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The University of Cincinnati’s assembly of buildings and landscapes has much to teach the higher education community. The collection of opinions regarding the campus' appearance is as diverse as the campus community itself. An interested observer can find an integration of old and new structures and landscapes on this campus. The new structures and landscapes have received national, and occasionally international, attention from the press and the architectural community and have taken on “signature” status. The existing structures and landscapes have been integrated with the new but like the new are not documented in a preservation plan.

The University needed a plan to document the physical history of the campus, including both old and the new to serve as a guide for future development. In 2006, The University of Cincinnati pursued a Campus Heritage grant from the Getty Foundation in order to prepare a preservation plan for the reinvented campus. The plan addresses preservation and/or change in the buildings and landscapes and processes for addressing the rehabilitation, reconstruction, restoration or demolition of the buildings and open spaces on campus current and future generations might use to make thoughtful decisions about the campus. The University of Cincinnati is grateful for the opportunity to prepare such a plan due to the generosity of the Getty Foundation. Together with our consultants we now have such a plan for the future.
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Introduction

Project Background and Purpose

It can be said that history, like beauty, lies in the eye of the beholder, as preservation decisions reflect the values of the preservationist as much as the merits of that which is preserved… Historic preservation is a process that involves an imaginative transformation as much as a conservation of material culture.¹

We require reminders of our heritage in our memory, our literature, and our landscapes. But advocates of preservation who abjure us to save unaltered as much as we can fight a losing battle, for even to appreciate the past is to transform it. Every trace of the past is a testament not only to its initiators but to its inheritors, not only to the spirit of the past, but to the perspectives of the present.²
The University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan has been prepared in the penultimate year of the Getty Foundation’s program of providing seed money for colleges and universities across America to study their historic built resources. “Historic” may be defined in the traditional sense as resources having achieved at least fifty years of age and having contributed to American historical events, people, or design characteristics. Preparation of a campus heritage plan for a predominantly contemporary campus such as this may appear at first glance to be premature at best.

What then should be the focus of the Campus Heritage Plan, with its emphasis on the contemporary work of signature designers—architects and landscape architects—who have only recently contributed to the extensive transformation of the university campus? What would be of the greatest value to the university?

For instance, how should the plan address the landscapes recently completed? These landscapes are architectural in nature with their mounds and angled edges rather than pastoral in nature. Are the expressions of design of enduring quality to serve the campus community or will they require renovation and redesign to address changing needs and more human engagement?

Questions like these are the basis for the discussion and recommendations of the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan.
Historic Preservation at University of Cincinnati

The University of Cincinnati retains a few buildings, some landscape features and organizational elements from all of the campus’ evolutionary periods of development. In general, the university’s remaining historic (predating 1948) resources have been well maintained and respectfully treated. Two structures shown on the current master plan as demolished structures may want to be re-considered for an appropriate use.

Over the 20th century, program expansion in response to changing national trends, acquisition of institutions merging into UC with their own independently conceived facilities, and enrollment “booms” from the 1940s through the 1970s were addressed by adding mostly utilitarian academic and residence halls to an increasingly commuter-centered campus. The campus has undergone such radical change since the early 1960s that the older, historic campus and portions of the surrounding neighborhoods are barely recognizable. Buildings from this modern period (before 1991) are not always considered significant for the present, although some may be valued as local landmarks, and could be inadvertently lost.

The campaigns of new construction over the past twenty-eight years—culminating in the implementation of the Hargreaves master plan—have measurably transformed the campus. Rather than relying upon ivy-covered walls, historic buildings and pictorial landscapes, the image of the university relies instead upon the dynamic contemporary artistic character of its signature buildings and landscapes and its pedestrian-centered campus, most notably visible on the university’s MainStreet. The Campus Heritage Plan recognizes these masterworks to be of potential historic significance and recommends that great care be taken in how changes to these buildings and landscapes are undertaken.
Chapter 1 - 4

How the Plan Is Organized

Recognizing this evolving understanding and appreciation of UC’s historic resources, the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan is organized to accomplish the following objectives:

- **Foster a new appreciation for campus resources by placing them within a broader context of college planning and design.**

  Chapters 2 and 3 provide an overview of the historical background and context for understanding the history and significance of the buildings and landscapes. The chapters discuss the development of the University of Cincinnati’s campus through various periods significant to its history and outlines relationships between the university’s development and the history of campus planning in America. Through these relationships, the national significance of the campus and many of its buildings and landscapes can be established.

- **Identify what aspects of the campus design may be recognized as significant to the university’s or our nation’s heritage now or in the future when the signature designs have reached fifty years of age.**

  The Getty Campus Heritage Grant application identified specific buildings and landscapes as the focus of the plan (figures 1.1 and 1.2). Architectural critic Michael Sorkin was invited by the university architect to assess the “essence” of the Hargreaves master plan and the signature projects it spawned. In a public
lecture delivered on campus at the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning in April 2007 (Appendix A, Preserving the Future of the University of Cincinnati Campus), Sorkin described the significance of the signature buildings and landscapes in order to “initiate a dialogue about the nature and practicality of continuity and change.”

- **Identify likely threats to the resources, particularly impetuses for change when resources are either not performing successfully, are difficult to maintain, or fall out of favor through normal cycles of taste and style.**

Understanding that the campus and its buildings and landscapes cannot be frozen in time, the preservation approach described in Chapter 4 goes on to describe the underlying principles for accommodating change where buildings and landscapes are considered significant and worthy of a preservation ethic. Chapters 5 and 6 outline the significance, condition, and recommended treatment of individual buildings and landscapes in the context of pivotal management issues identified in the course of preparing the plan. These chapters are supported by the description of character-defining features for each building or landscape that are included in the plan’s appendices.

- **Establish a set of treatment and management guidelines that help protect the most significant values and principles of the design as time takes its toll on materials.**
How to Use The Campus Heritage Plan

The goal of the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan is to address the process of change and provide guidelines for its implementation. It should be viewed as a roadmap for a case-by-case process of accommodating needed change while preserving the character and integrity of both “mature” and “signature” buildings and landscapes at the university using the tools that have been developed and refined in the field of historic preservation over the past forty years. Specific outcomes are not prescribed; rather, the plan serves as a resource for:

Understanding the history and significance of buildings and landscapes

Identifying character-defining features that are significant to the designs of buildings and landscapes

Determining appropriate levels of treatment and degrees of change to which buildings and landscapes, or portions of them, can be subjected without losing character-defining attributes

Using appropriate guidelines to evaluate proposed changes
The Campus Heritage Plan and the Future

Universities are among the most dynamic of institutions in their need to change over time. To survive and stay relevant, universities necessarily respond to a variety of program and market-driven influences. The University of Cincinnati is no exception. Changes at UC are complicated by the restraints of an urban campus with few remaining land banks for future buildings and landscapes. The campus is densely developed and will continue to evolve to use space to its highest utilization. Pressure to stay on the cutting edges of education and research and in “market” perceptions that will attract the best faculty, staff and students will lower tolerances for substandard or dated facilities. All university buildings must be designed with the knowledge that change is inevitable. Historic and signature buildings and landscapes will need to be able to adapt to new programmatic and environmental needs over time.

UC’s image or identity shaped by the physical character and appearance of the campus plays a critical role in impressing parents, attracting students, and, perhaps most importantly, maintaining, inspiring, and activating alumni boosters and donors. Universities that change too fast and too radically do so at the peril of alienating alumni constituents who may no longer identify with the changed institution. Most universities to carefully preserve their older campus buildings and landscapes while adding new facilities as infill and around the edges, as a strategy for maintaining and enhancing their images. Just the opposite has been true at UC. It is the new buildings and landscapes that have brought it so much critical acclaim and public recognition of the “brand or identity”.
To some degree, then, the Campus Heritage Plan is an ongoing discussion about the role of Planning + Design + Construction on behalf of the Board of Trustees in shaping the environment that survives into the future. Given the university’s enormous investment in the built environment and the desire to make the campus an inspiring and educational experience in itself, the underlying premise of this plan is to support conservation and protection of all features with inherent value to the university community. When change is required, the plan will suggest processes and procedures for testing this change in order to avoid construction or demolition where the loss of such a building or landscape would be regrettable.
Endnotes

1 Charles A. Birnbaum and Mary V. Hughes, eds., Design with Culture; Claiming America’s Landscape Heritage (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 1-2.
3 Getty Campus Heritage Grant Application, June 6, 2006.
4 Getty Campus Heritage Grant Application, June 6, 2006.
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Note: The Cincinnati Observatory, "a mature building," is not shown on this map.
Cincinnati in the late 18th century was a thriving trading center, strategically located on the northern banks of the Ohio River. Surviving on the fringe of western settlement, its inhabitants needed protection. A garrison, Fort Washington, was built to provide security from the warring Indians of the Ohio Valley. By 1792, nearly 1,000 residents had settled in the central river basin of land surrounded by steep topography on the north, west, and east. Commerce flourished, with mills, tanyards, and foundries. In 1802, the City of Cincinnati was incorporated.

Cincinnati residents, realizing the need for an institution of higher learning in their new city, created a school association in 1806 and planned to open a college financed through a lottery system. Despite the construction of the first university building and the formation of the Cincinnati University, the economic depression of 1807 and a tornado in 1809 hindered further development of the college.1
The Cincinnati Lancaster Seminary was formed with a state grant in 1815 and housed in a building at Fourth and Walnut streets. The school thrived for a few years but did not fulfill the city’s needs for a university.

The idea of the university found its next champion in Dr. Daniel Drake, scientist and physician, who succeeded in gaining charters from the State of Ohio for the Cincinnati College and the Medical College of Ohio in January 1819. That fall, classes began for what is now the University of Cincinnati, the second oldest municipal university in the nation.2 (First was the University of Charleston, founded in 1770.)3

Although both Cincinnati College and the Medical College of Ohio had rough beginnings and unfortunate failings, their original charters would later be used to establish the academic departments of today’s university.

Cincinnati College was housed in the Lancaster Seminary building on Fourth and Walnut Streets; its first president, the Reverend Elijah Slack, also taught classes in mathematics, philosophy, and chemistry. After four commencements, the college experienced a fire and declining admission due to competition from nearby Miami University.4 Classes were suspended for a time.

The Cincinnati Law School was established in 1833 and became a department of Cincinnati College one year later. In 1835, Dr. Drake established a Medical Department under the charter of Cincinnati College. In 1836, the Reverend William Holmes McGuffey was appointed the new president of the College and subsequently revived the Academic Department (also termed the College of Liberal Arts).
During this era, higher education opportunities began to be offered elsewhere in the city at the Ohio Mechanics Institute, founded in 1828 (housed in the former Bazaar department store and literary salon); the Cincinnati Observatory in Mt. Adams, founded in 1842; the Cincinnati College of Pharmacy, founded in 1850; the Conservatory of Music, founded in 1867; and at the College of Music, founded in 1878. All of these schools would eventually coalesce as the modern University of Cincinnati. A common location and funding were needed to unify the institution. These needs appeared to be fulfilled by the bequest of Charles McMicken (1782-1858), a wealthy businessman, who had cherished a dream of endowing a university.

McMicken bequeathed $1 million to the City of Cincinnati upon his death but the endowment was diminished by the poor economic conditions caused by the Civil War, leaving the university in an untenable position by the late 1860s. The City of Cincinnati’s decision to intervene, entwined the future of the university and the city for the next 100 years. After consolidating funds from the Cincinnati Board of Education and the McMicken endowment, the city chartered the University of Cincinnati, in 1870. Classes were initially held in the Woodward High School building on Twelfth Street, and in 1875, they moved to the McMicken estate on Clifton and Vine Streets.

For 20 years the university occupied the McMicken estate, a narrow strip of land on a steep hillside that offered no room for expansion and abutted an industrial environment that was not conducive to higher education. After Jacob Donelson Cox was inaugurated as university president in 1885, he immediately initiated changes in the institution that led to the incorporation of several existing small colleges into one school. Cox oversaw the assimilation of colleges specializing in medicine, pharmacy, and dentistry. Cox forged an urban university that would give back to the
community in service, production, and leadership. To accommodate the new collection of colleges, President Cox negotiated with the City of Cincinnati in 1889 to move the university from the McMicken estate, to a more bucolic setting on 43 acres at the southern end of Burnet Woods Park.
The new site was well situated geographically between the city and the surrounding suburbs on high ground with an unimpeded outlook on the west toward the hills above the Mill Creek Valley. Northward stretched the remaining undulating woodland acres of the city park.9

Having escaped the congestion of the city, the fledgling university built a campus. In 1894, six architects submitted plans for the proposed site, which would consist of three related buildings to be made of stone or brick with stone trim. In 1895, Samuel Hannaford won a competition with five other architects for the first college building — McMicken Hall and the subsequent additions of Hanna and Cunningham halls, connected to either side. Hannaford’s campus plan placed the buildings along a ridge within the park above the McMicken estate facing Clifton Avenue and the streetcar line. The classical aesthetic referenced in the new buildings suggested the university’s desire to be considered simultaneously worldly and inherently American.10 The linear plan was functional but unusual among college campuses of the time being laid out in quadrangles centered
on common green courtyards. Commuting students arriving by streetcar along Clifton Avenue defined the university’s identity as a municipal commuter school which would set the pattern for further campus development.

In this new park setting, athletics became highly popular and competitive during the 1880s and 1890s. A lowland area behind the “academic ridge” became the logical site for constructing a stadium. Taking advantage of the bowl-like terrain, rows of concrete bleachers were built, then an entire stadium. As the university continued to grow, the stadium was positioned to be at the heart of the west campus.
In 1899, Howard Ayers became president of the university. By the end of his tenure in 1904, the university had grown. Van Wormer Library, designed by Samuel Hannaford, was built with a gift of street railroad stock from Asa Van Wormer in memory of his wife. The gift was made in 1899, and the library officially opened in 1901. The College of Engineering was established in 1900. Summer and evening classes offered, added academic opportunities to students.

By 1904, the university’s growth had prompted President Ayers to hire noteworthy campus planners and architects McKim, Mead and White to propose a new campus plan. The University of Cincinnati plan they presented strongly adhered to Beaux Arts traditions, with symmetry of form and strong axial alignments composed of hierarchical spaces surrounding a central quadrangle. The plan did not reflect the rolling topography of the park setting and barely acknowledged the existing buildings on the ridge above Clifton Avenue (possibly referenced in the grouping of structures at the right side of the rendering). Although never realized, the plan beautifully embodied the ambitions of the University of Cincinnati and laid the groundwork for the plan of the Engineering Quadrangle to follow.

Charles W. Dabney followed President Ayers in 1904. During his tenure (1904–1920), the colleges of Education, Commerce, Home Economics, and Graduate Studies were created. Dabney strengthened the university’s connection with the city and elicited the support of Cincinnati citizens setting the stage for more creative approaches to education.
In 1906, Dean Herman Schneider of the College of Engineering introduced the revolutionary concept of cooperative education to a class of 27 students. The “co-op” program allowed students to alternate classes at the university with quarters of paid employment. The program became synonymous with the University of Cincinnati and contributed to its international reputation as a leading institution. By 1907, the number of students applying to the program increased to 800. Naturally, this increased enrollment created a need for more facilities.

In 1910, a power-generation plant was built to supply coal-powered heat and electricity to the campus buildings on the ridge. Following the strong axis of the power plant and Carson Field, Schmidlapp Hall (later named Dieterle Vocal Arts Center) was built in 1910. The axis along the lowland area created the alignment for the field, the first rise of concrete seating surrounding the field, the new power plant, and, later, Memorial Hall (1924).

The architects of the power plant, Teitig & Lee and Garber & Woodward, were also responsible for Baldwin Hall, the new home for the College of Engineering, which followed in 1911. Breaking with the tradition of siting buildings in a linear manner along the ridgeline to develop the campus along a subsidiary axis determined by the hilly terrain, the new Engineering Quad may have drawn some inspiration from McKim, Mead, and White’s plan. In the following years, two complementary buildings, Old Chemistry and Swift Hall, would flank Baldwin Hall to the south and north, creating the traditional green space presently known as Herman Schneider Quadrangle.
Also in 1911, the Samuel Hannaford & Sons-designed College of Medicine, was built in the Avondale neighborhood together with a new General Hospital, forming the core of what today is known as the East Campus. The massive new complex comprised 24 buildings, including a power plant, an administration building, a pathological institute, a school of nursing and health building, a surgical building, a medical reference library, a medical college building, and dormitories. In 1920, economics professor Frederick Hicks became interim president. By the time he retired in 1928, increased enrollment, prompted construction of a number of additional buildings. These included Beecher Hall (1916), Nippert Stadium (1916), Old Chemistry (1917), Swift Hall (1925), Memorial Dormitory (1924), Taft Hall (1925), and Tanner’s Laboratory (1924). Aerial views of the campus from 1910 to 1920 show the progression of buildings as initially developed in a linear pattern along the ridge being shifted by the terrain.

Dean Herman Schneider was named university president in 1928, in part because the co-op program he created had succeeded so brilliantly. Schneider held the presidency until his retirement in 1932. His devotion to teaching and a dedication to producing cultured, practical, and service-minded graduates characterized Schneider’s presidency. The co-op program had inaugurated a method of connecting theory with practice that has since influenced various departments, and helped to form important relationships between students and the community “in music through performance, in classics through archeology, in the arts through design and in the life sciences through medicine.”
Schneider also envisioned establishing a series of academic and residence hall quadrangles on campus, each encompassing a separate college although the plan never materialized as he had hoped. One of Schneider’s notable gestures was to supplant Van Wormer Library (1899) with a new larger Main Library designed by Hake and Kuck in 1930 (now called Carl Blegen Library), to accommodate the burgeoning collection. The Art Deco style of the building included decorative reliefs that celebrated the history of the printed word, featuring notable printers through the ages as well as printers’ marks. The symbolism drew attention to those who spread the written word to a wider public audience.18
In 1930 a new Teachers College, designed by Garber & Woodward, was built along the academic ridge. To the east, a natural sciences building, Dyer Hall, also designed by Garber & Woodward, was built in 1931. These two buildings would be connected in 1958, creating a green space traditionally used as a quadrangle. Schneider's tenure also saw the construction in 1930 of the University branch YMCA, designed by Zettel and Rapp.

Raymond Walters was inaugurated as president upon Schneider's retirement. Walters' 23-year presidency, although clouded by the difficulties of the Great Depression, provided stable governance and sustained the university to commitment to community service, research, and medical discoveries. During Walters' tenure, UC received worldwide recognition for Carl Blegen’s archeological excavations and George Rieveschl’s formulation of the antihistamine Benadryl.

With enrollment declining as the Depression grew, Walters was forced to implement pay cuts and dismissals. Faculty and staff found additional income through Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal programs. The Works Progress Administration (WPA) provided funding for the construction of the Student Union building (Tangeman University Center).

After World War II, the G.I. Bill brought new students — veterans — to the campus in numbers so great that the university hastily built new housing facilities and classrooms to accommodate them. Temporary housing and classroom facilities in the area adjacent to McMicken Hall were so conspicuous that they were collectively dubbed “Vetsville”. By 1949, two-thirds of the students graduating were veterans.
Top photo: Military exercise within McMicken Circle during World War II.

Bottom photo: "Vetsville," temporary housing and classrooms, adjacent to McMicken Hall.
The university’s enrollment continued to grow, reaching a total of 13,783 students in 1950. Of these, about 7,000 attended evening programs. This growth placed a great deal of pressure on the physical campus as the student population outgrew the site. During the mid-1940s, the university made several unsuccessful attempts to acquire an additional 22 acres of land for the campus within Burnet Woods Park. In 1952, City Council approved expansion of the campus to the north of University Avenue (now Clifton Court). In that same year, Alms Memorial Hall, home at that time to the College of Applied Arts (later to become the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning [DAAP]), was dedicated on a hilltop in Burnet Woods. The topography of the Corryville neighborhood on the east side of the campus behind Nippert Stadium was considerably altered by the construction of French Hall dormitory and James C. Allen’s 8,000-seat Armory Fieldhouse (completed in 1954), and the nature of construction at the university took a new direction. Buildings were no longer grouped around open space; rather, open space became the leftover edges.

In 1955, Walter C. Langsam became university president, serving until 1971. Langsam’s tenure was characterized by vast changes in both the physical character and the academic and social culture of the university. His stewardship straddled the “street-car college,” Cold War, and Vietnam years. Amid these external social forces, the university felt new growing pains. The university again expanded by adopting several colleges that previously had been independent, while continuing to develop new programs of its own. The College of Pharmacy merged with the university in 1954; the College of Music and the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music were allied in 1962; and the Ohio College of Applied Science (or ‘OCAS,’ previously the Ohio Mechanics Institute) was brought into the fold in 1969.

Post-War Expansion and the Automobile Campus (1950–1984)
OCAS remained at its downtown location but, on campus, the construction of buildings like the CCM complex in former open spaces was dramatically altering the university landscape. The grass lawn amphitheater in the ravine behind the university library, once used for graduation exercises, became the site and form-giver for the fan-shaped Patricia Corbett Theatre. As the number of students driving to campus continued to rise, parking lots and high-rise residential buildings surrounded by parking changed the fabric of the Corryville neighborhood and established the outlines of a campus “superblock” which can be seen to be emerging in a campus map from 1962.

As new growth strained the university’s finances in the mid-1960s, the administration sought a closer alliance with the state to ensure the institution’s survival. In 1967, an agreement was reached that provided an influx of state funds while keeping the university under city ownership, although city funding had dwindled to a trickle. The university was on the road to becoming a full-state institution. Even as public funding lagged behind ever-increasing enrollment buildings continued to be built, introducing new building patterns. Beginning in 1964 with the “Three Sisters” (Sawyer [demolished 2005], Scioto, and Morgens Halls) at the eastern edge of the block and continuing with Calhoun Hall along the southern boundary, large-scale high-rise buildings edging open space (in this case, much of it temporary parking) followed a pattern similar to high-density housing in cities being reshaped by Urban Renewal.
When it was built on the east side of the campus superblock in 1971, the 27-story Sander Hall topped the Hughes High School tower as the most visible skyline feature on the hill. Sander was designed to house 1,300 students in 5-bedroom suites, which were meant to foster interaction and small-group community-building. However, the high-rise architecture did not meet later building codes and was considered both unsafe and too costly to upgrade. Sander Hall was imploded in 1991.
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Crosley Tower, Rhodes Hall, Rieveschl Hall, and Zimmer Hall—components of the Brodie Science Complex—were built in 1969 and 1970 at the end of President Langsam’s tenure, filling in the north side of the West Campus adjacent to DAAP. Langsam Library, conceived as part of this development, followed 10 years later in 1979.

Throughout the late 60’s and 1970’s, the College of Medicine and the General Hospital continued to grow. The area around General Hospital expanded into the University Medical Center. In 1960 the City of Cincinnati granted the university executive control of the Cincinnati
fourth of an acre on the north side of St. Clair Street (Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive) to DAAP for the purpose of siting the monument.

General Hospital (renamed University of Cincinnati Hospital in 1982).\textsuperscript{23} New wings or additions were added to the Pavilions (1916) and Kettering Lab (1930). The College of Pharmacy was established and housed in Wherry Hall (1959), and a new home for the College of Nursing, Procter Hall, was built in 1968.

Student and community engagement continued in the 1960s with an idea envisioned by DAAP students, called “Operation Resurrection.” The students put into motion the recovery of roughly 150 stone pieces from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce building (designed by the late architect H. H. Richardson), which had burned down in 1911. The park board donated one-fourth of an acre on the north side of St. Clair Street (Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive) to DAAP for the purpose of siting the monument.\textsuperscript{24}

Warren G. Bennis, a noted theorist in the field of organizational design and leadership, was inaugurated as university president in 1971. The presidency changed again in 1977 at a seminal moment in the University of Cincinnati’s history, when the university became a full-state institution. Henry R. Winkler, became the first president to have graduated from the university, took the helm. The administration developed a new vision for the university’s future, but lacked commensurate funding for new buildings. In 1980, a new facility for the College of Law was constructed around the 1925 Taft Hall, rather than creating an entirely new building. Nippert Stadium, was renovated instead of constructing a new facility. After 13 years in an off-campus facility, the university basketball team received a new home, Shoemaker Center, in 1989.
In 1984, Joseph A. Steger succeeded Dr. Winkler as president. At the outset of his tenure, Steger expressed dissatisfaction with the character of the campus. Steger sought to change the school’s direction and image, and, with support from the administration, he launched a search for a visionary planner. The importance of a master plan to establish a direction for university physical growth and evolution was recognized as paramount. The office of landscape architect George Hargreaves was selected for its recognition of the need to establish a sense of connection throughout the campus, and to create a sense of place, or specific character, that would serve the various needs of the university’s population. Hargreaves presented a vision that looked beyond individual works of architecture to the total environment and imagined a strong interaction between buildings and landscape. His concept was derived from Frederick Law Olmsted’s 19th-century plan for Boston’s parks, the “Emerald Necklace;” in fact, Hargreaves’ plan was dubbed the “string of pearls.”
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One problem of the “streetcar” campus was its lack of evening activity once commuters left for the day. The campus would need functional and vibrant places where students could gather and participate in social and scholarly activities, including outdoor restaurants, cafes, and theaters, enveloped by architecture. Hargreaves sought to replace the remained open spaces and parking lots that occupied the center of campus with a series of designed open spaces and activated places. The identification of “force fields” provided a basis for analyzing the conflicting lines of orientation that had developed. Hargreaves’ plan suggested using buildings to infill, but in a way that permitted the creation of open space through courtyards or plazas, as in an urban environment. Hargreaves thought of the buildings as a means to carve and shape space, connecting with the landscape in a sculptural way. His landscape design encompassed molded landforms, sparse plantings, and non-Euclidean walkways. It was intended to function as a unifier between buildings and outdoor spaces, to make visual connections, and to create a sense of place through activities shared across the campus community.
Hargreaves’ master plan began to make an impact beginning with the construction of a broad, fan-shaped lawn, designed in 1993, between McMicken Hall and Tangeman University Center, where Old Commons, Old Tech, Tanners Laboratory, and Beecher Hall had previously stood. This green immediately completed the previously unrealized central portal of McMicken Hall and introduced the concept of walkability into the campus. University Avenue also provided a ceremonial-like space that became a major thoroughfare between buildings.28

Under the leadership of Jayanta (Jay) Chatterjee, new architecture was included in the master plan to accommodate the growth of the DAAP program. Dean Chatterjee’s advocacy for the selection of “signature” architects to design the master plan’s new buildings and spaces would greatly influence the new visual character of the university landscape.
One technical issue of the state-owned university’s obligation to employ local architects was accommodated by first engaging a local “architect of record” who then participated in the selection of a nationally or internationally recognized designer to be part of the project team.29 Between 1991 and 2000, some of the world’s most renowned architects designed works for the University of Cincinnati, including Peter Eisenman, Michael Graves (a UC DAAP graduate), David Childs, Henry Cobb, Frank Gehry, Rudolfo Machado and Jorge Silvetti. Design firms influential both before and after 2000 were the Cambridge Seven; after 2000, Leers Weinzapfel Associates and Gwathmey Siegel & Associates Architects contributed to design at the University of Cincinnati.

The first of the signature architect-designed buildings was the Edwards Center, built in 1992 from a design prepared by David Childs of Skidmore Owings & Merrill. Although not as dramatic as some of the later signature buildings, the Edwards Center provides one of the most obvious interpretations of the campus master plan and a direct nod to the “force field” organizational system. Named for Vera Clement Edwards, one of the first black women to earn a master’s degree from and teach at UC, the building expresses the two conflicting orientations of the campus.30

In 1995, Michael Graves was selected to design the post-modern Engineering Research Center, located at the main approach to campus from the east. A colonnade marks the main entry to the building, and a public passage leads to the rest of campus. A more unusual building, which immediately struck a different note on campus, was the Aronoff Center for Design and Art, a building that provided library, exhibition, and office space as well as classrooms, studios, and lecture halls. The Aronoff Center, designed in 1996 by Peter Eisenman in association with Lorenz and Williams, acts as a link between Wolfson Hall (1976) by Tweddel Wheeler Strickland and Beumer; the Alms Building, (1952) by George Rath and James E. Allen; and the DAA building (1958). The Aronoff Center both confused and astonished UC students and visitors, but it functioned as a catalyst for future change. Its construction began a
trend that suggested architecture was intended to challenge the intellect, work together with the landscape to create a sense of movement through the campus grounds, and provide significant spaces within which activity could occur. Frank Gehry’s Vontz Center for Molecular Studies, constructed in 1999, offered further indications of the new dynamic forms that provided living and work space, and offered alternative ways in which buildings could function together with the landscape.

The addition of further buildings contributed to the creation of groups or complexes that provided new active spaces connecting related activities while acknowledging the campus’s past. The College of Music (CCM), for example, occupies “CCM Village” and consists of several buildings, including Memorial Hall and the Dieterle Vocal Arts Center (formerly Schmidlapp Hall), Mary Emery Hall, and the Corbett Center for the Performing Arts. The Center incorporates several 1970s structures, such as the Patricia Corbett Theatre and Corbett Auditorium, the new Werner Recital Hall, and a studio theater. The theater is set into a hillside and echoes its amphitheater form; a low brick dance studio wing runs around
part of the exterior, forming a system of small courtyard gardens that wrap around the eastern side. The gardens were designed by Laurie Olin, known for his work on Bryant Park in New York City. In 2000, Henry Cobb unified these buildings and gave them a center with a long brick wing, Mary Emery Hall, punctuated along its rooftop by distinctive pyramidal luminaries. The complex makes less of a splash than some of the successive signature buildings, but is, in fact, considered a masterpiece of highly sensitive interior and intelligent siting. It plays a central role in the master plan, connecting spaces at the intersection of the CCM Village, the old academic ridge, and the new MainStreet project.\footnote{31} Green spaces, together with dramatic buildings, provided connections along which the student could walk through the university grounds. Separate but not isolated individual spaces, such as the Library Square designed by Hargreaves in 1995 and Sigma Sigma Commons (1998), give texture and character to the place, enriching the more traditional green represented by the Clifton Avenue and Herman Schneider [formerly Baldwin] Quadrangle.
Signature landscapes, from top: University Commons, Mews, Campus Green, and Zimmer Roof Garden.
Fulfillment of the Cohesive Landscape Vision (2000-present)

In 2000, construction of the University Commons on the East Campus and of Hargreaves Associates’ Campus Green, located on the site of parking lot No. 1, furthered the master plan’s concept of individual and connected spaces situated within a pleasant and walkable landscape. McMicken Commons, which was initially constructed in 1990 as the first open space completed under the master plan, was opened in 2004 after renovation of the Tangeman University Center.

Also in 2004, Moore Ruble Yudell Architects created an open-space corridor called The Mews running between the Steger Student Life Center and Swift, Baldwin, and Rhodes halls. This landscape of terraced spaces draws connections to the campus’s past from architectural fragments of earlier buildings. On the other side of the Steger Center, Hargreaves’ plan for MainStreet suggests the ways in which he envisioned the landscape functioning. Bearcat Plaza was constructed in 2004 as part of MainStreet, and in 2006 Hargreaves completed the Zimmer Roof Garden above Zimmer Hall. After 2000, signature architecture that continued to dramatically change the look of the

In 2006, Morphosis Architects designed the highly geometric, multi-purpose Campus Recreation Center. The building maximizes its location along the sloping main street, and offers 350,000 square feet for team sports and personal fitness, as well as space for learning, dining, and living. The Center for Academic Research Excellence (CARE), designed by Studios Architecture, was completed in 2008. Each of these buildings has been highly publicized, bringing the University of Cincinnati to the forefront of design visibility that reflects 20th- and 21st-century concerns both for accommodating students’ physical needs and for raising the university’s “brand” appeal.32 Whether the buildings successfully address the social, personal, and contemplative needs of the student continues to be a matter of discussion.

Many accolades have been written praising the highly visible aesthetic statement achieved by the new buildings. The New York Times, for example, referring to the new building campaign, described the University of Cincinnati as “one of the most architecturally dynamic campuses in America;” the Washington Post called it “an experiment worth watching.” Students, too, have begun to assign names to some of the new buildings. Gehry’s Vontz Center, for example, is referred to as a “sculpture” and jokingly as the “marshmallow building.”33

The University of Cincinnati began as a small college whose departments were housed in separate buildings across the city, lacking any unified sense of place. It has since emerged as a comprehensive research university and an international leader in campus planning and design. Over a 15-year period of master plan implementation, the university has established a cohesive campus, with walks and open spaces leading faculty, staff, students, and visitors through views of architecture and landscape architecture developed by master designers at the heights of their careers. These designed buildings and landscapes attempt to provide...
interior and exterior places in which to gather, study, and relax, and an environment that is conducive to intellectual growth, social interaction, and civic purpose.

In 2003, Nancy L. Zimpher — the University of Cincinnati’s 25th president, and the first woman to hold the position — articulated this goal in the UC|21 Academic Plan by seeking to imbue the newly built environment with “a sense of ‘place’” and “a sense of belonging for students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends”...“where members of the campus community and the community at large want to spend time — learning, living, playing, and staying,” to promote collaboration among people and programs.34

Above: Center for Academic and Research Center/Crawley Building, (Studios Architecture).
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America’s history of conceiving, designing, and building college campuses now stretches back nearly four centuries. This chapter establishes relevant historic contexts for considering buildings and landscapes of the University of Cincinnati campus, including those newer works of signature architecture and landscape architecture, within the national spectrum of campus planning. In this context, the evolution of the University of Cincinnati campus is to be understood as having achieved a unique sense of place with strong local and national significance that is worthy of “preservation.”

Campus Planning in America

Higher education was on the minds of even the earliest American settlers, who in 1640 established Harvard College, basing its design on the English higher education system of centralizing instruction in one complex that served the entire country, as at Oxford and Cambridge. The number of degree-granting institutions in the colonies reached nine by the time of the American Revolution and, by the late 18th century, Americans had broken from the English system to disperse higher education among independent colleges. These were frequently located in rural landscapes with views to natural surroundings that were thought to have a favorable impact on students’ mental and physical health.

The design and planning of early American college buildings were highly diverse. At Harvard, for example, a three-sided open courtyard plan
prevailed while the original scheme for the College of William and Mary formed an Oxford-like enclosed quadrangle, which later developed into one large building flanked by smaller structures. Several colonial colleges operated single large buildings that often had expansive greenswards in front. At Princeton, this green space was created by purposely setting back the building from the road.

Expansion of college campuses in the colonial period often produced very different spatial patterns than those found at English colleges, which tended to be inward-looking, with buildings based around a courtyard. American colleges were extroverted, with separate buildings set in open landscapes. In 1826, Thomas Jefferson initiated a different approach to higher education in the United States. His creation of an “academical village” dedicated to “enlightened dialogue between students and teachers,” with the focal point and largest building designated as the library, suggested a commitment to research and continuing study that previously had not existed at American colleges.1

The years between the 1820s and the present would find all American universities responding to the forces of history and change. In that time, America’s higher education institutions have continued to change in response to increased enrollments, technological advances, and evolving perceptions of the role campus planning should play in influencing pedagogy. Aside from attempting to satisfy physical needs, a continuous thread in campus planning has been the expression and reinforcement of the universities’ symbolic image.2 Some 160 years later, in 1984, this would motivate lead University of Cincinnati administrators and President Joseph A. Steger to seek a visionary plan for a campus that appeared to have grown exponentially without direction. The university would engage contemporary American landscape architect George Hargreaves to re-imagine the campus plan. Cutting-edge architectural and landscape design ideas would provide a forward-looking image for the new campus.3 Some have suggested that, by creating a “Renaissance on the River” campus plan, the university was signaling its commitment to excellence.4

**Early Campus Planning and the Rural Setting**

Between 1820 and the Civil War, American higher education experienced a surge in students whose numbers increased to 800 at all colleges. In keeping with design ideas of the time, the buildings were frequently constructed of stone in a classical style. The Greek-temple form was favored because it expressed democratic ideals of the republic and the role of education. Academic enclaves in the early 19th century were set apart from the local villages or towns that were initially thought to be poor influences on impressionable students, and campuses were designed with picturesque settings. The advantages of rural over urban locations were much debated, and the “college system” was criticized as being too strongly centered on religious affiliation, excessively strict, and elitist. Some complained that colleges were isolated from communities and therefore insulated from the “salutary restraint of public observation.”5

Nevertheless, the idyllic influence of nature was integrated into the design of urban colleges such as Yale, where park-like settings were created as integral components of the building scheme.6 In Cincinnati, an exception to the preference for locating colleges in rural settings was Xavier
University, a Catholic college. Situated on Sycamore Street, Xavier’s urban location tended to evoke a more European character than the Anglo-American system.

Cincinnati College, too, opened in an urban area, close to the pollution of factories, but later moved deliberately out of the downtown basin to the hillside above which was accessible by streetcar, and thence to the hilltop ridge at the edge of a city park. Perhaps because it had begun as an urban institution with strong ties to the city, the University of Cincinnati continued to foster connections with the city, despite its physical removal from its original urban location through the medical school, which provided facilities both for teaching and for serving the population, and through the university’s seminal cooperative education program, which forged a link between education and work experience and remains a renowned and integral part of the university program today.7

University Beautiful and the Beaux Arts Tradition

In the late 19th century, the American higher education system began moving away from the concept of independent colleges and toward a university curriculum and pedagogical philosophy. Initially, Americans emulated the German example of a university as a collection of departmental faculty devoted to scholarship and teaching, usually housed in individual “colleges.” However, the earlier American collegiate tradition had become entrenched to such a degree that “college” and “university” models began to coalesce. What emerged was a highly democratized system that provided education for increasingly larger numbers of students — both men and women — often with very different goals, including technical and liberal arts education, and undergraduate and graduate study. Such diverse interests required a new form of planning. Where the earlier American college had been expressed as a “village,” the new university would be a “city.”8

Following the sensation of architect Daniel Burnham’s “White City” at the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago, universities adopted a “City Beautiful” planning philosophy derived from Beaux Arts principles
of monumental organization. These included a strong adherence to symmetry, connecting disparate buildings through axial alignments that ran through building interiors and across landscaped spaces, constructing significant buildings at focal points which terminated long axis in the landscape, and employing hierarchical circulation patterns that featured central walkways with secondary routes leading from them.

At the University of Cincinnati, campus planning reflected these national trends and embraced the Beaux Arts design and architectural style for a time. The original linear arrangement of a group of buildings on a knoll or ridge was augmented with buildings constructed in a courtyard or quadrangle arrangement along an intersecting axis. Instead of the eclectic Italianate style of Hannaford’s McMicken Hall, the university employed a classical Beaux Arts aesthetic in grouping Baldwin Hall, Old Chemistry Building, and Swift Hall. These buildings are characterized by their monumentality, with flat roofs and attic stories, colossal columns emphasizing double doorways, dentil moldings on cornices, and limestone banding between stories. Later, Braunstein Hall and Wilson Auditorium would further extend the north side of the quadrangle to link green space to the “Clifton Arc” in front of McMicken Hall and to Clifton Avenue. However, the university was not entirely dedicated to following this model and did not adopt it as its standard.

The Influence of Modern Architecture

Universities in the 20th century gradually came to more closely resemble urban environments, sharing their attendant problems: dense but fluid populations, conflicting land-use patterns, traffic congestion, and diverse (sometimes opposing) interests. Changes in architectural styles and philosophies began to influence the way campus plans developed. The southern Chicago campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology was among the first in the United States to employ modern architecture. Mies van der Rohe’s Crown Hall, his first steel-and-glass campus building from 1956, retained classical ideals in its design and might not, therefore, be considered truly modern in plan. As colleges weighed the pros and cons of introducing modern architecture to their campuses, uncertain of the effect this new style might have on the college image, Frank Lloyd Wright designed the campus of Florida Southern College, a free-flowing campus
plan freed from the classical constraints of hierarchical, symmetrical organization and connections. Wright’s architecture was rooted in nature and expressed an organic concern with native materials and forms and with the site. Reflecting on his design for Florida Southern, Wright opined that “[i]n Organic Architecture then, it is quite possible to consider the building as one thing, its furnishing another and its setting and environment still another. The Spirit in which these buildings are conceived sees all these together at work as one thing.”

Organic architectural expression of the importance of individual buildings greatly influenced the planning process. In a move away from the design model where buildings contributed to a unified plan, Joseph Hudnut, chair of the planning department at Harvard University, declared all attempts to bind universities to master plans have been failures. Instead, Hudnut advocated a system of free-flowing “organic” development in which buildings could be conceived as individual components that bore no relation to the general composition of a campus. Insisting that individual architecture was more important than coherent planning, he said: “Let no building depend for its character upon its relocation to another, nor let any of the open spaces be of such absolute proportions that new construction built into them will destroy them.”

This theory of free-flowing development was soon tested as buildings appeared ad-hoc on campuses where there was space for them. Large unconventional building forms for lecture halls, dormitories, and student unions were built to fulfill the needs of increasingly large student populations. Yale’s President A. W. Griswold rejected a coherent university campus style or pattern of development in favor of buildings that created an “effect” and expressed the university’s modern interest in diversity. The university embraced contemporary architects of distinction such as Louis Kahn, Eero Saarinen, Paul Rudolph, and Gordon Bunshaft. At the University of Cincinnati, modernist aesthetic and planning concepts debuted with the construction in 1952 of George Roth and James E. Allen’s Alms Building, and James E. Allen’s the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning (DAAP) wing, built in 1958.

The post-World War II college population boom prompted a building phase at campuses around the country and also resulted in changes in the types of colleges available to prospective students. More young people desiring higher education were also restricted by their economic means, leading to the inauguration of programs catering to students who worked full or part time while also attending classes. This phenomenon produced a proliferation of community college “commuter campuses” in the 1950s and ’60s and affirmed the need for colleges to be located within easy reach of both city centers and suburbs. As a precursor of this trend, the University of Cincinnati’s own Evening College was organized in 1938 and continued until 2002 (individual evening classes had begun as early as 1902).

Physically, these more urban colleges tended to have less land on which to expand, and some grew vertically rather than horizontally. At UC, rapid growth in enrollment through the 1960’s pushed the edges of the campus into the Corryville and Clifton neighborhoods to achieve “superblock” proportions in order to accommodate new housing and surface parking.
In the late 20th and early 21st century, landscape design tended to challenge the intellect and use both existing and invented topography to shape the open spaces that complement the buildings. A 2005 exhibition of new landscapes at New York’s Museum of Modern Art, “Groundswell: Constructing the Contemporary Landscape,” portrayed these new landscapes as “intelligent sites” with multivalent characteristics encompassing “the physical properties of the ground, its history, and the program for the new landscape.” Landscape architect George Hargreaves is thought to have learned lessons from earth artists like Robert Smithson, sculpting the land into shapes with strong symbolic resonance. At the site of Peter Eisenman’s Aronoff Center, which “cascades down a hill,” Hargreaves formed a series of long mounds that are both sympathetic to the architecture and strongly reminiscent of Ohio’s Indian burial mounds.

This new landscape architecture, like architecture, became more concerned with the expression of the design process. In his early work, Hargreaves, looking for a way beyond the “formulaic language of landscape architecture” that would break from the “reflexive use of the English picturesque for public parks on the one hand, and the reliance on the balanced, asymmetrical geometries of modernism for urban plazas on the other,” found inspiration in contemporary art, specifically sculpture and the repetitive units of minimalist art. Scholars like John Beardsley suggested that Hargreaves found the solution in a more “open-ended” approach that generated design in response to the conditions at a particular site. Beardsley took note of Hargreaves’ discovery that a
compelling combination of factors, including time, gravity, erosion, human commerce, and the physical properties of all matter could render a landscape “extraordinarily meaningful.” Hargreaves gradually developed a flair for the structural and symbolic use of sculptural form. His landscapes are regarded as settings in which people observe and interact with the elements, where designs establish “visual and physical connections between people and the natural systems within which they live.”

Hargreaves’ University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000 is an exemplar of his mature work. It takes into consideration the natural forms of the land, draws on these, and emphasizes them to create focal points with additional sculptural landforms. Hargreaves also weaves the landscape between buildings in an attempt to create dynamic spaces that draw the pedestrian from one part of campus to another.

Elsewhere, urban campuses have also been paying more attention to green space, developing plans that include planting large numbers of trees and using landscape to create communal spaces where students can relax, interact, or simply move from one building to the next in a congenial atmosphere. By energizing the density and the vibrancy of their urban locations, colleges and universities are recognizing the need to provide outdoor spaces that give students greater opportunities to interact at a different pace than in the classroom. Around the country, concepts being explored in campus master plans include leveraging historic landscape features to recreate green spaces infused with a sense of tradition; creating spaces that blur the boundaries between interior and exterior and increase the sense of community; and establishing multi-purpose student centers that consolidate amenities and expand options for interaction.

At the Illinois Institute of Technology, an early landscape design will be reinstated with the planting of more than 1,000 trees; at the University of Wisconsin, a new master-planning effort emphasizes the key concept of “urban pedestrian landscapes.” At the University of Cincinnati, the creation of such communal spaces has added to the dynamic nature of the campus. The CCM Village renovation designed by Laurie Olin, for example, received a 2001 Honor Award from the American Institute of Architects for the “imaginative reuse of existing buildings that provides an attractive interior and exterior gathering place for the performing arts.”

Subtle landscape and environmental elements can make extensive, discontinuous campuses cohere into harmonious academic communities. David J. Neuman, University of Virginia architect, espouses a strong planning armature as a key to a successful campus. Neither memorable architecture nor distinctive landscapes by themselves can make a good campus. It is the interplay between the two; the order of the whole that counts. While signature buildings and landscapes have become a high priority among university and public officials, planning — which brings the two together to create a more meaningful place — is paramount. Planning is the key to a comprehensive vision that integrates the physical campus with institutional identity. As Vassar College President Frances Daly Ferguson put it, without planning, “even the most beautifully situated campus can be ruined by poorly located buildings and bad open space.”
Signature Architecture and 21st-Century Campus Planning

At the turn of the 21st century, city planners are expressing new optimism about the ability of large-scale development to reshape and reinvigorate the American urban environment, echoing Daniel Burnham’s famous dictum to “make no little plans.” The success of Frank Gehry’s Guggenheim Museum in Bilboa, Spain, in attracting visitors and infusing new economic vitality and physical vibrancy in a declining industrial city center, has inspired other cities to give the go-ahead to master plans that include “big name” architectural and landscape designs for large-scale building projects. In the City of Cincinnati there has been a long history of engaging recognized designers to add aesthetic currency and practical amenities conducive to attracting visitors and potential residents to the city. Zaha Hadid’s design for the Contemporary Arts Center is but a recent example. This new attitude toward planning “big” is seen by some as a reinterpretation of Jane Jacobs’ cautionary lessons for creating lively neighborhoods. Other commentators are, naturally, still skeptical about the possibilities inherent in tall towers to create lively streetscapes.

Trends in campus planning and design around the nation can be understood, in part, as responses to students who have grown up amid revolutionary developments in the sciences and communication technologies and an increasing tendency to integrate disciplines. The 21st century student has high expectations of the built environment. Surveys of visiting students place an attractive and interestingly built environment high on the list of positive attributes of a campus. This is but one of the most visible ways of attracting visitors and students.

Campus development has also come to depend on a broad base of private donors and the development of public–private partnerships to supplement limited state funding. In a climate where cities are doing the same, university planners recognize the importance of “signature” architecture and landscape architecture in attracting both students and donors. It is not coincidental that urban campuses, like the cities they inhabit, are reinventing themselves to project a unique sense of place or “brand identity” that will boost their economies, manage population growth, and exploit local natural and cultural resources.
The University of Cincinnati has, since the 1990’s, led the way in using highly expressive architecture and landscapes to help attract top students and funding. This approach is now being employed at schools as diverse as the University of Illinois, the University of Missouri, St. Louis University, the University of Dayton, and Youngstown State University in Ohio. The designers of many of the new buildings at the University of Cincinnati have been recognized as masters of late 20th and early 21st century architecture. Two have been awarded the prestigious Pritzker Architecture Prize (Frank Gehry in 1989 and Thom Mayne of Morphosis in 2005). Moore Ruble Yudell Architects received the American Institute of Architects Firm Award for 2006, at which time their work was applauded for “its spirited celebration of habitation at many scales and its respect for people, context, and place.” At UC, although the unifying vision of George Hargreaves’ master plan considered buildings as “infill,” signature architects—chosen on the basis of their reputations as innovative designers—exhibited a notable desire to successfully realize the plan by collaborating both with each other and with Hargreaves. Concepts and designs were shared on an interactive Web site, and architects discussed their progress with one another, ensuring that site and buildings were created in collaboration.

The adoption of cutting-edge design by leading architects has attracted critical notice and popular attention to the University of Cincinnati. Some critics have struggled to classify the styles these designs express. Each building is highly representative of an individual architect’s style. Several of the buildings, in particular Thom Mayne’s Campus Recreation Center, Frank Gehry’s Vontz Center for Molecular Studies, and Peter Eisenman’s Aronoff Center for Design and Art, have been described as both deconstructivist architecture and as expressionist modern—perhaps because, stylistically, they incorporate some of the philosophies of both expressionism and modernism. This new design expression has also been variously called “complex architecture” and an “architecture of movement.” Not only is movement implicit in the building forms, where walls and floors are often angled as if in a state of arrested motion, but curved outer edges also lead the eye to views beyond, and materials direct the eye to views of adjacent or nearby buildings and landscapes. Individual buildings are also given physical and psychological meaning:

Peter Eisenman’s Aronoff Center has been described, for example, as “confronting the curvilinear with the gridded,” and as recording “processes of its own metamorphosis, frozen in time.” Architecture critic Herbert Muschamp of The New York Times described the building at once as “cheerful, bewildering, generous, controlling,” and something that “one works through as if it were an emotional problem.” Michael Sorkin explained the work of Frank Gehry as “informing fantasies of tipped facades and rotating masses, a simulation of instability.” Thom Mayne’s Campus Recreation Center is a multifaceted building that “juxtaposes key components of student life — eating, sleeping, studying, exercising,” and focuses these activities at the center of the campus, an unusual concept given that traditionally, such accommodations have been located on the periphery of campuses. The Campus Recreation Center is understood by Mayne as a connective building that also has a powerful individual presence. According to one critic, it “cannot be fully grasped from any single viewpoint.”

Of all the architects who have designed buildings at UC since 1990, Mayne (and, perhaps, Gehry) is the most difficult to define. Mayne’s approach has
been described as more global in scope, drawing neither from European modernism, American precedents of the last century, nor Asian influences. Perhaps this is the quintessential message that universities today hope to convey: that they are as diverse as the world itself, offering students and faculty immense possibilities with a global reach. Mayne’s buildings exhibit a “strong family resemblance” with an “explosive energy and angularity in plan and elevation, a demonstrable affection for exposed structure and metallic skins, a joy imposing and then solving complex formal and functional questions.” The Campus Recreation Center is “an explosive collage of taut muscular shapes in glass and metal” that “impart energy and activity to public spaces that surround and penetrate it.” By comparison, glass and metal are employed to different effect in the Joseph A. Steger Student Life Center (Moore Ruble Yudell Architects and Planners) to connect interior and exterior spaces both physically and psychologically, working together to provide the interwoven details of the campus plan. Wide bays and galleries present views toward gardens and terraces, and offer a transparency of the interior to those on the outside.

UC’s signature buildings have attracted critical appraisals and acclaim, and they have contributed to a new campus that is dynamic and engaging. Architecture critic Herbert Muschamp declared that the University of Cincinnati campus has risen to the challenge that also faces contemporary cities which cry out for life once more: “Show us something new. Give us big, urban objects that we can look at, discuss, love or despise.”

Significance

The considerable number of scholarly articles dedicated to the University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000 in the recognized literature of the design profession, strongly suggests that sufficient research and evaluation have been provided within which to discern the property and its role in the context of 20th- and 21st-century campus planning.

Is the transforming work that has remade UC’s campus significant? The recognized standards for analyzing and evaluating historic or cultural resources strongly suggest that the answer is “yes.” The UC campus is significant for its physical design and construction as it embodies “distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction,” representing the works of those recognized within the design professions as highly esteemed artists; possessing high artistic value in the estimation of critics in the public realm; and representing a significant and distinguishable entity even when its components do not share a consistent level of individual distinction.

The University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan approaches the question of preserving buildings and landscapes by signature designers:

Buildings
- Aronoff Center for Design and Art, Eisenman Architects
- Center for Academic and Research Excellence (CARE)/Edith J. Crawley Building, Studios Architecture
- College-Conservatory of Music, Pei, Cobb Freed and Partners
- Vera Clement Edwards Center, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
- Engineering Research Center, Michael Graves & Associates
- Richard E. Lindner Center, Bernard Tschumi
Significant “mature” or historic buildings also formed the campus before the implementation of the Master Plan 2000 and are important for the ways in which their “force fields” influenced that plan in determining the placement of new buildings and landscapes. These buildings provide the background narrative of the university’s past:

West Campus
- Alms Building
- Van Wormer Hall
- Baldwin Hall
- Old Chemistry Building
- Swift Hall
- Memorial Hall
- Dieterle Vocal Arts
- Braunstein Hall
- Teachers College/Dyer Hall
- Blegen Library
- McMicken Hall
- Tangeman University Center
- University YMCA
- Wilson Auditorium

East Campus
- Health Professions Building

Understanding the physical evolution of the campus within local, regional, and national or international planning and design trends provides a framework for appreciating the heritage to be passed to future generations and for approaching the ongoing need for change in the campus environment. What are the appropriate treatments for the stewardship of the university’s resources? Having said “yes” to the question of significance, we can examine the characteristic features and materials of buildings and landscapes to decide what strategies should be used to address the process of change and adaptation. This is the subject of the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan.
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Significance and Change at the University

Since its establishment on the ridge at Burnet Woods in 1895, the University of Cincinnati (UC) has moved through various periods of development significant to its history, including, most recently, the construction of signature buildings and landscapes that have transformed the campus. These projects have received national attention and are exemplary in how they incorporate contemporary attitudes and trends in campus planning and design.

The campus and its buildings and landscapes cannot be frozen in time. A familiar axiom tells us that change is the world's only constant. As is true anywhere on Earth, change will continue at the University of Cincinnati. This Campus Heritage Plan will help guide future change at UC as it relates to the university's historic and signature buildings and landscapes. This chapter describes the underlying principles for accommodating change where buildings and landscapes are considered significant and worthy of a preservation ethic. The chapters that follow will apply these principles in their recommended treatments for specific buildings and landscape areas.
The Evolving Master Plan

To provide context for a preservation strategy, it is helpful to recall some of the decisions made in the years leading up to the University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000. The year 1948 was seminal in the evolution of the University of Cincinnati campus. In that year, old McMicken Hall was torn down, and salvaged bricks were used to build a new McMicken Hall on the footprint of the former building. Old McMicken, built in 1895, was the first campus building to be established on the ridge at Burnet Woods. The new McMicken Hall, designed in a traditional neo-Georgian style by longtime university architect Henry Hake, clearly marked the end of an old era rather than heralding the beginning of a new one.

Between 1895 and 1948, campus planning and design at UC was representative of the Picturesque and Beaux Arts traditions. The Picturesque is seen in the original siting of McMicken Hall and its two wings on the ridge of Burnet Woods, an urban city park originally envisioned with curving roadways and naturalistic landscaping in the Olmsted park tradition. The later siting of Baldwin Quad on a subsidiary ridgeline, at an angle to McMicken, and the siting of the early athletic field (now Nippert Stadium) and Schmidlapp Gymnasium (now the Dieterle Center) in a ravine, also at an angle to McMicken, are remaining examples of the Picturesque’s influence in planning the early campus to work with natural topographic conditions. Today’s roadway on the north edge of McMicken Commons, which curves around the south of Baldwin Quad into what is now MainStreet, is a remaining trace of the original park road system. These features faintly echo the earliest period of the campus’s evolution while continuing to influence its current identity, in that the key orientations and alignments they established would become the “force fields” of the current master plan.
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The university’s Beaux Arts tradition can be seen today in the courtyard form of Baldwin Quad and in the other early 20th century buildings still existing along Clifton Avenue. Memorial Hall, the original portion of Tangeman University Center, and Nippert Stadium also remain from this period. The grid of the city street pattern that extends into the campus from Jefferson Avenue is the only remaining echo of a neighborhood of residential houses that existed on the east side of the campus into the early 1960s.

The University of Cincinnati’s early history ended with the aforementioned reconstruction of McMicken Hall, in 1948. The year 1952 saw the construction of UC’s first modern facility, the Alms Building. The movement from McMicken’s neo-Georgian to Alms’ modern style marked a significant change. Although the campus landscape as a whole did not change radically until the early 1960s, a new era had begun.

As discussed in Chapter 2, radical change occurred between 1964 and 1989, ushered in by enormous growth, the transformation of the university into a nationally ranked research institution, and the reshaping of the modest and traditional early campus into a dense urban complex. This period of growth was important in university history, although it resulted in a campus landscape that the university would seek to reshape in later years.

Although two high-rise residential buildings from this period have been demolished, numerous other modern buildings from the period remain and still actively contribute to university life. The design and functional qualities of these buildings vary; some are handsome examples of their type. Care should be taken not to dismiss these buildings simply because they were created during a difficult period in the university’s physical evolution or because modern buildings of the 1960s and 1970s are currently being
reviewed for preservation. When contemplating the future, university planners should apply to these modern buildings the same careful process of thought and analysis that was followed with earlier university buildings now considered historic.

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000, which was adopted in 1991 and became fully developed in 2000, brought a unifying vision to the campus and laid the groundwork for a landscape that is still evolving today. Compared to the haphazard and somewhat forbidding urban sprawl that existed in 1990, the campus today is a pleasing and stimulating place, largely because of the master plan. Add to this the national recognition that UC has received for its expression of contemporary thought and design, and the master plan becomes a significant work in the body of campus planning literature. The University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000 is an established document, the product of more than a decade of thought and evaluation. While it has contributed to a unifying vision for the campus, it should never become static; rather, it should be the blueprint for continued evolution. The philosophical design concepts underlying the master plan encourage movement and dynamic relationships between outdoor spaces and the buildings that help define them. The master plan’s concepts of pedestrian and vehicle accessibility, clear lines of connection between important places, and positive open spaces that unify buildings and landscapes while also providing variety will remain as underpinnings of campus planning and design at the university. These design concepts are distinct, however, from the execution of the specific landscape and building designs that have been implemented within the master plan’s conceptual framework. The master plan should continue to be the inspiration and guideline for the continued evolution of the university campus. However, it should never hinder continued reevaluation or ongoing change, lest the campus become stagnant.

With this in mind, the master plan should be viewed as an evolving document, to be periodically and regularly updated. Underlying concepts and the physical recommendations to which they lead should be adjusted, adapted, and revised in a way that respects the concepts and processes of the plan but also takes in new information through observation, experience, and reflection. Designs that have been implemented within
the plan’s framework should, likewise, be monitored and evaluated. Information about how well buildings and landscapes have succeeded in addressing the programs they were intended to fulfill, as well as whether they have been successful in implementing concepts and goals of the master plan, should feed into the process of adjustment and adaptation. This Campus Heritage Plan describes one step in that process.

Buildings and features predating 1948 should be considered historically significant and treated as historic resources. In general, the university’s historic buildings have been well maintained and respectfully treated, although some, such as Wilson Auditorium and the University YMCA, are awaiting appropriate reuse. Buildings and features dating from the university’s modern period, 1948 through 1990, should be treated with care on a case-by-case basis so that buildings and features that may later be considered significant are given a fair assessment. Buildings such as Alms, Rhodes, and Baldwin may be valued for the quality of their design. A building such as Crosley Tower, although monolithic, may be valued as a local landmark.

Many of the buildings and landscapes constructed at the university over the past 27 years were designed by recognized contemporary masters and may themselves be considered masterworks. This plan recommends that the signature buildings and landscapes constructed since the adoption of the master plan in 1991 be considered contemporary works of art that may be of national and local historical significance. Great care should be exercised in undertaking changes to these buildings and landscapes, and they should be treated as though they have been determined to be historically and architecturally significant, as indeed they probably are.

Recognizing that changes are inevitable, the process for addressing change (including ongoing maintenance) should be similar to that used for historic buildings and landscapes. This process will use the recommendations of historic preservation, including the defined preservation treatments applicable to historic resources and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, which serve as design guidelines for applying appropriate preservation treatments. Both preservation treatments and the Secretary’s Standards are discussed below. All these resources will benefit by addressing potential future change through a historic preservation perspective.
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Image and the Agents of Change

The University of Cincinnati campus has undergone major change since the early 1960s. To some, buildings from the university’s modern period, 1964 through 1989, have massive institutional personae that lack the appeal and sentiment of ivy-covered neo-Georgian halls. Alumni who attended the university in the 1960s, ’70s, and ’80s (the current pool of potential donors) recall urban high-rise buildings set amid a sea of parking lots. Today, rather than relying solely upon historic buildings and picturesque landscapes, the university’s image draws instead upon the dynamic contemporary artistic character of the signature buildings and landscapes that now dominate the campus.

Now that the frenetic building campaign of the past 15 years has come to a pause, UC’s current image is the one it will carry for the indefinite future. That image consists of (a) remaining historic buildings, (b) remaining modern buildings, (c) recent signature buildings, and (d) the campus landscape that attempts to weave them all together. These elements now are mostly in balance, and the job in the coming years is to fill in, enhance, fine-tune, and correct problems.

A real danger to these contemporary “signature” works of architecture, which seem so intellectually aggressive, dynamic, fresh, stimulating, and curious to many people today, is that they may seem dated in 10 to 20 years. Many architectural and landscape design styles experience a period of decline in appreciation as tastes change. The buildings of the 1960s and 1970s are in this period now. Buildings and landscapes of the early 20th century that are now considered historically significant went through a similar period of disfavor in the 1950s and ’60s. Buildings going through this period face a greater risk of being taken for granted, inappropriately altered, neglected, or lost. As they emerge from such periods, they can be rediscovered, viewed with fresh eyes, and appreciated again. The Campus Heritage Plan stresses the importance of the signature buildings and landscapes and can be used to help mitigate any potential period of disfavor, if future university administrators follow its recommended process for appropriately accommodating change.

One key issue with the signature buildings and landscapes is maintenance. These buildings and landscapes were expensive and cutting-edge. In some cases they were constructed with new materials and complex assemblies, the maintenance characteristics and life cycles of which may
not yet be known. As a result, maintenance needs may be intensive and relatively costly. As with historic buildings, inappropriate maintenance for these materials and systems could lead directly to even more costly problems in the future. The issue of maintenance and sustainability needs to be studied individually, with the goal of reducing costs and increasing lifespan while preserving building and landscape character. Issues related to maintenance are outlined by resource in Chapters 5 and 6.

Issues have also arisen regarding how the signature buildings and landscape fulfill the programs for which they were intended and about the usability of some of the spaces. The university cannot afford to have spaces and facilities that do not serve their intended programmatic purpose. Again, these issues must be examined on a case-by-case basis, and interventions must be crafted that preserve building and landscape character while addressing needs. These issues are also discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

Agents of change at UC can be summarized in five broad categories, most of which have been mentioned previously:

- Changes in use influenced by growth, expansion, and the introduction of new programs;
- Changes in programs that cause existing facilities to no longer be adequate, such as changes influenced by technology, teaching methods, research needs, user expectations, required support facilities, and building systems;
- Lack of appreciation due to changes in taste, leading to inappropriate alterations, neglect, or loss;
- Maintenance issues that are addressed using inappropriate techniques that damage existing materials, compromise existing systems, and/or alter appearance; and
- Buildings or spaces that do not work for their intended use.

The following preservation treatments, guidelines, principles, and processes for decision-making are intended to help the university accommodate change while preserving and enhancing the existing character of its buildings and landscapes.
Preservation Treatments

The historic preservation field uses a variety of terms to describe treatments that may be applied to historic preservation. Although many of these terms are used loosely in discussions about historic buildings, they have specific meanings. Four key terms are generally used to describe the treatment of historic buildings and landscapes: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction.

Of these four terms, Preservation treatment requires retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, features, and materials. Rehabilitation treatment acknowledges the need to alter or add to a property to meet continuing or new uses while retaining historic character. Restoration allows for an accurate depiction of the property’s appearance at a particular time in its history. Reconstruction establishes a framework for re-creating vanished historic elements with new materials.

In planning for changes to UC's historic and signature buildings and landscapes, Preservation and Rehabilitation are the most appropriate and applicable treatments for consideration and use. These terms have been applied in recommending overall treatment approaches to individual buildings and landscape character areas in subsequent chapters of the Campus Heritage Plan. The protection, maintenance, and repair of historic resources should always be a priority and should precede other considerations related to intervention. Appropriate treatments for individual buildings, landscapes, features, and management zones should be identified consistent with the recommendations included in these guidelines when projects are in the early planning stages. How this should be accomplished is outlined below in the chapter section titled “Process for Accommodating Change.” Subsequent chapters provide further information on treatment on an individual basis.
Preservation
Preservation is defined as the process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize features, generally focuses on the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features. Removals, extensive replacement, alterations, and new additions are not appropriate. Preservation stresses protection, repair, and maintenance. Preservation should be the baseline treatment for buildings and landscapes that are too significant and important to change.

Rehabilitation
Rehabilitation is defined as the process of creating a compatible use in a historic property through carefully planned minimal alterations and compatible additions. Often referred to as adaptive reuse, Rehabilitation protects and preserves the historic features, materials, elements, and spatial relationships that convey historical, cultural, and architectural values. In this context, new, expanded, or upgraded facilities should be designed to avoid impacts to character-defining historic elements. They should also be constructed of compatible materials. Retention of original historic fabric should be the primary consideration in undertaking a program of rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. Rehabilitation accommodates needed change and is the most appropriate treatment for most buildings and landscapes at UC.

Restoration
Restoration refers to returning a resource to its appearance at a specific previous period in its history. Restoration is the process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular time removing features from other periods in its history and reconstructing missing features from the desired period. In this context, historic plans, documents, and photographs should be used to guide the work. Limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, as well as code-related work to make a property functional, are all appropriate within a restoration project. It is unlikely that restoration will be a treatment used for projects at UC except for possible isolated, special circumstances.

Reconstruction
Reconstruction is defined as the process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a non-surviving historic property using new construction for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its original location. A reconstruction is a new resource made to replace an historic resource that has been lost. Reconstruction is not anticipated to be relevant to future projects at the university.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards
The philosophy behind the recommendations in this plan is based on a set of federal guidelines entitled The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Commonly called the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, they were established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to provide national benchmarks for the treatment of historic resources. An individual set of standards and guidelines was developed for each of the four commonly identified historic preservation
treatments noted above: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. They were developed to ensure that policies toward historic resources were applied uniformly, even if the end result was different in every case. In the language of community planners, these standards are a list of “best practices” for historic preservation. The standards are often included in preservation plans, ordinances, and regulations that govern activities affecting local historic districts. All federally funded and permitted activities affecting historic resources are evaluated with respect to these standards.

Because of their wisdom, flexibility, and usefulness, the Secretary’s Standards are also widely used throughout the field of historic preservation to aid property owners, designers, and preservation professionals in making good decisions affecting their historic buildings and landscapes. They ensure that important issues about the care of historic buildings and landscapes are not forgotten in the process of making decisions about other issues. When these guidelines are used in the context of a new project involving a historic building, they provide a starting point for the discussion of proposed changes to the building’s historic character and fabric.

Because Rehabilitation is the most appropriate preservation treatment where extensive changes are anticipated to meet changing programmatic needs, the Secretary’s Standards for Rehabilitation have been used in this Campus Heritage Plan as the basis for recommended treatments for UC’s historic and signature buildings and landscapes.

The durability of the Standards is testimony not only to their soundness, but also to the flexibility of their language. They provide a philosophy and a sensitive approach to assessing changes and problem-solving for those involved in managing the treatment of historic buildings, rather than a set of solutions to specific design issues. Following a balanced, reasonable, and disciplined process is often more important than the exact nature of the treatment option that is chosen. Instead of predetermining an outcome in favor of retaining or recreating historic features, the Standards ensure that all the critical issues are considered. The Standards are also useful in consideration of the construction of new buildings in an historic context and the alteration of older buildings as necessary for reuse, safety, accessi-
bility, or maintenance. As with any public policy issue, the public interest in preserving historic buildings and landscapes must be balanced with other public interests.


The 10 standards that make up The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are quoted in full below, followed by a brief discussion of the implications of each.

Standard 1 – A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Standard 1 recommends compatible use in the context of adaptive reuse and changes to historic buildings and landscapes. This standard encourages owners and managers to find uses that retain and enhance historic character, not detract from it. For example, the work involved in reuse projects should be carefully planned to minimize impacts on historic features, materials, and spaces. The destruction of character-defining features should be avoided.

Standard 2 – The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Standard 2 recommends the retention and preservation of character-defining features. It emphasizes the importance of preserving integrity and as much existing historic fabric as possible. Alterations that repair or modify existing historic fabric are preferable to those that require total removal.

Standard 3 – Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
Standard 3 focuses on authenticity and discourages the conjectural restoration of an entire property, feature, or design. It also discourages combining and/or grafting historic features and elements from different properties, and constructing new buildings that appear to be historic. Literal restoration to a historic appearance should be undertaken only when detailed documentation is available and when the significance of the resource warrants restoration. Reconstruction of lost features should not be attempted without adequate documentation.

Standard 4 – Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Standard 4 recognizes that buildings change, and that many of these changes contribute to a building’s historical significance. Understanding a building’s history and development is just as important as understanding its original design, appearance, and function. This point should be kept in mind when considering treatments for buildings that have undergone many changes. Most historic buildings contain a visual record of their own evolution. This evolution can be identified, and changes that are significant to the history of the building should be retained. The opportunity to compare multiple periods of time in the same building lends interest to the structure and helps communicate changes that have occurred within the larger landscape and community context.

Standard 5 – Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Standard 5 recommends preserving the distinctive historic components of a building or landscape that represent its historic character. Workmanship, materials, methods of construction, floor plans, and both ornate and typical details should be identified before work is undertaken.

Standard 6 – Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Standard 6 encourages property owners to repair historic character-defining features instead of replacing them when historic features are deteriorated. In cases where deterioration makes replacement necessary, new features should closely match historic conditions in all respects. Property owners are urged to document existing conditions with photography and notes before any features are altered or removed. These records assist future choices that are appropriate to the property’s historic character.

Standard 7 – Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Standard 7 warns against using chemical and physical treatments that can permanently damage historic features. Many commercially available
treatments are irreversibly damaging. Sandblasting and harsh chemical cleaning, in particular, are extremely harmful to wood and masonry surfaces because they destroy the material's basic physical properties and speed deterioration. Potential treatments for UC's signature buildings should be carefully considered in this regard. Some of the materials used in the buildings are new, and it is not known how they will weather over time. Potential maintenance treatments should not alter or damage these new materials.

**Standard 8** – Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Standard 8 addresses the importance of below-ground prehistoric and historic features. This issue is paramount when a construction project involves excavation. An assessment of a site's archeological potential is recommended before work is undertaken. If archeological resources are found, some type of mitigation may be required. Solutions should be developed that minimize the need for excavation of previously unexcavated sites.

**Standard 9** – New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

**Standard 10** – New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Standards 9 and 10 are linked by issues of the compatibility and reversibility of additions, alterations, and new construction. Both standards are intended to (a) minimize the damage to historic fabric caused by building additions, and (b) ensure that new work will be different from, but compatible with, existing historic conditions. The level of craftsmanship, detailing, and quality of materials should be appropriate to the significance of the resource. Following these standards will help to protect a building's historic integrity.

The basic premise of the Secretary's Standards is that historic resources are more than objects of aesthetic merit; they are repositories of historical information. The Standards provide a framework for evaluating preservation activities and emphasize preservation of historic fabric, honesty of historical expression, and reversibility.

**Principles for Accommodating Change at UC**

The philosophy behind the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan is that a historic preservation approach is appropriate to both UC's historic and signature buildings and landscapes, and that a preservation ethic of stewardship contributes to a viable, healthy campus by preserving and strengthening character and by accommodating change in a sensitive manner. When character defining building and landscape elements are identified and preserved, the campus is enhanced as a significant and
distinctive place. Continued education of students, faculty, staff, and visitors regarding the history and significance of the university and its buildings and landscapes is important in generating appreciation and support for the appropriate treatment of its resources. Appropriate maintenance is vital to the conservation of character-defining building and landscape elements. Flexibility in planning and design is the key to developing solutions for changing needs that will last for a long time to come.

Thus, the general principles of this preservation approach encourage and facilitate the long-term preservation of character-defining buildings and landscapes, and are based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, which should be considered in planning maintenance, reuse, renovations, new construction, and other future work on UC campuses:

- Continue to use a property as it was designed to be used, or find a new use that minimizes necessary changes to character-defining features.
- Identify and retain distinguishing building and landscape qualities and characteristics.
- Maintain, protect, and repair existing character-defining features, materials, and finishes. If features are deteriorated beyond repair, replace in kind.
- Be authentic: if a feature is missing or must be removed, use accurate documentation to guide replacement.
- Respect the evolution of historic changes, fashion, taste, and use.
- Do not use maintenance methods or materials that damage significant building and landscape fabric.
Where needed changes require new construction:

- Respect the evolving master plan.
- Follow an established design review process.
- Accommodate the needed program to the maximum extent possible without destroying the character of the existing resource.
- Understand that change will continue to occur.
- Respect the existing built context.
- Maintain a high quality of design and craftsmanship.
- Take a humanist approach — design places where people want to be.
- Take a sustainable approach — be responsible to society and the environment.
- Where change is necessary, existing university buildings offer opportunities for creative new uses. Often found with multiple layers of history and aesthetics, existing buildings can inspire creative and compatible designs for new construction.
- New construction should not destroy character-defining building or landscape features or materials.
- Additions and alterations to historic or signature buildings and landscapes should speak of their own time but should be compatible with the character of the existing resource.

Management Issues

Finally, any preservation approach will necessarily intersect the current, very specific management issues, concerns, and objectives of the University of Cincinnati from which the impulse for change will arise. These are the “backstory” of the setting within which change agents interact and through which the preservation principles recommended in this plan will be applied. All decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis. When the Secretary’s Standards are carefully and consistently applied, they meet the test of common sense.
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Landscape Assessment and Treatment

Introduction

This chapter, in conjunction with Appendix C, describes and analyzes the character and characteristics of the University of Cincinnati’s signature and heritage campus landscapes using narrative description of their spatial components and materials and photographic and cartographic illustrations. Condition, management, and maintenance issues that threaten the long-term viability of these important landscapes are also raised below and in Appendix C.

This chapter suggests appropriate approaches to the future management and treatment of these landscapes, taking into consideration their role in the campus and as components of the university’s celebrated Master Plan 2000.
The signature and heritage campus landscapes discussed in this chapter include (see also figures 1-1 and 1-2 in Chapter 1):

- Bearcat Plaza
- Campus Green
- CCM Plaza
- Clifton Arc
- DAAP Landscape
- Eden Quadrangle
- Herman Schneider Quad
- Library Square
- MainStreet
- McMicken Commons
- Sigma Sigma Commons
- The Mews
- The Observatory
- University Commons
- Zimmer Roof Garden

Note: the Cincinnati Observatory "a mature building" is not shown on this map.
Overview Description of the Campus Landscapes

The University of Cincinnati campus has gained international recognition as an icon of architectural and landscape architectural design. The evolution of the university's campus has occurred over a 15-year period based on an in-depth campus master plan prepared by the office of George Hargreaves & Associates. *Master Plan 2000* set about systematically updating the more-than-100-year-old campus to meet one of the most important contemporary challenges facing university administrators: how to attract the best and the brightest students, faculty, and staff in a highly competitive market. An unexpected benefit of the campus makeover has been far-reaching popular acclaim that has generated extensive publicity. The campus's collection of works by famous designers has literally put the University of Cincinnati on the map; it is currently a featured stop on regional architectural tours.
Master Plan 2000 has been the conceptual and pragmatic blueprint for the University of Cincinnati’s emergence as a recognized leader in campus planning and design. At once conceptually comprehensive and detail-oriented, the master plan has guided implementation of various university goals, such as transitioning from a commuter school to a residential college, enhancing campus walkability, establishing clear lines of connection between important places, and creating positive open spaces that unify buildings and landscapes and afford variety in the sense of place. Also of importance to the university has been the conceptualization and construction of landscape spaces suitable for the engagement of students, faculty, staff, and visitors alike in a dynamic interactive environment.

The Hargreaves master plan embraces the multi-layered relationships that exist between older features of the campus while judiciously inserting many new elements. The plan works to ensure the continued viability of historic features, such as the spatial configuration of Herman Schneider Quad. At the same time, the master plan has guided major changes to areas that conflicted with the university’s primary goals of a pedestrian-friendly environment and spaces that afford opportunities for education, recruitment, and socializing. Implementation of the master plan has led to the removal of some large buildings, such as Beecher Hall, the old book store, and Swift Annex, as well as surface parking facilities. It has also generated construction of a series of dramatic and unique new features that are without precedent or context within the campus.

The broad gestures employed by the master plan include establishment of a central spine of open space on the West Campus, use of new buildings as “infill” that supports the broad vision of place making, and the identification of a system of connective lines and axes that effectively knits the campus and its various disparate parts together. The master plan also suggested the establishment of strong relationships between interior and exterior spaces; of all the goals of the master plan, this is one where additional work remains to provide better linkages between building entrances and programmed landscape space. MainStreet, however, is an example of a successful application of this goal. This is a place where outside and inside mesh, where buildings hang over walks, and where steps that cascade down the street and serve as seating and impromptu theatre also lead to building entrances. In many cases, the interior spaces mirror or are enlivened by views to exterior spaces, and the activities going on inside are visible on the street. It stands as a model for future development on campus.

The other masterfully executed component of the plan is the handling of transitions and junctures between places and spaces. Junctions, knuckles, seams, and connections are difficult to address successfully in design. At the University of Cincinnati, transitional spaces, such as the fountain at University Plaza that edges McMicken Commons, the pedestrian bridge between Tangeman University Center and Mary Emery Hall, the theater-like stairs leading into CCM Plaza, the walkway following one of the force fields between McMicken Commons and the Herman Schneider Quad, the Light Tower that marks the transition between Sigma Sigma Commons and Campus Green, and Bearcat Plaza overlooking Nippert Stadium on the periphery of MainStreet, are often well developed and carefully considered. Steps and seatwalls, axial views and connections, and
compelling views of something interesting just around the corner draw visitors through spaces and along corridors and are often part of the transitional vocabulary. The master plan’s skillful treatment of these junctions becomes especially apparent when one experiences those areas of the campus not yet updated. These older areas have a static feeling and, in some cases, a left-over quality.

Another design issue the campus master plan has successfully navigated is the creation of an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible route to all buildings and outdoor features. The pronounced grade changes over the West Campus and between the two campuses pose great challenges to accessibility. The university has done an extraordinary job in developing ADA-compliant circulation routes, which often parallel or are compatible with non-accessible walks that emphasize stairs, steps, and seat walls as integral design elements.

As part of the master planning process, the university has also established a set of design standards, guidelines, and product standards for site furnishings. These design standards and guidelines provide visual clues for wayfinding and unify place making design gestures. Standards have been adopted for such features as benches, lighting, kiosks, tree grates, trash and recycling receptacles, and bike racks, as well as for certain types of paving. These help identify and reinforce the campus as a whole, as well as specific districts, such as MainStreet, where colored concrete pavers are used consistently to unify its appearance and signal its unique identity, as are lighting, tree grates, and signage. In another important design gesture, the university has adopted granite as a signature landscape material because of its durability and life-cycle cost relative to sustainability.

Environmental graphic features are also well conceived and executed on the University of Cincinnati campus. The university employs an environmental graphic designer to develop concepts for graphics and signage. These elements are designed to facilitate the continuity of buildings and open spaces and provide areas and districts, like MainStreet, with a recognizable character. In addition, the designs incorporate a consistent use of color; red is used in signage and in floral displays to reinforce brand identification.

As an urban campus, the university has many perimeter entrance portals. The master plan helped to establish an iconic design vocabulary to introduce major entrances. Campus entrances or “gateways” are typically marked by a grid of pylons with sign walls fashioned from a native Ohio stone, copper-variegated Briar Hill sandstone. The pylons are topped by copper-encased recessed lighting. Many of the entrances also feature campus identity signs constructed as curved walls with “University of Cincinnati” and the name of the specific entrance drive in bronze letters. The signs are also lit.

The University of Cincinnati has made a concerted effort to incorporate sculpture and other artworks into the built environment. Recently placed examples include “Figura Prima” by Magdalena Abakanowicz at CCM Plaza, “Belief” by Terry Allen at University Commons, and “Forest Devil” by Kenneth Snelsen at Zimmer Roof Garden. The integration of art is compelling and intriguing, and reinforces the creation of a sense of place.
Despite the natural interest of the intellectually intriguing and challenging signature works of landscape architecture that have been implemented based on the guidance provided by the master plan, including Campus Green, University Commons, The Mews, and CCM Plaza, there remain differences of opinion within the university community about the usability of some of the campus open spaces. The curiosity factor that has put the campus on the map may not be sufficient to sustain the success and popularity of these landscapes. Possible solutions are offered as part of the treatment recommendations section that follows the identification of campus character areas below.

**Identification of Character Areas and Districts**

Various planning documents divide the University of Cincinnati campus into a series of distinct districts or areas. These include *Master Plan 2000*, Paul Bennett’s *University of Cincinnati Campus Guide*, and a PowerPoint overview of the campus developed by the Office of the University Architect. Each of these assembles buildings and landscapes into definable areas; this Campus Heritage Plan presents yet another organizational system, although many commonalities remain between the systems.

The character area system presented in this plan serves two purposes. The first is to help organize information and establish smaller, more manageable areas for discussion. The second is to identify places that have a consistency of materials, spatial qualities, visual connections, and/or historical development that should be considered as units when describing an approach to future management. The character areas described below are used to organize treatment recommendations later in this chapter.

The character areas identified for the campus include (figure 5-1):

**West Campus**
- DAAP Complex
- Engineering Complex
- Campus Green, which includes Sigma Sigma Commons
- Jefferson Avenue Housing
- Dabney-French Complex
- MainStreet
- McMicken Commons
- Clifton Arc
- CCM Complex
- Athletic Complex
- Calhoun Streetscape

**East Campus**
- University Commons
- Eden Quad

**Observatory**
- The Observatory
Description of the Character Areas

**DAAP Complex**
The DAAP Complex is the series of buildings that make up the university’s College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning: Alms, DAAP Addition, Wolfson, and the Aronoff Center. The character area includes the open space that wraps around the complex, including the Hargreaves-designed DAAP landscape that features sculptural landforms, turf grass, and carefully placed plantings that play off of remnants of historic Burnet Woods. This landscape forms the northwestern corner of the campus. A sandstone identity sign stands on the knoll overlooking the major intersection of Martin Luther King Drive and Calhoun Avenue.

**Engineering Complex**
This large character area includes the various buildings and features that relate to the study of engineering at UC: the Geology/Physics Building, Braunstein Hall, Old Chemistry Building, Swift Hall, Baldwin Hall, Rhodes Hall, Engineering Research Center, and Rieveschl Hall, as well as related and proximate buildings and structures such as Crosley Tower, Langsam Library, Woodside Drive Garage, and the Clifton Court Garage. This cluster of buildings is sited on the ridgeline that extends northeast from the academic ridge that was first developed by the university along Clifton Avenue. The buildings in this character area are generally sited around central open spaces. Three of these are signature landscapes that are a focus of this study: the Zimmer Roof Garden, Library Square, and the Herman Schneider Quad.

**Campus Green**
The Campus Green landscape occupies much of the northeastern portion of the West Campus, extending across six acres of land reclaimed from a former surface parking lot. The central open space features two complementary pedestrian walk systems, the “braided walk” that recalls the meandering flow of a stream corridor and is edged by fountains and tightly-planted groupings of bald cypress and hornbeam trees, and a series of orthogonal and angled walks that lead to perimeter buildings, road crossings, and small seating areas. Turf panels, ornamental trees and shrubs, an earthen mound, and a small arboretum also enliven this large greensward. Buildings loosely edge the central open space, including the Campus Green Drive Garage, Lindner Hall, and the Myers Alumni Center, as well as the dormitories of the Jefferson Avenue Housing area, and the Engineering Research Center. This character area includes a campus entrance at Campus Green Drive marked by a sandstone identity sign and pylons.

**Jefferson Avenue Housing**
This area includes the three distinct housing complexes that line Jefferson Avenue: Scioto and Morgens Halls, Turner and Schneider Halls, and Daniels Hall and Sander Dining. It does not include any signature landscapes. This character area forms the northeast corner of West Campus and features a challenging pedestrian crossing of Martin Luther King Drive, the primary connection between East and West Campuses. Scioto and Morgens Halls are two surviving buildings of a triad that once edged the open-air parking lot now occupied by Campus Green. A multi-level parking garage is located east of these tall residential buildings. South of this cluster, the campus entrance at West University
Avenue is marked by sandstone pylons and a campus identity sign. Schneider and Turner Halls form a geometric composition of straight and angled lines of buildings and interconnected spaces adjacent to West University Avenue. The placement of the buildings and walks, in conjunction with landform and plantings, form a series of small outdoor spaces. Further south, Daniels Hall and Sander Dining Hall are, older buildings set within more static environments of grass, shrubs, trees, and walks.

**Dabney-French Complex**
Dabney and French Halls form the eastern edge the Jefferson Avenue Housing area. These two buildings have been modified from their original residential uses to accommodate administrative and classroom needs. They frame Commons Way across from Schneider and Turner Halls, and French Hall forms a portion of the backdrop for Sigma Sigma Commons. There are no signature landscapes included within this character area.

**MainStreet**
MainStreet extends from University Plaza to Woodside Drive at the Engineering Research Center. It also includes the Steger Student Life Center, CR Residence Hall, and residence halls above the Campus Recreation Center, and is edged by Nippert Stadium and Rhodes Hall. The area follows the curvilinear route of this pedestrian passage through the central portion of the campus. MainStreet has a unique identity comprised of design features and materials such as an exclusive paver, consistent signage and site furnishings, and a vocabulary of steps and seatwalls that allow for informal gathering. This area includes two signature landscapes of interest to this study: MainStreet and the Mews, which provides a quiet, positive pedestrian corridor behind an active, meandering MainStreet.

**McMicken Commons**
This area is characterized by the central open space that unifies a collection of perimeter buildings with a wide range of architectural expressions, including McMicken Hall, University Pavilion, Braunstein Hall, and the Tangeman University Center. McMickens Commons, the university's first Hargreaves-designed signature landscape, edges MainStreet to the east and Clifton Arc to the west. The open space features extensive lawn, concrete walks, granite seat walls, and shade tree plantings.

**Clifton Arc**
This area forms much of the western margin of West Campus. It is bordered to the west by Clifton Avenue and by a series of campus buildings – Taft Hall, Blegen Hall, the Teachers College complex, Van Wormer Hall, McMicken Hall, and Wilson Auditorium – that occupy the narrow ridge that was the focus of early campus development. Clifton Arc is characterized by a rectangular greensward of open space that slopes from east to west, and is cut by the curving form of McMicken Circle, one of the campus entrance drives. Many of the buildings are older, and complemented by the pastoral setting of the greensward, which includes lawn and ornamental tree and shrub plantings.
CCM Complex
This character area includes the assemblage of arts buildings — Mary Emery Hall, Corbett Auditorium, Theater Production, Patricia Corbett Theater, and Corbett Pavilion — and associated buildings such as the Dieterle Vocal Arts Center, Memorial Hall, and the CCM garage entrance that edge a central paved plaza. The area, which is often referred to as a village, is unified by the brick paving of Olin Partnership-designed CCM Plaza, the only signature landscape within this character area, and by walks and a courtyard garden along the Galleria. Dramatic elements, such as Figura Prima, a sculpture by Polish artist Magdalena Abakanowicz, and a circular arrangement of steel bollards that reinforce the concentric bands of paving and plantings within the plaza, contribute to a lively and dynamic urban environment.

Athletic Complex
This area encompasses the majority of the athletic facilities associated with the University of Cincinnati: Gettler Stadium, Marge Schott Stadium, the Varsity Village Tennis Center, and Nippert Stadium, as well as the indoor facilities associated with the Richard E. Lindner Center, Fifth Third Arena/Shoemaker Center, Armory Fieldhouse, and the Campus Recreation Center complex. Because of the proposal to develop a soccer field on the land east of Marge Schott Stadium, this land has also been included within the Athletic Complex. Most of the features located within the area are relatively new and convey a clean, crisp character, and include cutting-edge design features associated with the individual sports facilities. Older facilities are also present, including the Armory Fieldhouse and Fifth Third Arena/Shoemaker Center.

Calhoun Streetscape
This area includes the series of buildings that edge Calhoun Street along the southern margin of West Campus: the University YMCA Building, Siddall Hall, Calhoun Hall, Market Pointe at Siddall, University Park Apartments, Calhoun Street Garage, Corry Boulevard Garage, and Edwards Center. Although the buildings date from different eras and maintain distinctive characters, the area is tied together through its location along a prominent ridgeline.

University Commons
Two signature landscapes are associated with East Campus: University Commons and Eden Quadrangle. At the time that this Campus Heritage Plan was prepared, Eden Quadrangle remained under construction. University Commons, designed by Hargreaves and Associates, provides the primary open space for this campus, which houses the university’s medical school and several administrative facilities. The commons is framed by Martin Luther King Drive to the south, the Vontz Center for Molecular Studies to the east, the Kingsgate Conference Center and University Hall to the north, and Proctor Hall to west. The central open space includes a diverse array of landscape features such as a fountain, the sculpture “Belief” by artist Terry Allen, two earthen mounds, undulating berms, and a variety of seating areas. North of University Hall, another campus entrance is marked by sandstone pylons and a university identity sign.
The Observatory
The Cincinnati Observatory Center is located near the intersection of Observatory Place and Avery Lane east of the primary university campus. The character area features two observatory buildings, which sit atop a broad knoll characterized primarily by turf grass. The open area that surrounds the Observatory is edged by deciduous woodland and topography that drops away more steeply. The Observatory landscape is pastoral, marked by turf lawn dotted with ornamental and shade trees. Landscape features include an access drive with a circular turnaround, parking area, walkway system, outdoor seating plaza, etched stone and concrete plaques and pylons, site lighting, and a historical marker.

Treatment of Landscape
This section offers a framework for considering, evaluating, and managing the mature and signature landscapes of the University of Cincinnati campus. Issues presented include a recommended approach to maintaining the campus landscape and the particular challenges the university faces in doing so. Additionally, this section includes some of the guiding principles to be considered in making site-specific recommendations for future management and, in some cases, change. For individual landscapes, this treatment section identifies aspects of the various landscapes that may be recognized as significant to the university’s or our nation’s heritage, as well as factors that threaten their survival.

Recommended Treatment Approach
During the past sixteen years of Master Plan implementation, the university has experienced a transformation of nearly 50 percent of its campus with a commitment of over $2 billion, the journey has produced a cohesive assembly of new and renovated buildings, recreation facilities, improved residential environments, athletic and performance venues, and sculpted landscapes and plazas.

Given the enormity of the university’s recent undertaking, the community will need time to assess and reflect upon the success and utility of their new campus environment. There will likely be a period of growing pains and adjustments as students, faculty, administrators, and alumni take stock of the campus and identify specific issues that may need to be addressed in the future. The overarching concept for appropriately managing the signature and historic landscapes of the University of Cincinnati campus is to maintain a flexible approach to treatment, preserving the design concept and spatial intent of each landscape while permitting limited adaptations that will meet the university’s changing needs. Such adaptations should only be undertaken within carefully established parameters aimed at protecting inherent design values. This concept arises from the knowledge that, although the campuses have attained unique and recognizable characters and have earned international acclaim, they remain “living” entities that must constantly evolve to meet the current and future needs of students, faculty, staff, and visitors. Many of the following recommendations address identified deficiencies and concerns regarding the landscapes’ usefulness and sustainability without altering the significance of the existing designs.
The primary treatment concerns for the University of Cincinnati campus landscape are:

- retention of and respect for character-defining spatial patterns and building relationships;
- retention of and respect for the dynamic, fluid, and connective quality of the central green spaces and other focal points of school and building complexes;
- retention and enhancement of views to the adjacent Burnet Woods and neighborhoods; and
- assurance that new features are visually compatible with the existing character of the landscape, and that the design of new open spaces carefully considers the relationship to the broader intent of the master plan as well as internal connections to adjacent buildings and spaces. The existing spatial patterns, derived from the placement of buildings, roads, paths, force fields, open spaces, vegetation, and topography, have created the physical expression of the campus as it exists today.

**A Particular Challenge**

Design is influenced by trends, fashions, and styles, and often reflects a particular point in time and space and/or a world view. Among the three design firms represented in the various signature landscapes, Hargreaves Associates stands out for having designed much of the open space as well as the overarching master plan that determined its placement and underlying context. The landscapes Hargreaves established at the University of Cincinnati are highly representative of his international body of work. His style is recognizable, and his landscapes may be referred to as stylized. While Hargreaves himself was likely an important influence in this phenomenon, they are emblematic of a late-20th-century sculptural-design aesthetic upon which George Hargreaves had a strong influence.¹

Styles change as our world evolves. The sculptural landforms and mounds of the Hargreaves designs, while recent in their introduction to the campus landscape, reflect a style that is not now in vogue. The issue of style (and its partner, taste) is one of the values considered by the National Register of Historic Places. In fact, the 50-year age consideration for historic designation is expressly intended to remove the issue of stylistic cycles from the evaluation of design ideas and expressions. Only with the passing of time can the question of what is “in,” “out,” and “in” again be taken out of the mix, allowing work to be evaluated with critical perspective.

Another issue that currently raises concerns about the designs is an acknowledgement of the growing need for sustainability. Most of the Hargreaves landscapes on the UC campus benefit from a labor-intensive effort to keep them in a constant state; they are not intended to evolve over time. The energy resources required to maintain these landscapes are considerable. This, in conjunction with dwindling university budgets, is one of the greatest threats to the signature campus landscapes.
Besides the question of popularity, the Hargreaves design style raises concerns about utility, functionality, and comfort, as well as people-friendly design and human scale. These designs have in common both a conceptual strength and a lack of opportunities for shade, scale, and contemplation, universal qualities of public space that are critical to their value and timelessness. In each of the Hargreaves designs, the big idea is readily apparent, impressive in its scope, and awe-inspiring. However, once the design concept is revealed, the challenge is to draw the user back into the space. Three important questions arise from this observation: What are these landscapes missing that would make them more memorable places for the university community? What overlay activities and elements might make them more interesting? How much can these spaces evolve before the important design ideas are lost?

Design is a primary value within the University of Cincinnati campus. The fact that the university has made design a high priority is an important gesture to consider when evaluating existing landscapes and buildings and proposing changes. The Planning + Design + Construction has ensured that the master plan and expressions of the individual spaces recognize that design involves the essential elements of form and space and those principles that control their organization in our built environment... While utilitarian concerns of function and use can be relatively short-lived, and symbolic interpretations can vary from age to age, these primary elements of form and space comprise the timeless and fundamental vocabulary of the designer... The element of form [is] the primary tool of the designer and it serves to lay out and classify for analysis and discussion basic forms and organizations of space and their generic transformations in a typological manner. It is ultimately the province of the individual designer to select, test, and manipulate these elements into coherent, meaningful, and useful organizations of space, structure, and enclosure.2

Architecture is normally conceived (designed) and realized (built) in response to an existing set of conditions. These conditions may be purely functional in nature, or they may reflect, in varying degrees, social, economic, political, even whimsical or symbolic intentions. In any case, it is assumed that the existing set of conditions — the problem — is less than satisfactory, and that a new set of conditions — a solution — would be desirable. The act of creating architecture, then is a problem-solving or design process.3

Fundamentally, the physical manifestations of architecture must accommodate human activity. The arrangement and organization of the elements of form and space will determine how architecture might promote endeavors, elicit responses, and communicate meaning. These elements of form and space are presented, therefore, not as ends in themselves, but as means to solve a problem in response to conditions of function, purpose, and context.4

The master plan, it must be acknowledged, has slowly solved many of the campus design and planning problems identified in the late 1980s. However, the university is currently recognizing that some of the designs for individual spaces and landscapes are not successful on the functional level and that others do not resonate with the university community. It is unclear whether these perceptions can be attributed to the existing landscapes’ relative lack of maturity or to a lack of appreciation for the
new on-campus opportunities, given the university’s long-standing history as a commuter college.

Many of these landscape designs have received national and international recognition. After 50 years, these landscapes would likely be considered architecturally significant by the National Register of Historic Places as the work of a recognized master. The future of these landscapes could unfold in either of two ways: they could be acknowledged as prime examples of a particular style, philosophy, or cultural world view representative of the late 20th century, and inspire generations of students and designers; or, they could be lost to neglect due to a lack of appreciation. To support the conservation of these landscapes, this plan attempts to identify their value and importance, but also seeks to enhance their usefulness without denigrating their design value.

**Principles to Consider in Developing Treatment Recommendations**

Principles taken into consideration in preparing these treatment recommendations include the Master Plan 2000, the university’s Sustainability Landscape Overlay, and the needs of the people who will live and work within any designed space, as espoused by sociologist William Whyte in *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*.

The sections that follow present key elements and reference principles from these different sources. Together, these principles help to guide a holistic understanding of the existing campus, the vision that has provided a blueprint for reaching this stage, and the vision that will likely be needed to successfully guide the campus into the future.

**Principles of the Master Plan**

The primary goal of the master plan as it evolved between 1988 and the present has been to create an identity for the University of Cincinnati as an international leader in education and research. Some of the master plan’s goals were to make the campus more pedestrian-friendly, make open space the organizing element, enhance connections between these spaces and buildings, and establish spaces that are intellectually and aesthetically challenging. Specifically, the master plan set forth four objectives to be met through the document’s design and philosophy:

**Emphasize education and enhance the quality of life.** Education can occur through interaction with the physical environment, both its indoor and outdoor places. Education is enhanced through connections between academic disciplines; students should be encouraged to live on campus; the campus should provide an environment for discourse and social interaction; open space should be emphasized as the primary structural element of the campus, it should be made people-friendly in every way, and the scale of all new campus development should enhance the human experience; and outdoor space designs and plantings should create outdoor gathering places of various sizes.

**Nurture diversity and promote creativity.** As a place, the campus should acknowledge the element of controversy, and the places of the university should nurture intellectual exchange and social interaction among people. The architecture of landscapes and buildings can evoke the
controversy inherent in strong ideas, thus fostering an environment of creativity. Public art should herald freedom of expression, exchange of ideas, and creative conflict; the university’s goals are diverse and should be expressed in the process of physical planning; and campus traditions should be recognized in the planning process.

Create connection, campus identity, and a stronger sense of community. Individual programs and disciplines should have a clear self-identity with a physical heart or central gathering place, which in turn is connected to the larger university fabric. Campus open space should be developed as the primary structural element of the campus environment; it should link existing and proposed buildings, and invite interaction of all kinds. There is a need to create a greater sense of connection and community throughout the university, including better linkages between the East and West campuses and between the campus and its surrounding neighborhoods, community institutions, and business districts. Finally, connections between the university’s history and its future should be articulated and given physical expression, and emerging technologies necessitate the development of a stronger campus identity.

Celebrate creativity, innovation, uniqueness, and technological innovation. The university has a unique physical setting. Topographical variation within the campus is unique and affords many opportunities for exciting spaces. The topography is also a source of potential problems for circulation and building expansion; the age of the university and the depth of its roots should be recognized in the physical planning effort; the campus is a 12-month, 24-hour campus.

Principles of the University’s Sustainability Landscape Overlay

The university is currently working to make its campus more sustainable. Planning + Design + Construction has prepared a set of draft guidelines for landscape sustainability that provide suggestions for limiting the use of fossil fuel and the application of fertilizer, pesticides, and other noxious chemicals, conserving water, and managing invasive plant species.

The University of Cincinnati’s draft “Sustainability: Our Common Future; Landscape Overlay” presents a number of laudable goals for managing and maintaining the campus landscape. The goals, objectives, and practices of sustainable design and historic preservation are often compatible and synergistic. Therefore, a critical component of this study assesses the sustainability of the existing signature landscapes. For example, high maintenance costs are anathema to sustainability if they cannot be supported and pose a threat to the viability of landscapes over time.

Specifically, in recognizing its environmental leadership role, the university seeks to incorporate the concept of sustainability into its academic and research program for the design, operation, and maintenance of its buildings and landscapes; while maintaining safety and preserving comfort. The university recognizes that sustainability is a multi-disciplinary, holistic concept that seeks to achieve harmony between human activities and natural systems by efficiently using resources and preserving them for future generations.
The specific tools identified for meeting the sustainability objectives include:

- Encourage conservation of the ecosystem through:
  - Use of regionally specific community models
  - Increased (though not exclusive) use of native plants, which are adapted to the climatological conditions of the region
  - Sound management of aggressive, invasive exotic plants
  - During new construction, minimal site disturbance and preferential reuse (if possible) of existing plant material
  - Careful selection, siting, and proper installation of new plant material, including proper aftercare, to reduce such problems as transplant shock, long-term plant stress, and mortality

- Keep high-maintenance lawn areas at a minimum, thereby reducing maintenance requirements and costs associated with mowing, raking, fertilizing, irrigating, aerating, soil amending, and pesticide application. Reduction of total lawn area will also reduce maintenance costs.

- Conserve water by reducing surface and subsurface run-off through preservation and use of vegetation, and through water detention and retention areas; reduce storm drains and diversion of water off-site; reduce impervious paving surfaces and increase porous surfaces.

- Employ preferential use of local materials (pavers, concrete, wood, mulch, plant materials, etc.). Encourage utilization of renewable and recyclable materials.

- Identify the importance of sustainability in the living process, and its contribution to the creation of “the sense of place.”

The plan recommends that the university continue to search for better, more energy-efficient lights to be used in landscape lighting.

Finally, “understanding the amount of energy (fossil fuel) being used, and constantly seeking viable alternatives to minimize their consumption is the first step to reducing maintenance costs.” The university can help reduce energy costs by planting more trees, which clean the air by absorbing carbon dioxide and releasing oxygen, save energy consumption for heating and cooling, reduce air temperatures, break winter chilling winds, and using certain types of ground covers such as water-thrifty grasses (buffalo grass, fescue) which will reduce the use of fuel, water, time required for mowing and watering.
Meeting the Needs of Community: William Whyte’s Sociological Principles of How People Enjoy Urban Spaces

The principles that follow are based on the field observations of sociologist William Whyte in New York City in the 1970s and documented in the seminal work *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. Whyte studied the way people gather in urban environments and what features contribute to a human sense of well-being, comfort, and social interaction. His observations are relevant to the university as an urban campus, in that most campuses function like small cities. Whyte identifies the conditions and landscape features that lead people to gather and interact. These principles offer clues as to how landscapes at the University of Cincinnati might be carefully adapted to enhance their integration into the university community:

- People attract people.
- People like to watch other people from a safe and comfortable location.
- People like to stand near objects that afford a sense of human scale and protection.
- People like well-defined places.
- People like places with a view or prospect.
- People like steps and sittable space with socially comfortable seats and a variety of choices.
- People seek comfort, like sun and protection from the wind during cold periods and shade during hot periods; warmth is as important as sunlight.
- People like to be near flow points, particularly heavily traveled circulation routes.
- People do not like to stand in the center of open spaces.
- The sense of enclosure of a space, not its size or shape, is critical.
- Trees are one of the best elements to provide social and physical comfort and ease within a space. They provide comfort, protection, and a satisfying sense of enclosure. They provide human scale.
- Water is usually an attractive element.
- Art and music and recreational activity are all draws.
- Visual accessibility is important to afford a sense of safety and security.
- The best places are comfortable sitting spaces with a view of passersby and trees for a canopy.
- Diffusion of activity is deadening.
Treatment Recommendations

This Campus Heritage Plan links the overall philosophy or approach to solving management issues with treatment recommendations in two categories: general treatment issues and recommendations that address campus-wide topics, and treatment issues and recommendations relating to each of the character areas. The general treatment issues consider some of the big-picture items, such as safety and maintenance, which should be considered a context for the signature and mature landscapes. Although these are the focus of the character area recommendations, other areas of the campus are discussed as well. In most cases, the focus landscapes are introduced with a description of their design intent or role within the campus. The introductory descriptions are followed by a list of the issues considered by the Campus Heritage Plan team. These issues were derived through field investigations and discussions with the university. Specific recommendations to address the issues follow.

The recommendations generally consider and address the three sets of principles documented in the preceding three sections of this chapter. In each case, the goal is to respect and adhere to the master plan principles where possible, to incorporate sustainability when appropriate, and to identify and rectify the functional deficiencies that diminish the success of some of the campus landscapes by considering the needs of community and the individuals who will be using them.
General Treatment Issues and Recommendations

ADA Accessibility

Issues and Considerations
There are 70-foot elevation changes across West Campus alone, making the University of Cincinnati site a great challenge to ADA accessibility. The university has done an extraordinary job developing an accessible route through the entire campus.

Recommendations
Continue to integrate ADA-accessible walks into design solutions beginning early in design. Avoid shoehorning incompatible ADA-accessible walks and ramps into historic, signature, and future campus landscapes.

Design Standards

Issues and Considerations
The university has established a set of design and product standards for site furnishings, lighting, kiosks, and tree grates to ensure that fixtures are consistently used early in the design. The design standards are also intended to support wayfinding needs. Many campus landscape site furnishings, plantings, and signs feature the school colors, red and black.

Recommendations
To promote consistency and hierarchy of materials, continue to employ a standardized approach to the selection and design of site furnishings and lighting. Consider the design intent of landscape places as well as sustainability in the development of university design standards. Continue to consider integrating the school’s colors into these features, but avoid overusing the colors to the degree that the practice becomes banal and predictable.

Evaluate and select a lighting standard that reduces energy use and light pollution.

Materials

Issues and Considerations
The university has adopted granite as a sustainable landscape material because of its durability and life-cycle cost.

Recommendations
Continue to select materials using the criteria of durability, life-cycle cost, and sustainability for long-term performance of landscape features.

Gateways

Issues and Considerations
Sandstone columns have been repeatedly nicked by mowers, and the stone damaged.

Recommendations
Continue to install paved areas below the stones to prevent mowers and string trimmers from coming into contact with the stones. Consider replacing the stones that are badly damaged. Briar Hill sandstone is still available. Given the slender profile and the ground contact of the existing stones, replacement is likely the best option. Repairing the stones through patching is a possibility, but the available materials (with the exception of Conproco products) do not hold up well under ground-contact conditions.
Environmental Graphics and Signage

Issues and Considerations

The campus generally exhibits a cohesive approach to design and application. This is likely the result of an attentive, thorough, and highly qualified staff. These professionals continually attend to the needs of campus design while also establishing overarching policies and initiating projects that address those needs and policies.

The university’s standardization of site furnishings, lighting, kiosks, and tree grates is highly successful.

Recommendations

Continue to support the Office of the University Architect in establishing and maintaining high design standards and implementing a well-founded, thoughtfully executed, and standardized design approach.

Connectivity

Issues and Considerations

Some students do not agree that connectivity is working as well as the master plan seems to suggest. What design considerations would address this issue while avoiding interference with signature landscapes?

Some areas of the campus have not been updated because of a lack of direction provided in the master plan.

Recommendations

Work with a student committee representing different academic programs across the campus to determine which areas, if any, remain difficult to navigate.

Identify any potential connections that might enhance campus circulation, and then engage a designer to develop proposals for new connection routes that are consistent with the master plan’s overarching goals and approach.

Art on Campus

Issues and Considerations

Outdoor exhibits have done much to enhance spaces. Art on campus is exciting and exhilarating for the community. The placement of art and sculpture is an important part of campus design. How should the university choose, site, and place artwork as part of future designs?

Recommendations

Continue to engage an art-on-campus committee that is responsible for placing art and sculpture. Ensure that the committee’s work is coordinated with that of the Office of the University Architect.

Consider the design intent of all spaces where new art installations are proposed, and evaluate the work within that context. Coordinate the work of the committee with the work of any designer hired to develop landscape architectural plans for new spaces at the beginning of the design process to ensure that the proposed siting of a sculpture or other piece of art is consistent with design intent and space configuration.

Include a reasonable allowance for the commissioning and maintenance of public art in the planning and budgeting of all significant landscape and building projects.
General Treatment Issues (continued)

**Maintenance**

*Issues and Considerations*

The steep slopes of the Hargreaves-designed landforms are difficult to maintain; mowing is challenging in places for the crew, the mowers cause rutting of the soil, and the mowing is not sustainable. Keeping the grass healthy requires an expensive input of topsoil, seed or sod, and fertilizers.

*Aeration* is an important maintenance consideration for all the lawn areas. This treatment is also expensive, and the lawn areas are vast.

*Irrigation* is part of all new projects. Irrigation heads are difficult to maintain. They are damaged by vandalism and by maintenance vehicles driving off paved roads and walks. Irrigation heads are located just off of walks in same areas where they drive. Contaminants can get into the heads and keep them from closing properly. There are 46 separate irrigation systems to maintain.

Since 1998, staffing has been reduced because of funding cuts, although the area to be maintained has increased.

The University of Cincinnati is generally a “high-maintenance” campus.

The university already follows a program of integrated pest management.

The current trend toward perennial gardens will increase the need for maintenance, as these gardens require regular deadheading, mulching, and dividing. Training is not a problem, as crew members are well-trained and versatile, but staffing levels are insufficient within the current funding situation.

There was once a nursery associated with maintenance. There is currently no interest in reestablishing this activity.

Compost is a problem. There is currently no location available to compost waste.

Mulch is carefully applied, balancing the benefits with the overuse that is apparent in many locations. There are no “volcanoes” of mulch on campus. Currently, mulch is applied once each year, again because of funding limitations. Should the maintenance department change to a spring mulching schedule?

**Maintenance (continued)**

*Issues and Considerations (continued)*

It is difficult to keep drains clear of leaves and other waste/debris during the fall months. The maintenance crew ensures that water is able to reach the drains.

The university contracts annually with arborists for tree care, including evaluation, deep-root feeding, pruning, and so forth.

There is currently no budget for replacing damaged or diseased trees on Clifton Arc. Should this be a fundraising project?

During the winter, the crew receive training in new areas, and they address erosion problems.

Invasive plant species are difficult to control on parts of campus. For example, honeysuckle is a problem.

Defacement of university property occurs periodically, including graffiti on signs. The university takes steps to prevent signs and identity systems from vandalism, and panels on signs are replaceable. A product called PGR is used to remove graffiti from concrete.

With training, mowing crews are improving their treatment of plant tags in Campus Green and stone pylons at campus entrances, some of which have been damaged in the past. Bag mowing and string trimming are problematic approaches for the crew.

Operator training and care are needed to prevent landscape features from being damaged during snow removal.

The maintenance facility is currently located in a pole-barn structure along Jefferson Avenue. The building is currently under evaluation for relocation. Many of the stored materials and the equipment required to maintain the campus need to be located in close proximity for transportation purposes.
**Maintenance (continued)**

**Recommendations**

Experiment with sustainable alternatives to high-maintenance lawn in some areas of the campus. Consider species that require less water, fertilizer, and pesticide applications, as this will reduce irrigation requirements and costly chemical applications.

Consider alternatives for the 2:1 slopes of the Hargreaves-designed berms to lessen the difficulty involved in maintaining these features.

Evaluate alternative locations for a new maintenance facility. Locations must be proximate to campus and must accommodate the desired program of the maintenance department. Possible programmatic needs include a composting facility, a propagation facility, stockpiling and storage space, office space, and equipment storage space. The space should be able to be secured. Investigate the likelihood that a new facility might be sited along Calhoun Street behind the campus.

Consider a variety of means for addressing maintenance budget shortfalls. For example, consider establishing a donation fund to rehabilitate the plantings associated with Clifton Arc. Engage a friends group in the fundraising and selection of appropriate species for plantings.

Continue reinforcing the need for crew members to mow and remove snow in a way that does not damage pavement or landscape features, such as stone pylons and arboretum tags.

---

**Vegetation**

**Issues and Considerations**

There is a general lack of evergreen trees on campus.

Many of the newer landscapes are large, open spaces with few canopy trees. Students are not gravitating to these spaces. A lack of trees, programmed uses, activity, and spatial definition, such as buildings with doors that open onto the spaces, are diminishing the role of these spaces in campus life.

**Recommendations**

Consider enhancing the large, open landscape spaces individually to determine any spatial, programmatic, or perimeter gestures that might help animate them and invite the university community to come in.

Consider the Clifton Arc landscape an opportunity for planting more evergreens.
As the Getty Foundation grant application states, “The DAAP Landscape complements and completes the Aronoff Center’s unifying effect upon the DAAP complex. Meandering landforms along an existing hill interact with the DAAP complex and provide continuity to the southwestern portion of Burnet Woods.” Designed by George Hargreaves, the DAAP landscape was presented with an award of merit by the American Society of Landscape Architects in its 1998 international professional awards program. It was cited for its success in complementing the “originality of Eisenman’s building design, ‘with its pastel-tinted stucco exterior, off-kilter windows, and hardly a right angle in sight.’ . . . Hargreaves responded with a series of grass-covered berms that seem to emanate from the structure itself and ripple down the hillside. The undulating landforms create mysterious shapes and shadows.” 7

A Landscape Architecture magazine article about the design notes

The landscape responds to the Center’s labyrinthine structure with a series of grass-covered berms that seem to emanate from the structure itself and then proceed down the hillside in serpentine ripples. Grassy mounds and pyramidal landforms emerge from the lawn areas... Another aspect of the project was the reintroduction of native trees consistent with those found in a park adjacent to the Center. Although efforts were made to protect existing mature specimens during the construction phase of the building, several were lost, prompting the university to adopt guidelines formulated by Hargreaves Associates for safeguarding trees during future construction projects. The landscape architects also helped the university develop maintenance guidelines and select new equipment for mowing the two-to-one slopes of the berms.” 8

For the most part, the DAAP landscape is designed to be viewed as a foil or foreground to the Aronoff Center. There appears to have been an intent to establish a variety of outdoor spaces that students can use in displaying and interacting with projects. The success of this intent is unclear. With all of the Hargreaves-designed landscapes, the success of the sculptural qualities of the landscape relies on a visitor’s ability to read them. This suggests that maintaining the sculptural elements is essential to perpetuating the design intent.
Aronoff Center for Design and Art (DAAP) Landscape

**Issues and Considerations**

The Hargreaves design allows for the coexistence of historic older trees surviving from Burnet Woods and a new grid of trees planted in association with the campus identity sign. What happens when older trees begin to decline?

Erosion is occurring along some of the steeper slopes.

The berms are a high-maintenance landscape feature. Mowing the berms is challenging and can lead to deterioration of the sculptural forms.

Opinions differ regarding the visual and sensory impact of the steep topography and serpentine berms associated with this prominent campus gateway at the intersection of Martin Luther King Drive and Clifton Avenue.

As a foil, the landscape is generally successful, but may lack an inviting quality that might be considered desirable for this key public façade of the campus.

The gesture of retaining evidence of Burnet Woods within the landscape is important and should be taken into consideration as part of any future proposed change.

**Recommendations**

As they decline, replace older trees on the hill that are a vestige of Burnet Woods. Plant new trees in informal groupings to ensure that the design remains consistent with the existing patterns.

**Recommendations (continued)**

Evaluate the cause of existing erosion. Consider whether it arises from mountain-biking use, slopes that are too steep to retain grass, or shade that is preventing the existing turf grass from thriving. Repair erosion and work to correct the underlying cause. For example, establish structures that prevent bicycles from accessing the eroded slopes, diminish the severity of the slopes using the least fill necessary, or replace the existing grass with a more shade-tolerant species.

Consider alternatives for enhancing the streetscape along this edge of the campus, such as a regular planting of small, ornamental trees that will not obscure the reading of the landscape, but will provide a welcoming gesture to the community.

Consider potential locations for replacing lawn with a more sustainable groundcover planting; for example, warm season grasses and meadow forbs that require limited mowing could be planted in the interior façade of the DAAP complex.

Identify designated sites for art installations.
As described in the Getty Foundation grant application, Herman Schneider Quad “is the greenspace that ties together the buildings of the Engineering Quadrangle. In recent years, of necessity, the Quad has been home to temporary pavilions that housed relocated functions during the lengthy MainStreet construction period. Work [was subsequently conducted] to restore trees, plantings, and grass for the enjoyment of pedestrians.”

A George Hargreaves design for a refurbished quad was not executed. It proposed to extend pedestrian paths from McMicken Commons and to plant trees, both in formal rows of ornamental trees to accentuate the visual focus on Baldwin Hall and in loose “drifts” of shade trees as a counterpoint to this formality and an extension of the landscape on the academic ridge. Benches on either side were planned to offer views to the center of the space.

The current design does not appear to have successfully encouraged student use of the landscape. Many of the principles in William Whyte’s *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* (previously listed in this chapter) could be considered for their applicability to the life and activity not now evident within the quad.
Herman Schneider Quadrangle

Issues and Considerations

Herman Schneider Quad lacks canopy and shade trees that would render the space more appealing. Additional benches would also provide an opportunity for people to gather and help activate the space.

Recommendations

Evaluate the potential to enhance the program and elements of the Herman Schneider Quad to encourage social interaction while respecting the design intent of the space. Use William Whyte’s principles to determine the elements that will support this goal. In particular, facilitate direct connections between building interiors and the landscape. Provide warm and inviting intermediate spaces with elements that convey a sense of human scale between interiors and larger exterior spaces that allow people to pause and gather. This will help establish a critical mass that will encourage movement into the larger landscape. Provide shade and shelter along the margins of important thoroughfares, and provide flexible seating opportunities that can be used to take advantage of sun and shade.

Recommendations (continued)

Consider planting additional deciduous canopy trees with good fall color within the landscape. Use paths and force fields as the design organizer for the plantings. Consider adding trees to the outer perimeter of existing pathways to allow the central space to remain open. Consider including additional trees along the force-field walk leading to the quad from the McMicken Commons area to emphasize this pedestrian connection. (figure 5-1)

Consider replacing lawn panels along the margins of the space with more sustainable plantings.

The photographs above show examples of historical plantings in the quad.

On the following page various alternatives for phased tree plantings are explored.
Figure 5.1: Plantings could articulate the paths along Hargreaves "force fields".
Engineering Complex Character Area
Signature Landscapes:

Library Square

As described in the Getty Foundation grant application, Library Square “provides the pedestrian connection between the Engineering Research Center, Langsam Library, and Zimmer Auditorium. A nautilus form in the pavement represents the university’s unending pursuit of knowledge.” Like the DAAP landscape, Library Square was honored by the American Society of Landscape Architects in 1998 as part of their annual international professional awards program. Library Square received a merit award and was lauded by Landscape Architecture magazine for its “dynamic quality and humor,” and “the nautilus design of Library Square (in front of Langsam), [and] the contrast to its organic form created by a nearby grid of stairs.” The design was further described in the magazine:

Some would argue that the greatest educational moments take place beyond the halls of academe, on the greens and squares that comprise the campus. This is where the rallies, protests, and public debate have always taken place, a tradition since the time of Socrates and Hellenic Greece. For a library square on the University of Cincinnati campus, Hargreaves Associates took this idea seriously. Weight restrictions for an underground parking garage beneath the site prohibited the planting of trees. In response, the landscape architects created a central plaza in the shape of a nautilus, a form of Fibonacci spirals that ever since ancient times has been thought to express the perfect symmetry of nature. Alternating bands of hardscape radiate from a central stone etched with a quote from Oliver Wendell Holmes. To compensate for the lack of verticality that would have been provided by trees, a grid of slender neon triangles, each about five feet tall, was constructed at the “mouth” of the nautilus. From above the grid contrasts with the organic form of the nautilus, while at ground level it breaks up the monotony of the space. A complex stairway designed in conjunction with the architect provides an innovative linkage across a grade change.”
Library Square (continued)

Issues and Considerations
The engineering requirements of this rooftop landscape leave only small areas available for planting.

Recommendations
Retain and maintain this successful, internationally recognized landscape. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed. Insofar as possible, ensure that the margins of the nautilus continue to be edged by shade and ornamental trees, to provide an element of human scale within this space.

Repair in-ground step lighting.
Re-grout deteriorating paver joints.
Program the area to activate it.
Add new lamps to the light features.
Add new hardware where missing.

Engineering Complex Character Area Signature Landscapes:

Zimmer Roof Garden

The Zimmer Roof Garden is described in the Getty Foundation grant application as having the potential “to improve the plaza area above Zimmer Hall. A pedestal paver walkway system will be installed, and new skylights in the Plaza will light the corridors of Zimmer. Grass, trees, and perennial beds complete the plaza. The project also includes restoration of a stairway leading from Library Square to Zimmer Plaza.” Installation of Kenneth Snelson’s “Forest Devil” sculpture is planned.

George Hargreaves designed the Zimmer Roof Garden. In Master Plan 2000, he described the design intent of the plaza as follows:

Next to Library Square, Zimmer Plaza is the northernmost element in the series of open spaces which make up the Academic Ridge. This is to be reinforced by incorporating the Academic Ridge “frame” lighting fixture. Zimmer Plaza is to continue to serve as a major connector for pedestrian traffic from the Academic Ridge to Campus Green, and is to reflect the major pedestrian traffic patterns which cross the roofscape. The open space is to serve as a campus oasis, a place for quiet passive recreation. To create this oasis-like setting, it is to be designed as a rich environment that includes a variety of both flowering and non-flowering plant materials to define spaces for sitting and studying within the garden setting. Formal rows of trees are to be incorporated to provide shade, as allowed by the structure of the Zimmer Auditorium below, and to reflect the Baldwin Quad force field, which is the basis for the orientation of the building. Zimmer Plaza is to be designated one of the campus outdoor sculpture gardens. Art in this sculpture garden is to be integrated into the design of the space and should focus on the natural environmental phenomena of the space — light, wind, and sound.
Zimmer Roof Garden (continued)

Issues and Considerations
A lack of maintenance staff or proper training could spell the end of the perennial beds within this landscape, although this is not presently a concern.

Recommendations
Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when faced with any proposed change.

Consider soliciting the assistance of a friends group of students and community members to provide maintenance support for this garden landscape.
The Campus Green landscape was described in the Getty Foundation grant application as “The largest open space in UC’s Master Plan, Campus Green replaced six acres of parking and pavement with formal gardens, an international arboretum, waterscaping, braided walkways, and places to sit. Campus Green is the primary pedestrian route through campus, and perhaps the single most defining element of UC’s transformation from a commuter to a pedestrian university.”

The design intent is described in the *Master Plan 2000* as follows:

*Campus Green and Sigma Sigma Commons together are the major open space for the northeastern quadrant of West Campus. Campus Green has replaced a vast parking lot with a landscape that satisfies a proven need for open space in this area, and has created a new destination and social meeting places at the core of the campus. The density of the residential population in adjacent dormitories, both existing and proposed, supports the addition of this new green space, which now dominates the district. The green is the campus’s primary open space window from the northern edge of West Campus and gives the university greater presence on Martin Luther King Drive. Both the force-field geometries, and the irregular geometries of the braid and the arboretum along its length are overlaid onto the site, asserting the significance of the green as a gathering place “intersection” for the entire campus. As a nexus, both visual and pedestrian connections are created, linking the green and East Campus, and along its eastern edge a pedestrian link is made south to Scioto Street, University College, Jefferson Quad, and the recreation fields. Bordering the new Recreation Center, residential structures, and major academic buildings, Campus Green is where students, faculty, administrators, and alumni can find generous outdoor space for passive recreational use and respite from classes, as well as more intimately scaled spaces for discussion and study.*

While the Hargreaves plan was intended to provide a central forum for university community activity, its success in this capacity is an open question. The Campus Green landscape is enormous, expansive, and open, with few sheltered areas. Although the space works well for circulation, it is not adequately contained, and there are few direct connections to buildings that would help to activate it. Like Herman Schneider Quad, the Campus Green landscape would benefit from the application of William Whyte’s design and programmatic principles as espoused in *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* to make it more attractive to students and help fulfill its intended purpose.
Issues and Considerations

The ball-in-basket light fixtures cast light upwards, and therefore fall short of sustainability guidelines.

The fountains are difficult and expensive to maintain.

The steep slopes of the berm landforms are challenging to maintain.

The extensive area of lawn requires laborious and expensive maintenance.

Triangular spaces and joints are difficult to maintain. The Campus Green landscape includes numerous triangular junctures.

Access to the apex of the cone-shaped mound along Martin Luther King Drive was not provided in the Hargreaves design, but visitors have established a footpath to the top. It is human nature to want to gain a perspective by climbing to the top of a landform such as this, and a route to the top should be provided to replace the erosive and unattractive worn-earth path that is highly visible directly behind a campus identity sign.

Issues and Considerations (continued)

Currently, the arboretum plantings are set in and around sculptural landforms, and small plaques identify the plantings by Latin and common names. There is currently no preferred method for viewing the plantings or the plaques, which limits their educational value.

Recommendations

Select a replacement groundcover or surfacing material to proactively address the loss of designed plant material within the narrow, triangular tips of the planting beds that edge walkways within this landscape.

Provide a pedestrian route to the apex of the Campus Green cone-shaped mound to replace the footpath currently used by visitors. To avoid altering the design intent of this landscape feature, design the route to be as unobtrusive as possible. Universal accessibility should be a consideration, but not a requirement if the design of the route effectively diminishes the design value of the cone (figure 5-3).
Recommendations (continued)

Replace ball-in-basket luminaires with lighting that is consistent with the principles of the light pollution reduction credit of the US Green Building Council’s LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards. In particular, design new lighting in conformance with the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America’s exterior lighting recommended practices.

Replace groundcover plantings on steeply-sloped landforms that are composed of invasive, non-native plant species. Removal will support sustainability initiatives. Follow the guidance provided by the state of Ohio Department of Natural Resources or the National Park Service in identifying species that are considered to be invasive, non-native plants within this region. For example, euonymus, which is an ornamental groundcover that is being used to protect the Hargreaves berms and slopes from erosion, is also considered by some states and the federal government as an invasive, non-native plant species.

Recommendations (continued)

Consider the margins of the Campus Green open space for new building development, particularly housing. The university needs housing, and the activity generated by residents would render the Campus Green landscape more active.

Consider replacing some areas of grass within Campus Green with a more sustainable groundcover species to reduce the need for fertilizers, irrigation, and mowing while avoiding alteration of the overarching design concept for the space (figure 5-4). In particular, consider adding warm-season grass and meadow perennials to the panel where replacement of evergreen tree plantings is recommended (see below).

Consider enhancing the Campus Green landscape by planting groves or bosques of shade and canopy trees in various locations as an invitation to gather. Consider the margins of the open space, and along heavily traveled circulation routes, which are more desirable for gathering than the center of a large open space. Refer to The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces.
Grass panels could be replaced with more sustainable and easily maintained native ground covers and ornamental grasses.

Campus Green (continued)

Recommendations (continued)

for guidance. Consider carefully the design intent of the landscape in the development of enhancements.

To enhance appreciation of the existing arboretum plantings, consider establishing new paths to provide access along the western margin of the Campus Green space. Design the access routes to be as simple and unobtrusive as possible.

Protect the species identification tags from damage by mowers. Consider alternatives such as establishing a groundcover or paving area around each tag that will preclude the need to mow in close proximity to the tags. Continue to train maintenance personnel to avoid damaging landscape features such as these during mowing.

Consider alternative methods for maintaining the hornbeams that mark the edges of the braided walk. The dense canopies of these trees, unless frequently pruned, are prone to disease. Consider removing every other tree to allow sufficient light and air to reach the centers of the canopies.
Sigma Sigma Commons

The Sigma Sigma Commons landscape is described in the Getty Foundation grant application as “three acres of green space bordered by French Hall and the Campus Green. It features a 65-foot light tower and a grassy amphitheater that can seat 3,500 people.”

Sigma Sigma Commons was one of the first signature landscapes established on campus. It was intended to be used for theatrical performances and spontaneous congregation. The landscape is highly sculptural, with clean horizontal lines and planes of turf edged by stone. While its design is theoretically intriguing, it does not attract the type of use for which it was intended.

Issues and Considerations

Although designed as theatrical or performance space, it is not currently used as such. This space has become marginalized or peripheral to campus activities and has never achieved its potential for congregational assembly and performance.

Recommendations

Consider adding a bosque of trees to the upper levels of the Sigma Sigma amphitheater. The trees would afford a sculptural appearance against the backdrop of the building, provide shade and a sense of protection for those trying to use the space, and break the monotonous openness of this area. A bosque of trees would not necessarily detract from the design concept for the space, which is a sculptural use of ground plane and stepped, stone-edged levels. Planting a bosque along the top level would likely enhance this sculptural quality by punctuating it with a vertical element, and would also encourage students to use the space as it was intended.

This Page: Sigma Sigma Commons (Hargreaves).
Sigma Sigma Commons. A bosque of trees planted on the facing plane at top of stairs would retain the formality of the design while also making it a more shaded, inviting gathering space.
Chapter 5

Other Character Area Landscapes
Signature Landscapes

Faculty Center/Russell C. Myers Alumni Ctr.

This assemblage of buildings, which edges the Campus Green and sits in the shadow of the Engineering Research Center, retains a relatively unique character within the overall campus landscape. The buildings are horizontal in their massing, and human in their scale. The lawns, plantings, and outdoor terraces associated with the buildings are intimate and human in scale as well. There is a large, mature shade tree in front of the complex. This complex provides a counterpoint to the massive scale of much of the rest of campus.

Issues and Considerations

The buildings of this grouping are being considered for removal. Given the university’s enrollment and current character of the campus, there may no longer be a place for smaller-scale buildings like these on the campus.

Recommendations

Consider adaptively reusing these buildings and rehabilitating them in support of conservation. Consider constructing additional buildings in this area that might enhance the spatial quality of Campus Green, which is diminished by a lack of strong edges.

This Page: The Faculty Center and Russell G. Myers Alumni Center.
Jefferson Avenue Housing Character Area
Other Landscapes

Morgens and Scioto Halls

Issues and Considerations
This is a very desirable site for developing new housing. Existing housing could be rehabilitated. The location of the third “sister” (Sawyer Hall) that was demolished could be used to develop additional housing. The activity generated by this housing would benefit the Campus Green landscape.

Evergreen trees are planted along diagonal walks cutting across the Campus Green landscape and leading to the broad walk below the two remaining “sister” dormitories. These trees act as a vegetative screen between the housing and the landscape. They also appear to create an unsafe condition by affording opportunities for concealment.

Recommendations
Consider replacing the evergreen plantings with shade or canopy trees that provide a more inviting character for this juncture between the housing facilities and Campus Green.
Consider adding new housing facilities on the site of the demolished Sawyer Hall.
Consider replacing lawn in the panels where the evergreens are removed with a more sustainable planting that might include warm-season grasses and meadow forbs.

Graduate Residences Morgens and Scioto Halls.
Jefferson Avenue Housing Character Area
Other Landscapes

Schneider and Turner Halls

Issues and Considerations
This area has recently been redeveloped as housing.

Recommendations
Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed.

Jefferson Avenue Housing Character Area
Other Landscapes

Sander Dining and Dabney Hall

Issues and Considerations
This area has not been updated as part of the master plan.

Recommendations
Engage a design firm that has successfully developed context-sensitive designs to consider the needs of this area when it is slated for rehabilitation. Ensure that the design is consistent with and respects the intent and goals of the master plan.

Dabney-French Character Area
Other Landscapes

Dabney and French Halls

Issues and Considerations
This area has not been updated as part of the master plan.

Recommendations
Engage a design firm that has successfully developed context-sensitive designs to consider the needs of this area when it is slated for rehabilitation. Ensure that the design is consistent with and respects the intent and goals of the master plan.
MainStreet Character Area  
Signature Landscapes:  

MainStreet and Bearcat Plaza

As noted in the Getty Foundation grant application, “Bearcat Plaza is a triangular open space in the heart of MainStreet, in full view of Nippert Stadium, Tangeman University Center, and the Steger Student Life Center. It is a popular site for informal musical performances, social interaction, intellectual challenge, lunching, and sunbathing.”

Master Plan 2000 describes the design intent for this linear and curvilinear landscape as follows:

This district is defined as an intensively programmed open space and pedestrian circulation corridor that begins at University Plaza, moves through the campus along the route of Campus Drive, and extends east along Daniels Street to Jefferson Hall housing at Jefferson Street. MainStreet is to provide accessible circulation routes that traverse open spaces and move through buildings between the Academic Ridge and Daniels Street. Buildings are to have a contemporary expression and are to adopt a material palette of stone, metal, and glass, distinct from the red brick on campus. Buildings may incorporate brick elements, especially where existing buildings are retained. Buildings are to adopt the massing and layout characteristics of the district in which they are located — the simple force field geometries of the ridge, the curvilinear geometries of the abstracted braid, and the north-south, and ravine geometries used as organizational devices near Jefferson Street.
The open space corridor is to be developed as an urban pedestrian corridor. Open space forms are to be generated from the arcs emanating from Campus Green Braid. Microscale geometries are to be influenced by force field geometries. The landscape material palette, including special paving, granite 'outcrops,' unique lighting, and a special graphic and wayfinding system are to be utilized to establish the district character. Existing pedestrian connections are to be retained and new connections along Nippert Stadium and through the MainStreet buildings are to be created. MainStreet is to be graded with continuous accessible sloping arcs connected by switchbacks. Grade changes are to be concentrated in granite outcrops of steps and seatwalls. Outcrops along the Student Life Center are to form elevated terraces overlooking the corridor and allowing activity to spill out of the building. A central plaza is to be a gathering and performance space; shade trees, water features, and movable chairs and tables are to be part of the flexible space. The existing wall at the corner of Nippert Stadium is to be removed to open views from the plaza. Arcs of trees and meandering paths are to make the formal transition from MainStreet to the Campus Green Braid, and a shuttle bus turn-around is to be provided at this area. Landforms are to make the transition from Sigma Sigma Commons to the architectural forms of the Recreation Center. 21

The vision proposed for the Student Life Center in the master plan is worth recalling wherever spaces need activation elsewhere on campus: “The MainStreet façade of the building is to be expressed as a permeable filter, allowing activity to spill out onto covered arcades, porches, and terraces, and create an active building edge down the entire length of MainStreet.” 22
Issues and Considerations

The university has done an outstanding job of using design palettes and materials to unify areas and support wayfinding on the campus. This is particularly true within the MainStreet landscape.

The gaps between the hadite-filled pavers associated with the drip lines of trees have been problematic for maintenance. They are periodically a trip hazard, particularly for people wearing narrow-heeled shoes.

Bearcat Plaza is more successful than Sigma Sigma Commons for its amphitheater-like performance and gathering space. This may be attributable to the intense programming of the surrounding buildings and attendant critical mass of people, as well as the availability of shade, shelter, and variety of seating choices. Heavy use of this area will likely result in the need to repair and replace materials regularly.

Recommendations

Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed.

Evaluate materials to potentially replace the hadite between the pavers associated with street tree plantings.
The Getty Foundation grant application describes the Mews landscape as follows:

“The Mews is an open-space corridor running between the Steger Student Life Center and Swift, Baldwin, and Rhodes Halls. This terraced space is also a final resting place for a number of architectural relics rescued from UC building demolitions. Landscaped grounds, overlooks, and gathering spaces complete the area.”

The use of the relics provides a reminder of the university’s past.

**Issues and Considerations**

This space is beautifully conceived and executed. It suffers, however, from its location in a shady tunnel of space.

**Recommendations**

Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed.

Consider design solutions for providing additional warmth within this space. Lighting is one potential feature that might be added to provide warmth to the space.

Consider means for providing additional connections between adjacent buildings and circulation routes that might promote more active use of this area or serve as an invitation to explore the Mews landscape.
DAAP Complex Character Area
Signature Landscapes:

McMicken Commons

As described in the Getty Foundation grant application, McMicken Commons was “the first open space completed as part of the university’s Master Plan. McMicken Commons has become a major gathering place. The Commons, located in the center of the Uptown Campus West, provides continuity to the MainStreet buildings, courtyards, and plazas.”

Master Plan 2000 distinguishes between McMicken Commons and Lower Commons, but they are treated together within this character area. The plan describes the design intent for Lower Commons as follows:

Building facades are to encourage activity to spill out to exterior plazas and connect to the CCM bridge. The Lower Commons and TUC Plaza are to be a gently sloped area to accommodate multidirectional pedestrian flow and spill-out activity from the bookstore café. A cluster of benches and shade trees is to provide opportunities for sitting. The grade change between University Plaza and the main entrance to TUC is to be articulated with stone outcrops in order to create meeting spots, and is to provide an accessible entry.
McMicken Commons

Issues and Considerations

Along the interior edge of McMicken Hall, there is a brick landing that is raised less than a riser height above the surrounding grade. It presents a potential trip hazard.

Metalwork features in close proximity to the building have a historical character.

This space lacks canopy and shade trees, and has not been as successful as the university hoped in serving as an outdoor gathering place.

Recommendations

Consider planting additional deciduous canopy trees with good fall color within the McMicken Commons landscape, taking into consideration the design intent for the space. Utilize paths and force fields as the design organizer for the new plantings. Consider adding trees to the outer perimeter of existing pathways in groves or bosques that will form a canopy and allow for activity underneath. Maintain the important sight line through the middle of the space (figure 6-6).

Retain the ornate metalwork of tree grates, light poles, and handrails in proximity to McMicken Hall.

Consider removing the kiosk structure near the entrance to McMicken that currently impedes the axial view to Tangeman. Consider an alternative landscape treatment, one that does not deny this axial relationship, to accentuate the entrance.
As with the Baldwin Quad (Schneider Quad), tree plantings in the McMicken Commons could be phased and support the current design and pathways.
Clifton Arc Character Area
Signature Landscapes:

Clifton Arc

*Master Plan 2000* describes plans for the Clifton Arc area, most of which appear never to have been implemented. Given the historic nature and appropriate existing character of the Clifton Arc landscape, further development of the recommendations included in *Master Plan 2000* for this area is discouraged. The ideas presented in the master plan include:

*Clifton Arc is to be reinforced as the major historic open space and threshold to the western edge of the university. A gateway wall is to announce Clifton Arc as the significant symbolic entry point of the campus. The design of the arc is to retain the existing character of the space, while adding elements that punctuate it and align it with the force field geometries. Trees are to be strategically removed and drifts of trees are to be strengthened to allow views through Clifton Arc to the campus, and to encourage use of the space. The existing meandering path is to be replaced with a V'd path which steps up the hill. This path should be sensitive to the relocation of the crossing light and improved walkway from the Stratford Lot. At the edge of the arcing lawn, the drive is to be reduced by one lane and a hedge is to be added to reinforce the form of the curve.*
Clifton Arc

Issues and Considerations

Clifton Arc is one of only a few true historic landscapes remaining on campus. It serves as the front door to the campus and an appropriate foreground for the older buildings located along Clifton Avenue. Many of the trees may be in decline. The character of the Clifton Arc landscape has changed over the years. One question is whether to perpetuate its current character, or restore an earlier character. Are the individual tree species represented important, or is perpetuation of the picturesque quality sufficient? Do the trees need to be replaced in kind? Are there interesting plants that could be added here to enhance the campus landscape, even though they would be new additions to the Clifton Arc palette? Is the existing landscape based on a planting design, or has it evolved over time? Should the central walk and road corridor be reconsidered in accordance with the unexecuted aspects of the master plan?

The foundation plantings along the front of McMicken Hall are overmature, and some are experiencing dieback. The plantings will need to be either rehabilitated or replaced. Should these efforts respect the existing species and planting design? Should they be reconsidered to address any maintenance problems experienced with the existing planting design?

Recommendations

Retain and maintain the existing picturesque quality of the Clifton Arc landscape. Avoid altering the central walk and road margin in conformance with the master plan, which would introduce an incompatible character into this historic landscape.

Consider retaining and enhancing the qualities of the existing landscape, comprised of grass, trees, and shrubs. Consider replacing trees that are hazardous or at the end of their useful life with species of a similar character, but evaluate the possibility of adding new species for ornamental and educational value.

Consider making the planting of new trees within Clifton Arc a fundraising endeavor.

Consider replacing the existing plantings along the front of McMicken Hall using the original design concept. Evaluate the potential for replacing species and cultivars that can no longer be acquired from nurseries or that have been especially challenging to maintain. Seek alternatives in species and cultivars that will convey a similar character, but whose qualities are more consistent with the university’s maintenance capabilities.

Retain and maintain the historic metalwork of the handrails.
Clifton Arc Character Area

Other Landscapes:

**Teachers College and Dyer Hall**

**Issues and Considerations**

This landscape is another historic feature of the campus. It currently conveys a tired appearance and is a good candidate for rehabilitation.

**Recommendations**

Consider replacing the existing plantings within this courtyard with new plantings that respect the original design, but replace species and cultivars that can no longer be acquired from nurseries or that have been especially challenging to maintain. Seek alternatives in species and cultivars that will convey a similar character, but whose qualities are more consistent with the university’s maintenance capabilities.
**CCM Complex Character Area**

**Signature Landscapes:**

**CCM Plaza**

This Olin Partnership-designed landscape is described in the Getty Foundation grant application as follows: “The entryway to CCM Village is a broad brick quadrangle studded with gray-painted spheres. The plaza showcases an evocative sculpture by Magdalena Abakanowicz. The main entrance opens onto the lobby of Corbett Auditorium.”

**Issues and Considerations**

Soil subsidence is occurring in the planting beds to the margins of this space.

One of the trees has been lost within the outer ring of the pavement.

**Recommendations**

Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed.

Replace the tree that has been lost from the outer ring. Given the design intent of the concentric circles that characterize this space, the loss of individual features detracts from the design’s impact.
CCM Complex Character Area
Other Landscapes:

Alumni Courtyard Garden

Issues and Considerations

The Alumni Courtyard Garden is very intimate. This garden, and the walk that extends along the exterior of its perimeter wall, are small gems in the university landscape.

Plantings along the exterior walk need maintenance, and the loading dock and dumpster at the end of the walk should be screened.

Recommendations

Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed. Take particular care in maintaining plantings within these areas.

Screen the loading dock and dumpsters at the end of the walk using evergreen plantings and wood fencing.
Chapter 5 - 52

Athletic Complex Character Area
Signature Landscapes: None

Corry Boulevard Area

Issues and Considerations

Portions of this character area have not yet been redeveloped on the basis of the master plan. The master plan indicates development of Jefferson Quad that will replace an existing maintenance facility. No alternative location has yet been identified for maintenance.

Recommendations

Engage a design firm that has successfully developed context-sensitive designs to consider the needs of this area when it is slated for rehabilitation. Ensure that the design is consistent with and respects the intent and goals of the master plan.

Identify an appropriate new site for maintenance. Develop this new site to include the full range of programmatic needs identified by the department. Maintenance of the campus landscape is integral to protecting and enhancing the existing signature and historic landscapes.
Issues and Considerations

This steeply-sloped area has walks leading to Calhoun Street that are heavily utilized. One of these is an asphalt walk that is failing; the slope is not stable and the walk has had to be repaired in areas where the soil fell away.

A segment of the pedestrian connection in this area is a mulch path. Plantings occupy the sides of the road and walk and the steeply sloped banks below. Some of the plantings may include invasive, non-native plant species.

Recommendations

Engage a design firm to design a solution to the erosion problems experienced along this bank, and strengthen the pedestrian connections between the campus and Calhoun Street.

Remove invasive, non-native plants. Consider engaging a volunteer crew of students and community members to help with this maintenance activity.

YMCA Building

Issues and Considerations

The landscape associated with this historic building needs repair. The walk and retaining-wall segments that provide connections to the side entrances of the building are failing.

Recommendations

Retain this historic building. Rehabilitate the landscape, particularly taking into consideration pedestrian safety.
East Campus
Signature Landscapes

University Commons

As described by designer George Hargreaves, “University Commons [is] one in a series of connective open spaces on the Cincinnati campus [that] will provide informal gathering spaces for large and small groups as well as paved classroom areas amidst sloping lawn surfaces and serpentine landforms.”

Issues and Considerations

The mound landform is accessible via a paved walkway. A seatwall is provided at the apex of the mound. However, a dense planting of hornbeam trees blocks the view from the top of the mound, an expected benefit of scaling this sculptural landform.

Recommendations

Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed, and maintain its key character-defining elements of the University Commons design, including the berms, the fountain, the sinuous berms, the paths, and the variety of seating areas.

Provide visual access to the landscape surrounding the mound by limbing up the trees on top enough to at least allow a view from the seatwall (see next page).
The mound on the East Campus with seating at top is densely encircled by tree. Limbing up these trees would allow for people seated their to vie the Vontz Center.
Chapter 5

East Campus
Signature Landscapes

Eden Quadrangle

This landscape was under construction at the time the Campus Heritage Plan was prepared. The university noted in the Getty Foundation grant application that “Eden Quadrangle is a planned open space that will complement the expanded Medical Sciences Building. It will feature granite seat walls and steps, a large plaza, an outdoor amphitheater, and trees.”

Top photo: The newly completed CARE/Crawley Building is framed on two sides by the Eden Quad Landscape (Hargreaves).
Left photo: View of Kresge Circle and Levine Park which connect to Eden Quad on the west edge.
Right photo: Close up of Eden Quad Landscape (Hargreaves).
**Proctor and University Halls**

**Issues and Considerations**

The walkway between these buildings is a gateway into East Campus from Vine Street. The walk also leads to the Kingsgate Conference Center and overlooks the University Commons landscape. A single step at the junction of the concrete walk and the stone walk is hard to notice and is a possible trip hazard. Lighting is ball-in-basket luminaires.

**Recommendations**

Address the tripping hazard of the walk.

Replace ball-in-basket luminaires with lighting that is consistent with the principles of the light pollution reduction credit of the LEED standards. In particular, design new lighting in conformance with the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America’s exterior lighting recommended practices.

---

East Campus
Other Landscapes

East Campus
Other Landscapes

**Power Plant**

**Recommendations**

Replace the daylilies and other plantings along the front of the power plant with a simple grass lawn panel.

Top right photo: Procter Hall is on the right and University Hall on the left.
Bottom right photo: Vehicular access to Procter Hall. University Hall is in the background.
Bottom left photo: East Campus Power Plant.
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Off-Campus Character Areas

Cincinnati Observatory Center

The university notes in the Getty Foundation grant application that “The Observatory is owned by the university and leased to the Cincinnati Observatory Center, a private nonprofit organization. This facility’s history spans more than 150 years and two different locations. It was the brainchild of Ormaby McKnight Mitchel, a professor at UC’s predecessor Cincinnati College, whose enthusiastic lectures awakened public enthusiasm for astronomy locally. The original Observatory was built in 1842 atop the present Mt. Adams, overlooking Cincinnati, with former U.S. President John Quincy Adams laying the cornerstone. In 1871, the University of Cincinnati accepted control of the Observatory and moved the facility to its present location in Mt. Lookout, just a few miles away. The original cornerstone was moved to become part of the new structure. Today, the Observatory Center works in partnership with the university, private citizens and foundations, and the State of Ohio to carry out its educational programs. After a 2001-2002 renovation, both the exterior and the interior of the Observatory are in excellent condition. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1997.”

Recommendations
Retain and maintain this successful landscape design. Respect the design intent of this space when changes are proposed. Take particular care in maintaining plantings within these areas.
Summary

Campuses are active and evolving places with emerging needs and landscapes are living entities. Within the past 15 years, fundamental aspects of American society have changed dramatically. The role of technology in our daily lives has affected our behavior, and we are recognizing that our relationships to the global community and an interconnected environment are altering our treatment of the natural world. These changes, along with others that can only be imagined today, may suggest adjustments to the existing landscapes over time.

A 2002 article in Landscape Architecture magazine noted that “master planning at the University of Cincinnati is an ongoing process and not a completed work. The historic significance of the project for landscape architects and planners lies not only in its guiding design imperatives but in the institutional process that is making them real. Because of their technical and organizational complexity, such campus implementation strategies are often neglected in campus master plan documents and not reported in the design press.” 32 Based on the master plan principles, “what matters is how buildings, paths, and space as outdoor rooms work together and that the campus remain loyal to Hargreaves’ planning imperatives in decisions at every scale.” 33 “Neither pastoral nor monumental, UC is a campus in the true sense of the term ‘encampment.’ It is a place where people come together in pursuit of personal and collective goals. ‘Campuses’ imply safety, density, and access to other people and ideas.”34

The success of Master Plan 2000 has made the University of Cincinnati a recognized leader in campus design and planning. The master plan has guided the successful implementation of a transition to a pedestrian-friendly environment that enhances walkability, encourages engagement, sparks intellectual curiosity, and inspires creativity. The unified vision of signature buildings and landscapes put forth by the master plan will continue to benefit the university for many years ahead. The design ideas expressed in the landscapes will also likely be recognized for generations as both novel and representative of their time, place, and a particular world view. Their integrity ought to be preserved through recognition and appreciation of their contribution to the history of campus planning. These recommendations are intended to protect the evidence of this successful endeavor, while maintaining an eye to the future. This approach will also govern the discussion of the signature and heritage buildings in the next chapter.
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Architectural Assessment and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter describes and analyzes the character and features of buildings on the East and West campuses at the University of Cincinnati. In particular, this chapter explores individual “signature” and “mature” or heritage buildings through a narrative description of their forms, components, and materials, accompanied by photographic and cartographic illustrations. Condition, management, and maintenance issues that threaten the long-term viability of these buildings are also discussed.

The survey is divided into two groups, “signature” and “mature” buildings, on the basis of a list submitted to the Getty Foundation. To understand and discuss these buildings, the survey team reviewed the entire campus environment during a series of campus tours in October, November, and December 2006, using Paul Bennett’s University of Cincinnati as a guide for further information about the buildings. We also benefited from observations of the signature buildings and landscapes by Michael Sorkin, engaged as the architectural critic for the Getty grant, whose commentary (see Appendix A) offered a unique perspective on works of the “recent past” that in most campus heritage plans would only rarely be considered for their significance before reaching the 50-year threshold for historical evaluation. Finally, while this plan focuses on “signature” buildings selected by the Office of the University Architect, the list of “mature” buildings was expanded on the basis of field observations, for a fuller discussion of those resources more than 50 years old.

Each structure was visually assessed from the exterior; limited interior assessments focused on major public spaces or rooms and features that were brought to the team’s attention during the campus tours. The campus buildings that are the focus of this chapter include (figures 6-1 and 6-2):

Signature Buildings

West Campus:
- Aronoff Center for Design and Art
- Campus Recreation Center
- College-Conservatory of Music; CCM Village
- Vera Clement Edwards Center
- Engineering Research Center
- Richard E. Lindner Center
- Joseph A. Steger Student Life Center
- Donald Core Tangeman University Center
- University Pavilion

East Campus:
- Vontz Center for Molecular Studies
Mature Buildings

West Campus:
- Alms Building
- Baldwin Quadrangle: Baldwin Hall, Old Chemistry Building, Swift Hall; Braunstein Hall
- Carl Blegen Library
- Dieterle Vocal Center (formerly Schmidlapp Gymnasium)
- Annie Laws Auditorium (Teachers College)
- McMicken, Hanna, and Cunningham Halls
- Memorial Hall
- University YMCA
- Wilson Auditorium
- Van Wormer Hall

East Campus:
- Health Professions Building
- Logan Hall

Mt. Lookout (Off-Campus):
- Cincinnati Observatory

These buildings, along with their landscape settings, are icons of the academic vision and aspirations of successive generations of university leaders and patrons. They reveal the influences of choice of architects, stylistic trends, topography and expansion patterns, economic factors that affected the duration and coherence of building campaigns, and the vision of the Hargreaves master plan.

Overview of Campus Architecture

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, much of the University of Cincinnati campus was, until the mid-20th century, shaped by classical planning and aesthetic traditions. The university’s traditional buildings display a variety of styles — each influential when the buildings were constructed — which characterize discrete areas within the campus and infuse the whole with layers of significance. Although not typically considered “signature buildings” like those that have raised the university’s national profile in the press, these structures are still integral to the character of the built environment as the campus has evolved.

The Beaux Arts style, made fashionable in public buildings and civic planning by the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, came to dominate early development on the West Campus through the use of a vocabulary of monumental symmetrical forms and axial relationships, expressed in masonry, and the classical orders seen in examples like Van Wormer Hall and Baldwin Quad. A restrained Art Deco-detailed classicism is manifested in the Blegen Library, Annie Laws Auditorium, and Braunstein Hall. This movement was carried forward in the freely interpreted Neo-Georgian style of buildings like Tangeman University Center (the old “Union” building embedded within the present structure) and “new” McMicken Hall. Only Memorial Hall and the University YMCA building portray a more romantic collegiate Gothic aesthetic.
Successive building campaigns increasingly challenged classical values of harmony, stability, and unity, replacing them with strict functionalism, competing and conflicting axes, increasingly irregular forms, and unpredictability of deconstructivism, seen in the Aronoff Center for Design and Art and the Vontz Center for Molecular Studies. These buildings express more about the organization of social spaces within than a particular aesthetic. In the new century, University Pavilion, the Steger Student Life Center, and the Campus Recreation Center suggest the return to a restrained “classical” vocabulary of strong geometric forms used to define space while decorative elements are used to express structural forms and modern materials.

However, if categories based on “style” describe the chronological development of the campus, campus buildings may also be discerned as sharing common patterns derived from topography, building materials, and character-defining features, as objects in the landscape or as frames for open space, as derivatives of the automobile’s necessary presence on campus, and as the products of reshaping open space and surrounding neighborhoods through building retention and demolition of the urban fabric. Not surprisingly, the interplay of these patterns and the grouping of land/building uses — both at the perimeter of the “superblock” and as infill within the core — play significant roles in defining the character of the campus and its various districts. The University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000 provides an extensive analysis of these and other physical frameworks of the campus.

Construction Chronology

Overlaying plans of campus building development, in decade-by-decade layers, show the patterns of earliest construction along the “Academic Ridge” and in the adjacent ravine. Later, they show building out at the fringes of the superblock, culminating in the astonishingly dense infill of the last decade, which has brought the university to the 21st century (figures 6-1 through 6-24).

Topography and “Force Fields”

Topography has played a major role in the development of the university’s West Campus buildings. The orientation and location of buildings responded to the topography of Burnet Woods, establishing a framework and form for the development of the hilltop campus. The master plan analyzes these and other “force fields” as a means of linking historic and contemporary campus buildings and open spaces.

- First, the ridge running north-to-south on the west side of campus became the location of Samuel Hannaford’s “old” McMicken Hall and Van Wormer Library, parts of a symmetrical alignment proposed in an 1895 “suggested” view of the “University of Cincinnati Campus in the Twentieth Century.” Subsequent buildings were located along this “Academic Ridge” to create a formal, outward-facing line of buildings along and above Clifton Avenue.

- Second, a ravine running northeast behind the ridge bisected the present campus superblock and provided space for recreational activities. Nippert Stadium and an open-air amphitheater took advantage of the natural topography of this ravine, thereby establishing a new axis of construction.
Third, Baldwin (now Herman Schneider) Quad filled in the northeast end of the ridge, adjacent to the ravine. Baldwin Hall, Old Chemistry Building, and Swift Hall were composed at a tilted 13-degree angle from the linear arrangement of buildings along the Academic Ridge.5

Buildings added to the campus were generally oriented around one of these three axial constructs. As the campus grew away from these three axes, construction was oriented to streets. Eventually, the ravine was filled in with new construction, providing a natural subterranean location for the garage beneath the Mary Emery Hall of the College-Conservatory of Music. An earlier amphitheater, at the south end of the ravine, is echoed in the Patricia Corbett Theater’s fanlike shape.

At a pedestrian scale, the hilly terrain of ridge and ravine has required the construction of steps, stairs, bridges, and ramps for building access. Entrances to many buildings occur on multiple levels, taking advantage of the sloping ground planes. For some buildings, the main floor is level with grade on one side while exposed foundations at the opposite side form a plinth for the construction rising above.

Relationships between Buildings and Open Spaces

Early campus construction addressed open space in two ways. Buildings located atop the ridge at the “Clifton Arc” faced outward to acknowledge the city and public street grid. Behind this public front, structures were sited in ways that created open spaces within processional groupings of buildings. Baldwin Quad and Teachers College Courtyard are examples of spaces defined by buildings.

Later, mid-20th century construction did not appear to address the creation of open space. Rather, structures during this period were placed around the perimeter of the campus to accommodate the automobile. At the same time, buildings constructed within the campus core were large enough to enclose space. The science and engineering cluster became a stand-alone destination rather than contributing to the pedestrian feeling and scale of the earlier campus. Large buildings became barriers to casual pedestrian interaction.

As envisioned in the University of Cincinnati Master Plan 2000, signature buildings have been constructed to adapt to spaces. Organic forms curve and angle around “force fields” and pedestrian “streets.” Interstitial spaces have been carved out as small-scale, lush courtyards. Some buildings, like the Steger Student Life Center, have been designed with openings at ground level to allow pedestrians access through the building, without entering the interior, as gateways to adjacent open spaces and buildings. This building also shelters the Mews, an intimate collection of outdoor spaces designed concurrently with Steger.

Building entrances and parking bear strong relationships to open-space issues:

Entrances

Campus buildings constructed in the first half of the 20th century celebrated the sense of arrival. Monumental stairs, elaborately carved architraves, entrance bridges with large light pylons, and delicate concrete cantilevered canopies were designed to be focal points and provide orientation to the pedestrian.
Determining where to enter some later structures, where entrances are located deep in shade, off tunnels, under buildings, or at inside corners, seems to require special knowledge. Many of these structures, responding to site topography, have more than one “principal” entrance and, on occasion, what appear to be entrances are actually emergency egress doors. Dumpsters and loading docks also often appear to be more prominent than building entrances. A notable exception is University Pavilion, which is remarkable for its bright red panels and metal canopies marking and sheltering the main building entrances.

**Space for Parking**
Accommodation of the automobile has molded the university’s built environment in many ways. As more and more students arrived by single-occupant cars, the need for parking and access to parking lots and garages drove construction decisions. During the last quarter of the 20th century, large portions of the campus beyond the Academic Ridge and ravine came to be occupied by surface lots. Implementation of the master plan carried with it the determination to remove surface parking while providing equivalent space in new parking structures. Buildings such as Rieveschl, Langsam, Lindner, and Edwards were constructed with underlying parking structures, resulting in an imposing massiveness that dwarfs earlier structures.

**Demolition**
Historic aerial photographs reveal that a number of older structures have been demolished to make way for new buildings and open spaces. In particular, McMicken Commons required significant demolition between McMicken Hall and Tangeman University Center to create this new, monumental open space and for construction of University Pavilion. Removal of buildings was also required to construct the large-scale Campus Recreation Center north of Nippert Stadium. Other demolition has resulted in the removal of Sawyer Hall; one of the “Three Sisters;” and Sander Hall. The master plan envisions further potential demolition, notably Wilson Auditorium, and there has been discussion of removing the University YMCA building.

**Neighborhood Character**
The West Campus has grown to fill a superblock that clearly demarcates the neighborhood edge. At earlier times, the Clifton and Corryville neighborhoods were interwoven along the north and east sides. The first significant move beyond the Academic Ridge and ravine occurred with the construction of Alms and the DAAP Addition in the 1950s, extending the campus northward across a street into Burnet Woods. Urban renewal of the Corryville commercial center at Vine and McMillan Streets; the widening of Jefferson Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive; construction of the “Three Sisters” group of dormitories; and displacement of small-scale housing by surface parking (and the federal government’s construction of the EPA lab in the early 1970s) effectively redrew the northern and eastern boundaries.

The loss of residential neighborhood areas had an impact on commercial strips along Jefferson Avenue, which fell into vacancy and disrepair. Recognizing that the quality of the surrounding neighborhoods’ environments had a critical impact on attracting and retaining students and faculty, the university undertook an ambitious program of fostering neighborhood collaboration to encourage the development of new housing and commercial space that would enhance both the campus setting and
the neighborhoods. Community urban redevelopment corporations were established in partnership between UC and the neighborhood organizations of Clifton Heights, University Heights, and Corryville. Among the resulting new development efforts are University Park and McMillan Park retail on Calhoun Street (both on campus); Bellevue Gardens apartments on Martin Luther King, Jr., Drive; luxury condos and apartments at the Village at Stetson Square (adjacent to Bellevue Gardens); Charlton Place apartments; and Stratford Heights student housing west of Clifton Avenue. As these projects have come on-line, the university has begun to withdraw from its involvement in the corporations. Significant neighborhood clearance is in evidence along the McMillan/Calhoun corridor, where redevelopment remains incomplete.

Materials
Many of the earliest campus buildings were constructed in revival styles using brick with stone or terra-cotta detailing. The red brick and buff-colored trim visually unite the buildings to create a cohesive appearance. By the mid-20th century, as modernism arrived on the campus, brick and stone continued to be favored materials; however, large expanses of glass and exposed concrete structural systems replaced multi-light double-hung windows, carved stone trim, and intricate terra cotta decoration. Aluminum-frame window systems and precast exposed aggregate panels were hallmarks of contemporary high-rise construction on the east side of the campus superblock. At the end of the 20th century, brick — although in a variety of colors, especially the brown and tan ranges — remained the characteristic material choice, with structural concrete becoming more prominent in cantilevers and balconies. Ribbed-metal panel systems were also employed, but mostly for sheathing mechanical penthouses. For the most part, architects for projects completed since the turn of the 21st century have rejected brick as the primary finish material and, instead, used a variety of metal panel or shingle systems, or precast concrete.
Description, Assessment, and Recommendations for Signature Buildings

As exemplars of modern architecture, UC’s signature buildings are described and assessed by noted critic Michael Sorkin in Appendix A. Being works of the recent past, these structures’ significance lies in the extent to which they embody clear design ideals, as the works of recognized masters at the peaks of their careers.

Detailed notes describing the character-defining features of the structures are presented in the thumbnail descriptions, photographs, and condition assessments found in Appendix B. It should be noted that sealant failures or the likelihood of such failures is an almost universal maintenance issue that must be continually addressed for all of the buildings surveyed.

West Campus

Aronoff Center for Design and Art (1996)
Peter Eisenman in association with Lorenz and Williams

One of a few built examples of work designed by Peter Eisenman, the complex mass of the Aronoff Center is nestled against the side of DAAP Addition into the terrain of the vestigial Burnet Woods landscape.

Eisenman’s “generative methodology” (to use Michael Sorkin’s phrase), which might be the pioneering application of “force fields” later described in the master plan, is expressed in a vocabulary of deconstructed wall planes and a disorienting floor plan with a confusing array of interior footbridges and passageways. The interior skylighted main hall/atrium space, lodged between studio spaces and the DAAP building, arcs upward to follow the external topography as a monumental staircase. Office, library, and studio functions are organized along the outside with views of Burnet Woods. The lightweight material construction of the building (exterior insulation and finish system, interior drywall, aluminum window frames with baked-enamel finishes, pastel color palette), while a practical low-budget means to a formal end, imparts a perishable character to this contemporary masterpiece.

The atrium promenade offers a community gathering space, particularly in the lower-level café, and is used for juried critiques of student work. While the formal expression of the atrium is relatively fixed, office and studio spaces along the north side of the building are more utilitarian in character and could be reconfigured to meet changing needs. Materials and finishes have experienced extensive wear and tear in the decade since the building's completion, notably the exterior cladding system, which shows signs of degradation (cracking, surface delamination to substrates, and fading) and discoloring biological growth in shady areas where runoff has washed over surfaces. Water infiltration around the window system has been persistent.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

The long-term performance of synthetic stucco is still an unknown but vulnerable to moisture intrusion. At a minimum, the exterior finish system should be repaired in kind. Consideration may be given to proven, traditional stucco materials, but there will undoubtedly be issues of structural support for heavier materials, color matching, and long-term maintenance of any applied paint coatings, all of which militate against a wholesale change of the cladding material. The lack of flashing at heads and sills and inadequate weeps at window assemblies must be addressed. Appropriate detailing of remedial measures or replacement window systems should be selected to maintain the architect’s “thin-line” aesthetic and color scheme.

Studio and office areas may be reconfigured without apparent effect to the building character. The approach to the principal entrance from Clifton Court and the Crosley Tower plaza and garage should be reconsidered in order to strengthen linkages to campus pathways. This will assist in better orienting the visitor who otherwise approaches the interior atrium from the DAAP Addition — a very confusing path, indeed.
The CRC is a key component of the streetwall along MainStreet and also mediates an extreme 20-foot grade change from end to end. It is a brooding, massive programmatic ensemble of student housing, classrooms, recreation facilities, and a dining room intended to animate campus life 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Enclosing the open north end of Nippert Stadium with an expansive roofscape and a bridge to the Lindner Center, the S-curve of the building parallels MainStreet and extends the arc of the stadium’s grandstand to an intersection with the cantilevered housing slab, which visually terminates the Campus Green. Dark colors, metal-panel cladding materials, canted perforated metal shade screens at rooftop level, and the slotted windows in the dormitory accentuate the expressive forms of each component of the building envelope. This building has also achieved LEED certification.


The CRC, which opened in early 2006, is in excellent condition with no signs at this early date of material failures. Much of the building envelope’s performance depends upon the success of the gasket system and sealants used in the cladding assemblies, the life expectancy of which is unknown. The building’s somber nature and recessive activity spaces do not notably contribute to a sense of “24/7” activity on MainStreet. Dark colors, low lighting levels, shadowy recesses, and the interior plaza punctuated by sunlit oculi project a foreboding air that can be uninviting. Concerns have been expressed that the quality of the dormitory living spaces is diminished by the stinginess of the strip windows. Classroom and dining spaces may require reconfiguration over time as needs change. The planning team did not visit the residence-hall interiors.
Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Failed joint sealants and expansion joints will need to be repaired and replaced on a cyclical basis. Birds roosting in the metal screens may become a nuisance, and steps should be taken proactively to minimize the problem. The architect should be engaged to re-examine the interior plaza design and suggest ways of softening its present character which may be deterring people from gathering comfortably—perhaps through the introduction of technological elements, such as “light pipes” in the oculi or fiber optic lighting, consistent with the building design.
Integrated into the topography of the ravine behind the academic ridge, the Patricia Corbett Theater roof, with its fanlike shape, recalls the earlier amphitheater. A series of interior and exterior public spaces, often approached down cascading stairways and affording glimpses of landscape, are woven together around four performance venues by an extensive armature of classroom/studio, office, stage support, and practice spaces. Adjacent rehabilitated historic structures, including Dieterle Vocal Arts Center (formerly Schmidlapp Gymnasium) and Memorial Hall, further enrich the complex.

The palette of warm brick elegantly detailed, horizontal window mullions uninterrupted by vertical mullions, “stacked” rectangular modules of the curtain walls at lobby entrances, and the vest-pocket gardens and plaza spaces reinforce the building’s horizontal emphasis and intimate scale. Within the CCM complex, spiky pyramidal rooftop monitors on Mary Emery Hall suffuse the principal interior concourse and grand stair with daylight. The exuberant light fixtures and rich wood finishes of the rehabilitated Corbett Auditorium interior have turned this performance hall into an event in itself. The CCM was the winner of 2001 American Institute of Architects National Honor Award.

The CCM is in excellent condition and appears to perform well for its intended functions. The highly specialized spaces within CCM are unlikely to be easily altered for other purposes; interiors of lobbies and performance venues will eventually require upgrades in seating, finishes, electronics, and/or acoustic performance. The rehabilitation of Corbett Auditorium is a first-rate example of this kind of change.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

The principal issue appears to be ongoing maintenance of masonry, some of which displays signs of biological staining and efflorescence, missing flashing, and sealant failures. Water infiltration through masonry needs to be addressed immediately and may require rebuilding of some parapets, which do not appear to have flashing in all instances. Inspecting flashings, cleaning masonry surfaces using the gentlest means possible, and re-pointing where necessary using the original mortar specification are appropriate components of a cyclical maintenance regimen.
Vera Clements Edwards Center (1992)
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Built for use as “swing space” during the major building campaign, the Edwards Center is an “undistinguished functional work...more corporate than campus.” The precast-concrete building structure appears as a skewed cube above the podium.


The building is in excellent condition and easily adaptable to various office and classroom functions.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Interior adaptation was built into the design equation for the Edwards Center. Cyclical, non-abrasive cleaning of the exterior is required to remove dirt and staining.
Possibly one of Graves’s best buildings, the ERC provides a transition between the traditional campus to the scale of modern signature buildings. It is sited on-axis with University Avenue on the approach from Jefferson Street; however, the building’s apparent symmetry is counterbalanced by its off-center entrance module surmounted by a peripteral temple form. Laboratory bays, expressed in four exterior volumes or modules, are linked by a barrel-vaulted copper roof that is punctuated by four mechanical penthouses with conical vent stacks. The floor plan is clearly delineated: the internal core of lab spaces is circumscribed by a perimeter corridor, while office/classroom bays along the corridor’s external edge articulate each of the four building modules. The rich use of materials includes an Ohio sandstone base; brick detailing with roundel windows, which provide natural light to the internal circulation paths at each end of the structure and in setbacks between modules; and interior wood trim. Inside, a barrel-vaulted stairway (echoing the roof form) within a classic Gravesian peristyle hall/lobby transects the building and mediates the grade transition from MainStreet to Library Square.


The building is a model of functional clarity and is pleasing in its post-modern detail. It is in excellent condition. Lab and office/classroom bays may require reconfiguration as needs change, but such change is unlikely to affect the basic building plan.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Cyclical, non-abrasive cleaning of the exterior is required to remove dirt and staining. Faded sealants require replacement and should match the color of the brick; open joints should be sealed. Special attention should be given to the character-defining peripteral temple form, where sealant failure and color washout are most evident. The integral color of precast-concrete sills is washing out and streaking the face of the building.
Richard E. Lindner Center (2006)
Bernard Tschumi

The Lindner Center’s “beefy, minimally detailed, structural system” is expressed in the triangular geometry of deeply recessed windows and the curvilinear precast concrete construction of the exterior. A vertigo-inducing, full-height central atrium — with glass railings that dissolve the corridor edges at each floor, a free-floating ribbon-like stair, a red and black color scheme, and display cases celebrating the university’s athletic programs — is surrounded by flexible perimeter offices. The building has been LEED certified.


The building is in excellent condition. The geometry of its precast exoskeleton minimizes opportunities for successful alteration. Likewise, the central atrium has an almost temple-like quality in which most change will be reflected in the contents of exhibits. Perimeter office areas are flexibly planned and could easily be changed as needs arise. The building seems suitable for a future green roof installation.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan for the building should be prepared. Changes to perimeter office areas should be limited.
"Literally and figuratively central in creating the form and atmosphere of MainStreet," the Steger Center’s large windows reveal its mixed tableaux of retail, student activity organization offices, and multipurpose uses while affording views of street activity, Nippert Stadium, and The Mews. This sliver of a structure follows the curve of MainStreet and stair-steps with the topography to provide terraces and recesses among the column bays for gathering. It also forms a gateway between MainStreet and the Herman Schneider Quad. The building’s horizontal scale is emphasized by its brick base surmounted by terne-coated, metal-clad structure and expressed by horizontal seams of cladding and brises soleil. Simple interior spaces have polished concrete floors and drywall finishes. The SSLC is LEED certified.


The building is in excellent condition and receives high marks for its functionality. While the overall footprint is fixed by the geographic context of the building, making expansion unlikely, its loft-like interior spaces can be reconfigured for changing office or commercial uses without adverse impact on the whole. The building appears suitable for a future green roof installation, particularly since roof areas are visible from the interior.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan for the building should be prepared. Guidelines for commercial signage may be desirable in the future, if none are already in place. Decomposed granite being tracked in from the adjacent Mews is causing floors to scar prematurely.
Tangeman University Center (2003–2004)
Gwathmey Siegel & Associates

The TUC is a gathering space and multipurpose meeting facility with food courts and a campus bookstore. The iconic clock tower, floating within a skylight atop the gabled slate roof, and Ionic limestone portico face McMicken Commons and align with McMicken Hall. The zinc-coated metal (echoing the clock tower cladding) encasement of a traditional brick building describes a circle in plan intersected by the west wall of the original 1935 neo-Georgian structure. Curved glass walls on the east side open to views of Bearcat Plaza and Nippert Stadium from a skylighted interior atrium, which occupies the original building shell. None of the original building interior has been retained.


The building is in excellent condition and serves well as an indoor gathering space and “transfer point” between various campus paths on different levels at the heart of the campus. It is a functional component of the larger campus activity center, which includes the Campus Recreation Center and the Steger Student Life Center. Large, loosely programmed spaces could be easily modified to meet changing needs; food vendor and bookstore spaces and furnishings are most likely to change over time.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptablety

A cyclical maintenance plan should be prepared for the building, with particular attention given to inspection of the interlocking seams of metal shingles and siding as well as to in-kind repair or replacement of slate roofing and cleaning and re-pointing of masonry.
University Pavilion (2003)
Leers Wenzapfel with GBBN

University Pavilion, housing a variety of student services as well as university executive offices, is an elegant enclosure for the south side of McMicken Commons. “Volumetrically simple... at once airy and solid,” the pavilion’s limestone panel walls with punched windows on three sides relate to the Teachers College Quadrangle and more traditional buildings nearby. The solid planes of the limestone “wrapper” are then offset at the corners adjacent to McMicken Commons to, expose the five glassy bays of the atrium within. Set into a sloped site (formerly the site of Beecher Hall), a monumental interior stairway inside of the glass curtain wall ascends the academic ridge within the atrium and is mirrored by a parallel exterior stair in granite. Red insets reveal public entrances at varying levels, which are announced by projecting flat canopies supported by slender diagonal braces. The structure is capped by the cantilevered roof overhang of the penthouse, which floats over a roof terrace. Interior finishes include a generous use of maple screen paneling for atrium railing panels and walls, which is complemented by the brushed-aluminum or stainless-steel hardware.


The building is in excellent condition. Office space is likely to be adapted as needs change.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan should be prepared for the building, along with clear specifications or guidelines for partition systems and materials to be used in renovated office areas. This approach will ensure a high level of finish commensurate with the building design.
East Campus

**Center for Academic and Research Excellence/Crawley Building**

*(completion anticipated in late 2008)*

*Studio Architecture with Harley Ellis*

This building was under construction at the time of our visit and was not assessed.
Vontz Center for Molecular Studies (2000)
Frank O. Gehry in association with Baxter Hodell Donnelly & Preston

Clad in prefabricated brick panels, the sculptural form of the Vontz Center features curved or twisted wall planes juxtaposed with the glassy grids of projecting window bays. Inside, the open cruciform plan neatly divides office and laboratory functions, which meet in a central circulation atrium. Interstitial floors house mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems for the laboratories. Natural wood finishes delineate lobby/circulation spaces.


The building is generally in excellent condition and, by all accounts, works extremely well for its intended purposes. The building is designed with interstitial spaces to allow easy reconfiguration of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems without disruption to ongoing work in the building.

Window seals have leaked and repair or replacement requires exterior access. Automated interior sun screens were added to windows to curb glare and heat gain. Brick panels show open joints and moisture damage that need to be addressed.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

The long-term durability of the brick panels is unknown. A cyclical maintenance plan should be prepared for the building to address water leakage, with clear specifications for the repair of brick-panel and window systems. This approach will prevent future ad hoc solutions that would compromise the building’s character. Office and laboratory spaces each have their own material palettes, which should be respected and maintained.
Chapter 6

Description, Assessment, and Recommendations for Historically Significant Buildings

The significance of UC’s “mature” structures lies in the story they tell of the early development and 20th century expansion of the university. These buildings reflect university leaders’ aspirations to build a “city [of learning] on the hill,” following classical principles of planning and design.

Detailed notes describing the character-defining features of the structures are presented in the thumbnail descriptions, photographs, and condition assessments found in Appendix B. In recommending preparation of cyclical maintenance plans for each building, it should be noted that the university already has a successful regular process for roof inspections. Additionally, sealant failures or the likelihood of such failures is an almost universal issue of maintenance that must be continually addressed for all of the buildings surveyed.

Off Campus

Cincinnati Observatory (1873), Samuel Hannaford
Ormsby McKnight Mitchel Building (1904), Samuel Hannaford & Sons

Located away from the main campus, the Cincinnati Observatory complex is a National Historic Landmark and a unique cultural monument of significance to the university, the city, and the nation. The recognition of the observatory’s historical importance through its recent rehabilitation demonstrates the university’s commitment to preserving this important resource.


The buildings have recently been restored and are in excellent condition.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A historic structure report (including a cultural landscape component) for the observatory buildings and grounds should be prepared, if one has not, to supplement the National Historic Landmark nomination as the documentary foundation for planning a cyclical maintenance program and careful in-kind repair based on analysis of materials.
Alms Building (1952)
George Roth and James E. Allen

Designed to house the College of Applied Arts, the Alms Building “jumped” the barrier of University Avenue (now Clifton Court) to occupy what was then the southwest corner of Burnet Woods. It is a well-proportioned, geometric, concrete and masonry structure, the horizontal emphasis of which — accentuated by rooflines, projecting canopies, and ribbon windows — is strongly reflective of the early modernists, in particular artists such as Piet Mondrian. Large aluminum-framed windows set in front of the structural grid offer views of the park to the north, dissolving the boundary between interior and exterior space, while the campus side presents a solid composition of masonry planes and glazed voids. The DAAP Addition forms an ell with Alms and complements the ensemble in form, massing, and materials. Aluminum window systems are single-glazed without thermal breaks and awning/jalousie window units may allow air and water to infiltrate or be inoperable.


The original auditorium, gallery, and library spaces have been cluttered with makeshift studio partitioning, furniture, and trash, which obscure the original interior clarity. There does not appear to be a second means of egress from these areas, and the original stair no longer meets code.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Interior spaces, if no longer needed for their intended purposes, are adaptable as open studio space, but consideration should be given to using these spaces as models of interior design and contemporary furnishing that reestablishes their integrity. Front-door access to the building should be re-established and lobby spaces clarified. Elevator access and code-compliant means of egress should be thoughtfully upgraded or inserted to avoid compromising the unity of the spaces. A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared. Poor thermal performance in the window systems may result in a desire to retrofit or replace them. In-kind repair of such character-defining features is preferable from a preservation standpoint, and alterations should be carefully considered to match the existing materials, framing patterns, and transparency.
Herman Schneider Quadrangle (formerly Baldwin Quadrangle):
Baldwin Hall (1909) and Old Chemistry Building (1917), Teitge & Lee and Woodward & Garber with addition by Harry Hake (1938); Swift Hall (1925), Harry Hake; Braunstein Hall (1933), Crowe & Shulte

Baldwin Hall, built to house the College of Engineering, is the focal point of a rectangular open green space that was balanced by subsequent construction of Swift Hall and the Old Chemistry Building. Baldwin Quad was the first attempt to apply the Beaux Arts planning idiom to the UC campus, steering toward a new orientation that canted off axis from the original academic ridge — the “city on a hill” where buildings were lined up in formation and overlooked the city below — by initiating a new practice of grouping buildings together in axial symmetry to create self-contained spaces.

These massive, neo-classical red brick and terra-cotta buildings feature temple fronts and symmetrical façades. The processional entrances are elaborated by monumental stone stairs, double doors with transoms, engaged piers and Ionic columns supporting entablatures, and classical detailing such as dart-and-egg molding, cartouches above doorways, tripartite inlaid meander fretwork in the friezes, and heavy cornices with dentil molding. Limestone or terra cotta is used in stringcourses to delineate floors and lintels and sills for double-hung six-over-six windows. The interior of Swift features a Rookwood tile vestibule, and Old Chemistry has a Rookwood fountain.

In 1920, fire ravaged Baldwin and prompted the first restoration; since then it has undergone three renovations, in 1971, 2002, and 2003. Old Chemistry was expanded in 1938, and the interior was renovated in 1972. Windows have been replaced. Swift Hall underwent a complete renovation as part of the Steger Student Life Center project in 2004.

Baldwin is in excellent condition, with public spaces and classrooms rehabilitated to retain their historic character. Many of its laboratory functions have been moved to the adjacent Rhodes Hall, with which it connects. Swift Hall is in excellent condition, although it exhibits some staining in the stone work. Old Chemistry needs updating and repair. Corridors are cramped gathering spaces for students waiting for class changes.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared, notably for terra-cotta cornices and trim and for repointing the brick masonry. Because the interiors of Swift and Old Chemistry have undergone significant change over the years, few character-defining features remain (the Rookwood pieces are an exception), and spaces can be freely reconfigured.
Carl Blegen Library (1930)
Hake and Hake

The Carl Blegen Library, a stripped-down rendition of a classical building in the style of Paul Cret, was built during the university’s early-20th century expansion to house a growing collection of 500,000 volumes. The principal façade is composed of a limestone base (which extends two more stories below the apparent grade at the sides and rear) and two-story reading room surmounted by an attic story. The central bay, with tall windows denoting the reading room, is clad in limestone and flanked by projecting brick pavilion ends, which are distinguished by fluted corner pilasters and shallow vestigial balconies with bas-relief panels below deeply inset windows.

Art Deco decorative elements, typical of this transitional period, appear in the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin iconography in bronze window grilles, front entrance and interior doors to the reading room, exterior and interior light fixtures, bas-relief stone sculpture, and other details of the interior public spaces. The two-story reading room on the second floor, spanning the central façade bay above the main entrance, has a shallow arched ceiling and tall windows that allow daylight to enter. Replacement windows have been installed throughout the building.

The building is generally in excellent condition, although the reading room is highly cluttered and should be restored down to furnishings and fittings. The closed stack and study carrel areas may be ripe for reconfiguration, depending on current library needs. Information-technology, energy-conservation, life-safety, and accessibility upgrades may be required.

Recommendation: Maintenance and Adaptability

The building continues to be used for the purposes originally intended and requires little alteration. Restore the simple clarity of the reading room, including the adjacent circulation-desk and card-catalog lobbies. Non-public, utilitarian spaces such as stack areas may be rehabilitated to adapt to new uses.

Great care should be taken with the exterior and principal interior public spaces to preserve decorative metalwork, masonry detailing, interior spatial volumes of public spaces, and decorative features and iconography, using the Secretary’s Standards and best conservation practices. A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared, with particular attention paid to bronze and stone conservation, flashings, and re-pointing of masonry (not to mention the removal of “pigtail” fluorescent light bulbs in exposed locations).
Dieterle Vocal Arts Center
(formerly Schmidlapp Gymnasium)

As a counterpoint to the sleekness of the CRC, Dieterle punctuates the southern rim of Nippert Stadium with a Beaux Arts statement in the brick and terra-cotta vocabulary of Baldwin Hall. Dieterle is the only example of a tile roof on campus. The interior has been rehabilitated for use as a choral training facility. The gymnasium volume, which replicates the size of the Corbett Auditorium stage, has been preserved and provides a symphonic practice space.


The building is generally in excellent condition and appears to well serve the new function for which it has been adapted. It seems highly unlikely that the building would ever revert to its original function, for which it is outmoded by current physical recreation standards.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Exterior terra cotta requires removal of paint coatings and careful repair. Replacement window sashes have been set within the original wood frames. These frames and the decorative flagpoles require repainting. A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair of materials, should be prepared, with attention paid to roof repair/replacement and maintenance of ornamental copper downspout collection boxes, in addition to terra-cotta repair and exterior painting.
Annie Laws Auditorium (1930)
Garber and Woodward

Annie Laws Auditorium is part of the Teachers College quad, and its lobby has long served as a path along the Academic Ridge from McMicken Hall to the Blegen Library. The auditorium is expressed as a distinct volume with engaged pairs of limestone columns in a tripartite colonnade supporting an entablature on the principal façade. Each end of this brick pavilion has single columned bays with inset two-story arched windows. Like Blegen, Laws is a stripped-down classical composition with Art Deco sensibilities. The lobby and double-height auditorium space have extensive classical detailing, such as molded cornices and decorative panels, columns, wainscoting and vaulted or coffered ceilings, and fanlight doors. The auditorium has been divided into two classrooms with suspended ceilings.


The building bears heavy traffic and appears — aside from the lobby and the now-concealed auditorium — to have an undistinguished, utilitarian character. Interior classical detailing in the auditorium has been largely concealed by alterations that divided the spatial volume to accommodate classrooms and lower the ceiling.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

Despite the traffic, the lobby and auditorium appear to have survived as hidden jewels of this period of campus development, and should be reclaimed. It is recommended that the auditorium space be restored to its original volume and detailing for multi-purpose use. Exterior stone detailing, especially at the columns, is damaged and requires conservation.
McMicken, Hanna, and Cunningham Halls (1948)

Hake & Hake

The brick classical McMicken with its flanking wings, designed in the Georgian idiom, replaced the original structure destroyed by fire. An iconic Wren-like steeple dominates the Academic Ridge and recalls the country’s colonial roots in the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia. A massive engaged temple front with a decorative entablature and three-tiered tower above demarcates the entrance passage with engaged columns, Ionic engaged capitals, and the venerable sculpted lions, “Mick” and “Mack.” An arched passage opens from the University Arc green space to a view of McMicken Commons and the Tangeman University Center. Limestone trim delineates parts of the building, visually separating the two upper floors from the ground floor, which appears as a continuous arcade with inset windows. Replacement windows are double-hung aluminum or fiberglass, and window openings have limestone trim keystones and sills. The dormered gable roof is covered with slate shingles. Interior public lobby areas feature wood cornice moldings, chair rails, and pedimented architraves; classrooms are of utilitarian design. It is significant for its contribution to reinforcing the university’s efforts to project itself as a national institution.

Offices and classrooms are arrayed in a double-loaded corridor scheme. These spaces are generally utilitarian in finish and serve their intended purposes, although information-technology, life-safety, and accessibility upgrades may be required.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared, with particular attention paid to masonry, slate roofing, and associated concealed gutters. Stone and wrought-iron stair entrances are deteriorating and should be addressed soon. The lack of expansion joints in long masonry walls may result in cracking. Interior lobbies, in Hanna and Cunningham halls particularly, should retain their architectural woodwork features (architraves, wainscoting, etc.) in their natural finish.
Memorial Hall (1924)
Hake & Hake

Memorial Hall first served as a residential hall for men and later, for women. It is a Jacobethan-style building with a six-story tower sporting large gargoyles at each corner, bay windows, crenelated parapets, a dormered slate roof, and decorative chimneys. A renovation in 1958 added a south annex and altered the hall’s entrance. Memorial Hall harmonizes with the earlier University YMCA building in style and contributes to the change in planning, which redirected buildings from the linear ridge alignment to an expansion that worked with the steep grade of the topography, placing buildings at an angle to the Academic Ridge.

The 1996 building rehabilitation converted dorm rooms into practice rooms for the College-Conservatory of Music.


The building is in excellent condition and functions well for its adapted purpose.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared and should call for checking of downspouts. Properly remove paint and repair the terra-cotta trim. Tower windows should be restored to leaded glass in lieu of the glued-on muntin system presently in place.
The University of Cincinnati contracted with the YMCA to open a facility on campus in 1915. Located close to the sidewalk on the Calhoun Street corridor, the compact red brick building with limestone trim is in the Collegiate Gothic Revival style. Several large public rooms feature carved stone fireplaces, wood-beamed ceilings, and leaded-glass bay windows and are ranged along the north and west sides around a central stair hall. Dormitory accommodations are located on upper floors.


The University YMCA is currently unused and showing signs of deterioration due to neglect. Some consideration has been given to removing the building. The interior is currently not fully accessible. Information-technology, energy conservation, and life-safety upgrades are required.

**Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability**

The university should reverse any course toward demolition and seek a creative, sustainable reuse of the structure. The Y’s location and character could accommodate alumni-related uses, an honors student study center with housing, public receptions by university officials, or (possibly) library or mock courtroom space for the nearby College of Law. Appropriate mothballing measures should be undertaken immediately. Roof leaks at bay windows and other deterioration of the building envelope (including the steel casement windows) must be addressed immediately through in-kind repairs. Interior finishes must be repaired and code compliance issues resolved in a well-considered rehabilitation plan.
A sister of the Carl Blegen Library, Wilson Auditorium was built in a stripped-down classical style. Aligned with Braunstein Hall, it “bookends” the Clifton Arc (Taft Law School being the other “bookend”) and extends the line of the Baldwin Quad to connect with Clifton Avenue. As a location for public performances, the building has strong associational ties for the community.

The tripartite arrangement of lobby, auditorium, and stage house is expressed in the streamlined volumes of the building exterior. The almost windowless exterior is articulated by strong vertical lines of decorative stone panels, including Art Deco bas-relief panels on the side elevations. The paneled lobby and second-floor memorial library (featuring a large carved stone fireplace), decorative stairwell railings and light fixtures, and other original auditorium details are also infused with an Art Deco sensibility.
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Wilson Auditorium, having been supplanted by the more modern performance venues of the College-Conservatory of Music, is currently unused (or used for storage) and is in poor condition. Its state of neglect has been aggravated by water leakage, vandalism, and use as a police anti-terrorist training center. Insensitive alterations have resulted in the removal of the original front doors and exterior lighting.

The master plan shows the building being removed to make way for a new structure. The building is not currently accessible, and the large interior volumes of the auditorium and stage house present both challenges and opportunities for adaptive reuse. Information-technology, energy-conservation, and life-safety upgrades are also required.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

The university should reverse any course toward demolition and seek a creative, sustainable reuse of the structure. If medium-sized, auditorium-like classroom space is not needed on campus, rehabilitation for other academic uses should be considered. Roof leaks and other deterioration of the building envelope must be addressed immediately with appropriately mothballing measures.
Van Wormer Hall (1899)
Samuel Hannaford and Sons

Van Wormer is significant as one of the first buildings constructed on the Academic Ridge and the university's first library. A cubic, neo-classical building with Greek Revival details and forms, including an attic story, dentil molding on a heavy cornice, a temple front with double-height Ionic columns, and a decorative entablature, it represents the stylistic arrival of Beaux Arts planning principles later evidenced in the Baldwin Quad. In 2006, the glass dome, which had been removed in the 1930s, was reconstructed. The interior is planned around the two-story rotunda with balcony. It recalls the many libraries built by Andrew Carnegie and the 19th century concept of the university as a “city on a hill” and a beacon of learning.


The building was rehabilitated in 2006 and is in excellent condition. Adapted for office space long ago, this former library works successfully for university administrative functions and now holds the honor of being the oldest building on campus.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared. The new stone cladding at the raised building base appears especially vulnerable to moisture and related deterioration.
The Health Professions Building, formerly the UC College of Medicine, was constructed as the last phase of a new Cincinnati General Hospital and Medical College complex built in the Avondale neighborhood just before World War I. The Beaux Arts building is E-shaped with a symmetrical façade on an elevated basement. The seven-bay-wide central block is connected by hyphens to two large projecting wings, each three bays wide, which bracket the ends. The corners of the central block are expressed by shallow projecting bays, and the center bays of the end wings are also projected. Structural bays of the principal façade are delineated by full-height pilasters surmounted by a simple parapet cornice, which is further elaborated with a higher parapet on the central block. Windows are mullioned in bands above masonry spandrel panels set between the pilasters. Van Wormer Hall on the West Campus and the Health Professions Building and Logan Hall (opposite page) on the East Campus are the last Hannaford-designed structures remaining on either campus.


The interior is in poor condition, and the exterior is in fair condition. The building is currently used for classrooms and office space, and its generally utilitarian interiors can be adapted to new uses.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared for the exterior. Inside, the front vestibule, lobby, and auditorium spaces retain finishes and details that should be retained and repaired as needed.
Logan Hall (1915)
Samuel Hannaford and Sons

Logan Hall, formerly the General Hospital Nurses’ Home, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and was constructed as part of the Cincinnati General Hospital and Medical College complex. The Beaux Arts building is U-shaped, with a symmetrical façade, the central block of which is one story higher than the two projecting wings and features an arcaded entrance loggia. The first floor is articulated by heavy stone banding, which creates a rusticated base. The lobby (the only interior space visited) is classically detailed with a coffered ceiling and pilasters, but the space has been subdivided by drywall partitions that are not at full height. Original interior wood doors appear to be in place.


The building is in good condition and is reasonably well suited for its current office use by a university-affiliated psychiatric practice group. Former residential spaces now used as offices are presumably utilitarian and can be adapted to new uses.

Recommendations: Maintenance and Adaptability

A cyclical maintenance plan, including careful, in-kind repair based on materials analysis, should be prepared for the exterior and should include repair of ground-floor stucco, stone cleaning and repair, and flashing and sealant replacement. Inside, the lobby retains original finishes and details and should be restored.
Building uses come and go, but original historic fabric, once lost, can never be reclaimed. Seemingly small losses and degradation that occur over time will, eventually, amount to significant and irreversible damage to the integrity and character of both signature and historic resources. Therefore, the goal of preserving and maintaining historic or character-defining fabric, features, materials, and design elements is the basis of the recommended treatment approach. The importance of routine cyclical maintenance using methods and materials appropriate to the university’s buildings, and of training facility managers and maintenance crews in the application of recommended treatment guidelines, cannot be overemphasized.

In general, observing the principles for accommodating change outlined in the preservation approach (Chapter 4) is the foundation of any maintenance program.

- Continue to use a property as it was designed to be used, or find a new use that minimizes changes to character-defining features.
- Identify and retain distinguishing building qualities and characteristics.
- Maintain, protect, and repair existing character-defining features, materials, and finishes. If features are deteriorated beyond repair, replace in kind.
- Be authentic: if a feature is missing or must be removed, use accurate documentation to guide replacement.
- Respect the evolution of historic changes, fashion, taste, and use.
- Do not use maintenance methods or materials that damage significant building fabric.

*Typical Conditions: Masonry*

The majority of the late-19th century and early-to-mid-20th century buildings on campus have masonry walls. As with all historic materials, frequent evaluation and careful maintenance can solve minor problems before they become large, expensive repairs. The preservation approach recommended here places the emphasis on retention and repair; any necessary replacements should be made in kind, matching the existing in color, texture, size, and other visual qualities.
Masonry repairs should be performed only by those skilled in preservation solutions and techniques. Masonry repair is a complex subject. It is important to understand that different types of stone and brick have different physical properties, weights and densities, and surfaces. The masonry material, the type and extent of damage, and the proposed methods of repair should be determined before any work begins.

An examination of masonry on campus reveals damage from defective or missing flashing, open joints, and (occasionally) rising damp, as well as the effects of applying ice-melting compounds. Treatment approaches may be categorized as follows:

Cleaning
Harsh chemical cleaning, sandblasting, and high water pressure can cause significant, irreversible damage to buildings. Careful analysis of masonry properties is recommended, as is testing of proposed cleaning agents on small areas before proceeding with the work. In general, use the gentlest means possible.

Repointing
New mortar joints should match their historic counterparts in color, material, and profile. Mortars with a high percentage of Portland cement are less permeable than soft bricks and can cause deterioration by salt deposition in the masonry. Refer to building specifications, or conduct mortar analysis to determine the composition of original mortar for use in repointing.

Inappropriate Repair
The use of inappropriate materials or workmanship can alter historic appearance and damage historic fabric. This can include the use of contemporary synthetic sealants and caulking applied in lieu of mortar. These sealants and caulks, intended to keep moisture from entering a structure, can instead trap water and cause joints to fail, with adverse visual results. In some instances, sealants have failed to retain their colors, and runoff has discolored adjoining wall surfaces. In other instances, inappropriate color matching has created an unintended visual prominence for sealant joints.

Deferred Maintenance
Water penetration, efflorescence, spalled stone or terra cotta, and cracked masonry were observed in several buildings, and, in some cases, terra cotta has been painted to conceal deterioration. On exterior walls, deteriorated mortar, open joints, and settlement cracks are evidence of moisture and possible thermal differential movement. Failed or open joints in brick, limestone, terra cotta, and granite masonry, most due to normal weathering, are visible at parapets, cornices, and trim. Open joints are often found behind downspouts.

It is fair to say that many of these observations are transferable to modern panel cladding systems. The long-term performance of the panels, gaskets, and sealants may not be known as yet, but the principles of carefully examining material properties and taking appropriate measures before problems become insurmountable apply the same as for masonry structures.
Building alterations to upgrade accessibility, energy efficiency, and information technology will likely present the most immediate challenges to UC’s “mature” buildings. Generally, loosely programmed or secondary spaces may be considered as candidates for changes in use. Some of these areas are identified in the preceding paragraphs, as are several significant interiors (some of which should receive greater appreciation). Alterations and new construction should not destroy significant features or materials nor alter a building’s defining character. Additions and new work should be compatible with their context.

Demolition

Lack of appreciation due to changes in taste can lead to inappropriate alterations, neglect, or loss of buildings. Notwithstanding the master plan concepts, structures or parts of structures that contribute to the integrity of the campus should not be demolished unless it is determined that there is imminent threat to life or property. From the standpoint of sustainability, the embodied energy of these structures can provide environmental and cost-saving benefits to future generations.

Where it is determined that demolition is required, the demolition should be kept to an absolute minimum and limited to secondary areas or areas of extreme deterioration. Any demolition should be carefully planned to minimize impacts on historic features, materials, and floor plans. Historic features, elements, materials, and designs that would be altered or lost by
demolition should be thoroughly documented with photographs and measured drawings.

Additions and New Construction

As stated in Chapter 4, existing university buildings offer opportunities for creative new uses, and the multiple layers of history and aesthetics found in existing buildings can inspire creative and compatible designs for new construction. Just as signature and historic buildings vary, new construction should be individually tailored to the historic building and its site. The design of any addition or new infill should be in proportion to the size and scale of the adjoining building(s) and should take into account the character of the landscape and the precepts of the master plan.

The primary objective in planning an addition is to determine whether the building can be modified without detrimental impact to the signature or historic design, materials, and site. Some buildings cannot accept new exterior additions because of these considerations. Additions should be subordinate to the original building and should not impact or change the general perception of the building's signature or historic design. They should be compatible with the architectural character of the signature or historic building, using matching or complementary materials without being a copy of the original building.
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Chapter 7

Administrative, Management, and Policy Recommendations

Introduction

The goal of the University of Cincinnati Campus Heritage Plan is to address the process and guidelines for implementing change. The plan’s intent is to “initiate a dialogue about the nature and practicality of continuity and change” and to ground that dialogue in the context of the campus as it has developed over time, particularly as a result of the remarkable transformation introduced by the new “signature” buildings and landscapes of the master plan. This final chapter focuses on the management issues, concerns, and objectives of the University of Cincinnati through administrative, management, and policy recommendations intended to support the vision of the university master plan and preserve UC’s unique sense of place.

Preceding chapters reviewed existing conditions and character-defining features or elements of buildings and landscapes, which are cataloged in the plan’s appendices. Potential impetuses for change were forecast on the basis of interviews and observation of the unique characteristics of each. This activity helped the planning team to better understand the degree to which change can be accommodated without sacrificing the significance of the buildings and landscapes that have brought acclaim to UC. Potential treatment recommendations were then provided as guidelines for the further development and implementation of maintenance standards based on “best practices.”

Management Issues

The potential forces for change can be summarized as a series of management issues, which the planning team identified from university representatives’ responses to the following questions:
• **New Development on Campus:** How and where should new development occur as remaining land banks and building infill locations are built out to reflect the vision of the master plan? What should happen if planned development in these areas does not occur? How should future development relate to neighborhood redevelopment along campus boundaries? How might changes fully realize the potential for a rich residential community life on campus and affect signature buildings and landscapes?

• **Removing Existing Buildings:** In the current master plan, certain buildings are considered for demolition. Should they be reconsidered for an appropriate new use? How will the university evaluate what might be lost or gained by a proposed demolition?

• **Re-Conceptualizing Existing Buildings and Open Spaces:** The new signature buildings and landscapes will mature. Programmatic needs or expectations are likely to change over time and may be out-paced by accelerating changes in technology. The users will test expectations for these facilities and the assumptions about their intended functions. What weight should be given to the intentions or opinions of the original designers as the university community evaluates and reconsiders their work? How might changes affect the public image of the university?

• **Maintaining Buildings and Landscapes:** Many of the signature buildings employ modern curtain-wall or cladding systems, the long-term performance and life expectancies of which remain uncertain. Some landscapes are identified in the master plan as requiring a high level of maintenance. How should the university maintain the unique design characteristics of the materials chosen for these buildings and landscapes, which may be impacted on by shortfalls in maintenance funding and capabilities? What guidance can the Campus Heritage Plan provide about making wise choices when faced with limited funding? Where should maintenance facilities be relocated to most effectively and efficiently care for the university’s landscapes?

• **Sustainability Initiatives:** The university is evaluating its operations as they relate to sustainability and the impact on the environment. This initiative bears directly on the previously cited management issues: How might any proposed sustainability guide lines (and potential legal mandates) impact on the maintenance or proposed alteration of signature buildings and landscapes?
The answers to these and many other questions are not so self-evident that they can be prescribed in detail for all circumstances. Indeed, each of these issues will need to be addressed specifically in the context of each campus character area. Rather than adopting a prescriptive approach that will quickly become outdated, the following management and policy recommendations suggest a process for informing good decision-making, promoting communication and teamwork, and providing tools that develop and reinforce the awareness of best practices by managers, consultants, faculty, and staff.

### Accommodating Change: Management and Policy Recommendations

How should the university’s signature buildings and landscapes be considered when new development or alterations are proposed? How will change be managed? The Planning + Design + Construction department within the Division of Administration and Finance is responsible for setting the pace and direction of inevitable change. Under the leadership of the University Architect, PDC plays the pivotal stewardship role on behalf of the Board of Trustees in shaping the environment that survives into the future.

Several key factors are crucial to success in fulfilling the university’s stewardship goals:

- Oversight by experienced, trained staff with awareness of and commitment to appropriate stewardship;
Participation of consultants who have expertise in preservation approaches, contextual design, and sustainability;

• An internal design-review process that considers stewardship issues;

• Integration of best-practice guidelines in the cyclical maintenance of historic and signature buildings and landscapes (as called for in this Campus Heritage Plan) and in planning for changes; and

• Funding levels that support effective preservation and stewardship.

Staff Oversight

The ongoing maintenance and treatment of character-defining building and landscape fabric depends on fostering an awareness of and commitment to appropriate stewardship among university decision-makers and within the existing facilities maintenance process.

Preservation Planner/Architect

It is recommended that the university establish or designate a position for a preservation planner, architect, and/or landscape architect within Planning + Design + Construction to direct and implement the guidelines in the Campus Heritage Plan in the context of the university’s strategic planning and sustainability initiatives. This person would serve as the University Architect’s liaison between maintenance staff and other decision-makers, review proposed work for compliance with conservation standards, make recommendations and serve as an institutional resource to building managers and maintenance staff, and participate in the development of cyclical maintenance plans and training programs.

Trained Personnel

Building materials conservation experience should be one consideration in the interviewing and hiring of new maintenance personnel, including supervisors and master craftspersons. Initiating a regularly recurring preservation training program for all staff levels would also instill a preservation ethic as a key component of all planning, construction, and maintenance activities.

Repairs typically handled by university maintenance staff and/or contractors who are unfamiliar with appropriate conservation practices could result in damage to historic or significant character-defining fabric and features. Specialized knowledge and skills are often required for complex work on roofs, flashings, sealants, masonry, windows, and unusual building fabric. Conservation specialists should conduct routine maintenance
procedures or monitor contractors experienced in specialized types of maintenance and conservation work. Continuous improvements should be made through development and application of recommended treatment guidelines for significant buildings and landscapes.

**Consultant Participation**

The participation of professional consultants who have expertise in preservation approaches, contextual design, and sustainability is recommended to supplement the expertise of Facilities Management staff in determining appropriate treatments for significant buildings and landscapes. Specialist contractors should be able to demonstrate sufficient hands-on experience and should employ conservation personnel experienced in building materials conservation and its practical application. To ensure a high quality of workmanship and materials, contract documents for treatments should list best practices and specify the appropriate qualifications of specialist firms and individuals performing the work.

**Design Review Process**

The University Architect, working with a design review committee experienced with the master plan, historic preservation, and stewardship issues, should be designated to respond to potential design and preservation treatment issues associated with building and landscape improvement projects. Conservation issues related to building and landscape maintenance should be subject to expedited review by qualified staff on the basis of established guidelines. The design review committee, however, would most likely exercise its advisory role when considering the issues of new development on campus or the removal of existing buildings, and in reconceptualizing existing buildings and open spaces.

When the university undertakes construction projects that are associated with historic or signature buildings and landscapes, it is recommended that the following process be followed:

- Review project-specific requirements provided by or developed in conjunction with the university;
- Consult with the Facilities Management department and building managers on building-related issues, requirements, and codes;
- Consult the landscape and building assessment and guidelines portions of this Campus Heritage Plan for information on the general...
• Consult the treatment recommendations included in this Campus Heritage Plan for historic fabric that will be affected;

• Submit conceptual plans for the proposed work that describe the project in drawings and text, and that demonstrate how the proposed work will conform to these guidelines; include options and alternatives that have been considered, if appropriate;

• With respect to the conceptual plan, obtain the approval of the University Architect and the Campus Planning and Design department, including the design review committee as advisers in the review process; and

• Prepare construction documents for the work consistent with these guidelines and submit them to the University Architect, Planning + Design + Construction, and the design review committee for review.

Best-Practice Guidelines

The general principles of this Campus Heritage Plan encourage long-term conservation of the character of significant buildings and landscapes. A university-wide policy reinforcing the importance of appropriate stewardship would help develop an awareness of best practices by managers, consultants, faculty, and staff.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards should be considered when planning maintenance, reuse, renovations, new construction, and other future work on UC campuses. The catalog of buildings and landscapes in this plan can be used to develop treatment guidelines and maintenance standards based on “best practices.” Together with cyclical maintenance plans, periodically refined and updated, these valuable reference resources can be shared with facility managers, maintenance staff, and design reviewers charged with implementing plan recommendations.

Cyclical Maintenance Plans

The foundation for good stewardship is a program of sound preventive maintenance, one that emphasizes the importance of routine cyclical maintenance by staff members who are trained in the methods and materials appropriate to the individual buildings and landscapes. The university already has a successful program of cyclical inspection and repair for roofs, which could well serve as the cyclical maintenance model for other systems and materials in a holistic preservation program that includes the participation of conservation specialists.

Cyclical maintenance plans for signature and historic buildings and landscapes should include schedules for each type of maintenance and should be linked to the Facilities Management department’s record of the maintenance work undertaken on a year-by-year and building-by-building basis. The plans should include information about recommended products, methods, and materials, and best-practice techniques for the maintenance and repair of significant materials. As buildings and landscapes evolve, the cyclical maintenance plans and recordkeeping will become the institutional memory, transmitting crucial facility and treatment information to new managers and maintenance staff.
Implementation Strategy

Adoption of the Campus Heritage Plan as the university-wide preservation policy will promote communication, collaboration, and teamwork. First, it is recommended that the university Board of Trustees formally adopt this Campus Heritage Plan as an addition to the campus master plan and direct that it be consulted as part of the university’s maintenance, planning, and design processes. Second, enhancing knowledge of campus heritage among faculty, students, staff, administrators, and alumni through the university’s Web site and other media will play a critical role in strengthening any commitment to implement the principles, recommendations, and guidelines for reasonable and responsible stewardship included in the plan. The development of guidelines to address specific management issues in each campus character area, through the involvement of the design review committee, could also provide teaching opportunities. Third, consideration should be given to allocating resources for hiring or designating a university preservation planner/architect to facilitate implementation of the plan upon its adoption. A knowledgeable community and staff support will be essential to developing the consensus needed for funding the remaining stewardship objectives of the plan.

The Getty Campus Heritage Program and the University of Cincinnati have been partners in an initiative to make stewardship of historic and modern “signature” buildings and landscapes a major goal in the university’s strategic planning. In adopting the plan as a flexible guide to inform good decision-making, rather than a rigid rule book, the university will be taking another significant step toward fulfilling its planning goals by preserving the rich heritage and tradition of this unique academic environment.
Endnotes
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