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 bookstore, 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
- Dubney-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.
Chapter 5

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.

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.

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.

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

#### 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.

#### 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 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.

---
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**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**

Enlist 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**

Engage design teams to complete the landscape architectural designs for areas of the campus that have not yet been rehabilitated. Consider professionals who have a proven track record for developing context-sensitive solutions, and who have a portfolio of successful campus and urban plaza designs that fit in with the university’s vision for the future of the campus.
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.”

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.”

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".
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.

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 [Herman Schneider] 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.
Campus Green (Hargreaves).
Campus Green Character Area
Signature Landscapes:

**Campus Green**

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 arboratum 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. Bordered by 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.

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.

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.
Campus Green Character Area
Signature Landscapes

**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.
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.
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.”¹⁹

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.²⁰
MainStreet Open Space Design

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.
MainStreet Character Area
Signature Landscapes:

**The Mews**

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.
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.
Calhoun Streetscape Character Area
Signature Landscapes: None

Bank below Calhoun Street/Corbett Drive

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.
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).
East Campus
Other Landscapes

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

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.
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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