V. Plan Foundation and Framework

This section presents the foundation upon which the current plan is based. It begins with a brief overview of some of the changes that have shaped our campus, revealing the origins of the current mix of buildings, landscapes, and varying districts. The priorities that are the pillars of the Plan are listed next, followed by an explanation of the holistic approach to layered land use in the districts. This section concludes with the physical planning principles that guided the goals and recommendations.

A. University of Maryland’s Changing Face and Heritage

Planning starts with the given: what is there. To understand the goals of this Plan, it’s useful to have a brief overview of how the campus changed and how some of the key features that have shaped our campus emerged.

The University of Maryland campus has a rich history of landscape planning and architectural development. The face of the campus has been shaped over its 155-year history by changing demographics and enrollment pressures, the demands of new academic programs and the explosion of research, a growing emphasis on athletics, and differing visions put forth in a series of master plans.

The campus has witnessed many changes since the University was initiated in 1856:
- Educationally: a recipient of the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862, followed by establishment of a post-Civil War Agricultural Experiment Station and the formation of the
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extension service; transformation from an agricultural school into a major research university.

- Socially: development from an all-male military system into a coeducational institution; the modifications from barracks to dormitories to a predominantly commuter community to today's expansion of on-campus and nearby residential units.

- Culturally: Ante-Bellum agrarian interests; infusion of students via the GI Bill of Rights' guarantees of higher educational opportunities to veterans; commitment to developing a diverse faculty, staff, and student body following the Civil Rights movements.

The face of the campus has reflected many of these changes but certain key features remain. The original campus was 428 acres of rolling farm land provided by Charles Benedict Calvert. The dominant building pattern over the years was to place buildings on ridges and leave the valleys open. For example, the original Maryland Agricultural College was built on a knoll at the head of College Avenue and nicknamed the “Acropolis.” The knoll with surrounding area is now known as Morrill Quadrangle, after Morrill Hall, the oldest remaining college building (completed in 1898). The environs of the initially modest campus were developed generally following trends of American campus planning.

A series of master planning efforts through the 1920's contributed still-recognizable patterns of development. A central academic core was proposed to be surrounded by men's, women's, and faculty residential quadrangles, and an expanded Agricultural Experiment Station. The men's residential communities, Calvert and Washington Quads, based upon English Collegiate models were completed by World War II (WWII). The plan of 1933 proposed a women's dormitory arranged in a horseshoe format surmounting the ridge of the valley that was to become McKeldin Mall.

In the 1930's farming, agricultural programs, and the Agricultural Experimental Station were relocated from the region surrounding Rossborough Inn to recently purchased, rich farmland north of Campus Drive. McKeldin Mall, a large quadrangle surrounded by buildings, was established at that time and remains an iconic University space.

WWII and the subsequent emphasis on science and engineering led to many changes in the appearance of the campus. In contrast to the Colonial Revival style buildings that dominated the campus, more urban and contemporary looks were introduced. Expansion of the engineering programs was supported by the Glenn L. Martin Institute, designed by Skidmore Owings and Merrill (SOM). The Institute forms a continuous wall facing the Engineering recreational fields, centered on a domed building with pedimented portico.

The Institute's interconnected buildings contrast with the previous arrangement of individual buildings that outlined quadrangles. The contemporary plan for the science and engineering colleges formed a more-urban feeling grid. This build-out of the science-engineering district and the placement of Byrd Stadium, a dominating athletic facility, in the east-west valley between Stadium and Campus Drives, effectively consumed most of the agricultural land thus reducing the size of the Campus Farm.

The GI Bill of Rights brought a three-fold increase in campus population: housing quantity issues were addressed via two differing avenues. SOM designed three residential communities of high-rise towers surrounding student service buildings (dining, community) to be interspaced with “fingers” of forested reserves stretching from Campus Creek south along a peninsula overlooking both the creek and athletics valleys. Secondly, Walton and Madden designed Fraternity Row, a horseshoe arrangement of independent, small-scaled residential fraternity facilities surrounding an athletic field with a view across Baltimore Avenue that centers on Memorial Chapel.

The years following WWII also saw the construction of two other buildings that changed the face of campus: the Memorial Chapel (1952-1953) that towers over the Chapel drill fields facing Baltimore Avenue, and McKeldin Library (1955), a building that completes the current signature academic quadrangle of the Campus Core district.

The Facilities Master Plan of 2001-2020 brought significant changes to campus. While previous plans were willing to place buildings wherever space was available, the focus of the 2001 Plan was on coherent design that clustered academic buildings in reasonable distances, preferred parking garages over surface parking lots, and placed a value on open spaces that add to the beauty, appeal, and ease of movement across the grounds. With its emphasis on the protection of the environment, the Plan gave more attention to cultivating and nurturing the trees, streams, and land that are home to the University community.

Over the years, the campus expanded and changed but the emphasis on ridges with buildings and academic buildings around open spaces remains a dominant feature. The campus now has a mix of
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districts that cross six major landscape typologies common throughout the United States: natural (Paint Branch and Campus Creek); agrarian (farm remnants in Northeast District); classical (McKeldin Mall and Hornbake Plaza); picturesque (Chapel Lawn and University Golf Course); contemporary (Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center and Riggs Alumni Center); and urban (Northeast District). The campus retains major iconic open spaces such as McKeldin Mall, the Engineering recreational fields, the Memorial Chapel Lawn, and the lawn in the Fraternity Row horseshoe.

Following the trend established by the 2001 Plan, the Facilities Master Plan of 2011 builds on the best of the architectural heritage and important landscape typologies, respecting the past while accommodating the needs of the present and future.

What does this mean for an individual district? The impact and importance of good campus planning and administrative follow through can be perhaps best illustrated by the transformation of the South District of campus. In the 1950’s, the lowland of this district, known as the “Gulch,” was covered by a field of wooden, temporary barrack-like buildings to accommodate student overflow caused by returning veterans. This scene morphed over the years into a valley with Van Munching Hall on the east side and the School of Architecture Building on the west, surrounded by acres of paved parking lots, an impervious surface whose wastewater run-off fed into Guilford Creek.

Following the 2001 plan, surface parking was replaced by structured parking, and asphalt was converted to green open space with pedestrian walkways. Mayer Mall was completed over the last decade in a quadrangle framed by academic buildings and pedestrian corridors linked the east-west parts of the district. The University Commons residential complex encircled Calvert and Washington low-rise residential quadrangles with 6-story buildings and provided a consistent, defined University border overlooking the business district of the City of College Park.

Looking forward, this district will expand in pleasing shape to build a greater sense of an academic community of buildings, extending the green corridors and quadrangles surrounded by academic buildings. The 2011 Plan envisions academic buildings terracing down from the Morrill Quad ridge to Mayer Mall, making it easier for students to move up to the South Campus Dining Hall and onto the Campus Core. Improved pedestrian corridors will extend north to an expanded Tawes Plaza that links Tawes and the renovated residential buildings across Campus Drive. From an unattractive bunch of barracks thrown up rapidly in a crisis, the South District is being transformed into an attractive, vibrant and major academic and residential community with connections to the districts that surround it.

This is the type of result we aim for with the district developments and goals and recommended actions set forth in Section VI of this Plan. Protecting our original architectural and landscape heritages and creating new architectural successes is the goal of this Facilities Master Plan.
B. Priorities

Four strategic priorities cut across the global issues that are the heart of the Plan and inform the goals and recommended actions. These priorities are the pillars on which the Plan is built.

**Excellence.** The University has reaffirmed in all official University documents its commitment to excellence. In accord with this mandate, this Plan aspires to excellence in its vision of a campus serviceable for the next decades, confident and outspoken in its identity and treasured by alumni and friends. Though current fiscal and other challenges loom, the Plan will present a blueprint for future development that is visionary and realistic. The University is required to present a Plan that will guide the orderly development of the campus over the next decades. The aim of this plan is higher. Its goal is to imagine a campus that excels in beauty and functionality and creates the optimum environment in which the academic enterprise and the University family can flourish. Long-term development patterns, land use, redevelopment and renovation strategies will be designed to utilize and balance available land and financial resources effectively. Projected development patterns will be a model of smart growth.

**Connectivity.** Members of the University are part of a community within a natural and cultural context, and connections to the community are a significant part of the Plan. Goals and actions are recommended to facilitate and encourage connectivity on a variety of levels. Design and landscape patterns connect districts one to another and connect the campus to the mid-Atlantic ecology. Planning for all facilities and physical systems is designed to increase the sense
of community among those on campus. The Plan recognizes that the campus’ boundaries are porous and that interaction and connectivity to the region around us is an important goal. Thus, recommendations are included that strengthen connections to the surrounding neighborhood communities and to regional systems of transportation. The Plan positions the campus as an important and attractive destination for residents of the region and all citizens of the State.

**Stewardship.** The campus is heir to an architectural and cultural heritage that we intend to preserve and treasure. Many of our structures are excellent examples of American campus planning since the 1850’s. They give the University a distinct character that is worth protecting. Protecting our heritage means adding landscape and structures that are in harmony with its setting, that blend with past successes, and that set new standards for aesthetic appeal and effectiveness. The University also plays a significant role in protecting the land and environmental features that are of major importance to the regional ecology. The need to be sensitive to our impact on the environment is a key priority that is present throughout the Plan. Our treatment of urban tree canopies, cultivation of Arboretum and Botanical Garden collections and concern in the placement of structures, roads, and trails are all examples of our commitment to being good stewards of the environment.

**Sustainability.** The University will continue its national leadership in sustainability. Sustainability initiatives and recommendations are dealt with in a separate section (VI.A.) but they are spread throughout the Plan. As sustainability continues to be defined and measured, the University will serve as a laboratory and model for best practices. LEED standards for buildings, efficient management of wastewater and stormwater run-off, and reduction of carbon emissions are among our goals. Sustainability measures are a key component of landscape planning, underlie transportation initiatives, and influence the design and placement of buildings.
C. A Holistic Approach

This Facilities Master Plan takes a holistic approach, looking at the campus as a fixed space (the main campus) that supports concurrently four layers of use.

1. The first layer considers the space in terms of the land, a tangible resource, which is home to the University of Maryland Arboretum and Botanical Garden (ABG). From this perspective, the Plan takes into account the ecological context of the setting, regional streams, waterways, urban forest canopy connections, etc. It considers the types of conservation, stewardship, tree collections, placement of gardens, and sustainability measures that will protect, preserve, and enhance this invaluable natural resource.

2. The second layer considers the campus as the base for a transportation network and system of roads, paths, and trails that permit pedestrian and vehicular circulation. Transportation issues focus on the routes of shuttle busses, internal circulation of commercial vehicles such as busses and the proposed Purple Line, pedestrian links and pathways, and bicycle paths. From this perspective, the Plan looks at ways to link more effectively campus systems to surrounding transportation and circulation systems.

3. The third layer considers use of the land for other than academic or residential purposes and includes plans for recreational spaces and intercollegiate athletics fields. Concerns at this level are the creative use of spaces that can accommodate formal or informal recreational and sports activities.

4. The fourth layer looks at the land in terms of its use for buildings that house research laboratories, classrooms, residence halls, event centers (performing arts, athletic, alumni center), and administrative offices and buildings. Concerns at this level are the projected placement of buildings over a two-decade term for effective land use.

A LAYERED APPROACH ● planning for a holistic community
D. Physical Planning Principles

The 2011-2030 Plan updates, embraces, and follows the planning principles that were established in the 2001-2011 Facilities Master Plan.

Support the Institutional Mission

The land and other physical resources of the University of Maryland campus will be used to support the University’s mission and programmatic needs and help achieve its strategic plan and academic aspirations.

Practice Environmental Stewardship in Landscape Design and Maintenance

The campus plan will protect and enhance existing natural environments (woodlands, wetlands, and floodplains) and create connections with adjacent habitats; new development will be guided by principles of smart growth and environmental stewardship.

Enhance Environmental Performance of Buildings and Utilities on Campus

Long-term environmental and economic sustainability will continue to be primary goals in the planning for new facilities, renovation of existing buildings and the location of supporting utilities and infrastructure. LEED silver certification will remain the campus’ minimum standard for new construction and major renovation; facility siting and development will maximize solar orientation and natural lighting, maximize energy efficiency, incorporate smart energy technologies, and minimize natural resource depletion and environmental degradation.
Encourage the Use of Transportation other than Personal Vehicles

Plans for development will reduce the number of automobiles on campus and encourage alternative modes of transportation — shuttle busses, bicycles, new light rail or Metro line — in order to minimize vehicular congestion and support the Climate Action Plan and campus sustainability priorities.

Increase the Access and Appeal of the Campus for Pedestrians

Campus planning will encourage pedestrians to move easily and safely across the campus through appropriate design in and between campus areas and careful management of vehicular flow.

Strengthen Community Relations

Planning and design patterns will strengthen connections to the surrounding neighborhood communities and ensure the campus is an important and attractive destination for residents of the region and all citizens of the State.

Create an Attractive, Coherent Design for the Campus

Circulation patterns, a landscape framework, an open space network, and prescribed building placements will connect the spaces, corridors, and districts within a unified campus setting. The coherent campus design will recognize and reinforce natural environmental patterns, campus planning traditions, and neighborhood organizational patterns, and increase operational effectiveness.

Achieve Appropriate Development Patterns

Strategies for long-term development, land use, redevelopment and renovation will balance available land and financial resources effectively and respect the desire to create a coherent and sustainable campus. Projected development patterns will emphasize appropriate building densities and configurations (e.g., compact or spread out) that accommodate goals such as walkability, connectivity, community, and campus carbon neutrality.

Emphasize the Importance of Open Spaces

Campus design will affirm the essential importance of open spaces — natural areas, lawns, malls, plazas, patios, places to sit, etc. — to the image, organization, and quality of the campus environment.

Improve the Quality and Attractiveness of the Campus Landscape

Landscape plans will enhance the campus’ Arboretum and Botanical Garden (ABG) to bring aesthetic pleasure to the campus community and enhance the University’s teaching and research missions.

Enhance Campus Security

Planning and design of all areas of campus will make personal safety and the security of public and personal property a priority.

Embrace Campus Traditions and Heritage

New development on the campus will use nationwide campus planning best practices. Plans will respect historic and existing development patterns, affirm intrinsic cultural and social traditions, and reinforce important district-specific land use and physical characteristics.