has required that all subsequent development projects for the University Grounds since Jefferson’s time must consider the integration of new design elements in relation to the historically

114 It should be noted that the University of Virginia campus is known as the Grounds, a term coined by Thomas Jefferson in the nineteenth century
significant campus fabric. However, development efforts have had varying results in responding to Jefferson’s significant model over the last century. One campaign is notable because it successfully added to the Lawn without compromising Jefferson’s founding vision for this significant campus landscape. (Figure 25).

McKim, Mead and White’s 1898-1910 plan for the University of Virginia included the insertion of Cabell, Rouse and Cocke Halls at the South end of the Lawn, which forever changed Jefferson’s Academical Village, and forged an ideological and physical separation of the University from its surrounding neighborhoods. These changes were controversial at the time and many contended that they contrasted too greatly with Jefferson’s founding vision for the University. However, McKim, Mead and White’s design was particularly sensitive to the historic fabric of the Grounds by carefully incorporating new buildings into the historic fabric of the University Lawn. For example, Cabell Hall was built into the steep slope at the south end of the Lawn in such a way that this five-storey building did not spoil the scale and axes of Jefferson’s original design (Figure 26).\textsuperscript{117} Today it is arguable that the changes made to the Lawn by McKim, Mead and White appropriately addressed the physical realities of the University of

\textsuperscript{117} This information is from an unpublished draft version of the University of Virginia Historic Preservation Framework Plan, obtained with permission from Julia Monteith (University of Virginia, Land-Use Planner) March 27, 2006.
Virginia Grounds by innovatively adapting Jefferson’s design in order to meet the changing needs of the University community as it had evolved over time.\textsuperscript{118}

McKim, Mead and White’s plan for the University of Virginia was much like Bacon’s plan for Wesleyan in the early twentieth century for its attempt to incorporate Beaux-arts planning principles into the University campus. At Wesleyan, much of Bacon’s Beaux Arts plan was never realized; whereas at Virginia, where the Grounds had already developed from a coherent planning scheme, McKim, Mead and White’s plan was carried out to completion. The redevelopment efforts at Virginia in the early twentieth century had a much greater physical influence over the development of the academic campus than parallel efforts at Wesleyan, showing how the character and circumstances of an institution’s campus affects its ability to execute campus development campaigns.

Recent campus planning at The University of Virginia has concentrated in the protection of historic campus fabric through a variety of campus preservation planning efforts. In 1997, the University of Virginia Landscape Master Plan was developed by Michael Vergason Landscape Architects and Ayers Saint Gross. This plan, though never officially adopted by the University of Virginia, made influential observations about the contemporary value and evolution of the

\textsuperscript{118} Wilson, 55-58.
University. In the introduction to the *Landscape Master Plan* the authors articulated that:

> the Academical Village of the University of Virginia is an exemplary model of coherent planning in the integration of landscape and buildings. It has become a powerful singular icon of a timeless place, embodying countless patterns of spatial design and articulation [however], as the University has grown, the delicate integration of landscape and buildings has diminished.119

It is important to consider that although Ayers, Saint, Gross also drafted Wesleyan’s master plan, these two projects do not share the same approach to historic fabric. At Wesleyan, where the historic significance of the campus’s historic fabric has not been studied as carefully, the plan makes little attempt to respond to historic fabric in the development of new designs. However, at the University of Virginia, where the significance of the campus’s historic fabric is unquestionable, the firm carefully considered historic fabric as part of the redevelopment process.

The University of Virginia’s Office of the Architect received a Getty Campus Heritage Grant in 2003 to complete the *Historic Preservation Framework Plan* for the University in order to comprehensively document the evolution of the Grounds. In 2004, the Office of the Architect was reconfigured with the addition of a specialized historic preservation planner and a land use planner to the Office’s staff. As a result, the Office of the Architect is now able to
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119 Michael Vergason Landscape Architects and Ayers Saint Gross, *University of Virginia Landscape Master Plan* (drafted 1997), 1. This plan was never officially adopted by the University of Virginia.
employ the expertise of these planners in the development of such documents as the *Historic Preservation Framework Plan*, which is nearing completion. The *Historic Preservation Framework Plan* is similar to the *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* in its ambitious documentation of the architectural and landscape history of the University. Once the *Historic Preservation Framework Plan* is completed, it will inform a new comprehensive master plan, called the *Grounds Plan*, which is currently in the beginning stages of development by the University of Virginia’s Office of the Architect. The *Grounds Plan* will analyze the development needs of the University Grounds required to support academic growth and will analyze projected development for the next twenty years.\(^{120}\)

The recent comprehensive campus master planning efforts at the University of Virginia are an excellent example of how historic fabric can be incorporated into campus master planning and development efforts. Both Jefferson’s Lawn and McKim, Mead and White’s additions to the Grounds have served as models of successful campus planning at the University of Virginia throughout the last century, and should continue to be adapted to inform campus development efforts at the University as well as other similar academic institutions in the United States.

\(^{120}\) All information about the *University of Virginia Grounds Plan* and the *Historic Preservation Framework Plan* was obtained from Julia Monteith (University of Virginia, Land-Use Planner), telephone discussion with the author, March 27, 2006.
Summary

Historic preservation will never become a fully utilized component of campus planning until preservation policies and creative mechanisms are collectively established. Policies to ensure the maintenance and preservation of significant historic resources must not only be adopted but must also be related to the educational missions of academic institutions. Only when such policies are in place will campus preservation become an important contributor to campus planning at American academic institutions.

The campuses discussed in this chapter only offer a glimpse of the issues complicating campus preservation agendas at academic institutions in the United States. Many of these institutions share a concern for their historic resources, but are not informed about the best strategies for adapting and maintaining their campuses as they instead concentrate efforts on developing strategies to address immediate needs associated with the ever-evolving nature of academic institutions. Even if colleges and universities acknowledge the significance of their historic fabric, they may not have policies in place to ensure proper attention and care of these resources. The institutions discussed here as examples have established a series of campus planning policies and standards by which all new design and rehabilitation must follow at their respective campuses. The drafting of such policies is a necessary step in articulating the values of historic resources at academic institutions and establishing a comprehensive campus planning approach that is consistent with historic preservation efforts.
The three campuses discussed above offer examples of campus preservation strategies grounded in the specific circumstances of these historic campuses. However, the objectives of campus preservation planning chosen for discussion are universal and include the importance of: establishing an inventory of historic resources, recognizing historic preservation planning as an integral component of the campus master planning process, and celebrating the value of historic fabric as a potential model for future campus development. Each of these valuable principles can and should be applied in developing preservation strategies at all historic campuses, including Wesleyan, by adapting these principles to address specific circumstances of the academic institution and its campus.
“Lying ahead are decisions on the fate of the thousands of college and university buildings erected in the last half of the mid-twentieth century. Their physical quality may not merit capital reinvestment because of expedient designs and construction compromised by inadequate funding. Are there reasons to extend their life, explicit or implicit, because of their heritage value?”

Wesleyan University’s current campus planning strategies do not emphasize enough the importance of its existing resources and their potential to shape campus development projects. The lack of historic preservation policies as part of Wesleyan’s campus planning process needs to be addressed so that significant campus resources are not compromised by the University’s substantial redevelopment campaign currently in process. Analysis of historic campus fabric should involve a rational process of evaluation according to well-defined criteria in order to determine a hierarchy of historic significance of campus resources. The CFA is significant both as a valuable example of late-twentieth-century campus design and for its ability to serve as a model for contemporary and future campus development efforts at Wesleyan in its response to historic fabric.

Current redevelopment of the Wesleyan campus under the *2002 Campus Master Plan* by Ayers Saint Gross, does not respond to the scale, materials and

---

character of Wesleyan’s existing fabric, placing large-scale non-contextually driven buildings amidst a collection of nineteenth and twentieth-century designs. The goals stated for the master plan are as follows, “to create a firmly-rooted sense of place, a well-connected community, and reaffirm the Wesleyan Identity.”\textsuperscript{122} However, these goals are never thoroughly defined and do not appear to be based on a thorough assessment of the existing campus framework because they do not address historic fabric as part of the reality of the Wesleyan campus. Wesleyan’s historic resources have been celebrated in the past as examples of significant designs from several different periods. However, the new 2002 Campus Master Plan does not address the importance of historic fabric in framing the identity of the Wesleyan campus. Therefore, unless historic fabric is re-evaluated for the 2002 Campus Master Plan, recent development efforts will do little to establish long-term campus planning and historic preservation strategies for the institution in response to the institution’s significant historic fabric.

The following will revisit example preservation planning strategies discussed in Chapter Three in order to analyze universal issues faced by academic institutions in evaluating their historic resources and how certain strategies employed at these example campuses might be utilized in developing a campus preservation approach for Wesleyan.

Historic Resources: Identification and Education

One way that historic preservation advocates can become involved in the campus planning process is through the development of an inventory and analysis of campus historic fabric. As a part of the Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint, the completion of such an inventory helped raise new awareness about the characteristic historic landscape at Scripps that plays a major role in defining the institutional character of the College. By placing special emphasis on the campus landscape, the Blueprint committee produced planning documents that went beyond the identification of iconic historic buildings to consider the landscape elements that equally contribute to the celebrated historic character of their campus.

The purpose of the Blueprint was to “document the history, existing conditions, significance, and integrity of the Scripps College campus as a cultural landscape and to propose appropriate treatments for the continued maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation of the buildings and grounds.” The ambitious mission of the plan required the considerable investigation and analysis of existing campus resources as a means of identifying and educating students, faculty, and community members about Scripps College’s historic resources. The educational component of the Blueprint makes it a useful tool for
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encouraging wider awareness about the campus’s historic fabric, especially historic landscape features, which are often overlooked when new development projects require land and open-space for campus expansion.

It is not enough for college and university historians to understand the significance of historic resources and the social, physical, and ideological mechanisms that allowed for their construction and continued use. This information must be disseminated so that all stewards of the campus’s historic fabric develop an understanding of the historic significance of campus resources and their relevance to their contemporary campus experience. The *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* is an example of how campus master planning documents can provide campus planning policy recommendations as well as a record of the developmental history of the institution and its campus. By including this information as part of the College’s major planning document, it emphasizes the connection of current and future campus development projects to historic fabric, and reminds stakeholders about the historical values of the campus that should not be compromised to accommodate campus growth.

At Wesleyan, like many other academic institutions, historic resources only seem to undergo scrutiny on a project-by-project basis, as the land on which they sit is coveted for new building sites and existing historic resources are considered for demolition. The most pressing problem at Wesleyan is the fact that no comprehensive efforts has been taken to inventory and evaluate, and
therefore to prioritize historic campus resources and prioritize preservation and maintenance projects for them, which means that in the future significant campus resources may be lost. Rather than utilizing historic preservation only when historic fabric is threatened, historic resources should be inventoried and analyzed early on in the planning process for every new project.

The *Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint* represents a logical method for responding to historic fabric as part of Scripps’ comprehensive approach to campus master planning. Through the College’s careful inventory and analysis of existing campus resources, they have established a record and hierarchy of historic fabric to inform future development. This has led to a better understanding of the historic Scripps’ campus, and the inventory and analysis will be utilized as a tool in all future campus planning. This method of inventory and analysis of campus resources might be useful at Wesleyan to ensure that the significance of historic fabric is understood and prioritized as part of the effort to balance the preservation of historic fabric and new designs to meet contemporary and future campus needs.

**Historic Preservation: A Core Value of Campus Planning**

Once historic resources are identified and evaluated to determine their historic significance contemporary and future role in the overall campus experience, it is possible to develop campus preservation planning policies to guide the treatment of historic fabric. One lesson to be learned from campus
planning at the University of Oregon is that historic preservation should not be called out as a separate objective from those of the campus master planning process. The University of Oregon’s policy on architectural style and historic preservation in its 2005 *Campus Master Plan* emphasizes the important quality of historic buildings and landscapes as cultural artifacts that define the campus experience. As part of preservation planning efforts, a hierarchy of historic campus resources identified and evaluated in the first step should be established based on significance so that campus planning decisions can be made to determine the appropriate balance of preserving historic fabric and new designs to meet contemporary and future campus needs. Once this hierarchy of historic fabric is evaluated, preservation policies and strategies can be employed as part of the campus master planning process in order to encourage the development of new projects with attention to valued historic fabric in order to integrate new buildings and landscapes into the existing campus framework.

If historic preservation is to be made a contributing component of the campus planning process at any academic campus, then it must support the main educational mission of the academic institution. Christine Taylor Thompson articulated in a recent interview that historic preservation is just one element to be considered in any campus development project. She expressed the need to consider all of the factors influencing campus development in order to determine the best plan of action, instead of concentrating on individual factors, which

---

125 University of Oregon 2005 Campus Master Plan, 8.
inevitably causes conflicts.\textsuperscript{126} Historic resources are just one of the factors that influence campus development and must be considered along with factors such as funding, the need for upgraded facilities, and the overarching education mission of the institution. However, once historic preservation is determined to be an integral component of the campus planning process, it will be considered along with all of these other influential factors, allowing historic preservation to guide campus development efforts.

The development of a sustainable approach to campus planning at Wesleyan will require not only the drafting of historic preservation policies but also a new awareness about the crucial connections between new projects and existing fabric. It has taken almost thirty years since the \textit{Oregon Experiment} was first proposed for the University of Oregon to integrate the historic preservation of historic fabric into its campus master plans. This process also requires the support of campus stakeholders in consistently advocating for the careful analysis of new development projects to ensure sensitivity to historic campus resources.

At Wesleyan, and many other academic institutions, the lack of integration of new designs and historic fabric over time has led to an incoherent campus framework in which current designers must respond. Historic preservation is a useful tool for campus planners, especially when considered at the inception of

\textsuperscript{126} Thompson interview.
campus redevelopment projects as an option for guiding the integration of new designs within the existing campus context. By making historic preservation a core objective of campus planning at Wesleyan, it will become an inextricable part of the campus planning process, ensuring that historic resources are not compromised and that the value of historic preservation is considered in all campus development projects.

**The Need for a Comprehensive Campus Plan**

The most prominent campus planning problem at Wesleyan since the founding of the institution in the late nineteenth century has been the lack of a coherent campus plan to guide expansion of the campus in response to existing fabric. Though several attempts were made, including the Bacon Plan of 1913 and 1964 Campus Master Plan, none of the grand schemes proposed were ever carried out to completion. Wesleyan followed the same “fixed-image map” approach to campus development that was discussed at the University of Oregon. These maps dictated what the university “should” look like in the future, but did not accommodate for unpredicted changes that took place, including the dramatic increase in student enrollment after World War II.\(^{127}\)

---

\(^{127}\) Problems with this so called “fixed-image mapping” approach have been addressed at length in the discussion of the development of The University of Oregon’s *Oregon Experiment* approach to campus planning. It is important to note that the Ayers Saint Gross firm has made significant contributions to campus preservation in the past, but their plan for Wesleyan does not comprehensively address issues of campus planning and historic preservation. This may be partially due to the specific requirements imposed upon the firm by Wesleyan University, however the planning effort undertaken by Ayers Saint Gross at Wesleyan is not an example of the firm’s best work.
created to accommodate Wesleyan’s increased need for specialized facilities like the CFA in the late twentieth century. However, no guiding campus planning principles were in place to guide development and the treatment of historic fabric. These “fixed-image maps,” created to remedy immediate campus expansion needs like the 1952 plan at Wesleyan (see Figure 6), did not address historic fabric and were often abandoned as the University’s needs for improvements changed rapidly in the twentieth century.

The campus planning developed at the University of Oregon focuses on the establishment of universal campus planning principles to guide and shape campus growth, instead of prescribing exactly how the campus should physically appear in the future. The 2005 University of Oregon Campus Plan articulates that “the plan for the campus is a process rather than a fixed-image map.”\textsuperscript{128} Planners worked with campus administrators, staff, students, and faculty to develop a series of principles and establish a comprehensive campus planning process for this plan that would permit unpredictable changes over time. By acknowledging its historic campus landscape framework as a model for future growth, the University of Oregon emphasized the relationship of new buildings within a historic framework, making it possible to establish policies to shape future development efforts in the continuation of the campus’s celebrated “open-space framework” tradition.

\textsuperscript{128} University of Oregon 2005 Campus Plan, 2.
This idea of campus planning as an ever-evolving comprehensive process, building upon past models, could be adopted at Wesleyan in order to reverse the trends in campus planning that have resulted in unfulfilled master plans and the accumulation of buildings that do not respond to existing fabric. Should Wesleyan adopt an approach similar to the comprehensive campus master planning practiced at the University of Oregon, then new designs would be developed according to guiding principles in order to integrate new projects with historic resources. Once such planning principles are established at Wesleyan then potential conflicts between new development and existing resources can be analyzed campus-wide instead of only addressing historic fabric on a project-by-project basis.

Wesleyan’s current campus redevelopment campaign lacks attention to and understanding of the University’s rich historic fabric. Several new buildings are currently under construction as part of Adam Gross’ campus master plan completed for Wesleyan in 2002.\textsuperscript{129} Areas of the campus are in the midst of demolition and construction work, including a site directly across from the Center for the Arts where a new University Center and University Museum are to be located. These new projects are being undertaken as part of a grand campus renewal campaign with the objectives to improve and unify the campus and reaffirm its identity. However, though these objectives are declared in the plan, it

\textsuperscript{129} Adam Gross is a principle of Ayers Saint Gross, an architectural planning and design firm that specializes in Campus Planning, Academic Buildings, Student Life Facilities, and Town Planning.
offers little guidance for how these goals will be achieved through campus planning policies. The plan’s minimal reference to the campus’s significant historic fabric is problematic, because it is a crucial part of Wesleyan’s campus identity. The plans declare that areas of the Wesleyan campus are “distinctive” and “disconnected” but do not offer clarification of these terms or solutions for addressing these observations.\footnote{Ayers Saint Gross, 2002 Wesleyan Campus Master Plan, available online, http://www.wesleyan.edu/masterplan/mpprocess.htm.}

The Center for the Arts is included as one of Wesleyan’s “distinctive” areas in the plan, but new projects proposed in this plan offer no connection or response to the CFA, despite the close proximity of several proposed buildings sites. Wesleyan’s lack of established principles about the treatment of historic fabric is evident in the new University Center project currently under construction near the CFA. There is little recognition at Wesleyan of the significance of the CFA as an example of unusually responsive post-war campus architecture, its place in the development of campus arts centers nationwide, and its association with architect Kevin Roche.\footnote{The reason the CFA is not recognized as a historic campus resource is largely due to current debates in the field of preservation about the treatment of buildings and resources of the recent past. However, due to the limited scope of this thesis, the preservation of the recent past issue will not be discussed in detail. See Lawrence Biemiller, "Preservation Decisions Vex Campus Planners: Deans Want New Buildings," The Chronicle of Higher Education 48, no.43 (2002): A24-6; Scott Carlson, "Colleges Struggle with a 60's Legacy: Ugly, Wasteful, and Outdated Buildings," The Chronicle of Higher Education 47, no.49 (2001): A23; Deborah Slaton and Rebecca Shiffer, eds, "Preserving the Recent Past," (Philadelphia, PA: 1995; "Preserving the Recent Past," CRM: [bulletin] 18, no. 8 (1995): whole issue; and "Preserving the Recent Past," Progressive Architecture 55, no. 7 (1974): 48-79, 96-103.}
understood as a significant campus resource, and therefore, is not integrated into current development projects, which may prove problematic for the Center in the near future.

The proposed Suzanne Lemberg Usdan University Center will be a large-scale building located adjacent to the CFA site. This building responds to Bacon’s 1913 plan for the University in its location around the perimeter of Andrus Field, but forges as aggressive relationship with the inward-facing and residential-scaled CFA complex (see Figures 3, 27-29). The juxtaposition of these two drastically contrasting precincts may detract from the appealing aesthetic qualities of the CFA, by dwarfing the CFA and compromising its inward facing character and sensitive response to its historic site. There appears to be no conscious consideration of the Center for the Arts as part of the campus renewal projects proposed for Wesleyan, though interestingly the 2002 Campus Master Plan identifies this complex as a “distinctive” area of the Wesleyan campus.

In order to protect historic resources and allow for innovative new development projects, Wesleyan must develop a comprehensive campus planning approach. The first step in establishing such a process will be to locate and gather stakeholders from within the university to determine the essential values of the University campus. Outside experts and interested parties may also provide insight into the value of Wesleyan as both an academic institution and community resource. Once the objectives of the University’s administrators,
students, faculty and staff are articulated, then policies can be created to ensure that all future expansion and rehabilitation projects adhere to a universal set of guidelines that will monitor new development to ensure that it is consistent with identified preservation objectives.

The current master plan being followed for the campus renewal project at Wesleyan is not even a true master plan according to traditional models; no actual document has been produced by Ayers Saint Gross, and instead the concepts of the plan have been expressed through a series of PowerPoint presentations, a website and a campus map created to show the location of future building sites. A statement on Wesleyan’s Campus Master Planning website promises that a series of guidelines will be formulated according to Gross’ assessment of the campus, however, construction work has already begun on several of the campus redevelopment projects, and no official planning document has been presented outlining the policies and guidelines of these redevelopment efforts. Therefore there is no tangible record of the overarching goals of contemporary campus development efforts or a record of the objectives of these projects for campus planners at Wesleyan to consult and adapt in the future. It is important for an institution to clearly articulate the principles that will guide future growth, especially if there is to be any consideration of historic preservation. Without a clear set of flexible guidelines and policies, the efforts of the current administration at Wesleyan may not be

---

132 Wesleyan Campus Master Planning website.
continued by their successors, which will continue the insufficient planning
tradition of drafting new master plans every ten years without considering it the
connection of contemporary planning efforts to the evolution of the University
campus and its campus planning objectives over time. Planners and
administrators at Wesleyan might consider the historic evolution of the Wesleyan
campus in order to determine what methods have proven successful and which
have failed to achieve campus planning objectives in the past in order to inform
contemporary strategies.

The 2002 Campus Master Plan responds to historic fabric in a well-
intended but ineffective way. For example, the location of the University Center
building around the perimeter of Andrus Field as dictated by Bacon’s 1913 plan
for campus expansion, responds to an aspects of this historic plan that was
never realized at Wesleyan. Therefore the declaration that the 2002 Campus
Master Plan in fact responds to historic fabric is misinformed, since the plan does
not actually address historic fabric as built, but instead focuses on the past
intention of a major campus plan that was never fulfilled at Wesleyan. Overall,
the new campus master plan does not offer a comprehensive assessment of
historic campus resources, nor does it prioritize the preservation of these
resources according to their significance and contribution to the character of the
campus. In contrast to preservation planning principles, new building designs
that have developed out of the 2002 Campus Master Plan encroach upon
Wesleyan’s existing campus resources and even require the demolition of
historic resources in several areas. Therefore, until historic fabric is evaluated through a comprehensive inventory, the drafting of a campus master planning documents is an exercise in futility. A more comprehensive planning approach would involved the development of an extensive inventory to analyze the historic significance of campus resources, which will then inform the formation of campus preservation planning policies at Wesleyan

**Recognition of Successful Models to Guide Future Growth**

Richard Guy Wilson, Commonwealth Professor of Architectural History at the University and distinguished scholar on the architecture of the University of Virginia, articulates that the experience of the Lawn at the University of Virginia, “As with many great masterpieces…is open to various interpretations, eliciting over the years reactions ranging from admiration to dismissal; some hail it uncritically while other question the design and whether it serves its purpose. These perceptions come from many perspectives: visitors, architects who have tried to make additions to the original composition, and historians who have attempted to discover its meanings.”\(^{133}\) The Lawn was originally designed by Thomas Jefferson in 1817 to symbolize his educational ideals, and in the early twentieth century several buildings were added by McKim, Mead and White to meet expansion needs at the University. It can be argued that the addition of buildings to Jefferson’s Lawn by McKim, Mead and White at the University of

\(^{133}\) Wilson, 47.
Virginia is the ultimate example of campus design in response to historic fabric, and serves as a model of responsive campus development. The firm sensitively added to the campus landscape without compromising the character of the sacred Lawn, and these additions have since achieved historic significance on their own, adding another layer of complexity to this model.

At the University of Virginia, the integration of new buildings into the existing Lawn required an adherence to the stylistic characteristics of this significant landscape, since the Georgian campus is clearly connected through this aesthetic. However, at Wesleyan, where there is a much greater variety of campus fabric, stylistically innovative designs like the CFA are appropriate responses to the campus’s variety of nineteenth and twentieth-century historic fabric.
CONCLUSION

Roche’s design for the CFA provides a potential model for future development projects at Wesleyan for its forward thinking attention to existing historic resources and site context. Roche innovatively designed a complex that fit within existing historic landscape and architectural resources and carefully retained essential site characteristics while creating a complex of buildings that were thoroughly original in design. As the lack of preventative maintenance and current campus redevelopment threatens the characteristic qualities of the CFA complex, it is crucial to realize the significance of Roche’s design. Wesleyan’s Center for the Arts is certainly worthy of historic preservation based on its pioneering, preservation-minded design, and the overall character of the Wesleyan campus would benefit from the protection of this historic resource and others through the development of campus-wide preservation strategies.

Campus planners and administrators at Wesleyan and other institutions of higher learning need to encourage designers to create dynamic landscapes and buildings like the CFA that are respectful to the existing campus context but innovative in their response. New campus designs should be encouraged in the tradition of historic models, not as historicism driven copies of these historic resources. In order to identify these models, stakeholders must develop an understanding of the evolution of the campus through an analysis of existing fabric and the successes and failures of past campus planning campaigns.
Once historic resources such as Wesleyan’s Center for the Arts are more widely understood for their significance in shaping the development of the academic campus, then they will be able to serve as models to inform new designs, as is characteristic of the Lawn at the University of Virginia. Therefore, the CFA complex should not be left to deteriorate because it is an underappreciated product of the recent past, but actions should be taken to preserve this valuable campus resource so that it will remain as a model of successful campus preservation planning for its response and retention of historic fabric to inspire future campus development campaigns at Wesleyan.
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


"Board of Trustees Report." Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University, 1913.


Edmundson, Mark. "The Ideal City: If the Lawn at the University of Virginia doesn't play the role that Jefferson conceived for it, is it really one of America's greatest spaces?" Historic Preservation 51, no. 3 (1999): 34-37-89.


*Scripps College Landscape and Architectural Blueprint.* Claremont, California: Scripps College Blueprint Committee with Historic Resources Group, April 2004.


Figure 1: View of College Row, Wesleyan University, looking East, c.1873.

This photograph was taken from what is now Andrus Field. Notice South College (1825), the small building directly in center of the row. This is the oldest building remaining on campus and was part of the Military School founded on the site in 1825.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 2: Existing Campus Plan, Wesleyan University, 1871-1907.

This plan shows the Wesleyan campus before major campus planning campaigns took place in the early twentieth century.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
This early plan for Wesleyan proposed the construction of twelve new buildings, eleven of which were to be located around Andrus Field (numbers 7-18). Only three of these buildings were constructed: Olin Library, Clark Hall, and Harriman Hall. Notice Fayerweather Gymnasium, the building that appears to be off-axis with the rest of the plan. Fayerweather was aligned with Wyllys Avenue and does not follow the axial arrangement around Andrus Field that Bacon proposed.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 4: Memorial Chapel, Wesleyan University, 2006.

Built in 1871, the Memorial Chapel is one of Wesleyan’s oldest buildings and is prominently located on College Row. This building was renovated in 2003.

Photograph by Gretchen Hilyard, February 2006.
Figure 5: Center for the Arts, Wesleyan University, looking North, 2006.

View looking North into the Center for the Arts complex. Notice the stark contrast of these monolithic structures to the late nineteenth century designs of early Wesleyan buildings like the Memorial Chapel in Figure 3.

Photograph by Gretchen Hilyard, February 2006.
Figure 6: Proposed Site Development Plan, Wesleyan University, 1952. Arrow locates Clarke and Rapuano’s proposed creative arts center building situated on the current Center for the Arts site. This “fixed-image map” was meant to show how the University would develop in the late twentieth century, however, the creative arts center building is an example of one of the proposed designs that was not built according to its original scheme. 

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 7: Proposed Site Development Plan, Wesleyan University, 1952, Legend.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 8: Planned Facilities map, Wesleyan University, 1970. Notice the location of several new building sites scattered around the perimeter of the Wesleyan campus, specifically the “Art Center” site at the top of this map.

Figure 9: “Planned Facilities to 1974” map, Wesleyan University, 1964.

This map projected which projects would be completed by 1974. The proposed creative arts center building is located within the circle.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 10: “Planned Facilities to 1974” map, Wesleyan University, 1964.
Detail of proposed creative arts center.

The building represented here is based on the proposed 1964 design by Clarke and Rapuano.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 11: Existing Plan of Wesleyan University, 1927.

This plan shows the state of the campus shortly after McKim, Mead and White were commissioned to complete a campus study in 1925.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 12: Creative Arts Center Plan, Existing Properties, Wesleyan University, Clark and Rapuano, March 25, 1964.

Clarke and Rapuano’s design placed all of the creative arts departments in a single building. Had this design been approved, many of the 19th century houses shown beneath the creative arts center building on this plan would have been demolished to make way for the new building.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 13: Aerial image of Wesleyan University campus, c.1950.

Future site of the Center for the Arts is circled.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 14: Photograph of Center for the Arts model, c.1970.

The original caption read as follows:

“The Creative Arts Center, depicted in the above photographed model, will have three less buildings when offered to contractors for competitive bidding than were originally planned. Deleted are the Music Lecture Building, The Indian Music Building, and the Experimental Theater in the round, numbered 1, 2, 3 respectively above. To the left are buildings for music, to the right for theater, and in the center are buildings for the graphic arts and a library.”

(The library building, marked with an X on this photo, was later removed from the program as well).

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 15: Musicians of Wesleyan’s World Music Program playing the Javanese Gamelan, c. 1973.


Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 16: 1973 Bird’s-eye rendering of Center for the Arts complex as built. Notice the locations of mature trees on the site in relation to the buildings.

From “Center for the Arts-Wesleyan University,” 1973 Departmental publication.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 17: Contemporary montage of the Center for the Arts courtyard, looking North.

Photograph by Gretchen Hilyard, February 2006.
Figure 18: Historic houses, north side of Washington Terrace. These 19th century houses are representative of the historic fabric Roche was responding to for his design of the Center for the Arts.

Photographs by Gretchen Hilyard, February 2006.
Figure 19: Center for the Arts, containing wall and historic tree near the Art Studio Building, looking northeast. See Figure 21 for the location of this tree on Roche’s 1969 site plan (plan-Figure 21). This is one of the historic trees on the site that Roche noted as “Tree to remain with protective fence. This tree is also shown in Figure 4 and to the left of building E (Art Studios: Painting and Drawing) in Figure 16.

Photograph by Gretchen Hilyard, October 2006.
Figure 20: Center for the Arts Site Plan, 1969. This plan is significant because the Legend outlines Roche’s treatment of existing trees on the site (note Legend in Figure 21). He specified which trees should be kept, which should be removed, as well as which should be protected with fencing to preserve them as part of his Center for the Arts landscape design.

(Note: some buildings included on this plan were cut from final program).

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 21: Center for the Arts Site Plan, 1969. Location of tree in Figure 19. The Building and Music Lecture Building was not built, hence why it is possible to see this tree from the vantage point shown with arrow in contemporary views.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 22: Proposed Landscape Plan for the Center for the Arts, Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates, 1973
This plan was never executed because of budget cuts, but shows that Roche was thinking about the landscape for the CFA. Notice the system of pathways proposed as well as the planting of new trees and shrubs amidst historic specimens.

Reproduced by permission of Wesleyan University Library, Special Collections & Archives.
Figure 23: CFA basement, flooding in underground tunnel, 2006.

Notice the condition of the basement in one of the CFA buildings after several days of rain. The basements and connecting tunnels of the CFA buildings are prone to flooding, showing signs of serious water penetration problems that may prove harmful to the buildings over time.

Photograph by Gretchen Hilyard, October 2006.
Figure 24: The Lawn, University of Virginia, Looking North to Rotunda.

Photograph by David Hamrick, 2006.
Figure 25: Plan of the University of Virginia Lawn, McKim, Mead, and White, 1989-1910. Cabell Hall is building A at the south end of the Lawn.

Notice how this building fits within the scale of the Pavilion buildings around the perimeter of the Lawn. McKim, Mead and White’s design for the 5 storey building utilized the steep slope at the south end of the Lawn to disguise the height of the buildings so as to not intrude upon the scale and proportion of Jefferson’s design.

Photograph by David Hamrick, 2006.
Figure 27: View of the new University Center under construction, Wesleyan University, looking north across Andrus Field, April 2006.

Notice the location of the new University Center around the perimeter of Andrus Field and its proximity to the historic Fayerweather Gymnasium.

Figure 28: Wesleyan Campus Master Plan, Ayers Saint Gross, 2002.

Red buildings represent proposed development. See Figure 29 for detail.

Figure 29: Detail, Wesleyan Campus Master Plan, Ayers Saint Gross, 2002.

A is the proposed University Center Building, currently under construction. B is the Center for the Arts site. C is Andrus field.
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