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Auburn’s Inspiration
By Hugh Darley
March 21, 2001

With equal parts conservative thinking and academic skepticism, the world of campus planning has been slow to innovate and evolve. The idea that an institution of higher learning should think of itself as a business enterprise seems unthinkable to the average student, faculty or alumni member. The idea of a university being branded or packaged as if it were a product or an illusion of one’s imagination might seem equally foreign to the more lofty aspirations of the university. But “branding” is simply identifying that which makes one unique, the image and character of an object, and “packaging” merely the manner in which those qualities are presented. “Thus, the unparalleled challenges of thinking differently about the image and character of an institution do exist.”

IDEA and its teams of Auburn stakeholders have taken the challenge offered by Auburn University, its Board of Trustees and its student, faculty and alumni bodies to undertake a mission of redefining a university’s approach to master planning and the planning of integrated student life facilities.

A student village concept is born…

Imagine . . . a place where learning, lifestyle, business and pleasure coexist in the perfect environment to inspire and uplift both the brightest and most challenged young people of our time. A place where the inspiration for learning doesn’t stop at the classroom door or the lab hallway; a place where, the mere “presence of being” stimulates thought. An environment, so rich in its texture and vibrant in its energy, where people want to gather together to share in the moment. Faculty, staff, students and townspeople can assemble to share their views, beliefs and challenges of the world outside in a comprehensive
enclave of learning. A place that integrates one’s lifestyle with one’s goals and aspirations for the future; a place that is a safe reflection of the real world - this is our vision for Auburn and Student Life Village.

Inspired learning comes from one’s imagination of what might be; a picture painted by a teacher of possibilities and vision. Why should an environment for learning be so sterile that it demands one’s attention to the subject being spoken? When reflecting on one’s thoughts or reading words of inspiration, do we not seek out a warm, welcoming environment in which to contemplate the wisdom of the ages? A classroom, a study hall or a faculty or student lounge has to be part of the lifestyle we seek if we are to be engaged in the learning experience.

Why a Student Life Village... A village motif embodies the human qualities of warmth and hospitality in its human scale. The Village is a friendly inviting concept to all segments of the University community. It will physically and emotionally give the University a “heart and soul,” a town center in which the collegiate experience has a sense of place. The village will serve as an inspiration for visitors to understand the true character and value of this special place. Villages and town squares have often been the stage for a culture to showcase its sense of pride and well-being. A town center has traditionally served as a gathering place for celebration and remembrance, and sometimes a battlefield for debate. But a village always feels comfortable and safe, it reflects the values of a well founded community.
Statement

These questions serve as a statement of qualification for the report and establish the merits of this study.

Can synergy be established between the academic requirements of a university and traditional retail approaches of business in a new generation of student focused campus facilities?

Can student-centered campus facilities include a mix of meeting and conference space, unique retail, food and beverage, student government offices and resident housing?

Does an integrated student facility or village offer a way to recharge the life of a campus?

Can an integrated village of student facilities out-perform traditional campus models?

Will a new generation of student facilities at Auburn facilitate a new and distinct offering in the marketplace?

How will a university’s traditional sources of capital view the risks and rewards of an unproven product type, and will new funding sources become available?

The findings in this report attempt to answer these and other questions as well as make recommendations for the university to adopt, to preserve and enhance the Image and Character of Auburn University.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Phase II Overview
With the findings of a brainstorming session in Phase I compiled and published December 8th, 2000, a programming phase was established to create planning criteria for a new student village and campus-wide master plan. This document presents a conceptual program for a future student village and illustrates a philosophy of style and design guidelines for a campus-wide master plan.

Process
A successful programming phase includes fact finding, data collection and an in-depth survey of the University’s stakeholder groups. The survey information collected for this Phase II Program was provided by, and in cooperation with, the past University facilities vice president, current University planner, University architect and members of the University campus planning committee. Further planning criteria and specific academic programming was supplied by the University’s facilities planning group and associate provost for facilities. The student union program was provided by the student union building committee and supplemented by revisions accepted by the University in January, 2001. Our survey was compiled in three (3) subject areas to provide a guideline for this document. These subject areas include Master Planning, Student Village and Site Survey.

Approach
Three (3) teams were assembled to collect data and conduct meetings to establish criteria for illustrating Auburn’s image and character. These teams were made up of board members, faculty, staff, students and alumni. All team members were selected by Auburn University and the IDEA design team.
These three (3) teams are:
- Master Plan Team
- Student Village Team
- Site Survey Team

Once reviewed by their respective teams, the information collected was compiled into this Phase II report. The report is a collection of three (3) books of information:
- Image and Character Guidelines
- Image and Character Reference
- Image and Character Program

These books are meant to be used by the University as a quality control measure to ensure future planning and design efforts enhance the visual brand equity of Auburn University.

**Existing Conditions**

The teams reviewed information from over 600 documents from which to base the report’s recommendations. To understand the existing conditions, the following objectives were outlined:
- Study original site plan as well as other master planning exercises
- Review growth impacts 1950s - 1960s without guidelines
- Discuss monetary constraints and state funding
- Value building priorities in the new century
- Discuss competition in the future of higher education
- Consider new challenges facing the institution
Equity
Auburn University has a wealth of value in its current assets and long-term equity. Auburn’s equity can be expressed as follows:

- Unique
- Best of class/market leader
- Increased quality
- Increase demand

Assumptions
Based on preliminary findings in Phase I, coupled with discussions of data collection in Phase II, several assumptions have been made:

- The University has a strong desire to retain and enhance Auburn’s unique image & character
- The University has a strong desire to create a pedestrian campus
- The University has a strong desire to enhance the personality in architecture and landscape that reflects the quality of the Auburn experience
- The University aspires to adopt and abide by a strict set of guiding philosophies in architecture and planning
- The University will adopt a strong set of design guidelines

Our Findings & Recommendations
In order to preserve the value in Auburn University’s long-term equities, IDEA recommends the University take the following actions:

- Clearly define the planning process
- Increase the quality of database information
- Create an inspired vision for inspired giving
- Develop a focused communications strategy
- Clearly define the organizational structure of the planning process
- Adopt a strict set of design philosophies and guidelines
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1.1.1 Goal I: Define the Architectural Brand Language

The visual characteristics of Auburn University result from the interaction of green space with buildings. One is struck by the openness of the campus. The quality of exterior space and the massing of buildings have traditionally defined the Auburn character. Here exists a system in which outdoor rooms are defined by the buildings that border them, not a system defined by an architectural style. Yet the architectural language and proportions create a harmony with one another, with the environment and with the user. This is a people-friendly, if often formal, environment. The quality of exterior space and the massing of buildings are major factors in the creation of this environment. How these factors interact, defines an image and character unique to Auburn.

From its inception, the founders of the University recognized the importance of open green space and building design to an institution’s mission and image. The original campus was oriented toward a commons, directly addressing the town’s central crossroads and signifying the important relationship between the college and the town. The earliest academic buildings were of the Romanesque style, popular in the mid-nineteenth century. By the turn of the twentieth century, philosophical conflicts redirected development away from both the original campus center and nineteenth century architectural models. The convergence and resolution of the conflicting philosophies was an important factor in the creation of Auburn’s unique physical character; it resulted in the marrying of formal axial relationships with meandering rural organization. The 1892, remodel of Langdon Hall reflects this shift away from picturesque Victorian styles and toward formal Neoclassic variants, the dominant styles in both university architecture and planning during the next fifty years. Building materials, mass, proportions and site relationships of these designs tend to be consistent and of human scale and proportion.
In the early 1950s, Auburn entered an era dominated by the International style. Most designs of this period so fully reject the established site planning and architecture criteria that had come to embody the image of Auburn as to make them indistinguishable from buildings built anywhere in the country at that time.

By the mid 1980s, an embracing of the Post-Modern movement signaled a return to traditional forms, ideas of massing and the building-site relationship. However, the scale and proportion of these designs tends to be more monumental than their Neoclassical precedents. Physical and archival evidence reveals that, despite the impact of the automobile, the tradition established by early designers has clearly set the precedent for future development.

The Auburn campus plan today reveals that the design and placement of buildings, without regard for the parameters established by early planners and designers, results in the loss of elements which have traditionally defined the Auburn character; a prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape. Unfortunately, a breakdown of the system has resulted in unresolved formality, visually assaulting architectural statements and unrealized potential. Defining Auburn’s character for use by future designers, the intent of this survey, is key to reversing this trend.
1.1.2 Goal II: Define The Master Plan Philosophy

The master plan philosophy addresses guidelines for consideration on all future design and planning which will ensure the long-term enhancement and growth in the equity of Auburn University's physical assets.

This Philosophy and introduction begins to address the following topics:

- Master Plan
- Site Ratios
- Building Types
- Transportation
- Pedestrian Circulation
- Distribution
- Infrastructure

Introduction

IDEA has asked Sasaki Associates, as part of the team, to provide a resource paper on master planning at Auburn University that supplements and reinforces the “brand language” initiative being undertaken by the University with IDEA. The material herein draws from two sources:

- The understanding of the physical environment of Auburn drawn from a series of precinct planning and siting studies recently/currently undertaken for the University by Sasaki.

- Participation in the initial interviews of campus stakeholders conducted in the fall of 2000 by IDEA for the purpose of eliciting perceptions of Auburn’s “brand image,” identity and cultural values held by the campus community.

As a foundation for our recommendations on master planning
criteria, the following two sections of this paper summarize our impressions of Auburn as drawn from the two levels of involvement noted above. Section IV of this paper offers recommended planning criteria.

Our sense of Auburn’s physical characteristics and environment is built not on a comprehensive analysis of the campus as a whole, but on the knowledge of the campus that has been gained through a series of precinct siting studies. This has required us to consider the larger context of Auburn when making decisions on the future of individual precincts. A general understanding of campus-wide land use, circulation and potential growth patterns was essential in land use planning for the College of Agriculture in particular, since that work had to address pressures of campus growth on the land resources of the College. Decisions on building siting for Poultry Science Research and for the facilities of the College of Sciences and Mathematics were also based on campus-wide land use considerations and an understanding of the spatial and circulation connections that tie those facilities to other areas of the University.

Based on that work, our sense of the campus can be summarized as follows:

**THE CAMPUS AS A WHOLE: “THE VILLAGE AND THE COUNTRYSIDE”**

Auburn embodies the distinct attribute of great land grant campuses - it has a “village center” where academic, administrative, residential and social life is clustered, and it is embraced by a larger rural setting that supports its public legacy as an agricultural institution.

The campus as a whole occupies approximately 1,760 acres, typical of the size of most of the major public land grant universities in the U.S. Also typical among land grant campuses
is the fact that over two-thirds of Auburn’s contiguous land area is given over to outlying natural open space, agricultural lands, sports/recreation fields, and a loose fabric of support functions interspersed among those outlying lands. This is Auburn’s “countryside.”

The remaining third of the campus (approximately 400 acres) contains the main built-up area where the University’s academic, residential, administrative, community and sports facilities are centered. The built-up area is located at the northeast corner of the campus, bounded on the north by West Magnolia Avenue and on the east by South College Street. Downtown Auburn is adjacent to the campus north and east of those streets.

Most of University’s instructional, research and academic support buildings are in a 180-acre academic core area, bounded by South Donahue Drive, West Magnolia Avenue, South College Street and West Samford Avenue. All of the University’s colleges, except for Veterinary Medicine, are centered within the area. The area also contains the University’s traditional all-campus common facilities such as the Draughon Library, the Foy Union, Samford Hall and the Haley Center. This is Auburn’s “village.”

Typically, the academic core of a large university would occupy a somewhat more compact area of about 100 acres in order to contain academic instruction and support space within a ten-minute walking distance between classes. The Auburn core campus is more dispersed, in large part because the area includes the residential quad complex, the Jordan-Hare Stadium, Plainsman Park, and a substantial amount of surface parking, adding up to roughly 60 acres of non-academic functions at or near the heart of the University’s academic zone.

Although the academic core is relatively dispersed to
accommodate non-academic functions (residences, stadium, etc.), those functions add to the mix in a way that is distinct and important to Auburn's culture. The residences give 24-hour vitality and human scale to the core campus. While the stadium is only occupied a few days out of the year, it represents a significant aspect of Auburn's culture, social ritual and identity. These non-academic facilities can be blended into the academic fabric. The main imperative is to preserve and enhance the functional and qualitative character of Auburn's academic environment. The University in the future will rely on a high level of connection between academic disciplines, between undergraduate and graduate activity, and between pedagogical and social life. The academic core zone can work well if the quality of the pedestrian environment is improved and if future academic facilities can be contained within its perimeter.

Various precinct studies have demonstrated that there are numerous building “infill” opportunities in the academic core that can accommodate substantial future program capacity, while maintaining desired walking distances between facilities. More importantly, potential infill sites can be laid out to define and activate pedestrian spaces and passages, thus enhancing the functional and collegial aspects of the academic core.

A critical factor in being able to achieve a more coherent and functional academic core will be to address the large number of surface parking areas that occupy key sites that are more valuable for future academic buildings and/or collegiate open spaces. By any objective measure, the pervasiveness of cars on the core campus takes much away from the collegial character sought by most people. Transferring the priority from territorial “doorstep” parking convenience to better quality of the academic setting will involve a fundamental shift in attitudes and behavior.

The forthcoming campus master plan should examine building
infill opportunities in a comprehensive way, in conjunction with alternative strategies for consolidation of parking at locations that are less intrusive to the collegiate fabric of the campus. The conflict between people and vehicles must be reduced. A redistribution of parking can also reduce the extent to which streets in the central core area now accommodate drivers engaged in “search and seizure” for available parking.

Following is a summation of the key characteristics of the campus:

“Village-Like” Academic Core
The 180-acre academic “core” of Auburn (where academic, academic support and common facilities are located) enables most people to move from class to class generally within a ten-minute duration. The character of the academic core is very “village-like” because it also contains residential, social and sports facilities that give it a kind of vitality that is not evident at institutions where those uses are separated from academic functions.

“Natural” Feeling of the Campus
Notwithstanding the lack of traditional “icon” spaces and the abundance of roads and parking areas in the core, there is a pervasive sense of “natural green” at Auburn due to the widespread presence of pines and southern hardwoods. Even small patches of open land, if planted with stately trees and lush understory planting, magnify the impression of a natural, green environment.

Street and Parking Intrusion
The campus is traversed by a grid of streets that separate various precincts, often resulting in conflicts between vehicle and pedestrian movements. The automobile tends to dominate in the core of the campus, in part because of the abundance of streets, but also because many open spaces in the core area are given over to parking.
Architecture
Auburn's architecture is a mixed affair in terms of massing, materials and siting. Most traditional buildings tend to have brick and limestone façades and pitched rooftops, which is a significant unifying feature of campus. For the most part, academic buildings are about three stories in height, which also lends human scale and unity to the campus fabric. However, as with most American campuses, Auburn has its share of 50s-70s era buildings whose disparate scales, forms and façade materials erode the cohesiveness of the built environment. The Haley Center is an obvious departure, as are buildings like Saunders, Allison and Parker that depart awkwardly from the axial order of the campus. Most precincts contain a few buildings that are unsympathetic to the campus fabric.

Land Use Pattern
In general, Auburn's land use pattern follows the logic that one expects of a good campus. For the most part, teaching facilities are clustered in a walkable core zone, as noted above, with many of the academic support and social/common facilities woven into the teaching core. Residential functions ring the academic core, and sports and recreation functions are concentrated just to the west of the core. Various research operations and specialized facilities tend to be located on the “outskirts” of the campus.

The academic core is probably not as compact as it could or should be because of the intervention of so many streets and parking areas in the heart of the campus, but it has a reasonable dimension provided that future academic space is not dispersed further. The reason that compactness is a virtue is that it reinforces connections between and among academic disciplines and adds to the social sense of collegiality. Auburn has a distinctive and highly redeeming quality with the presence of undergraduate housing in the academic core that provides a pleasant building scale and an extra measure of human vitality. One could say that the residence halls occupy
space that is better suited for academic uses, but the Auburn environment would be the less distinctive if they were not there.

**Traditional Campus Spaces**

While there are a few “traditional” campus open spaces that are well-defined by architectural edges, (the residence hall quad), popularly used (the pedestrian mall east of Haley), and expressive “public” edges (the great lawn on South College Street fronting the Library and Samford Hall), Auburn does not have a unified system of open spaces centered on a great “icon” space like the lawn at Virginia or the drill field at Virginia Tech. Much of the campus has grown up by the placement of buildings along streets, rather than being organized around quads and courtyards.

**Pedestrian Circulation**

There is the potential for a strong, coherent pedestrian circulation network, but it is currently problematic, in large part because of the discontinuities in pedestrian patterns created by intervening streets and parking. The clarity of pedestrian movement is also affected by the layout and location of campus buildings that interrupt natural pedestrian flows. Pedestrian movement is strongest in corridors like the Haley Mall where deliberate investment has been made by the University to create a clear pedestrian environment. The Mall demonstrates the great potential for Auburn to be a truly “pedestrianized” campus.

**Gathering Spaces**

Finally, among general observations about the shape and character of the Auburn environment is the recognition that the most heavily used outdoor student gathering spaces in the academic core tend to be very concentrated in a corridor along Haley Mall from Roosevelt Drive to Thach Avenue and toward Magnolia on the north. Thach Avenue functions as a corridor
for gathering, as well, because it ties together the Haley Center, the Student Union and the Library. The apparent reason for this concentration is that the areas contain the venues with the highest levels of daily student social encounter. Other areas where one might expect more robust outdoor student gathering between and after classes, such as the library or various academic clusters, tend to be dispersed and limited in the availability of outdoor spaces that foster collegial interaction. This is probably a reflection, as well, that buildings in the core generally line streets rather than frame open spaces where pedestrians can spill out in a safe and concentrated way.

Community Edge
The campus shares a long and varied boundary with the surrounding community. The connection with the City of Auburn is particularly vital on the main business streets near the campus core area such as West Magnolia and South College. The commercial and residential environment of the town mixes with and extends the campus. The business environment on Magnolia is less robust, but has long-term potential depending on how the University develops along that edge. Outlying edge areas are more suburban and auto-oriented, so they contribute less to the vitality of campus life. In the outlying areas, the issue shifts from interactive edges to how the campus can present itself to the community and visitors as Alabama’s premier land grant institution, with an attractive, protected rural open space setting. This will become even more important as the Auburn community grows and suburbanizes, leaving the outer campus as a natural/rural landscape that will provide important visual relief for the developing community.
AUBURN “CULTURE” AS IT RELATES TO THE PHYSICAL SETTING

These observations are somewhat impressionistic, based on interviews and conversations about the campus over the last two years. Nonetheless, they generally resonate with many of the physical characteristics of the campus.

“Small Town Environment”
The sense of “family” and the feeling of a small town environment at Auburn are attributes valued by people at every level in the institution (students, faculty, staff, trustees, alumni, etc.). The small town setting is seen as a distinctive draw for recruiting of students and staff. Our interpretation is that this attribute is in part due to the friendly spirit of Auburn, reinforced by an environment that is essentially human in scale. The relatively intimate relationship between the campus and the community is an important aspect of the small town value, wherein, the town and the campus joint to create a common sense of community.

“Social Vitality”
People (particularly students) are drawn to the places that have human vitality. Being in places where one can see and be seen is a key part of Auburn’s day-to-day social ritual, even though in reality there are fewer such vital places than are typically found at comparable campuses. People in Auburn’s academic community seem to value the one-on-one attention and relationship between students and faculty, and among faculty; a condition that is also not manifested in the physical environment as much as people would like, but one where the creation of more gathering spaces and better proximity would fulfill a strong demand. The social rituals attached to sports are significant at Auburn, particularly tailgating and other activities before and after games. The accommodation of these activities in the campus environment has to be considered seriously (i.e., tailgating space, positive visual presence of sports facilities, etc.).
People value the “sense of green-ness” at Auburn, the feeling that the campus is natural and connected with the larger rural environment. Here again, the perception isn’t altogether in sync with the small amount of campus land dedicated to pedestrian green spaces, but one can sense a widespread aspiration for more abundant traditional open spaces. The value placed on nature also suggests that preservation of wooded areas, trail connections to the open natural sites beyond the core, and reclamation of spaces on campus would fulfill a real cultural imperative.

SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR CAMPUS PLANNING

The intent of this working paper, as noted earlier, is to lay out criteria for the University to follow in the development of the forthcoming master plan, factoring in ways to reinforce Auburn’s image and identity. The criteria are based on a blending of the initial results of the campus character and image study and our observations of the Auburn campus as a physical environment. The criteria below include some factors that are functional in nature, but the overall objective is to set criteria that emphasize the quality of place, the quality of community and the continuing creation of a campus that is distinctive to its region and culture.

Criteria for Land Use

The plan should reinforce the established land use patterns of the campus. The plan should sustain inherent functional and pedagogical values of the compact academic core that is surrounded by and integrated with residential, recreational and social functions. The plan should avoid further dispersal of academic functions beyond the established core area generally defined by West Magnolia, South College, West Samford and South Donahue, except for specialized research facilities and professional programs not requiring close proximity to the undergraduate instructional core. The underlying goal of this
criterion is to maintain the pedagogical and community values of proximity among academic functions, as well as to conserve land and infrastructure resources by inhibiting dispersal.

Criteria for Campus Open Space
The plan should establish a clear, legible open space order that connects the various precincts of the campus in a unified way. This should be accomplished by preservation and enhancement of existing signature spaces such as the residence quads, Ross Square, the South College Street forelawns, and the area that contained the Eagle Aviary. It should delineate the open space corridors that will connect major pedestrian open spaces, including well-defined street corridors such as Mell Street and West Thach Avenue. The plan should identify opportunities for the creation of an “icon” open space that establishes a compelling symbolic identity for Auburn.

Criteria for “Pedestrianization”
It is imperative that Auburn recaptures the basic idea of “pedestrianization” on the campus by creating safe and attractive collegial open spaces, reducing conflicts with parked and moving vehicles, and introducing venues into the heart of the campus that generate pedestrian interaction. The term “recapture” is a deliberate reference to historical images of an Auburn campus that was once oriented to clear, strong pedestrian open spaces. Planning for the enhancement of the pedestrian environment is not only an aesthetic and cultural goal, but also a functional response to the growing need for closer ties among academic disciplines.

Criteria for Campus “Architectural Fabric”
The plan should identify opportunities for building infill and replacements, wherein architecture strengthens and frames the pedestrian open spaces discussed above. The best examples of such “framing” are the dormitory quads at north of Roosevelt. The prospect of incremental removal and replacement of Saunders, Allison and Parker is a good example of the
opportunity to redefine buildings as a unified background to the open space fabric. The plan should set design guidelines for materials, massing and building façade lines that restore the sense of scale and unity embodied in earlier buildings.

The plan has to acknowledge that future architecture (laboratories, sports and recreation facilities, student commons, etc.) will likely be larger in scale and mass than traditional buildings and, therefore, will need to have good articulation of facades, abundant “transparency” at ground floor levels, and entry plazas that invite gathering.

Criteria for Circulation and Parking
The plan must find ways of harnessing the automobile on campus so as to make the pedestrian experience safer, more attractive and more coherent, and to utilize limited land resources in the academic core more effectively. The plan should examine selective street closures and a reallocation of the parking supply to serve various user groups while reducing the amount of parking that breaks up the integrity of the academic core.

Criteria for Community Functions: “The Campus as a Village”
The distinct cultural construct of Auburn University as a “town” or “village” is a powerful and unique factor that must be preserved and enhanced in setting criteria for planning the campus. The scale and character of future social and public facilities should reinforce the village-like atmosphere. Even the inevitable large-scale laboratory buildings should be positioned in such a way as to frame spaces where social interaction, gathering and community activities can take place.

The plan should accommodate an abundant array of places and functions that will foster the sense of community and collegiality. Those functions should include outdoor gathering places at pedestrian crossroads locations, public spaces related
to common facilities such as the student center and the library, and courtyards, malls and plazas that invite informal encounter.

**Criteria for the Environment**
The plan should strengthen the relationship between the formal built environment of the core area and the natural systems (stream corridors, wooded areas and fields, etc.) that define the outlying areas south and west of the core. Stream corridors should be protected by the preservation of the wooded banks flanking the streams. Reforestation programs should be identified where they can effectively link various parts of the campus and “soften” the visual impacts of large-scale parking and building masses at the edge of the academic core.
1.1.3 Goal III: Define The Student Village Philosophy

The student village philosophy incorporates a design direction and adds to the architectural brand incorporated into the master plan philosophy of Auburn University.

- Auburn Style
- Village Concept
- Student Life
- Unique Environment

Introduction
IDEA has asked team member Sasaki Associates to supplement and reinforce the “brand language” initiative undertaken by the University and IDEA. The material provided is based on the Auburn University Student Village site selection, planning and design. This material emanates from two sources:

- Planning and siting studies recently/currently undertaken for the University by Sasaki for the purpose of defining Auburn’s physical environment.

- Initial interviews of campus stake-holders conducted in the Fall of 2000, by IDEA for the purpose of eliciting perceptions of Auburn’s “brand image” and cultural values held by the campus community.

Branding
Sasaki Associates express our support for the concept of branding. We think this process, as defined by IDEA, will be useful to the University by allowing a more precise tailoring of the design of a new Master Plan and Student Village to Auburn’s wishes and image.

The image and character identification process allows all stakeholders in the Auburn community to express their best
aspirations for the University and the characteristics that make Auburn unique. This will necessarily lead to a better Master Plan and Student Village.

Among other things, the branding process has emphasized the agreement of many members of the Auburn community that one of the most unique aspects of life at Auburn is the small town quality of the University and of the town of Auburn itself. This character, of a safe and close knit community, is one of the major reasons parents send their children to the University and why the students enjoy their time there.

Site Selection
The specific site for the new Student Village has become an area of much discussion - some of it contentious - within the Auburn community. Five sites have been identified though an objective study is likely to discover additional sites, which might be appropriate.

Five sites have been identified:

Site A - West Parking: At the western end of Thach Avenue between the existing campus housing and the core campus, in the general vicinity of Morris Field and the Hangar

The site's main advantage is an unencumbered building site in an area that could anchor a major expansion of the Auburn University campus toward the west. If such an expansion was planned, the center of gravity of the entire campus might shift in the direction of Site A.

The disadvantage of this site is its remoteness from the campus core. While it would be convenient to the student housing at the western end of campus and the athletic facilities, it would be a long walk from the Toomer's intersection with the town and from most daily student destinations (library, classes, administration).
Site A-1 - Thach & Donohue: At the intersection of Thach Avenue and Donahue Drive

This site has most of the advantages of Site A with the added plus of being just within the campus core (defined as the area created by the intersection of 15 minute walking circle study. This site is still somewhat remote from much of the activity of the central campus. The site however is unencumbered by existing permanent buildings and would easily facilitate phased development.

Site A-2 - Petrie: Located at the intersection of Thach Avenue and Duncan Drive on the site of the current Petrie Hall

This site is particularly intriguing and should, we think, receive some serious consideration. It is a currently under utilized site with an awkward diagonal space relationship to Thatch Avenue.

A student village project at this site would be both close to the existing campus core and potential expansion sites to the west. By utilizing the low site area between Petrie and Hare Stadium, several levels of structured parking could be provided to serve both the Student Village and game day needs. The Village might be built up and over the parking structure to provide views (box seats?) of the field, thus connecting Jordan-Hare Stadium to Thach Avenue, and integrating the awkward geometry of the Stadium with the rest of the Auburn campus.

Site B - Cater: Made up of the site of the current student union (Foy), Cater Hall including the Cater Hall forecourt, park and the Haley concourse.

Ideally centered in the perceived core of the Auburn University campus and therefore a site that has many advantages, this area also has so many constraints that the development of a Student Village here will take great creativity and commitment on the
part of the University. Apart from Foy itself, no available site of substantial size exists within this area. This is not necessarily a problem, as the Village concept allows for the development of several smaller buildings. Thus, a Student Village in this area would likely comprise renovation of Foy Center and several other small buildings as well as in-fill construction on the lot behind Foy.

The major disadvantages of this approach are the shutting down of the existing campus center during renovation of Foy Center and the costs of construction on small sites surrounded by existing structures.

**Site C - Concourse:** Arrayed along the existing pedestrian walk between Haley and Cater Quads, possibly including the parking lot south of Haley and retain the green space around the Eagle’s cage.

This site has the advantage of central location, at an existing campus crossroads, in an established pedestrian environment on well-traveled student paths. It is near site of the existing Student Center. It occupies a symbolic nexus in the university placed as it is between small-scale housing, academic precincts, University administration and football. Given this site’s unique characteristics it might be possible to use the design of the new student center to engage and enhance Eagles Cage as a symbolic green space - a student landscaped entrance forecourt to the Stadium.

**General Site Selection Principles**

There are general principles that should be followed when placing a successful new Student Village within the context of a university master plan:

**Central Location**

Since Student/Campus centers normally involve short visits at least once or twice a day from every member of the community,
a central location is essential for convenience. Grabbing a quick bite, meeting friends, or picking up mail are activities that are often rushed and must be squeezed in between the longer more formal pursuits of lectures or committee meetings. Walking to a peripheral site for these impulse activities is not feasible in the brief time allowed.

Other activities served by a Student Facility such as recreation or entertainment are not so compressed.

Visibility
Student Facilities are the heart of campus life, and a new building will express the fundamental ideals and self-image of the entire institution. A successful new Student Village will inevitably become the focus of attention for alumni and prospective students (and their parents), and often for the University Board of Trustees and fund raising activities. A prominent and visible location on campus is a great aid to these functions.

Equidistant from Housing
If student housing is concentrated on campus, a student facility can be placed as part of the dormitory complex, or on the boundary between the academic and residential precincts of the campus. However, few academic institutions of the size, venerable age, and stature of Auburn have such clearly differentiated campuses. Most have several residential complexes, built over time, and scattered throughout the University grounds (and sometimes beyond). These include older residences built near the campus core in the youth of the institution, and newer larger dormitory and apartment complexes built on increasingly peripheral sites as the institution matured and expanded. Mapping of current and projected concentrations of student residence halls can help to locate a site that is most convenient for the majority of students. Unfortunately, due to the normal concentric growth pattern of institutions these sites are invariably right in the center of
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the core campus, and bring with them many challenges of construction, program fit, and parking accommodation, which need to be balanced against issues of optimal convenience.

**Equidistant from Classes**

New student facilities need to be sited in proximity to the major academic components of the University. Students should be no more than a quick ten-minute walk from the Library or major classroom, labs, or studio facilities. Preferably, the Student Center would always be placed along the path between the student residences and classrooms.

**Existing Desire Lines and Paths**

Normally the major paths of circulation are well recognized in mature academic institutions. The facilities department has long since had to accommodate the streams of pedestrian traffic by paving and landscaping, so the “desire lines” of movement throughout the campus are materially visible. A new Student Village should be placed to take advantage of the convergence of these existing paths because that ensures the most student traffic and therefore use of the facility.

Construction of new residential and academic facilities can radically alter the pedestrian flow in a large campus, however, so projected expansion of University facilities must be factored in when planning for the site of a new Student Village.

**Adequate Service** *(Including Area for Parking)*

Vehicular access and adequate accommodation for service and parking must be taken into account. These are often difficult to obtain in the core campus locations dictated by convenience and visibility. In many dense campuses (often in urban areas), parking is difficult to accommodate on limited sites. The amount of parking is highly dependant on the car and driving policies of the University vis-a-vis students and also on the nature of the event or conference facilities to be provided as part of the Student Village program.
Objective Analysis
Taking into account all these issues impinging on site selection, the necessity for a thorough and totally objective analysis of potential student center sites within the context of an overall campus master plan should be apparent. It is generally necessary to analyze the campus structure in detail including:

- Ten minute walking radii from residences
- Ten minute walking radii from major campus destination points
- Ten minute walking radii from peripheral parking
- Current and projected pedestrian traffic patterns on campus
- Service and access
- Need for parking based on program and anticipated operations

Student Center Organizational Concepts
Recent trends in the design of Student centers have seen the buildings fall into four different spatial organizational categories or types:

Single Building Concept
Traditional unions are generally housed in a single large building of impressive stature. They serve as a final destination, not as part of a campus circulation path. In style they may range from Gothic, through neo-classicism, European modernism, concrete Brutalism, to post modern kitsch. They rarely show evidence of functional differences on the exterior, and, because of their size can become confusing and “maze-like” inside.

Mall Concept
In this approach student and campus services are arrange to either side of a “galleria” type space similar to a suburban shopping mall in layout. All services are clearly signed and immediately visible. The interior space is elaborated to provide numerous areas for social interaction and gathering. These
buildings work best when they are designed to incorporate an existing campus pedestrian path.

**Distributed Buildings Concept**

In highly diffuse campuses, with widely separated districts for residences and academics, a decentralized approach may be adopted. Mini-Student Centers are built as part of each residential district. Unfortunately this model tends to duplicate services and increase maintenance costs. The division into neighborhood implied by decentralized Student Centers works against a positive sense of community and campus cohesion for the institutions as a whole.

**Village Concept**

It is possible to imagine a “village” type of organization for a new Student Center, though we know of none that have been successfully executed. What might such an idea mean in reality?

First, a new student center would not necessarily be a single contiguous building. It might be a series of smaller buildings aligned along a pedestrian street, plaza, or green “commons,” or a combination of all five. Not a Student “Center” at all - in the sense of a single edifice that contains all student services - but rather a pedestrian street, square, or green as an armature for many student activities.

The construction of individual small buildings linked by an outside pedestrian space is particularly appropriate for a southern college like Auburn where generally clement weather, and a tradition of veranda living make such a concept both feasible and attractive.

Breaking the new Student Village down into several discrete buildings would have ramifications for cost, phasing, and program.
Phasing
From a phasing viewpoint, breaking the complex into discrete buildings would make for easy phasing as funds came available. Since renovation of existing buildings might well become part of project, a multi building approach allows each project, new construction or renovation, to proceed at the appropriate time and at its own pace. Separate contractors might be utilized on different buildings setting up a bidding environment more conducive to competitive pricing.

Costs
Total costs would likely be higher, designing and constructing individual buildings, because of several factors:

- Greater external wall area
- More elevators and stairs required to make upper floors handicapped accessible
- More complex foundations
- Separate HVAC and electrical systems

However, ease of phasing may make initial outlays smaller than if a larger complex is constructed.

Program
Some redundancy in program areas might occur in a multi-building concept due to need to repeat servicing, lobby, rest room, and storage facilities in the separate structures. However underground service corridors (perhaps tied into parking) might be used to unite the separate structures into one building functionally.

The idea of expressing the small town “village” quality of the Auburn experience in the design of the new Student Facility is a stimulating and provocative concept.

Precedents
Many precedents exist for a “village” type of student facility in the infinite variation of America’s small towns and
villages. Auburn itself has a healthy main street anchored by Toomer’s. Storefront retail establishments lining wide sidewalks characterize these towns. Retail buildings are broken down into small units, though they often share party walls. These towns can be organized around an open space - a town green - a plaza, an intersection or simply along a Main Street.

In the South sidewalks tend to be wider, colonnades and awnings more frequent. Greek revival and neoclassical architecture predominates.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of Student Centers is the number of disparate functions contained in one facility. There is no uniformity of function or space type. The functions are grouped together simply because they are accessed as a group by students. Recent trends in student center design have tended to group these functions around a single through path - often a pre-existing campus pathway. By materializing this pathway within the new student center a “mall” like configuration is formed, where an internal “street” is lined with retail like choices for student services (dining, post office, club, offices, etc.).

At Auburn it might be only a short step from an internal “street” to a real exterior pedestrian mall or plaza. Such places already exist on campus and are much used and appreciated by the community.

To continue the metaphor a little further, think of a town green - a park-like space filled with grass and trees - surrounded by streets lined by storefront shops. There is a town hall (ballroom and conference center), a post office (same), a café (Starbucks), a general store (campus store), a book store (same), a club (student “rock and roll” venue), and movie theater (convertible classroom). Upstairs are professional offices (student function offices), and perhaps some flats or apartments (student housing). As you can see, a student center
functions much more like a village green or main street than as a single monolithic building.

The idea of “Village” is so flexible that it can be accommodated on each of the sites currently under consideration by the master planning committee (and probably at several more not currently under consideration). The concept of a student center planned as a “Village” is independent of the issue of siting on the campus.

**Architectural Style**

Ideally an appropriate architectural style language for a new student center should be derived from the best existing buildings at Auburn. In this way the architectural expression becomes part of the Auburn “image.” Elements of this “vocabulary” would have to include:

- Quality red brick
- White trim
- Pitched roof
- Towers
- “Punched” windows (as opposed to ribbon windows or curtain wall)
- Windows with vertical orientation - traditional
- Southern vernacular - colonnades, awnings, pergolas, verandas, shutters

However, it is most important to emphasize the fact that Auburn is a forward looking research institution - as firmly committed to innovation and progress as it is rooted in the past. To express this idea, the architecture should avoid historic re-creation of the older buildings at Auburn, but try to achieve a contemporary interpretation using the same or compatible materials.
Student Village Will Be A Campus Center

At Auburn, we are being asked to consider a Student Center - not a Campus Center. There is a fundamental distinction. The new Center will be paid for by student fees and is viewed by the students as a building uniquely their own. These types of facilities tend to become showplaces for universities and often attract many different programmatic functions into the single Campus Center. Given the focused purpose of the proposed Student Center, extraneous program elements such as administrative offices, campus tour/information services and conferencing should be kept to a minimum.

Summary

In this working paper Sasaki Associates has tried to emphasize the criteria essential to the siting and design of a successful Student Village.

- First and foremost, the Student Village in all its aspects should reflect the Auburn “brand” - academic excellence within a safe and cohesive small town community.
- Final site selection should be the result of an entirely objective process of analysis, based on agreed selection principles, as part of a comprehensive campus master plan.
- The Student Village could utilize one of several different organizational concepts, but that a “village” type organization may be particularly appropriate to the Auburn campus.
- An architectural vocabulary should be mandated which will ensure compatibility with the highest quality and best loved structure on the campus.
- And finally, the focus on students and services directly related to their needs should be maintained.

We are certain that, if these basic concepts are integrated into the final design, Auburn will have a distinguished new Student Village that the entire Auburn community can use and take great pleasure in for many decades.
1.2.1 Campus Survey

Research reveals that the quality of exterior space and massing of buildings are major factors in the creation of Auburn's built environment. The visual characteristics of the University result from the interaction of buildings with green space. Here one is impressed by a sense of openness, by a system in which outdoor rooms are defined by buildings that border green-space. Yet, although the physical environment is not defined by an architectural style system, the architectural language, mass and proportions create a harmony with one another, with the environment and with the user. This is a people-friendly, yet often formal, environment. Understanding the prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape, how these factors interact, is to understand the image and character that is unique to Auburn.

Historic Precedent

As with any institution, the image and character of Auburn University is rooted in its unique history. The East Alabama Male College, a liberal arts college founded in 1856, during a period of expansions of new colleges and universities that swept the country from about 1820, until the Civil War, was closely associated with the town of Auburn. The orientation of the original buildings on a green clearly anchored at the main crossroads of the town, is evidence of this relationship's importance.

With the rebirth of the college in 1872, as the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, a land-grant institution, emphasis shifted away from the classic Greek and Latin educational concentration. The new emphasis, towards more scientific and pragmatic concerns, is reflected in a shift in the physical focus of the campus, if purely on the basis of land needs. The college, renamed Alabama Polytechnic Institute in 1899, began to turn away from the town as its traditional center and toward available land to the west and south. At the same time,
the country was moving in a new stylistic direction that had begun following the centennial celebration. The new direction recalled classical Greek and Roman styles, forms and relationships in many of the arts, including urban planning and architecture. The conflict between philosophies, academic and stylistic, and the growth of the college are reflected in a move away from the old Romanesque revival architectural styles and simple campus organization of the nineteenth century toward the logical Greco-Roman ideals including a Renaissance axial approach to land planning and inwardly focused campus.

Master Planning
There are no records of a grand scheme set down by the founders of the University, and attempts to create a master plan came only after accelerating growth forced the need to establish a logical framework for growth. Precedents set by early planners and adopted by University developers stressed a balance between the built and the natural environments. Due to the academic and philosophical direction of the University, both formal and natural settings are appropriate, depending on proximity to the academic campus.

The present campus plan loosely follows the philosophy of Frederick Law Olmsted who had developed a prototypical layout for land-grant institutions. The plan rejected monu-
mental massing in favor of an informal arrangement of buildings placed in a semi-rural setting with a meandering curvilinear street layout. As seen in a bird’s eye perspective of the W.P. Spratling campus design, by 1915, a balance between the ideals of Olmsted’s approach and the Renaissance axial approach, espoused by the new classicists, was being developed.

In the 1920s, schemes provided by the firm of Olmsted’s sons combined their formal axial planning and building to grounds relationship with his fundamental philosophy, thus setting a precedent for all major planning exercises of the twentieth century. The impact of the automobile, on both traffic and parking, have resulted in later master plans recommending the construction of parking decks and extensive student parking lots in the periphery as well. Several prominent planning firms, including Warren, Knight and Davis in the 1930s - whose work was used as the basis for the work of the University’s Department of Buildings and Grounds from the 1940s to the 1960s - Harland Bartholomew and Associates, in the 1970s, and Johnson, Johnson and Roy, in the 1980s, were commissioned to study the campus and create master plans. All have respected the fundamental direction set down by the Olmsted Brothers firm in 1929.

Formal Renaissance axial composition is traditionally considered most appropriate for the academic campus. Precedents have been set for naturalistic compositions outside of the academic campus.
Building To Site Relationships

To preserve the sense of natural green at Auburn, a balance between the built environment and the natural environment must be maintained. Because of the academic and philosophical direction of the University, both formal and natural settings are appropriate, depending on proximity to the academic campus. Formal Renaissance axial composition is traditionally considered the most appropriate for the academic campus, identified in this guide as the area bounded by Magnolia Avenue to the north, College Street to the east, Roosevelt Drive to the south and Donahue Drive to the west. Here exists a system in which outdoor rooms are defined by the buildings that border them. The quality of exterior space and the massing of buildings are major factors in the creation of this formal, yet people-friendly environment.

The Women’s Quadrangles represent two of the most successful outdoor rooms on campus. Though built decades apart, all quad buildings are similar stylistically, feature similar architectural details and are rendered in similar materials. The building’s architecture and landscaping details are of compatible materials and style, reinforcing a union between the two and the composition as a whole. While buildings define outdoor rooms in both areas, the upper quad is much more formal while the lower quad is much more informal and receptive to outdoor activity.

Although precedent has been set for less formal composition beyond the academic campus boundary, the traditional Auburn building-mass and building-to-site relationships must be maintained. Planning within this area of campus loosely follows the philosophy of Frederick Law Olmsted, developer of a prototypical layout for land-grant institutions. His philosophy favors an informal arrangement of buildings placed in a semi-rural setting with a meandering, curvilinear street layout.

Though intentionally designed to contrast Auburn’s architecture, the designers of the Fine Arts Complex also set out to
unify the group and suggest the relationship of all fine arts buildings through the use of similar materials. Although the hard-edged forms are presented in a natural setting, this design philosophy, which considers architecture with site to create a unified complex, begins to speak to the Auburn tradition.

Architecture

Four primary periods of building construction exist on Auburn’s campus: from 1855 to 1890; from 1925 to 1940; from 1960 to 1979, and from 1980, to the end of the century. Distinct philosophies of both architecture and site planning correspond to these periods. Romanesque dominated in the nineteenth century. Neo-classical style variants were predominant from the end of the nineteenth century until the mid-twentieth century. Variants of the International movement dominated design in the third quarter of the twentieth century. And, in the last quarter of the twentieth century, traditional forms re-emerged with the Post-Modern movement.

Architectural Style

The earliest academic buildings were of the Romanesque style, popular in the mid-nineteenth century. By the end of the twentieth century, philosophical conflicts redirected development away from both the original campus center and nineteenth century architectural models. The 1892, remodel of Langdon Hall reflects this shift away from picturesque Victorian styles and toward formal Neoclassic variants. The convergence and resolution of the conflicting philosophies was an important factor in the creation of Auburn’s unique physical character.

Entering the twentieth century, formal Neoclassic variants became established as the dominant styles in both architectural and planning design at the University. From 1900, to about 1960, edifices in the Beaux Arts, Renaissance Revival and especially Neoclassical and Georgian styles dominated university design. The last two styles are most prevalent as seen in examples such as: O.D. Smith Hall (southern Neoclassical);
Tichenor Hall (Georgian); Ross Hall (Neoclassical with Georgian overtones); M.W. Smith Hall (Contemporary Neoclassical); Thach Hall (Contemporary Georgian); and Draughon Library (Georgian reinterpreted with Minimalists Sensitivities).

As with most American campuses, Auburn has its share of 50’s and 70’s era buildings that depart from these standards, eroding the cohesiveness of the built environment. The Haley Center is an obvious example. Saunders, Allison and Parker also depart from the traditional standards. In terms of both scale and their relationship to other buildings, this group departs from the cohesive fabric and axial order of campus.

Most districts contain a few buildings that are unsympathetic to the campus fabric or depart from the axial order of campus. Some districts contain groups of buildings that would not integrate with the fabric of the central campus, but are designed to relate as a cohesive unit within their surrounding landscape, as with the arts complex around Graves Amphitheater. However, despite this cohesion, these examples do not fully speak to the image and traditions of Auburn.

Although Auburn architecture is mixed, Neoclassical variants dominate the campus landscape. The predominance of a Classical design philosophy contributes to the human scale and cohesive fabric of campus. Similarities in scale, massing, proportion, materials and relationship to site are significant unifying features. The buildings tend to be three stories in height.
They also tend to have brick and limestone facades with hipped or gabled roofs. Found in all parts of campus, the proportions and massing of these traditionally styled buildings lend human scale and unity to the campus fabric.

Following are the most commonly observed specifications of the various Classical style buildings found on the Auburn campus.

**Scale:** Academic and residential buildings are rectilinear, with an average width to depth ratio of 4:1 and height of three stories. They generally have a clearly delineated **base, body** and **cap**.

The **base** is generally delineated by either a brick or rusticated stone foundation, or a clearly articulated water table of brick or limestone with a projecting brick foundation. Either technique provides a strong, stable base on which the body rests.

The **body** is generally rendered in brick to distinguish it from the base. Limestone or brick rusticated quoins strengthen the building corners or corners of projecting pavilions or ells. A belt or stringcourse may divide the ground floor from the upper floors.

The **cap** is generally a hip roof, a gable roof, or combination of the two. An attic story, with smaller windows, is sometimes substituted to reduce the scale of a massive building (example: Comer Hall).

The original design of Hill Dorms was austere, flat-roofed institutional architecture of the 1960s. However, in the 1980s and 90s, a complete dorm renovation added two-tone brick facing, hip roofs with simulated dormers and a center entry pavilion. Boxyness was reduced by pier and attic story delineation through brick color techniques and by adding walls to conceal wheelchair ramps.
Massing – composition of building mass is generally symmetrical. The use of gabled or pedimented projecting pavilions, ells, central porticos or combinations of the three is common to achieve formality while reduce large structures to a more human scale. Important buildings may be further emphasized through the use of cupolas, domes, attic stories and similar elements. Although symmetrical building composition is preferred, asymmetrical composition is also seen (example: M.W. Smith Hall).

Proportion - buildings are generally long and narrow, with a width to depth ratio of 3, 4 or 5:1 and are usually limited to three stories. Subtle visual emphasis is generally given to the main or ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing and greater floor-to-floor height on this level; detailing features designed to alter the perceived scale are also employed in lieu of an actual dimensional change. Buildings usually employ a clearly delineated base, body and cap.

Materials – facades are generally “Auburn red” brick and limestone with hipped or gabled roofs of slate or asphalt shingles. The consistent building materials of these designs ensure a cohesive campus fabric and help to preserve the human scale.

Brick, coursed in Flemish bond of alternating dark burned half bricks with “Auburn red” full bricks with white mortar, is preferred, especially for buildings of particular significance. However, English bond is the most common coursing on campus buildings.

Brick or limestone is generally used for a rusticated or projecting foundation, quoins on building corners and corners of projecting pavilions or ells and an articulated water table.

Limestone, or an articulated stringcourse, is generally used for horizontal details dividing floors.
Limestone is preferred for entrance details and surrounds; window lintels, sills, keystones and details; roof friezes, cornices and details; however, brick is also used.

Limestone is generally used for pilasters and portico columns and details; however, brick is also used.

Brick, limestone and ceramic or terra-cotta tiles all are used for articulated wall details, cartouches, medallions and other wall, window and door details.

**Relationship to Site:** A campus plan of today reveals that the placement of buildings without regard for the parameters established by early master planners results in the loss of quality exterior space. The prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape defines the image and character of Auburn’s built environment.

**Architectural Elements**
- Entrances
- Doors
- Windows
- Roofs
- Roof Details
  - Cornices
  - Domes and Cupolas
  - Chimneys
- Wall Finishes
- Lighting
- Building Graphics
- Handicapped Accessibility

**Free-Standing Architectural Elements**
- Towers
- Transitional Elements
- Arcades and Breezeways
1.2.2 Master Plan

Master plan evaluation of Auburn University mirrors the classic conflicts between Liberal Arts and Land Grant Institutions.

The following documents were used to define Auburn’s historical approach to master planning:

- 1915 Alabama Polytechnic Institute Plan
- 1929 General Plan by Olmsted Brothers
- 1939 Master Campus Plan by Warren, Knight & Davis
- 1941-1960 Master Plan by Auburn University
- 1979 Master Plan by Harland Bartholomew & Associates
- 1988 Master Plan by Johnson, Johnson & Roy

Our findings, in review of the documents, identified the following points of discussion:

- The lack of an adopted Master Plan
- The combination of two predominant campus planning philosophies
- Meandering natural setting with a formal axial relationship which reflects the conflicts present in current philosophies
1.2.3 Student Union Program

As is common practice among universities, the Student Union Center was programmed as one facility. Our first observation is that a single, large facility is in conflict with the historical building scale of Auburn University and that the atmosphere created is not consistent with the environment of the Auburn campus setting.

Based on our Phase I survey information, the stakeholders’ single most noted reason for attending Auburn University was its small town village atmosphere and congenial hospitality. These attributes must weigh heavily in the design and character of a student life facility and speaks to the total integration of student life. Upon reviewing the program developed, two distinct and separate programs emerge. The first programmed around the students’ daily life activities on campus, and the second, a University-wide need for a large assembly space. While the student body needs a large assembly space (1000 seated), its site requirements and constraints are much different from that of daily life program requirements, and have created an unnecessary conflict regarding site selection.
Upon review of the facility program prepared by WTW and the Student Union Building Committee, our findings were separated into two programs. One program of student life activities is pedestrian-focused, and a second, ballroom/conference program, is vehicular-focused.

**Program I - Student Life** (pedestrian-focused facility)

The criteria for identifying student life activities is defined as those activities frequently required by students during the scheduled class day, such as:

- Food and Beverage Services
- Convenience Retail Services
- Student Governance Services
- Bookstore
- Copy Center
- University Mail Services
- Lounges
- Study Halls
- Computer Labs
- Exhibit and Gallery Spaces
- Entertainment and Recreational Facilities

**Program II - Ballroom/Conference Facilities** (vehicular-focused facility)

Criteria for a large assembly space centered around special events typically after daily scheduled class activities. These events are predominantly evening events requiring heavy parking and service requirements. Special events also include:

- Camp War Eagle
- Exhibits
- Performances
- Student Group Events
1.3.1 The History of Auburn University

Auburn University is located in Auburn, Alabama. Founded in 1836, by Judge John J. Harper, the name was derived from the line “Sweet Auburn, loveliest village of the Plain,” in Oliver Goldsmith’s poem “The Deserted Village.” One of the Judge’s first acts was to donate a plat of land for a Methodist church, which doubled as a one-room school. The first college-level institution in the town was established for women in 1852. Its charter, granted by the Masonic Lodge, prohibited the sale of strong spirits within a two-mile radius of the campus. The absence of liquor, the presence of the women’s college and the railroad were some of the town’s chief enticements when a men’s college was created four years later.

Chartered on February 1, 1856, the East Alabama Male College formally opened its doors on October 1, 1859, in a four-story graystone building called The Main (Old Main); two months later, it came under sponsorship of the Methodist Church. The college had a faculty of six, an enrollment of eighty and preparatory enrollment of one hundred. The classical, liberal arts educational programs of the Male and Female Colleges soon merged and combined classes of young men and women were taught. Classes were suspended at both colleges in 1861, for the duration of the Civil War. The male college reopened in 1866; the female college never reopened.

Because the Methodist Church lacked adequate funding for the college following the Civil War, it offered the complete college facilities, plus two hundred acres, to the State. With Federal funding possible under the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided public lands and maintenance money to support a college in each state for the “liberal and practical education of the industrial classes” in agricultural and mechanical arts, the Alabama Legislature accepted the institution in 1872. The transfer made it the first land-grant college in the South to be established separate from the state university. The birth of
the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama signaled a shift in emphasis from the classic Greek and Latin educational concentration to more scientific and pragmatic concerns.

Inevitably, conflicts arose between the traditional and the land-grant philosophies. However, curriculum changes, over the next twenty years, completely restructured the basic course of study, striking a balance between the scientific agricultural program and the traditional, cultural curriculum. In addition, women students were admitted in 1892, making it the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, the oldest four-year coeducational school in Alabama and the second oldest in the Southeast. In recognition of the expanding academic program, the Legislature, in 1899, renamed the college the Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

Known since its earliest days as Auburn, the institution's name was officially changed to Auburn University in 1960, a title more in keeping with its location, size and complexity. Auburn's greatest growth and development has been experienced since World War II. From a campus of 35 buildings at that time, the University's multi-million dollar physical complex has grown to more than 200 buildings on 1,871 acres. The University's Agricultural Experiment Station owns 20,699 acres over the state for crop, animal and soil experimentation, and Extension agents are stationed in all 67 Alabama counties. Main campus enrollment is 21,778, with a faculty of more than 1,100.

In 1967, Auburn University at Montgomery was established as a separately administered branch campus. The institution has developed rapidly, especially since moving to a 500 acre campus east of Montgomery in 1971. Current enrollment at AUM is more than 5,500.
1.3.2 The Auburn Creed

I believe that this is a practical world and that I can count only on what I earn. Therefore, I believe in work, hard work.

I believe in education, which gives me the knowledge to work wisely and trains my mind and my hands to work skillfully.

I believe in honesty and truthfulness, without which I cannot win the respect and confidence of my fellow men.

I believe in a sound mind, in a sound body and a spirit that is not afraid, and in clean sports to develop these qualities.

I believe in obedience to law because it protects the rights of all.

I believe in the human touch, which cultivates sympathy with my fellow men and mutual helpfulness and brings happiness for all.

I believe in my Country, because it is a land of freedom and because it is my own home, and that I can best serve that country by “doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with my God.”

And because Auburn men and women believe in these things, I believe in Auburn and love it.

—George Petrie 1943
1.3.3 The Auburn Mascot

Auburn's nickname is the **TIGERS**.

Auburn's battle cry is **“WAR EAGLE!”**

Through the years, these two Auburn terms have often been used interchangeably and incorrectly. There are hats and T-shirts with Auburn War Eagles on them. Even the news media has been known to refer to an Auburn team as the War Eagles or to an Auburn player as a War Eagle.

In fact, when the Tigers play a game on the road, there is often an article written in the local paper wondering why Auburn has three nicknames -- the Auburn Tigers, the Auburn War Eagles and the Auburn Plainsmen. To set the record straight, Auburn has only one nickname -- the Auburn Tigers.

“War Eagle” is a battle cry, used by Auburn fans in the same manner Alabama fans yell “Roll Tide!” and Arkansas fans yell “Sooie Pig!” You never hear Alabama referred to as the Alabama Roll Tides or Arkansas as the Arkansas Sooie Pigs, and to call Auburn teams the Auburn War Eagles would be just as incorrect. The battle cry “War Eagle” should never have an “s” on the end of it.

The nickname “Tigers” comes from a line in Oliver Goldsmith’s poem, “The Deserted Village,” published in May 1770, “where crouching tigers wait their hapless prey...”

The term “Plainsmen” comes from a line in that same Goldsmith poem, “Sweet Auburn, loveliest village of the plain...” Since Auburn athletes were, in the early days, men from the Plains, it was only natural for newspaper headline writers to shorten that to “Plainsmen.”

It may be confusing to an outsider, but to Auburn people, it is very simple.
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2.1 Existing Conditions

The history and traditions of Auburn University are reflected in its campus. Through the gates at Toomer’s Corner one enters Samford Park, the original green. Here, not only are the changes in building style throughout the rest of the campus evident, but also a change in the physical relationship between the University and the town of Auburn. As the University has developed from a small, private, liberal arts college, to a government subsidized agricultural/mechanical college, to a major state university, Auburn has turned its campus focus inward, away from the town center. Ensuring that the visible evidence of this rich history is not lost requires an understanding of the physical campus today, both its strengths and its weaknesses.

Unlike many campuses, no records exist of a grand scheme set down by the University founders. Attempts to create a master plan came only after accelerated growth forced the need to establish a logical framework for growth. The most influential of these plans was developed in the 1920s by the firm of Olmsted Brothers. These sons of Frederick Law Olmsted, developer of a prototypical Land-Grant Institution layout, combined their father’s fundamental philosophy with formal axial planning and building to grounds relationship to create the unique campus of today.
The impact of the automobile, to both traffic and parking, have resulted in the construction of broader streets for traffic maneuvering and parking, parking decks, extensive student parking lots in the periphery as well as later master plan recommendations for the introduction of people moving systems to increase mobility between classes, offices, labs and dorms in an auto-free pedestrian campus.

On the academic campus, the interaction of formal axial planning and the buildings to grounds relationship has defined formal landscape features and outdoor rooms, locations that in turn define the campus. Similarly, the ratio of building to grounds has been established to promote harmonious interaction between two equally important pieces of Auburn’s visual language. Building proportions and massing are of a human scale, overwhelming neither the viewer nor the user. Samford Park, Ross Square, the Concourse and the green spaces of the Women’s Quadrangle and Hill Dorms are some of the most successful of these landscape features and outdoor rooms.

Respect for the building to site relationship has, in recent years, been sacrificed in favor of building program requirements or cost efficiency, a typical situation at American universities during the 1960s and 1970s. In the early 1950s, Auburn entered an era dominated by the International style philosophy. That philosophy rejected the traditional design criteria for architecture, site planning and materials selection that had
come to embody the Auburn image, in favor of individualistic statements that destroy established visual texture. Buildings such as Haley Center, the Pharmacy Building and Broun Hall reject traditional design criteria for architecture, site planning and materials selection in favor of individualistic statements that destroy established visual texture. Away from the main campus, academic complexes such as Allison Labs, Parker Hall and Saunders Hall fully reject traditional Auburn design criteria established for site planning and architectural massing, creating statements so lacking in characteristics to distinguish them from buildings built anywhere in the country at that time.

By the mid 1980s, an embracing of the Post-Modern movement by the majority of architects signaled a return to traditional forms, ideas of massing and the building-site relationship. These newest of the campus additions show greater sensitivity to the elements of the built environment that define the Auburn character; however, the monumentality of many of these structures is outside of the traditionally accepted range for building mass and proportion.
The inseparable relationship between landscape and building has created a unique and people-friendly campus at Auburn University. The visual characteristics result from the interaction of buildings with green space. From Samford Park to Ross Square and the Women’s Quadrangles, from the concourse at Broun Hall that unite Haley Center and beyond, to the grounds of the College of Veterinary Medicine, the image one takes away from Auburn is of openness. Here exists a system in which outdoor spaces are defined by the buildings that border them. This is not a system defined by an architectural style; yet, the architectural language and proportions create a harmony between buildings, the environment and the user. Unfortunately, the system, in many instances, has broken down, resulting in unresolved formality, visually assaulting architectural statements and unrealized potential.
2.2 Master Plan

Preface
Research reveals that the visual characteristics of Auburn University result from the interaction of university buildings with green space, buildings and landscape defining outdoor rooms. The image one takes away from Auburn is that of an open, people-friendly, if often formal, environment. The quality of exterior space and the massing of buildings are major factors in the creation of the built environment. And how these factors interact, the prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape, defines an image and character unique to Auburn.

The College Green
The founders of the East Alabama Male College, the institution that would become Auburn University, recognized the importance of building design and open green space to an institution’s mission and image. The college green established at the intersection of College Street and Magnolia Avenue and known today as Samford Park was the college front door; it
signified the important relationship between the college and the town. Building expansion across Samford Park and College Street, further solidified this relationship. This relationship would remain intact from the inception of the college in 1856 until the end of the century when a change in philosophical direction, from the liberal arts policies to the land-grant institution policies, resulted in physical growth that necessitated a redirection of development to the west and south.

**Convergence Of Styles**

Although there are no records of a grand scheme set down by the university, attempts to create a landscaping plan came after accelerating growth forced the need to establish a logical framework for growth. Physical and archival evidence shows that conflicting philosophies converged in the late nineteenth century that created a stylistic challenge for planners of the university. Education in agricultural and mechanical arts required greater land use than the traditional liberal arts education. Additionally, a philosophy of planning a land-grant institution was being developed that differed from the planning philosophy of the liberal arts institution. The resolution, a marrying of meandering naturalistic design with formal axial planning, was another important factor in the creation of Auburn's unique physical character.

Much of today's campus plan loosely follows the philosophy of Frederick Law Olmstead. In the late nineteenth century, he developed a prototypical layout for land-grant institutions. His ideals, based on “a democratic idealism and a commitment to the welfare of the working classes” led him reject monumental massing in favor of informal arrangements of buildings placed in semi-rural settings with meandering curvilinear street layouts. Conversely, at the turn of the twentieth century, formal Neo-classical ideals and Renaissance Axial planning were a major influence in all arts, including urban, institutional and architectural design. By the 1910s, Olmsted’s “democratic” philosophy had been combined with a classical
axial philosophy by university planners. In the first quarter of the twentieth century, precedents were set for future development that would be carried on until the final years of the century. A 1929 Auburn Master Plan provided by the firm of Olmsted’s sons combined the father’s fundamental philosophy with the sons’ formal axial planning strategy to create a core campus (liberal arts) organization based on formal axial relationships and an outer campus (agricultural and veterinary sciences) organization based on meandering rural street development; thus setting a precedent for future landscape development.

The series of master plans developed and refined from the 1910s through the 1980s reveals an unbroken resolve to establish formal building relationship around green spaces, all at a human pedestrian scale. However, American dependence on the automobile as well as the scarcity of campus housing have contributed to the proliferation of automobiles on campus, leading to constant traffic and parking concerns. Additionally, the combination of an extremely loyal fan base with a centrally
located stadium has resulted in an overabundance of automobiles on campus during game days. Recent master plans have recommended the construction of parking decks, extensive student parking lots in the campus periphery and the introduction of shuttle systems to move students and faculty between buildings on class days and fans to the stadium on game days in an auto-free pedestrian campus. Despite the impact of the automobile since the 1920s, the tradition established by these early designs clearly set the precedent for future development as evidenced by every major master plan adopted subsequent to the Olmsted Brothers Plan of 1929.

Building Periods
Three principal style periods have influenced design at Auburn University and distinct philosophies of both site planning and architecture correspond to these periods. Victorian variants, 1855 to 1890, separate nineteenth from twentieth century styles. Neo-classical formality, 1925 to 1940, dominated until mid-century. And the new International movement, 1950 to 1979, dominated in the third quarter of the century.
1855 to 1890
The earliest campus development followed an organizational and architectural style popular for mid-nineteenth century institutions. The original campus was oriented toward a commons, Samford Park, and directly addressed the town at its central crossroads. Buildings designers employed picturesque Victorian Romanesque styles, popular for institutional and municipal buildings of the period. The 1892 remodel of Langdon Hall in the Greek Revival style signaled a shift, for Auburn and American in general, away from the picturesque styles and toward classical models.

1925 to 1940
Entering the twentieth century, formal Neoclassical variants became established as the dominant styles in both master planning and architectural design at the university, and would remain so for the next fifty years. Beaux Arts, Renaissance Revival, and especially Neoclassical and Georgian variants dominated the design attitudes at the university for the years from around 1900 to about 1959. The classical ideals of axial formality and symmetry are principally evident in core campus.
At Ross Hall a formal square addresses the southern façade and creates the strong axial termination of Mell Street. On the northern façade, a strong axial relationship with Magnolia Avenue was established, including the use of a grand staircase, which is evident even today.

One of the strongest axial relationships on campus can be seen in the Upper Quad of the Women’s Quadrangles where an elegant outdoor room defined by Dormitories I-IV to the east and west, connected by breezeways, and Cater Hall and Quad Center, north and south respectively, define a strong cross axis. This formal attitude continued with the development of the Lower Quad in the 1950s, creating another popular outdoor room.

**1950 to 1979**

A tour of the Auburn campus reveals that respect for the building to site relationship has often in recent years been sacrificed in favor of building program or cost efficiency, a typical situation at American universities during the 1960s and 1970s. With the construction of Biggin Hall, Foy Student Union and the Hill Dorms in early 1950s, Auburn entered an era domi-
inated by the International style. Although these early examples of the style are fairly well integrated into the established system, most subsequent designs reject the established rules of proportion, order, materials and site relationship that had come to embody the Auburn image.

Buildings such as Haley Center, the Pharmacy Building and Broun Hall reject traditional design criteria for architecture; site planning and materials selection in favor of individualistic statements that destroy established visual texture. Away from the main campus, academic complexes such as Allison labs, Parker Hall and Saunders Hall fully reject traditional Auburn design criteria established for site planning and architectural massing, creating statements so lacking in characteristics to distinguish them from buildings built anywhere in the country at that time.

A campus plan of today reveals that design without regard for the precedents established by earlier master-planners results in
the loss of those elements which have traditionally defined the Auburn character, quality of the exterior space and the massing of buildings. The relationship between buildings and landscape, defines the image and character of Auburn’s built environment. Respect for the traditional building-to-site relationship has often been sacrificed in favor of building program or cost efficiency, a typical situation at American universities during the 1960s and 1970s. Unfortunately, a breakdown of the system results in unresolved formality, visually assaulting architectural statements and unrealized potential. Respecting the precedents of the early master planners and re-establishing the planning and organizational systems conducive with their ideals can reverse this trend.
2.3 Architectural Survey

The following are building descriptions are representative examples of Auburn University edifices from the nineteenth century and from each decade of the twentieth century, an existing buildings chronology and a campus buildings styles map. The purpose of the items in this section is to give the reader a sampling of the typical campus buildings as well as a graphic understanding of campus buildings’ styles. For more comprehensive texts, please refer to the following publications used extensively in this chapter:

The Auburn University Walking Tour Guide
*by R.G. Millman*

Lengthening Shadows
*University Relations, Auburn University*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Langdon Hall</td>
<td>Torn Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Old Broun Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Mary Martin Hall &amp; Carnegie Library</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Comer Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>O.D. Smith Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Cater Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Old Broun Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Langdon Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Cater Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Tichenor Hall</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>To Be Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Hall I</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broun Hall II</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Hall III</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teague Hall IV</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's House</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad Center</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowdell Hall V</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Hall VI</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Hall VII</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupton Hall VIII</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Hall IX</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Hall X</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall A. Duncan</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Hollifield</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Toomer</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Dobbs</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Dunn</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Graves</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Hall</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Boyd</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Dowell</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Knapp</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Sassenett</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Dormitory I</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Dormitory M</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table lists the residential facilities at the institution, categorized by the years they were built, and includes buildings from various architectural styles such as Georgian, Classical Revival, and Contemporary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan-Hare Stadium (Addition) 1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beard-Eaves Memorial Coliseum 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beard Handball Courts 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Activity Center 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Center 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.1 Academic Facility Survey

1850 - 1899

**University Chapel 1850**
The oldest building on its original site and still in use by the University, the former Presbyterian Church was built in the Greek Revival style by slaves. An early 1900's remodel in the Gothic style saw the addition of a corner entrance and steeple. In 1976, it was again remodeled under Auburn architecture professor Nicholas Davis’ direction and designated a bicentennial building in the National Register of Historic Buildings.

1 floor - 2,060 sq.ft.

**Langdon Hall 1853**
The Greek-Revival auditorium, built as a wood frame chapel on North Gay Street, was moved to the East Alabama Male College, its present site, in 1883. The removal of the steeple, brickling of the exterior walls and addition of the portico were part of an 1890’s remodel.

2 floors - 10,205 sq.ft.
1850 - 1899

**Hargis Hall 1888**
The Romanesque Revival structure with square tower and semicircular arched openings predates Samford Hall by a few months and occupies a key position in Samford Park. Originally constructed to house the chemistry department and remodeled in the 1930s, 40s and 50s, it was totally renovated within the shell in 1979.

2 floors - 9,462 sq.ft.

**Samford Hall 1888**
Built on the site of Old Main after an 1887, fire destroyed it, the Bruce and Morgan Victorian Romanesque design utilizes that building’s bricks in its foundation. Features include “Auburn red” brick ornamented with stone, multiple gables detailed with terra-cotta tiles and a projecting gabled pavilion flanked by square bell and clock towers of different heights. It anchors Samford Park, the center of early campus.

4 floors - 49,376 sq.ft.
1900 - 1909

**Langdon Hall Annex  1905**
The restrained Second Empire structure with concave mansard roof, arched window and door openings and deep brick detailing bears a family resemblance to Samford and Hargis Halls. At the lower level, it forms an intimate outdoor room walled with banks of azaleas, mondo grass and flowering plants.

3 floors - 10,692 sq.ft.

**Broun Hall  1906 (demolished 1984)**
A Neoclassical design by N.C. Curtis with touches of Beaux Arts exuberance, the “late” Broun Hall's importance here lies in its destruction. Such an outcry followed the announcement to raze the building in 1984, that its highly detailed four-column portico, in the Doric order, was salvaged and incorporated into the design of Nichols Center in 1986.

3 floors - 41,426 sq.ft.
1900 - 1909

**O.D. Smith Hall 1908 (restored 2001)**

A Neoclassical Warren and Welton design rendered in brick, Flemish bond of alternating dark burned half bricks with “Auburn red” full bricks. The grand pedimented portico with four Ionic columns, tall first floor windows framed in brick arches and details of inset brick, stucco and ceramic tile create an elegant facade.

2 floors - 16,568 sq.ft.
1910 - 1919

Comer Hall 1910
The exuberant Second Renaissance Revival design by N.C. Curtis, the first head of architecture at Auburn, is rendered in brick and stone. Scaling the pseudo-Corinthian order to the first two floors and using a lighter brick color for the third floor visually reduces the three-story mass. Other details include rams’ heads festooned with fruit and entwined with ears of corn, grapes and sheaves of wheat.

4 floors - 44,243 sq.ft.

Mary Martin Hall 1910
An example of Renaissance Revival architecture rendered in brick and stone, this well proportioned and imposing structure features a tripartite entry in the Ionic order. Originally the Main Library, it was partially financed by a gift of Andrew Carnegie. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

4 floors - 37,205 sq.ft.
1910 - 1919

**Cater Hall  1915**

This example of Colonial Revival residential architecture was designed by Joseph Hudnut, Auburn architecture faculty member and, later, Dean of Harvard Graduate School of Design. Built as the home for the University’s president, it reflects southern colonial elegance with its two-story portico and symmetrical single story ells.

2 floors - 7,720 sq.ft.
1920 - 1929

**Ingram Hall 1923**
This Georgian building by Warren, Knight and Davis, rendered in brick and stone, was renovated in 1952, in 1975, and finally in 1988. A pedimented center pavilion with monumental pilasters, a Venetian window and a pair of curving walls, built to conceal the wheelchair ramp, reinforce the façade’s symmetrical composition.

4 floors - 15,000 sq.ft.

**Ramsay Hall 1925**
This Warren, Knight and Davis Neoclassical design with Georgian overtones is rendered in Flemish bond coursed brick with alternating dark burned half bricks with Auburn red full bricks. The symmetrical facade features three gabled pavilions, a monumental arch and columns in the center pavilion and a crowning cupola.

3 floors - 46,378 sq.ft.
1920 - 1929

**Duncan Hall 1928**

This Neoclassical building with Georgian overtones designed by Warren, Knight and Davis is rendered in brick, with a stone base and quoins, and features a symmetrical façade with gabled center pavilion. It is a contemporary of Upchurch Hall, across the street, and a stylistic cousin to Agricultural Engineering and the Extension Annex.

3 floors - 28,050 sq.ft.

*Duncan Hall 1928*
1930 - 1939

Upchurch Hall 1930
This Neo-Classical building with Georgian overtones features a symmetrical brick façade with three gabled pavilions, stone quoins and a stone base. It is a contemporary of Duncan Hall, across the street and a stylistic cousin to Agricultural Engineering and the Extension Annex, built ten years later. All were designed by Warren, Knight and Davis.

3 floors - 69,258 sq.ft.

Ross Hall 1930
The Neoclassical building with Georgian overtones occupies the central position on Ross Square, a formal garden, flanked by Samford Hall (east) and Foy Union (west). Designed by Warren, Knight and Davis, its symmetrical façades are dominated by a Doric portico (south), a balustraded stairway (north) and a crowning cupola.

4 floors - 43,478 sq.ft.
1930 - 1939

Textile Engineering 1932
A symmetrical Institutional Georgian design by Warren, Knight and Davis rendered in Flemish bond coursed brick with alternating dark burned half bricks with “Auburn red” full bricks and features a pedimented entry pavilion, brick quoins and stone enhancements.

3 floors - 48,024 sq.ft.

Petrie Hall 1939
The Neoclassical building rendered in brick with Georgian overtones features a center pavilion, attached gabled dependencies, stone base and quoins. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

2 floors - 20,415 sq.ft.
1940 - 1949

Tichenor Hall 1940
This Georgian design is one of the purest on campus. Three gabled pavilions, stone quoins, stone base, and a monumental stair enrich the symmetrical composition of the front facade. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

3 floors - 41,742 sq.ft.

Cary Hall 1940
This Georgian design, with projecting gabled entry pavilion, is rendered in brick with stone quoins, base and delineated entry incorporating the second story window.

3 floors - 26,500 sq.ft.
**1940 - 1949**

**M.W. Smith Hall 1948**
The Sherlock, Smith and Adams design was a contemporary adaptation of the Neoclassical vernacular, lacking symmetry and ornamentation, yet incorporating classical proportions, a two-story colonnaded portico, brick quoins and a stone base and cornice.

3 floors - 39,542 sq.ft.

**Wilmore Labs 1949**
A Sizemore and Campbell Georgian design, the stone entrance surround of the facade’s gabled center pavilion features a broken elliptical pediment over the door and second story window framing. Details include brick quoins and stone lintels, water table and banding.

2 floors - 66,126 sq.ft.
1950 - 1959

**Thach Hall 1951**
Classified as Contemporary Georgian by Sam Brewster, former director of buildings and grounds, Van Keuren, Davis’ simplified bold design rendered in brick features a symmetrical front façade with a stone base and pedimented entry pavilion.

3 floors - 42,085 sq.ft.

![Thach Hall 1951](image)

**Biggin Hall 1951**
This first expression of the new International Style on campus and designed by Pearson, Tittle and Narrows includes on the west exposure a set of once operable vertical louvered that could be adjusted with changing sun direction.

4 floors - 51,500 sq.ft.

![Biggin Hall 1951](image)
1950 - 1959

Miller Hall 1952
The Institutional Georgian design by Shaw and Renneker is rendered in brick. The symmetrical façade features a gabled entry pavilion, brick quoins and a stone base.

3 floors - 22,674 sq.ft.

Foy Student Union 1953
An International Style expression rendered in brick, the Pearson, Tittle and Narrows design was sympathetically expanded in 1972, by the same firm. Most student organizations, the central campus information desk, Union Ballroom, Spectra Recreation Room, reading rooms, meeting rooms, administrative offices and food service call Foy home.

3 floors - 112,487 sq.ft.
1960 - 1969

Funchess Hall 1961
An example of Georgian formality reinterpreted with minimalist sensitivities, the symmetry of the façade is reinforced and the entry delineated by a monumental four-column portico. It is rendered in brick with concrete and stainless steel details and a flat roof. Architecture by VanKeuren and Davis.

4 floors - 148,688 sq.ft.

Draughon Library 1962
Another example of Georgian formality reinterpreted with minimalist sensitivities, the symmetrical brick façade is broken only by a colossal twelve-column entry portico and monumental stair, which, along with a stone base and cap, reinforce the building's horizontally. Architecture by VanKeuren and Davis.

4 floors - 172,000 sq.ft.
1960 - 1969

Haley Center 1969
Covering nearly two and a half acres and with a tower rising ten floors, this building has an undeniable presence. The first three floors, quadrants connected by wide passageways and punctuated by enclosed courtyards, create a base visually supporting the tower. The horizontal orientation of the quadrant grouping is reinforced by a white stone base and cap bordering the brick field and yet is broken by the vertical window slits and the four stairways connecting the quadrants. The tower, alternating vertical panels of brick and window system, is capped by white stone. The brutal yet formal organization of the exterior belies a frustrating interior, as corridors of seemingly endless sameness confound the uninitiated user. Architecture by Davis, Speake and Associates.

10 floors - 357,000 sq.ft.
1970 - 1979

**Swingle Hall 1972**
The Minimalistic interpretation of traditional bay articulation uses white stone details on a brick field to delineate base, cap and strong vertical window elements. The entry is highly articulated and the roof is flat. Architecture by Kirkland, Woodham and Associates.

3 floors - 42,085 sq.ft.

**Telfair Peet Theater 1973**
Designed intentionally to contrast Auburn’s traditional character, pink/red brick, white mortar and trim, by Northington, Smith and Kranert, also designers of Dudley Hall, set out to unify and suggest the relationship of all fine arts buildings through the use of dark red brick with matching mortar and bronze anodized window and door frames. The complex represents rather brutal forms placed in an idyllic natural setting.

3 floors - 22,674 sq.ft.
1970 - 1979

**Goodwin Hall 1973**
Music unit of the fine arts complex.

4 floors - 51,500 sq.ft.

![Goodwin Hall 1973](image)

**Dudley Hall 1977**
Architecture unit of the fine arts complex.

4 floors - 77,986 sq.ft.

![Dudley Hall 1977](image)
1980 - 1989

**Broun Hall 1983**
Architects Sherlock, Smith and Adams’ Minimalistic expression represents the first step in the realization of their master plan for a College of Engineering complex. Red brick was used to mirror the treatment of the Pharmacy Building and Haley Center. Two landscaped brick walkways form a cohesive connection to the immediate area and the rest of campus.

3 floors - 100,800 sq.ft.

**Harbert Center 1986**
This Post-Modern design by Architects Goleman and Rolfe employs the traditional architectural forms and materials of nearby campus buildings including gabled roofs, facade articulation and brick with cast details. Old Broun Hall was razed to make way for this facility.

3 floors - 45,763 sq.ft.
1980 - 1989

Nichols Center 1986
The Post-Modern expression is rendered in red brick with a stone base, cap and striations to the second story windowsills. A massive, four-column stone portico, in the Doric order, from old Broun Hall, reinforces the symmetrical composition of this otherwise understated building. Architecture by Barganier, McKee and Sims.

2 floors - 32,158 sq.ft.

Chemistry Building 1989
The Post-Modern Barganier, Mcree, Sims Associates design combines strongly expressed three-dimensional volumes with classical formality expressed in brick, glass and a standing seam hipped roof. Arcades flanking the entry, transition to stepped corner pavilions, and regimented punched window openings both unite and detail the façade.

3 floors - 70,301 sq.ft.
1990 - 1999

**Draughon Library** (addition) 1990

The Pearson, Humphries and Jones Post-Modern design combines elements both of the original library, in the brick with stone details and the vertical window elements, and of Samford Hall, in the Pavilions with an alternating brick color in the gables.

6 floors - 172,000 sq.ft.

**Lowder Business Building** 1993

The Post-Modern design expressed in red Flemish bond coursed brick combines modern details with classical symmetry and proportion to reduce the impact of a monumental scale. The facade features a delineated base, central gabled pavilion with monumental columns and arched window, attic story and crowning octagonal copper dome. Architecture by Volker and Associates.

6 floors - 158,000 sq.ft.
1990 - 1999

**Rouse Life Sciences Building 1994**
This Post-Modern design combines a strongly articulated mass with classical formality. The symmetrical brick façade features a stone entry surround, stone water table, sills, banding and cap, a pair of articulated pavilions, and monumental bay windows at each end. A standing seam hipped roof caps the delineated attic and pavilions. Architecture by Barganier, McKee and Sims.

6 floors - 82,445 sq.ft.

![Rouse Building 1994](image)

**Plainsman Park Grandstand 1996**

![Plainsman Park Grandstand 1996](image)
2.3.2 Housing Facilities Survey

The President’s Home 1939
The stately Colonial Revival house consists of a two-story, center block five bays wide and flanked by single story ells. A balustraded, two story, six-column portico extends across the width of the main block. Five, gabled dormers punctuate the gabled roof. Chimneys, at each end of the roof, are flanked with quarter-round lights. The entry door is flanked by sidelights and topped with an elliptical fanlight, both with tracery. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

2 floors - 6,750 sq.ft.
**Women’s Quadrangles 1939-1952**

The Quad, a group of women's dormitories, was built in two phases: the Upper Quad dormitories I - IV and Quad Center dining hall in 1938, the Lower Quad dormitories V - IX and Quad Center expansion in 1952, and dorm X in 1956. The quadrangles represent two of the most successful outdoor rooms on campus.

Upper Quad’s Renaissance axial composition focuses on Cater Hall (north) and Quad Center (south). Columned arcades, a balustraded north-side stair and landscaping reinforce the formality and sense of enclosure.

Lower Quad is less formal, more open, with edges defined but lacking the sense of enclosure. The commons is more suited to outdoor recreation.

**Dormitories I - IV 1939**

The Upper Quad dorms are Georgian designs rendered in brick and feature center gabled pavilions, balconied entry porticos and stone details, including: gable medallions with the original Roman numerical building designation, keystones, banding, bases and quoins. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

4 floors - 22,500 sq.ft.
Quad Center 1939
The Georgian design, similar in proportions and details to the Upper Quad dormitories, presents a one-story face to the Upper Quad green and a two-story face to the Lower Quad. Both facades feature four-column pedimented entry porticos. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

2 floors - 27,777 sq.ft.

Dormitories V - X 1952
Also Georgian designs rendered in brick, the Lower Quad dorms have lost the stone base and banding and the quoins have been rendered in brick. However, the gabled pavilions, balconied entry porticos, keystones and stone gable medallions with the original Roman numerical building designation were retained. Architecture by Warren, Knight and Davis.

3 floors - 22,500 sq.ft.
Caroline Draughon Village 1959
Occupied primarily by married and graduate students, this is the first group of apartments, 384 units, built contiguous to campus. The two-story buildings, each with its own grassy buffer, were sited to flow with the natural contours of the land and to preserve the natural surroundings. Residents report that a sense of feeling part of a community has been created despite the architecturally unremarkable nature of the buildings. Architecture by Streeter Wyatt and Associates.

2 floors - 239,811 sq.ft.

Sewell Hall 1962
This facility houses varsity football and basketball athletes. A rear annex provides a study hall, hospitality room, game room and three apartments for coaches. It was gutted and completely remodeled in 1985, giving it a resort appearance. Architecture by Streeter Wyatt and Associates.

3 floors - 28,982 sq.ft.
Hill Dorms Women's Dormitories
The original complex opened in 1962, and included three dorms designated 'A' - 'C' and the Terrell Dining Hall. In 1965, dorms 'D' - 'F' opened and the dining hall was enlarged. Dorms 'G' - 'K' and Building 'L', administrative, opened in 1967, completing the complex.

The site composition of the Hill Dorms complex is symmetrical about a single north-south axis with dormitory groupings flanking the dining/retail and administrative buildings at the center; here also is the common green-space. As in both the Upper and Lower Quads, dormitory placement creates outdoor rooms; however, in the case of Hill Dorm, the automobile is the primary occupant of the area as they are designated dorm parking lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dormitories</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-B-C</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,800 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell Dining Hall</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-E-F</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,800 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-H</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,800 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-K</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57,862 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Hall</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,561 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original design was austere, flat-roofed institutional architecture of the 1960s. However, in the 1980s and 90s, a complete dorm renovation added two-tone brick facing, hip roofs with simulated dormers and a center-entry pavilion. The boxy appearance was reduced by pier and attic story delineation through brick color techniques and by adding walls to conceal wheelchair ramps.
College of Veterinary Medicine
With the erection of McAdory Hall in 1960, a decision was made to create The College of Veterinary Medicine on open land away from the main campus. The original buildings were typical of 1960’s institutional architecture, rendered in brick with concrete details, flat-roofed and austere. However, the Overton Auditorium-Rudd Student Center design of 1987, ushered in a new attitude toward the still boxy, flat-roofed structures, incorporating bold Post-Modern forms and surface detailing. And the next generation of buildings promises to utilize still softer attitude to form, replacing the flat-roofs with standing seam gabled roofs and surface delineation.

McAdory Hall 1960
Large Animal Clinic wing of the complex that includes Hoerlein Hall and Scott-Ritchey Laboratories. Architecture by Pearson, Tittle and Narrows.

Hoerlein Hall 1970
Small Animal Clinic wing of the complex that includes McAdory Hall and Scott-Ritchey Laboratories. Architecture by Pearson, Tittle and Narrows.

Greene Hall 1971
Classrooms, administrative offices and the library of the College of Veterinary Medicine. Architecture by Pearson, Tittle and Narrows.

Scott-Ritchey Laboratories
Research laboratory branching from the junction of McAdory Hall and Hoerlein Hall in the animal clinic complex. Architecture by Renneker and Tichansky.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overton Auditorium & Rudd Student Center  1987

The auditorium allows the college to host conferences and seminars for veterinarians and large gatherings of students and faculty. The student center provides a student lounge, study rooms, computer areas, conference rooms and an informal dining space. Architecture by Gresham, Smith and Partners.

1 floor - 20,462 sq.ft.

Ware Diagnostic Center
1990  1 floor - 4,060 sq.ft.

Student Teaching Laboratory

Linear Accelerator Laboratory
1997  1 floor - ?sq.ft.
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The most noticeable features of the development pattern at Auburn University’s campus is in its architecture, abundant tree canopy and landscaping that prevail throughout both the Core Academic Campus and the outlying agricultural lands. The placement of buildings and attention to detail given to pre-World War II development has resulted in public spaces that are inviting to all, while still affording privacy to individual campus building sites.

The general guidelines contained in this chapter are intended to serve as a framework for the development of more specific standards to be included in the Campus Development Guidelines and in criteria for the review of projects by the Campus Planning Committee(CPC). The main objective of all guidelines contained in this section is the preservation and enhancement of existing physical assets where desirable, while allowing the greatest flexibility for architects and designers to create innovative projects that make positive contributions to the overall image and character of Auburn University.

Recommendation
IDEA recommends these guidelines be applied to all new development and substantial redevelopment of existing University buildings. In cases where existing buildings are undergoing renovation, these guidelines can be used as a basis for review of renovation plans while realizing that compliance with all guidelines may not be practical.

Action: Use the design guidelines identified in this plan as a basis for updating the criteria that the (CPC) uses to review proposed projects.
Action: Recommend that the University use these guidelines as a basis for establishing and revising existing design standards and publish an official document based on guidelines listed herein.
A. General Building Standards

IDEA has outlined a general building standard for each of two building types, residential/housing, classroom/laboratory. Two additional types have not been defined, but should be in an in-depth master plan study. These two types are Athletic Facilities and Service Facilities.

Residential/Housing
The following design guidelines apply to all types of housing development, including existing dormitories, new resident suites, future duplexes and apartment buildings.

Application of the guidelines is based on massing and scale issues that occur with different building types. Residential uses that are similar in character and scale are therefore grouped together and referred to as:
- Quad Type R-1
- Hill Dorm R-2
- Housing Suites R-3

Climatic Response
- Building designs should respond to Auburn’s summer sun, with deep recesses and overhangs.
- Entries, particularly the front door, should be generously protected by a porch.
- Principal rooms should have windows, whenever possible, on two walls to provide balanced day lighting and facilitate natural cooling and ventilation.
- Housing should be oriented so a majority of primary living spaces receive direct sunlight and incorporate overhangs, awnings or trellises which allow the low winter sun to penetrate the unit, while blocking the high summer sun.
Safety and Security

- Planners should incorporate appropriate safety techniques into housing designs and should comply with Crime Prevention through environmental design techniques to the extent required by the University Guidelines.

Materials

- New buildings should support University traditions and maintain a level of craft and detail in the process of construction.
- Recommended exterior finishes include brick and stone.
- Material changes should not occur at external corners, but should occur on interior corners.

Orientation to the Street

- Primary facades should contain the primary entry and should be street-facing or outdoor-room-facing.
- The principal orientation of the front façade of all buildings should be parallel, or nearly parallel, to the streets or outdoor room.
- Front and side setback for the street should be consistent with adjacent structures.
- Where formal green spaces are located across a street, the front facade should face the green space.
- The front door should be prominent and a welcoming feature on the front facade and should not be recessed back more than 6 ft. from the face of the primary facade.
- Walkways, that lead to the front door, are encouraged.
- To the greatest extent possible, front entrances should articulate with a covered front entry porch. The scale of the front porch should be in scale with the primary façade.
- Main building entrances, or individual unit entrances, should be visible from the street, well lit and easily accessible.
- On corner sites, facades of the primary building should be located along front and street-side setback lines and within the specified buildable area.
- All street-facing facades should have transparent windows covering at least 15% of the facade's area.
Building Design
- The facades of all housing buildings that face adjacent structures, parks, or open space, should be articulated. Articulation may include porches, projecting railings and/or balconies.
- Building foundations should be elevated above the adjacent grade level. Residential buildings should incorporate either raised concrete pads or a raised wood joist floor with perimeter foundation at a minimum of 18 inches above adjacent grade.
- Buildings with consistent window expressions are recommended. A “punched” window expression is specifically encouraged.

Mixture of Building Types
- Combining a variety of building types creates diversity in an area.
- All buildings, regardless of type, should be consistent in character, scale, proportion and massing with other University buildings.

Garage and Parking Placement
- Streets should promote bicycle and pedestrian usage and should minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Access to parking areas should be taken from secondary pedestrian streets, whenever possible. If access is taken from primary pedestrian streets, curb cuts should be limited to one 20 ft. access-point per block frontage.
- Street frontages for parking areas on secondary pedestrian streets should use landscaping to screen the parking from the street. A decorative low brick wall or fence (minimum 30” high) should be used in conjunction with the landscaping to define the site perimeter.
- Parking areas should be located to the rear of buildings on residential character streets and primary pedestrian streets.
- Shared parking areas and access points among buildings are encouraged.
- Parking structures should reflect the character, scale and
massing of the primary structure as well as other buildings in the area.

- Exterior wall materials for parking structures should be compatible with exterior wall materials and finishes used for campus buildings and retaining walls.

Classroom/Laboratory

The following development guidelines apply to all types of academic (non-housing) development, including classroom and laboratory development. In addition, the standard for mid-rise and high-rise buildings also applies to residential development, as noted in the previous section.

Application of guidelines is based on the following building types:

- Low-rise Buildings (LR) – one to three stories
- Intense lab/light industrial uses and service buildings (I/C)

Building Placement

- Buildings should have a clear physical and visual relationship to the street. Buildings sited close to the street strengthen the activity and vitality of the street.
- Building setbacks should be consistent with that of adjacent buildings.
- On corner sites, buildings should occupy the corner.

Orientation to the Street

- All buildings should reinforce the street framework by orientating the “main” building façade either parallel to, or perpendicular to, the street. Buildings placed at irregular or random angles to the street are inappropriate.
- To maintain a consistent street orientation, multiple building complexes are encouraged and should be organized at right angles to each other.

Placement of Entrances

- Building entrances should be visible from the street, well-lit, and easily accessible by students, faculty, staff and visitors.
• Placement of building entrances should, where possible, coordinate with street tree spacing and placement.
• Entrances should accommodate pedestrian access from public transportation stops.
• Articulation, such as pavilions, porticos, lighting and roof forms should be used to identify entrances.
• Through-lobbies or breezeways that address both the street and parking lots are encouraged.
• Large expanses of glass curtain walls are (discouraged) not acceptable.

**Laboratories**
For laboratories, the foreground floor elevation should include some percentage of transparency to engage the public realm. The particular amount of transparency should be determined in the design review process.
• Building designs should express a differentiated base, middle and top in appropriate proportions to each other and in keeping with the character of the campus district.
• The ground floor level of buildings should be differentiated to provide a defined, pedestrian scale space. This differentiation can be achieved through the use of colonnades and overhangs that cover the sidewalk, through differentiation in the building massing (setting upper floors back form the street), or other similar methods.
B. Village Concepts

IDEA has outlined a general standard for consideration in re-establishing a village atmosphere to the Auburn campus as a whole.

- To enhance the pedestrian experience, awnings, balconies and arcades that provide shade and protection for the elements are encouraged.
- Sloping roofs are encouraged at strategic locations, such as corners, mid-block entries, etc.
- All structures should be well-designed buildings that use high-quality materials such as brick and cut stone in a manner in keeping with other buildings on the campus.

Parking and Access

- Access to on-site parking areas should be taken from secondary pedestrian streets whenever possible. If access is taken from primary pedestrian streets, curb cuts should be limited to one, 20 ft. access point per block frontage.
- Parking areas should be located to the rear of buildings fronting on primary pedestrian streets.
- Streets frontages for parking areas on secondary pedestrian streets should use landscaping to screen the parking from the street. A decorative low wall or fence (minimum 30”) in height should be used in conjunction with the landscaping to define the site perimeter. The materials and height of the fence should be in keeping with the architecture of the main building and character of surroundings buildings.
- Parking areas should be located to the rear of buildings.
- Limited parking (one drive aisle with parking on one or both sides) should be allowed between the building and the street.
- It is recommended that buildings share parking areas and access points.
- Attached and detached parking structures should reflect the character scale and massing of the primary structure and/or other buildings in the area.
• Exterior wall materials for parking structures should be compatible with the exterior wall materials and finish used for adjacent buildings.

Service Areas
• Service and loading activities, if located on-site, should take access from secondary pedestrian streets.
• Service areas should be screened from streets and adjacent properties by walls of material compatible with the exterior wall of the main building in conjunction with landscape.

Outdoor Rooms and Green Space
To achieve the vision for community character, the design of public spaces needs to be given as much consideration, if not more, than private spaces. The following guidelines are intended to serve as a foundation from which to build. They include recommendations for public improvements to parks and streetscape.

Parks and other civic open spaces are the ultimate gathering place for residents and visitors. Their design must be interesting and include elements that excite people of all ages; and they must be secure. Parks and open spaces are separated into three basic types: Core Campus Parks, Campus Edge Parks and Athletic Parks. Design of new parks and open spaces (outdoor rooms) in the Core Campus should comply with the guidelines in the following sections.
• Core Campus Parks provide opportunities for public gathering. These spaces should have a size, shape and design to provide adequate space for activities such as outdoor concerts, exhibits, festivals and other student activities. These spaces should create outdoor rooms and should extend out from indoor spaces.
• Campus Edge Parks should provide modest and flexible recreation opportunities that meet basic district needs and accommodate multi-purposes. The park's design should provide areas for strolling, sitting and informal recreation such as block
receptions, picnics and class events.
- Athletic Parks should contain features that serve the larger student/faculty community as well as for student athletes. The focus of these park designs should be active recreational areas including facilities such as ball fields, playgrounds and apparatus areas and appropriate restroom and service facilities.

**Park Design**

The following design guidelines are intended to provide a park environment that is appropriate for the surrounding Auburn Character and Image. Primary considerations include the functional aspects of user comfort, scale, shade and air quality. These elements are of vital importance in defining the theme and quality of life of the area. Individual parks and open space should be developed according to project specific criteria based on theses objectives. Specific elements to be addressed at the detailed park design level include:

**Landscape**

On-site landscaping serves both aesthetic and functional purposes and has the additional advantage of benefiting both the site and the adjacent use. Plant material should be selected based on the soil conditions, water requirements, light exposure, overall size of the site and surrounding context and the intended theme.
- Street trees should be spaced according to species type, the University’s Landscape Planting Plan, and in accordance with the recommended streetscape design guidelines. Tree planting, in general, should provide enough overall shade coverage of the site to produce a pleasant microclimate and to reduce air pollution.
- Landscape design should include trees, shrubs, ground cover and minimal amount of irrigated lawn areas. Lawn is best separated from planting of trees, shrubs, ground covers and flowering plants so that it may be irrigated separately.
- Native plant material should be used where possible. Non-native materials should consist of plants that are shown not to invade natural landscapes and should comply with the University...
Guidelines.

**Buffers and Screening**
Landscape buffers and screens may include trees, shrubs or hedges, grasses or other living ground cover, berms, walls or fencing. Any technique used should be developed such that it enhances the view both on and off site. Wall or fence materials should be compatible with the materials and finishes used in park structures and the surrounding campus district.

**Paths**
Park paths should support direct connections from neighborhoods and surrounding commercial areas into parks. Park paths should also provide for a continuous connection within a “Green Link” trail system.

**Climatic Design**
Parks should provide comfortable areas for year-round sitting and recreation. Parks should include adequately shaded areas for comfortable summer use and unexposed areas for comfortable winter use.

**Natural Features**
Park design should conserve valuable natural resources and existing heritage trees.

**Views**
Vistas from surrounding streets that end in a park, should be preserved and enhanced. Loading and storage areas should not occupy these vistas.

**Site Furnishings**
Benches, trash receptacles and other site furnishings should be uniform in style, color and material and should relate appropriately to their campus pedestrian context.

**Lighting**
Pedestrian-scale street and pathway lighting should be used for
both aesthetic value and to enhance security. Lighting should be selected from, or comply with, the University Street Lighting Standards.

**Irrigation**

Conserve the use and retention of water on the site through the application of accepted principles and the efficient use of water on site. Irrigation of the street landscape should be provided as follows:
- All new parks and open spaces should include automatic irrigation system.
- Bedding areas should be irrigated with low volume (non-spray-head) type irrigation.
- Separate zones should be provided for plants with different water needs. Turf areas and bedding areas should generally be irrigated on separate zones.
- Preserved natural areas, within park space, may not require irrigation.

**Security**

The security of parks and open spaces is paramount to ensure that students, faculty, on-campus residents and visitors feel comfortable using and living near the parks.
- To ensure that parks and open spaces are designed to discourage criminal activity, all park spaces should incorporate “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” concepts.

**Design Guidelines for Gateways**

Auburn University is a destination, and as such, its main entry points need to be clearly delineated in a way that announces, “you have arrived.” The diversity of architecture, building scales and uses that are prevalent throughout campus require different gateway treatments that respond to the distinct character of a specific location, there is no “one size fits all” approach to gateway design.
Gateway Types
Gateway onto Auburn’s campus may vary in scale, magnitude and character. The following section begins to define the basic differences in these varying types of gateways and how design elements may vary according to the context and desired effect.

Vertical Icons
Vertical icons should be used as an opportunity to introduce an architectural element as part of the gateway. Their design, form and materials should have significant historical or contextual relevance. Vertical icons, such as columns, piers, statuary, fountains, icon lighting and shade structures should occur as a single element or group of elements. They should function as the dominant focal element at intersections or to define view corridors.

Architecture
While less easily manipulated than most other gateway elements, architectural elements (buildings) should be manipulated at an urban design scale to define the entire spatial sequence of the gateways into the campus. Building designs at these gateways should use scale and massing to contribute to the gateway design. Building use, scale, height and orientation are all important factors in the creation of a successful architectural gateway. Architectural elements are key in framing and directing views, enhancing the sense of passage through a threshold, defining a sense of place and again announcing that one has “arrived.”

Landscape
Landscape should be used to soften and define the gateway from a vehicular and pedestrian point of view. Seasonal planting and flowering trees should be used as focal elements in the landscape in conjunction with vertical icons, signs and long, planted medians. Street trees should be used along the full length of the gateway. This will heighten the experience of moving through a distinct spatial sequence.
Parks and Water Features
Parks and water features are elements that should be used to animate gateways and their surroundings. Parks and open space can be located at the entrance to a gateway or can serve as a gateway itself by providing a distinct change in surrounding context. Parks and open space allow room for additional landscape and provide a location for gathering and recreation. Water features can function as an icon or focal element and can provide animation as well. Water features can range from large water bodies to small-scale fountains.

Lighting
Lighting is an integral part of accentuating most of the other elements that define a gateway. Contextually appropriate pedestrian-scale light standards should be utilized for aesthetics and safety. Light standards should incorporate University symbol graphics and banners. Light spacing should be coordinated with street tree planting. Uplighting should be used in the landscape to accentuate single and grouped trees as well as in the hardscape to highlight vertical icons. On-street lighting should be consistent with University standards.

Roadway and Pedestrian Paving
Both vehicular and pedestrian paving treatments should be coordinated with the streetscape design guidelines and standards for Auburn University.

Median Treatments
Where possible, the addition of a landscaped median helps in several ways to enhance the gateways. Medians allow space for additional landscaping (color, texture and spatial definition) and street tree planting to further reinforce the sense of corridor and help to bring the space down to a more comfortable human scale. Medians also provide a central focal point for the location of vertical icons and signs.
Traffic Calming Effects
Traffic calming can be achieved by the addition of landscaped medians, as previously discussed, as well as by the addition of special paving treatments. The use of special paving heightens the sense of change from the vehicular experience. The rumble created by driving over textured pavers, for example, acts as a communicator to slow traffic and shift driver focus to other changes in the surroundings.

Visual Clutter and View Corridors
The creation of clear view corridors, free from visual clutter, is critical in the creation of a successful gateway. Elements previously discussed such as landscape (street trees and color in the landscape), architecture and vertical icons should be used to channel and direct a person’s attention to a series of views or as the foreground to a focal element at the end of a view corridor. Visual clutter, such as excessive signs, power lines and overbearing lights, lead to visual disarray and lack of focus on the intended view or intended experience.

Design Guidelines for Signs
- Signs can be one of the primary negative contributors to visual disarray in a campus environment. In order to provide unity and to prevent visual clutter in the streetscape, signs should be regulated as follows:
  - Signs should be either flush-mounted façade or shingle-style and should be perpendicular to the flow of traffic, both pedestrian and vehicular.
  - Facade-mounted signs should not be mounted above the cornice, parapet or top of the building façade. Signs should not obstruct pedestrian circulation in any way.
  - Signs should not be obtrusive and should be in keeping with the character, image, scale and building materials of the campus guideline.
  - Signs should be externally lit by façade-mounted accent...
uplighting or downlighting. Lighting should be generally limited to the sign surface. Sign lighting should not spill onto or disturb adjacent properties or buildings. External neon lighting is discouraged.

- Site signs should be in accordance with the University Standards and are subject to review and approval by the Facilities Planning Committee.

Design Guidelines for Landscape
Landscape is a highly visible element of the public realm and one of the primary mechanisms for providing continuity throughout the University. The appearance of the landscape along streets, and the functional aspects of pedestrian comfort: scale, shade and enhanced air quality, are of vital importance in defining the theme and quality of life of the University.

All landscape and irrigation plans for buildings, parks and open spaces should be designed by a landscape architect, registered to practice in the State of Alabama. Landscape professionals can also serve as a resource for advice, critique and/or development of plans. Plants should be selected based on the micro-climate, soil conditions, water requirements, surrounding context and intended theme.

Design Guidelines for Site Fences and Walls
Fences and walls serve two primary purposes, they identify the perimeter of a property and they increase the privacy of outdoor spaces. To ensure that fences and walls contribute to the overall character of a district, the following guidelines are recommended:

- Fences in the front and street side lot lines should be low to the ground (3-6’ max. height) and semi-transparent (at least 50% opaque above 30 inches in height) to allow for natural surveillance and spatial connection to the pedestrian right of way and street. Fences in the front should not be solid. All fencing should be made out of attractive, long-lasting materials.
• Recommended wall and fence types include brick, ornamental wrought iron or aluminum. The use of chain-link fence in the front, that is visible from public streets, is discouraged.
• Privacy fences and walls on side and rear lot lines should not be more than 6’ tall and should present the best side to adjacent properties. Masonry walls should have a decorative finish such as brick or stone veneer and caps to improve the appearance of the wall to adjacent properties. Wall finishes should be in keeping with that of the primary structure and the overall character of the district.
• With masonry fences, the use of exposed or unfinished/ unpainted concrete block is prohibited.
• Screening of loading areas, refuse areas, transformers, heating units and other ground-mounted equipment must be consistent with the University standards.
• Barbed wire, razor wire and any other similar fence types are prohibited (except on University agricultural lands).
C. Utilities

To protect the appearance of park and open space, utilities should be regulated as follows:

- Major public utility lines should be located underground where possible, including all electrical fiber optic, cable, telephone, water, sewer service and distribution line. Stub-outs should be provided at shared property lines.
- Above ground utility structures, such as back flow preventers, switching gear, control panels, etc., should be located so as to be out of primary public view. Such structures should also be screened with plant material, unless located in a service alley.
- Manhole covers, meter boxes and other at-grade structures should fall within landscape beds, where possible, or painted to blend in with the adjacent landscape treatment. Specific paint choices should be selected from streetscape design guidelines.

Design Guidelines for Utilities

To protect the appearance of the street landscape, utilities should be regulated as follows:

- Utilities, including gas and electric meters, electrical transformers, irrigation and potable water back flow preventers, switching gear, control panels, dumpster or other trash receptacle, etc., should be located underground where possible.
- All utilities should be placed in such a way as to be out of public view. Utilities should be screened by plant material, or a low wall or fence in combination with plant material.
- It is recommended that new and replacement power lines to the building should be underground if possible. If above grade, power connections should be located to the rear of buildings and should share existing power line routing where possible to minimize visual clutter and the need for new power poles.
- Manhole covers, meter boxes, and other at-grade structures that fall within sidewalks should be painted to match the concrete or pavers.
**Design Guidelines for Streetscape**

The following guidelines are intended to serve as a basis from which more detailed development standards can be developed. The streetscape guidelines are based on a hierarchy of three different types of streets: residential character, primary pedestrian and secondary pedestrian. The illustration identifies recommended street types for streetscape projects proposed in this plan—the “Green Links” network with the addition of arterial streets that require enhanced pedestrian facilities. The recommended streetscape guidelines for each street type are contained in illustration.

**Action:** Prepare and adopt revised streetscape design standards based on the guidelines contained in the illustration. Until such time as these revised standards are adopted, the guidelines in the illustration shall apply.

**Action:** As part of the streetscape design guidelines, assign street type designations to all streets within the University campus. (primary pedestrian, secondary pedestrian, primary vehicular and secondary vehicular).
3.1 Recommendations & Diagrams

3.1.1 Pedestrian Campus

Introduction
The image and character of Auburn is best seen and appreciated as a pedestrian. The human scale of the original campus plan was to embody the community feeling and atmosphere of the “loveliest village on the plains.” To protect and enhance Auburn’s prime asset, “its environment,” pedestrianization must re-capture the campus from vehicular traffic. Currently, major vehicular thoroughfares like Thach, Donahue, Duncan, Roosevelt and Samford divide the campus. The atmosphere of Auburn’s campus could quickly change by adopting a pedestrianization plan. This plan can be the result of a master planning effort and can recapture the image and character of Auburn.

Auburn can be defined by the “quality of walk” just as easily as it is defined by its quality of life. You need only to walk the campus to appreciate the history, tradition and quality of this place. Auburn, minus the vehicular traffic, in its simplest form, is a great space.

Recommendations
IDEA can make general recommendations based on observations and past circulation studies reviewed during this phase of work. The primary need for the University is to conduct, as part of the master planning effort, a complete circulation study. The circulation study will quickly confirm what casual observation dictates as the obvious need for closure of several major thoroughfares.

The streets should immediately be closed, if only by temporary means, to redefine the campus environment. A lengthy study conducted while the campus remains vehicular in nature may miss subtle qualities and circulation pattern influences not
realized in a planning exercise. These subtle differences will make themselves known in practice. The University does not need to wait for the results from a study to make the decision to pedestrianize the Core Academic Campus.

**Action:** Phase I- Close Thach between Ross and Duncan and have master planner study changes in circulation patterns, due to the closure.

**Action:** Eliminate parking along Quad Drive, and around Ross Square on Foy Union Circle.

An in-depth study, following these temporary closures will illuminate many hidden circulation patterns not seen while current circulation patterns continue.
Pedestrian Pathways Guidelines
Currently, IDEA has identified what appear to be four types of pedestrian pathways: primary pathways, such as defined by the concourse; secondary pathways, as defined by walks crossing Samford Park or other park green spaces, and the other two classifications are those which follow primary and secondary roadways.

Primary Pedestrian Pathways

Type I. 12.5’-15’ wide sidewalks with specialty paving (colored or textured concrete with accent banding of specialty pavers) along full length of street; full sidewalk length of specialty paving should be reserved for areas where already part of existing character. (Concourse)

Type II. 10’-12’ wide concrete sidewalks with specialty paving (colored or texture concrete within accent banding or specialty pavers) at nodes or intersections only. (Samford Park)

- Pedestrian scale lighting- double light fixture, 75’ on center located symmetrically on both sides of the street. The fixture should comply with Auburn’s Image and Character.
- Benches, trash receptacles, telephones, drinking fountains, newspaper vending boxes, tree grates and guards of consistent style and character.
- Brick streets and other specialty pavers at intersections for street surfaces.
- Street trees with spreading canopy 25’-50’ on center.
- On-street parking on one or both sides of street, where feasible, allowing for bicycle path, as required by guidelines.
- “Bulb-outs” of sidewalks at intersections to reduce street crossing distance.
Secondary Pedestrian Pathways

**Type I.** 7’-10’ wide sidewalks with concrete accent bands of specialty pavers at nodes or intersections only. (along College)

**Type II.** 5’-7’ wide concrete sidewalk 6’ minimum parkway width recommended for canopy trees; 3’ parkway for understory trees. (along Mell)

- Pedestrian scale lighting – single light fixture 100’ on-center symmetrical on both sides of the street.
- Trash receptacles; tree grates and guards; benches in areas of high pedestrian activity.
- Street trees with spreading canopy planted 50’ on center.
- Vehicular-scale street lighting. (12’-20’ height)
- Street trees with spreading canopy planted 50’ on-center; species tolerant of small planting areas.
Campus Center Study (fig. AU1.0)
During the collection of data and fact finding, the research teams found that the location, or perceived location, of a campus center was of significant interest. The prevailing assumptions were that the campus center had moved a great deal in the past 140 years. The diagram shows the approximate campus center in 1915, 1960 and in 2000. The campus center is not meant to be a true geographic center, but represents the center of the pedestrian traffic. As you can see from the diagram, the center point used for the 1915, walking circle was the front entrance to Samford Hall. In 1960, the walking circle center point is shown as the front entrance to Foy. In the 2000, diagram the center point is shown as the front entrance to Haley Center.

The 2000, diagram was depicted as the most recent pedestrian traffic study. In 1999, the study showed that the concourse could be considered the center as it carried an average of some 4000 students during a typical class change on the hour. The diagram shows that over the past 85 years, the apparent center of the student traffic pattern has only moved approximately 1200 feet.
Campus Core Study (fig. AU2.0)

As part of the fact finding efforts to identify possible sites for student based activities, a site study has been illustrated to show 15-minute walking circles from various points of departure around the campus. The diagram uses three of these walking circle studies to illustrate a Core Campus Concept. The first circle, to the south, is centered on Terrell Hall. The second ring, to the west, is centered on the West parking and the third circle in the intersection of College and Magnolia.

Many other points could also be shown as origination points from which a large number of students begin a cross campus journey. The diagram shows that the 15-minute walking ring creates a triangular core from which all converging students can reach within the 15-minute time frame. This illustration represents a loose interpretation of a proposed Core Campus diagram.
Campus Land Use Study (fig. AU5.0)
A preliminary review of the land-use plan for Auburn University suggests that a diagram be used to illustrate future building sites. The diagram also can be used to better understand the long-range pedestrian and transit issues for master planning efforts. The illustration also incorporates a new direction for increasing on-campus resident housing, which will enhance the village concept and be in keeping with the character and image of Auburn University.
**3.1.2 Student Village**

The village concept has two origins in the Auburn context. First, in the history and folklore as the “loveliest village of the plains,” and the second, in the warm hospitality most commonly found in a “Village” or small community.

**Definition**

The student village is a loosely defined term to represent the area of the campus which facilitates the primary student life programs. Depending on the selection of a final site, this term is generally used to refer to a collection of buildings connected with a student-focused green, or pedestrian town center.

IDEA has recommended that a student-focused program at Auburn University be designed as a collection of buildings to reflect the historical and cultural precedence of Auburn. This village should be located on a primary path and based on our findings, most probably Thach Ave. The village should also be located as close to a primary path North/South crossing Thach, which is currently the concourse, Duncan and Donahue.

The facilitation of such a collection of buildings or village must rely on a pedestrianized campus plan with no or extremely limited, vehicular traffic and should utilize a campus wide transit system.

In an ideal town center or village center, a Four Corner site plan facilitates the most convincing sense of place. In the site selection criteria, we refer to the Four Corner site concept. Site A-1 and the continuation into site A-2, creates a complete village plan beginning with the four corners of the Donahue/Thach intersection.
Student Village Site (fig. AU3.0)
During our initial workshop in the Fall, we identified a new village concept for a student union or center. This new village concept was seen as in keeping with the Image and Character of Auburn University. Rather than building a 250,000 square foot building, a concept for breaking the program into a series of smaller buildings was proposed. To illustrate the village concept, several sites were selected on which to diagram a potential student village. The diagram depicts 5 sites and illustrates how each presents a unique set of possibilities. All but one of these sites, (A-1), fall within the diagrammed Core Campus and are aligned with future transit and infrastructure planning studies.

see diagram on following page

conceptual elevations
Site A

West Parking Site

This site was originally selected for the new student union when programmed as a single building of some 250,000 sq.ft. The site meets and exceeds the parking requirements and is easily phased. The site also can be accessed easily with little disruption to student life.

This site however, is at the western end of the campus and outside the core pedestrian pathways. In the 20-year vision plan this site could facilitate some student activities as academic growth is planned around this site.
Site A1

Donahue and Thach

The intersection of Donahue and Thatch meets almost all the criteria for site selection of a student-focused facility program. The site is located in what is diagrammed as the Campus Core. It sits on an established transportation path, adjacent to ample parking. It has four developable corners and is easily accessed for phases of construction.

The Four Corners establish two possible out-parcels for development of housing suites by a public sector JV partner. The assembly program may be accommodated due to adjacent parking. Proposed transit link could easily be facilitated with pedestrianization of Thach.
Site A2

Petrie

Long revered, the Petrie site presents a valuable opportunity to facilitate a student-focused program. The site is located on a major pedestrian link in two major axes, both north-south and east-west. The site could easily accommodate a parking structure which would also play a dual role for game day parking.

This site has some drawbacks which include constrained construction access and limited availability of site to facilitate housing. The strongest opportunity for site A-2 is for the completion of a village program to include student athletic-focused facilities and integrate as a full campus district focused on all student groups.

A completely integrated site, A1 and A2, provides for a campus student district as well as for special game-day programming associated with Jordan Hare Stadium.
Site B

Haley Concourse
The Haley Concourse is currently part of the primary pedestrian pathway. By adding facades to Haley, along the concourse and student activity facilities to the south and in the current parking lot, a strong student program can be facilitated. With removal of three small structures on the east of the concourse, a site can be developed to accommodate future student housing which can extend the Quad influence in that district of the campus.

Limitations of this site include access for construction and lack of phasing opportunity. Due to a constrained site, full build-out would prove most prudent.
Site C

Foy and Cater
This site is the most traditional of those being considered. Foy and Cater have traditionally been centers for student activities. All traditional pedestrian paths cross on or near these two facilities. With a combination of scenarios, a strong village center could be established. Removal and redevelopment of Cater would be required. Additional building programs could be accommodated on the Cater site, and with additions to Haley and the concourse as proposed in site B, a substantial student village would emerge.

Limitations in this site include phasing due to demolitions as well as interruptions to daily student life due to its centralized location.
New Proposed Building: Entertainment / Retail
(includes conference rooms, ballroom and club space)

New Building
(information center & registrars)

Student Commons

New Cater Hall

Student Office Suites
(above 1st floor retail)

Retail / Housing Suites
(retail and student lounges on 1st floor with student housing suites above)
Proposed Programming Study

Based on information obtained in the investigative phase IDEA has made the following comparisons to selected sites. IDEA’s scope of work requires that a vision of the student village concept be realized that reflects the character and image of Auburn University. IDEA must first define which program will be the most illustrative of the proposed student village.

Site A: West Parking Site
The program for this particular site will be all-inclusive. The student village as envisioned would need to be self-sustaining in that all required student services be adjacent and in close proximity.

New Construction Program
Food Services
Ballroom
Conference
Bookstore
Copy Center
Assigned Retail
ATM
Mail Services
ID Office/Tiger Card
Multi use Theater
Billiards/Games
Computer Lab/Lounge
Exhibit Gallery/Storage
Office (SGA, Univ. Program Council, Int’l Student Org., Greek Life)
Office (IMPACT, Eagle Eye, WEGL, Student Pub., Plainsman)
Office (Black Student Union, Student Org. Mail boxes, Multicultural affairs)
Office Union Administration
Student Services
Success Center (Freshman, Counseling, Career, Academic)
Office Student Union Advisors
Bursar’s Office (Cash Control)
Housekeeping (BOH)

*New Student housing has been added to program 150-200 beds*

The image and character requirement for this site speaks to ratio of building to site and mass. The proposed program is seen as possible on this site with only one large building component being the ballroom. A collection of building can be assembled on this site to reflect a village center or gathering place. One draw back to this site is timing of development. Studies of existing and future student circulation plans indicate that this site will not be part of primary circulation for many years. Based on the proposed program for the student village, many of the program functions are on a convenience need basis. Site A as studied does not adequately meet that need until well into the future.

**Site A-1: Donahue Site**
Currently the site consists of a major intersection on the campus for both north/south and east/west circulation.

**New Construction Program**
Food Services
Bookstore
Copy Center
Assigned Retail
ATM
Mail Services
ID Office/Tiger Card
Multi use Theater
Billiards/Games
Computer Lab/Lounge
Exhibit Gallery/Storage
Office (SGA, Univ. Program Council, Int’l Student Org.,
Greek Life
Office (IMPACT, Eagle Eye, WEGL, Student Pub., Plainsman)
Office (Black Student Union, Student Org. Mail boxes, Multicultural affairs)
Office Union Administration
Student Services
Success Center (Freshman, Counseling, Career, Academic)
Office Student Union Advisors
Bursar’s Office (Cash Control)
Housekeeping (BOH)

*New student housing has been added to program, 150-200 beds

Remote Location New Construction
Ballroom
Conference

A unique feature of the site is the topography. The site sits at the bottom of three converging slopes. From the east the site is positioned as a natural arrival zone from the primary campus and along the future primary off campus parking. The site also sits with in the core diagram of the campus as defined in (figure 2) campus core study. For the site to facilitate a student village as programmed several building would be removed. The intersection would become the village center and create a sense of arrival from all four directions. It would be proposed that Donahue be terminated to the north and routed as part of the future-parking plan. Thach and Donohue would be pedestrianized and facilitate an on campus transit system. This site would also require a self-sustaining student program with the exception of the ballroom component. This site would not facilitate the mass required for inclusion of the ballroom footprint, parking and service requirements.
Site A-2: Petrie Site
Currently this site is occupied by the Petrie Building and surface parking adjacent to Jordan Hare Stadium. This site as with the Donohue site, resides on the primary circulation path from the west parking and only 400 feet west of the concourse.

New Construction Program
Food Services
Copy Center
Assigned Retail
ATM
Mail Services
ID Office/Tiger Card
Billiards/Games
Computer Lab/Lounge
Office (SGA, Univ. Program Council, Int'l Student Org., Greek Life)
Office (Black Student Union, Student Org. Mail boxes, Multicultural affairs)
Office Union Administration
Student Services
Office Student Union Advisors
Bursar’s Office (Cash Control)
Housekeeping (BOH)

*New student housing has also been added to program, 150-200 beds

Remote Location New Construction
Ballroom (west parking site)
Conference (west parking site)
Multi use Theater (west parking site)

Renovation of Foy
Meeting rooms
Exhibit Gallery/Storage
Success Center (Freshman, Counseling, Career, Academic)  
Office (IMPACT, Eagle Eye, WEGL, Student Pub., Plainsman)

Renovation of Haley  
Bookstore

*New student housing has been added to program, 150-200 beds

The site would not however facilitate a four-corner village center as other major academic structures reside on all three remaining corners. This site is well with in the campus core and adjacent to the Haley Center and is part of the current and future student circulation. The challenges of this site are in its unique topography and adjacency to the stadium. The site would easily accommodate structured parking and facilitate a great deal of assembly space for athletic events. It is understood that a plan to utilize this site or the south end of the stadium is under consideration for expansion by the athletic department. If correctly planned this site could accommodate a well-integrated student and athletic life programs. In combination with the Donohue site, Petrie could become part of a larger village and encompass student, athletic, administrative and faculty services on a central site.

Site B- Foy/Cater Site

Currently this site is the largest land area under consideration and encompasses Ross Square, Cater Hall and forecourt, the concourse and existing Foy Student Center.

New Construction Program
Food Services  
Multi use Theater  
Copy Center  
Assigned Retail  
ATM
Mail Services
ID Office/Tiger Card
Billiards/Games
Computer Lab/Lounge
Office (SGA, Univ. Program Council, Int’l Student Org., Greek Life)
Office (Black Student Union, Student Org. Mail boxes, Multicultural affairs)
Office Union Administration
Student Services
Office Student Union Advisors
Bursar’s Office (Cash Control)
Housekeeping (BOH)

*New student housing has been added to program, 150-200 beds

Renovation of Foy
Ballroom
Conference
Meeting rooms
Exhibit Gallery/Storage
Success Center (Freshman, Counseling, Career, Academic)
Office (IMPACT, Eagle Eye, WEGL, Student Pub., Plainsman)

This site has a lot of merit and utilizes new, existing and renovated spaces. The site is part of the historical circulation of the university and sits within its core. The possible reprogramming of Foy for short-term transition and eventual removal provides for a valuable redevelopment site in the heart of the campus. The utilization of the bookstore in Haley relives a large part of the student program for new construction and a modified façade on Haley enhances the character and image of Auburn. The need to renovate or remove Cater Hall, provides for the redevelopment of the forecourt and park along Thatch. A four-cornered village could be facilitated at the current concourse Foy and Cater Hall.
The site is already part of the highest traffic counts in student circulation and would be the intersection of the proposed north/south and east/west transit lines. This site can accommodate the proposed program for the student village. The ballroom requirement could be facilitated in the reprogrammed Foy site.

**Site C- Haley Concourse Site**

Currently this site consists of the concourse the Child Study Center, Clayton House and the Home Management Duplex as well as the parking lot south of Haley.

**New Construction Program**

Food Services  
Copy Center  
Assigned Retail  
ATM  
Mail Services  
ID Office/Tiger Card  
Billiards/Games  
Computer Lab/Lounge  
Office (SGA, Univ. Program Council, Int’l Student Org., Greek Life)  
Office (Black Student Union, Student Org. Mail boxes, Multicultural affairs)  
Office Union Administration  
Student Services  
Office Student Union Advisors  
Bursar’s Office (Cash Control)  
Housekeeping (BOH)

*New student housing has been added to program, 150-200 beds*
Renovation of Foy
Ballroom
Conference
   Meeting rooms
Exhibit Gallery/Storage
Success Center (Freshman, Counseling, Career, Academic)
Office (IMPACT, Eagle Eye, WEGL, Student Pub., Plainsman)

The site could also include Cater Hall and the forecourt park. This site is the current primary circulation path of the campus. The proposed use would include a series of small façade building fronting Haley to address the character and image of Auburn criteria. Removal of the three building on the east of the concourse and replacing them with retail and housing to complement the adjacent quad facilities. Utilization of the topography to the south of Haley with structured parking and large student assembly space. The site could not accommodate the proposed ballroom facility, however a reprogrammed Foy site could accommodate such a use and is adjacent.
Student Village Proposed Phasing Scenario

Phase I
Closure of Thach from Ross Square, through Donahue. Upon completion of west lots close Donahue as seen in the figure below. Demolish and remove the Dawson Police building and Physiology Building.

Phase II
Develop the site for the student administration building on the site of Dawson and Physiology Building.

Concurrently site work could begin for student village residence buildings 1 and 2. As suggested in this report, a private developer could be approached to develop these two sites.

Phase III
Install transit line between Ross Square and West parking lots through Student Village Square. Install East/ West Utilidoor.

Phase IV
Open student administration building, resident building 1 & 2 and East/West Transit Line.
3.1.3 Service and Distribution

Current Scenario
Upon preliminary review of Auburn University’s campus, an immediate observation is made regarding servicing of the facilities in the Academic Core, particularly along Thach Avenue, which, due to the delivery of product to the existing Foy Center, becomes a service alley. At any particular time, the street can contain some 4000 students changing classes, as many as 6 transit buses, delivery vehicles, including 18 wheeled semi-tractor trailers, and numerous passenger vehicles. As a by-product of the wide scope of vehicles currently used to service the campus, facility requirements such as service drives, service yards and compactor requirements invade the pedestrian spaces around most of the Academic Core facilities.

Locations and requirements for facilities are entirely dependent on the joint adoption of a Service and Distribution philosophy. Currently, facilities are planned to accept product in a vast array of delivery systems. This current practice requires that service drives and yards be designed to accommodate large delivery and service trucks which severely impact building locations, siting and adjacencies to primary and secondary roadways.

Recommendations
IDEA is recommending that a distribution philosophy be established to limit the access of delivery vehicles both in size and schedule. Should the University adopt such a philosophy, in conjunction with pedestrianization of the campus, a much improved campus environment will be established, consistent with the Image and Character of the University.

Service Recommendations
The University must adopt a service philosophy which restricts the size and scope of service vehicles, allows for recapturing landscape and pedestrian spaces around existing facilities and provides for more efficient planning of new facilities.
Further Service Recommendations

The service philosophy also impacts the operations of the University outside the physical realities of planning. The University must re-evaluate current practices in all aspects of service to the University. A primary concern expressed by stakeholder groups was the consideration of a 24-hour clock. As with any major university, maintenance and service must take a back seat to the primary mission of the institution which is education. Current practice integrates many of the service, maintenance and delivery systems within the same 8-hour clock as student classes. The conflicts and disruptions are obvious and add to the chaos already present on a university campus.

Action: The University must also re-write its policies and procedures to accommodate the new service and delivery philosophy. “On time delivery” can be accomplished, but requires a much more precise set of policies and procedures for procurement and off-site storage.

Distribution Recommendations

The distribution philosophy for Auburn University is a key to the preservation of the Image and Character. Current practice, as outlined in the services comments, is highly disruptive to the campus environment in a physical and psychological sense. In the physical sense, the presence of service and delivery vehicles in a pedestrian path are unacceptable, especially with the time constraints facing the pedestrians. The emotional and psychological sense is disrupted in the noise and danger encountered in what should be the “downtime” for the pedestrian. The tension and stress created by the chaotic experience of moving from place to place is not consistent with the Image and Character of Auburn. During the class day, distribution and service should not occur in common practice, however, when it must occur, it should do so within a controlled or restricted approach.
The University should institute a 24-hour service clock and restrict deliveries and service to non-academic time frames. This policy should strictly define the times at which delivery and service should occur. Location of storage and warehouse space must also be identified.

The University should also plan for and provide a central receiving and distribution center for campus-wide use. The adoption of a distribution and service program will also require an established motor pool of delivery vehicles and training programs for its personnel.

**Guidelines**

All service areas shall be designed and located so as to be unobtrusive and architecturally integrated into the building’s overall design. All infrastructures, pipes, equipment, and other mechanical equipment shall be disguised or camouflaged to ensure unique and visually appealing buildings and projects.

- Service, delivery and dumpster areas shall be located to minimize visibility from adjacent streets and adjacent sites.
- Service, delivery and dumpster areas shall be located at the rear or side of the building and substantially screened with masonry walls and opaque landscape.
- No long-term storage containers, compactors or dumpsters will be located on parcel expect within fully screened masonry enclosures designed for that purpose.

**Miscellaneous Site Facilities**

- No outside, freestanding vending machines, video games, propane stations, electric rides, newspaper boxes or similar equipment shall be permitted, unless substantially screened from view from adjacent roads or parking areas.
- No outside display of products of any kind shall be permitted, unless substantially screened within an enclosure.
- No outside work areas shall be permitted, unless substantially screened from view.
Criteria and Planning Philosophy for Service and Distribution

The accommodation of service and distribution functions should occur in a way that protects the pedestrian/open space environment and reduces the proliferation of service/receiving areas on the campus. At the same time, all campus facilities need to have suitable service access for day-to-day delivery of materials and equipment, building maintenance and repair, and disposition of refuse. Suitable access includes adequate maneuvering and parking room for trucks and service vehicles, which will vary with the needs of the building or facility being served.

To accomplish these ends, the following goals are recommended:

• The number and size of trucks providing delivery and service to buildings in the academic core of the campus should be limited to the extent possible. Large semi-trailers delivering to individual buildings should be avoided, except for special circumstances, by off-loading such vehicles at a central receiving area outside of the core. Vendor deliveries should be limited to schedules as much as possible.

• Multiple buildings should be served from a single or common court wherever possible, rather than having individual service courts and service drives to each building. An example of where common service courts currently exist is in the service area east of Chemistry 1, which serves several buildings.

• Service access drives should avoid traversing major pedestrian open spaces as much as possible. In the circumstances where service vehicle use of pedestrian pathways cannot be avoided, those pathways should be sufficiently wide and have raised or protected edges to avoid compaction of adjacent green areas, and should be designed so that service use is clearly subordinated to pedestrian use.
• Service/delivery courts adjacent to major pedestrian spaces and passages should be contained and screened by walls, planting and building edges to avoid both functional and visual interference with pedestrian areas. An example of such containment is the service area between the Library and the Library Parking Deck. Often, the visual obtrusiveness of minor service areas, such as at dormitories, can be visually mitigated simply by the careful placement and screening of objects such as dumpsters, and proper curbing and bollarding of the paved surface to prevent compaction of adjacent green areas.
3.1.4 Parking, Traffic & Circulation

Planning Philosophy
The University must adopt a parking and traffic circulation philosophy as a major initiative. Parking challenges for institutions are always present as the academic facilities are pedestrian in nature. In Auburn’s case, the lack of a defined parking philosophy and commitment to transit has left the campus prone to infill parking lots. As is evidenced by the current campus, parking has occurred in every available space accessed by any means possible. Some access crosses sidewalks, grass medians, and in some cases, lawns. The problem is further complicated by “Game Day” traditions which are addressed later in this section of the report.

Primary Academic Campus Parking Description
Primary Academic Campus parking is an important issue to address as the Core Academic Campus grows and a pedestrianization process begins. Currently, the only quality academic parking, in the core area of campus, is the Draughon Library parking structure. The Draughon structure is an excellent example of the quality needed to address the Image and Character of the University. The materials used, design of façade and use of landscape create a comfortable solution to a parking structure. Future pedestrianization of Thach, and interior parking spaces immediately adjacent to core structures, will have a major impact on core parking. It is suggested that parking structures be considered as future vehicular access to the core is restricted. Location for such parking structures is adjacent to Jordan Hare Stadium, on what is known as the Petrie site, as well as the excavated parking currently being used south of Haley. Both sites will facilitate more than adequate parking for the core. The proposed transit system, both, north/south and east/west, will pass both of these proposed parking structures and will connect all pedestrian pathways.
Secondary Academic Campus Parking Description
Secondary Academic Campus parking includes special access parking and ADA requirements. Current examples include the limited administration lot off Thach, adjacent to Samford Hall, Ross Square, and the Cater Hall forecourt. In future planning exercises, several sites should be identified for the establishment of these special parking rooms. They should be located so as not to allow vehicular traffic to cross primary pedestrian routes and they must be accessed by primary or secondary roads. An example would be limited access into the future-planned engineering precinct, via Magnolia on Wilmore Drive and Engineering Drive. Limited access to Haley, via Duncan Drive, could remain as primary parking structures could be planned on the existing Petrie and Haley surface lots. Other limited access, or secondary lots, may be located in Ag Hill on Samford Drive and to the new development site currently occupied by Parker, Saunders and Allison, via Duncan south of Roosevelt.

Primary Perimeter Parking Lots Description
Primary perimeter parking lots are already being established to the west and accommodate a substantial amount of the commuter traffic. Establishing additional locations along the campus perimeter to accommodate additional lots similar to those on the West Thach location would be a sound planning strategy. Long-range planning and substantial growth in commuter traffic may also make necessary the development of the west surface lots into structured parking facilities.

Secondary Perimeter Parking Lots Description
The University currently provides for secondary parking along primary and secondary roadways. Dependent on the introduction of additional bike lanes and pedestrian pathways, parallel parking options may be diminished. However, a similar parking strategy may be employed by identifying smaller parking rooms adjacent to perimeter roadways and connected with a transit system link, wheeled bus or tram. Proposed
pedestrian walks will also be used to link perimeter lots to primary pedestrian pathways. Secondary lots should not, however, be planned in random patterns, but should be consistent in size and configuration as part of a campus-wide parking room standard.

**Recommendation**

IDEA recommends that the University adopt a strict parking philosophy. This philosophy must be accompanied by a series of other decisions including, but not limited to, a pedestrianization policy, a transit policy and acceptance of structured parking as an acceptable solution.

**Game Day Parking**

**Tradition Defined**

The time-honored tradition of tailgating should be allowed to continue, but within reasonable guidelines which do not diminish or damage the Image and Character of the University. Through a phased program, the University can develop a series of “Game Day” parking rooms with AC/Water hook-up to enhance the tailgating experience.

**Recommendation**

Establish a “Game Day” parking plan, as part of the University’s parking philosophy. The University must develop and provide a more appealing tailgating environment than what is presently accommodated within the campus landscape. Develop an infrastructure plan for AC/Water hook-up and define pedestrian walks.

**Guidelines**

- All commercial parking and loading areas shall be designed and located so as to ensure visually appealing locations while protecting adjacent properties from any adverse impact and noise.
- Overnight parking of commercial vehicles, tractor-trailers,
boats, recreational vehicles, campers or motor homes shall be prohibited within parking lots not specifically designed for that purpose.

• No commercial vehicle, with signage placed thereon, shall be parked in a manner along public roadways to be visible as an advertising device.

• No commercial or recreational vehicle shall be parked in areas, except those specifically planned for such purpose.

• The design of on-site walkways and sidewalks shall provide for safe and efficient pedestrian access. At a minimum, this shall consist of a 6-foot wide concrete or brick paver sidewalk.

• Sidewalks shall be built along all public streets to facilitate direct pedestrian connections from surrounding buildings and adjacent parking lots. These shall be 6-feet wide, located between the curb of all adjacent roadways and the backside of the landscape buffer.

• Each location shall provide a seating area for pedestrians along the portion of sidewalk which fronts the site. The surface of the seating area shall be constructed of concrete or decorative pavers. A bench and trash receptacles shall be provided at these seating areas.

• Benches and trash receptacles shall be provided and located at the entrance to each building and within pedestrian areas situated along the main façade of buildings.

• Potable water and A/C hook-ups are to be provided to a minimum number of sites, as prescribed by the CPC.

• A limited number of shade structures and picnic tables are to be provided in “islands” of landscape as prescribed by the CPC.
3.1.5 Transit System

Define
IDEA is recommending that a transit approach be sought which aligns with the Auburn Image and Character. An authentic streetcar system (cable or electric) and/or a hidden guide-way system (navigation technology) should be incorporated in the master planning efforts. The existing topography creates an ideal setting for a hop-on, hop-off system similar to the city of San Francisco. A two-line system easily fits within the existing infrastructure of the campus roadway system and aligns with traditional pedestrian paths.

A proposed transit system could extend west and include the redevelopment of the CDV and the original Draughon Village and as far south as the proposed Poultry Science building.

Recommendations
IDEA is recommending that Auburn University adopt a transit philosophy which will integrate a requirement for a transit system into the campus Master Plan. Based on the study conducted and findings from the Phase II report, a transit line will allow the University to adopt and implement a series of philosophies, which in total, greatly enhances the Image and Character of the University.

The following issues are addressed once the University accepts a transit plan in principle. In the first instance, the campus can become pedestrianized and the campus again becomes an ideal setting for the Auburn experience. The second major benefit is that parking issues become much more defined and alternative parking strategies can be implemented, which in turn recaptures landscape for improving the Academic Core environment.

Guidelines
• Bicycle and Transit Facilities - Individual locations shall create
a safe, enjoyable environment for pedestrians, motorists and cyclists and shall encourage transit ridership.

- All locations shall accommodate bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Bicycle racks shall be provided on each site, at or near building entrances.
- If determined to be necessary by the University, major buildings and facilities shall designate access points and pick-up areas on-site.
- Transit stops, located adjacent to a site, shall have a direct sidewalk connection to the front entrance of any adjoining building.
Transit and Infrastructure (fig. AU4.0)
As part of the site selection process of the student village concept, a diagram needed to be generated to include future transit and infrastructure. The diagram illustrates, in simple graphic terms, where future transit and infrastructure may be placed. A propose solution for a transit system is a hop-on, hop-off street car system running in two main lines, east-west and north-south. The infrastructure plan illustrates a utilidor concept for future planning purposes.
3.1.6 Campus Landscape Plan

Introduction
Auburn University’s Image and Character is greatly influenced by a pervasive sense of natural green space. Unfortunately, the University has employed a passive landscape philosophy, one that has no defined requirements or minimum standards. The University’s current passive philosophy of simply maintaining current conditions, not for embellishment and improvement of the environment, is taking its toll on the physical landscape. As a formidable Land-grant Institution with a steeped tradition of agriculture, land planning and landscape architecture, it is unacceptable not to practice the craft about which you teach. Auburn is in a unique position to create and present one of the country’s finest landscaped universities utilizing many of its own resources.

The Campus Planning Committee must also adopt a strong set of criteria for new construction with a requirement of not accepting landscape plans which do not meet the minimum criteria of material and specimen specifications. Current practice has shown that projects are executed with no landscape plan and without minimum requirements on specifications. Several projects underway are utilizing the smallest specimens and minimalist materials available.

Recommendation
IDEA strongly recommends that the University adopt a landscape philosophy that reflects the Image and Character of Auburn. The University must also commission a landscape and planting plan with strict guidelines and specifications for implementation and maintenance.
I. **Landscape & Hardscape Guidelines**

   A. Compliance with adopted Campus Master Plan
      1. Definition of landscape and hardscape elements
      2. “Brand Image” relevance as design guide
   B. Utilization of existing site features
      1. Topography, views and vistas
      2. Existing trees and “character” shrubs and ground covers
      3. Campus landmarks and historical sites
      4. Existing relevant campus spatial organization
   C. Pedestrian use areas
      1. Pedestrian “outdoor room” design
      2. Pedestrian circulation design
   D. Vehicular use areas
      1. Streetscape design
      2. Parking area design
      3. Bikeway design
      4. Trolley corridor design
      5. Service drives and loading areas
   E. Infrastructure improvements
      1. Location requirements for site infrastructure
      2. Screens and buffers
3.1.7 Implementation Strategy

Process
Recognizing the need to protect and enhance the Image and Character of Auburn University by establishing guidelines is only part of a much more in-depth process. The University must establish a specific process which the University and prospective professional service firms follow to govern the future development of the campus. The maturity of the University and its staff, administration and Board of Trustees will be challenged in the day-to-day practice of these established guidelines. It is almost second nature for a consultant or professional services firm to seek its signature on a project. It is the responsibility of the stakeholder groups, using the guidelines as tools, to ensure the signature also is aligned with that of the University. These guidelines are not intended to, nor should they be used to prevent creative design solutions from being pursued, but only to ensure the pursuit is aligned with “Auburn’s Image and Character.”

All professional firms practice a series of processes tailored to their specific strengths or capabilities. The University, however, is encouraged to outline a process unique to Auburn and its needs, particularly as it pertains to the unique attributes of the Auburn campus. Recognizing that each firm’s approach may be sound, does not ensure that all aspects of the Auburn equities are considered. The University, as an institution, needs to outline, for each prospective firm, the “Auburn process.” This process will ensure that all issues important to the Auburn stakeholders are considered. This consistent process will also ensure that the University staff has a consistent measurement of how a firm is progressing in following the prescribed guidelines. With the current and future workload, the University staff cannot be expected to learn and manage many different processes from the wide variety of firms to be engaged over the next several years. We highly suggest that a precise process be recommended by the University and adopted by the Board of Trustees.
An example of a protocol (process) for master planning, that may be modified with Image and Character emphasis for use, was supplied by Sasaki and is herewith enclosed as an example:

**Illustrative Protocol for Campus Master Plan**

**Synopsis of Work Phases**

**A. Inventory and Analysis/Program Assessment**
During the initial phase, we conduct a site and facilities’ recognizance and data review. Then, we prepare an analysis of program and facilities’ needs, significant constraints and opportunities and identification of primary issues to be addressed/resolved in the planning process. This phase is initiated with a work session in which we conduct extensive interviews on goals and needs, as well as a field recognizance. The results of this phase, documented in an Inventory/Issue report, are reviewed in a second work session, which is also used to establish directions for the concept phase of the work. We identify, with the University, a general projection of space needs for the next ten to twenty years to be used as a test of site capacity. The intent is to confirm that we have, with the University, mutual understanding of the issues and needs and to convey our independent assessment of the campus. The information assembled during this phase is documented as a series of topical, inventory briefs and as a summary issues paper.

IDEA would recommend a modification to this protocol item:

_A. Our recommendation would be that the firm read and understand the Auburn Image and Character reference book. Then, based on review of these documents, incorporate and adopt the personality and character of Auburn as part of their results’ report. The protocol, as written, does not emphasize the value the University places on its unique attributes, but focuses on the facility program and needs._
B. Concept Alternatives and Siting Strategies

The second phase is based on a thorough exchange of alternative conceptual ideas as to the shape that the campus plan should take. This phase is typically made up of comparative evaluation of alternative conceptual plans. It should be a period of open dialogue and options. This phase tests program models in a comparative way. The intent of the phase is to reach a consensus on the plan and program at a conceptual level. To the extent that siting and accommodation of priority projects or actions will require near-term decisions, this phase can also focus on how those accommodations should be made. This phase consists of two work sessions for the review of each of the steps outlined above. The second of the two work sessions should be regarded as the opportunity to forge a clear consensus on the substance of the plan. Each work session is preceded by the transmittal of alternative concept plan studies, with comparative assessments of the concepts by our firm.

IDEA would recommend a modification to this protocol item:

B. In order to save time, “work smarter” and be more productive, we recommend that the firm conducting the work propose only those conceptual plans which meet the earlier reviewed guidelines of Auburn’s Image and Character. The modification we recommend is to place a requirement that “no concept shall be presented that does not meet the prescribed guidelines.” Many will argue that this position will limit creativity, but is actually quite the contrary. Firms, if left to their own devices, may “marry” themselves to a position outside the guidelines prescribed and waste the client’s valuable time and money in pursuit of unacceptable concepts. Following the guidelines, will challenge the firm to seek creative solutions and concepts already accepted in principle and that will not create controversy among the University’s decision makers.

Should the firm follow the prescribed guidelines, IDEA recommends the following protocol item be modified as follows:

C. Concept Refinement may be extremely limited in scope, or may be omitted all together.
C. Concept Refinement
The third phase entails the refinement of the concept, deemed as meriting further development and detail, as a result of the alternatives evaluation described above. In addition to advancing the near-term and long-term conceptual framework for the plan, this phase also outlines campus design guidelines and confirms the projected program of facilities’ improvements as the basis for the final plan. The work is usually subject to an interim technical review and work session, at the end of the phase, to verify the final concept.

*IDEA would recommend that the University use this particular phase as an opportunity to add value to the concepts selected, challenge the details and “push the envelope.” Many times, clients tend to accept the content of concepts as presented and not expand on a new idea due to time and fee constraints. Although the technical review for accuracy and viability is important, the conceptual content will “make or break” a project. “Challenge the concept now, not a later stage.”*

D. Master Plan Development
The final phase consists of refining and detailing the plan. The steps to accomplish the work include the preparation of a series of draft chapters that describe the plan on a topical basis, followed by the preparation of the composite master plan report and associated graphic materials. The topical elements usually included are space use, land use and priority siting, landscaping/lighting/graphics, circulation/parking, utilities, design guidelines and implementation strategies (phasing, capital costs, acquisitions/depositions, etc.). Additional or different, categories can be determined at the outset of the planning process or during the final phase. The intent is to formulate a plan with a clear vision, with respect to the organization and coherence of the campus, and to document the practical steps that would have to be undertaken to implement the plan. This phase typically consists of two work sessions. Open forums and meetings with user groups, would be conducted as necessary.
IDEA will recommend that a specific set of deliverables be established for this phase. This consistent list of deliverables assists the University stakeholders in several key ways. First and foremost, it assists the University staff in clearly understanding the scope of work to be performed and it establishes a comfort level between various projects relative to what to look for and inquire about. Many different projects, with many different lists of deliverables, leads to confusion regarding what information has and has not been addressed on what project. Having past projects to reflect on while reviewing current projects, sets a test bed of information for a checks and balances system. The second case for such a consistent list is for the benefit of the Board, Administration and Student/Alumni bodies that may not specifically be trained to review professional services. The stakeholder groups need to be involved in the process and, over a period of time, will also gain an appreciation for knowing what to expect in a staff presentation and will become better educated participants. Just as in business models, standards and practices must be established by which a large group of constituents can be enlisted to support the decision-making process. At the current time, it is our observation that final presentations take on so many different forms that no stakeholder group buys in until each is satisfied their specific interests are met. The standards and practices, once established, will speed up the confidence factor and the time required to implement plans.
A Proposed Outline of Work Program

The time durations in parentheses will vary depending on particular deadlines, internal review and responses and the relationships between the plan process and the school calendar.

**Phase A:** Site Recognizance/Program Assessment (Typically Six to Eight Weeks in Duration)

**Deliverables of Phase A**
- Topical Briefs
- Planning Issues Paper (in draft and working form)

**Phase B:**
- **B-1:** Round 1 Alternatives Assessment
- **B-2:** Work Session to Review Round One Alternatives
- **B-3:** Round 2 Alternatives Assessment and Priority Siting Memorandum
- **B-4:** Work Session to Select Preferred Option and Present Preliminary Report

**Deliverables of Phase B**
- Round One Assessment Brief
- Round Two Assessment Brief
- Priority Siting Memorandum

**Phase C:** Concept Refinement (Typically Eight to Ten Weeks in Duration)
- **C-1** Development of Preferred Concept
- **C-2** Final Concept Review Work Session

**Deliverables of Phase C**
- Concept Plan Report
- Preliminary Guidelines
**Phase D:** Master Plan Documentation (Typically Six to Eight Weeks in Duration)

**D-1:** Prepare Draft Master Plan
**D-2:** Work Session to Review Draft Plan
**D-3:** Prepare Final Master Plan Document
**D-4:** Presentation of Final Draft Master Plan

**Deliverables of Phase D**
- Draft Master Plan
- Final Draft Master Plan

**Typical Contents of Master Plan Documentation:**
- Summary of Existing Campus Conditions (taken from analysis in Phase A)
- Goals and Objectives of the Master Plan/Program Priorities
- Land Use/Program Definition (near-term and long-term)

This element will focus on the location, intensity and functional relationship of uses on the campus, including the following:
- Distribution of land and building uses
- Building density
- Short-term and long-term program of facilities
- Acquisition and disposition strategies, if appropriate
- Location of play fields and other outdoor athletic and recreation facilities
- Recommended strategies related to campus historic districts, if appropriate
- Phasing and Staging for systems and facilities to be provided in the short-term program (five to ten years), and the long-term program (20 years +).

**Campus System Plans, as follows:**
- **Pedestrian Circulation** - This element will define the system of walkways, identifying important arrivals, focal points, critical points of grade change and ease of movement. Attention will be given to the needs of the physically impaired.
• **Vehicular Circulation/Parking/Service** - This element will define the layout and characteristics of the vehicular circulation system for the campus, including service access and arrangement and location of parking.

• **Utilities** - This element will define the layout of additional trunk utilities necessary to accommodate new or future development.

• **Conceptual Cost Projections** - This element will consist of estimates of conceptual costs for plan implementation by phase. The estimates will be carried out only for those phases necessary for near-term development. The cost projection will be based on the consultant’s experience, utilizing published unit costs as a basis for estimation.

• **Urban Design/Civic Structure** - This element of the building and open space frameworks to clarify the civic structure of each district and the linkages among districts.

• **Open Space and Landscape Plan** - This element is the delineation of the system of major and minor open spaces, plazas, vistas and other spatial elements to be preserved as the organizing fabric of the campus. The open space/landscape plan will include a vocabulary of planting and site amenities to be provided along campus streets, pedestrian ways in or around principal open spaces and a general vocabulary of lighting and signage.

• **Design Guidelines** - This element will consist of the drawings and documentation necessary to set three-dimensional design criteria for the campus, including relationships between buildings and open spaces, architectural vocabulary (massing, proportions, fenestration, materials, etc.) and the vocabulary of site elements such as planting, lighting, graphics and site furnishings.

An Executive Summary, in a format for broad distribution, is usually prepared as an adjunct to the full master plan report. It identifies key plan features, assumptions and goals, and provides summary narrative and component plan graphics.
3.1.8 Campus Capital Improvements

The University should prepare a Five-Year Campus Capital Improvement Program (CIP) every year, during the annual budgeting process. The CIP is a proposed schedule for the expenditure of funds to acquire or construct improvements needed over the next five-year period. The CIP weighs the University’s capital needs against available funding to assure that the most essential improvements are provided first. The CIP coordinates fiscal and physical planning, allowing maximum benefits from available University funds and helps to provide an equitable distribution of public space improvements throughout the campus.

Each year, a financially feasible CIP is developed from project requests submitted by the various departments and Deans of the University, along with information concerning the financial resources obtained from the Campus Planning Committee. After review by the Campus Planning Committee (CPC), the Provost’s office evaluates the recommended CIP for compliance with the University guidelines. The CPC’s recommendation is then used by the Provost’s office and Executive Vice President to develop the annual budget, which becomes effective on October 1, of each year. The first year of the five-year program is the Capital Budget and the following four years is the CIP.

Once the CIP is adopted by The Board of Trustees, it becomes part of the annual operating and capital budget. The CIP does not commit the University to expenditures and appropriations beyond the first year, except for capital improvements needed to meet adopted level of service standards. The ultimate decision concerning the funding of an individual project rests with the Board of Trustees, after they consider available financial resources, critical need and competing priorities.

The following campus-wide projects are included in the Uni-
versity’s adopted CIP and may be a source of funding for projects identified by The Campus Planning Committee during the Neighborhood Horizons process:

- Sidewalk Repair- Continuously inspect and repair locations that need repair.
- Sidewalk Program- In coordination with the CPC, identify pedestrian/ bike routes for children going to school and construct sidewalks and bike paths where appropriate.
- Transit Stop Deficiencies- Construct brick/concrete pads, sidewalk connections, pedestrian bridges, etc., based on ridership data provided by transportation and guidelines.
- Intersection Safety Improvements- Ongoing project to modify, as necessary, existing signal installations to improve safety and traffic flow.
- Pavement Rehabilitation- A campus-wide project to maintain in excess of ___ miles of paved streets. Specific locations and strategies are identified annually, depending on appropriations and roadway surveys.
- Miscellaneous Repairs, Replacement and Upgrade of Sewer Lines-Correct known deficiencies through a program of system rehabilitation and expansion. (These projects often afford the opportunity for associated improvements to landscaping, pavement, lighting, etc.)
- Waterway Enhancement Improvements-Campus-wide project where problems/projects are identified and prioritized on an annual basis using water-flow monitoring data.
- Decorative lighting-Establish a five to ten year program to design, coordinate and install decorative street lighting on residential collector streets or at entrances to neighborhoods. Property owner assessments would be utilized if owners wished to expand on lighting offered by the City.
- Right-of-Way Beautification and Landscape Improvements-This project implements beautification projects to improve the appearance of campus thoroughfares. Future project locations are determined through stakeholder involvement.
- Drainage System Repair and Rehabilitation-A campus-wide project meant to address localized drainage problems caused by
inadequately sized and/or deteriorated storm sewer facilities. Continuous inspection, citizen complaints and routine maintenance reveal problem areas of this nature. Each situation is prioritized, re-engineered and repairs or upgrading are made, as funding is available.

- Bicycle Plan Implementation—Provides a campus-wide signage and facility construction program timed in accordance with phasing outlined in the bicycle plan.
- Traffic Management—This project was established to mitigate traffic impact on neighborhood streets through coordination with neighborhoods. A committee of students/faculty works with CPC staff to study and select, by discussion, measures to mitigate traffic impacts. Projects are coordinated with the University and the City of Auburn to ensure efficient implementation and to maximize cooperation.
- Curb Ramps—Continuously inspect and reconstruct curb ramps according to ADA requirements.
- Pavement marking and Signage upgrade—Continuously inspect critical traffic signage, pavement marking and raised reflective markers.

Criteria and Planning Philosophy for Infrastructure

Campus infrastructure is made up of utility distribution and collection systems, plant generation capability, and management of systems such as traffic, parking, storm water, information technology and building environments. The environment and operations of the University depend on the capacity and integrity of the infrastructure systems. The fundamental planning goal is to ensure that infrastructure capability is sustained in conjunction with any growth and change that is planned by the University. This assurance can take several forms as a planning philosophy:

- **Being Able to Predict Regional Capacity and Sources**
  Where the University is dependent on outside regional infrastructure sources (electrical power, gas/coal/oil, telecommunications, potable water, sanitary sewage, etc.),
it is critical to monitor and predict the capacity of those systems and establish back-up options for disruptions in the supply of infrastructure resources.

- **Projecting Facilities and Population Growth Demands so as to Determine Residual Infrastructure Needs**
  Notwithstanding that campus growth is contingent on unpredictable factors, the University should target likely or desired changes in enrollment, employees, research activity, visitors, building space and land absorption in five, ten and twenty-year horizons in order to project infrastructure demand (utility systems, traffic generation, etc.). Projected demand should be compared with existing capacity to determine the residual expansion in capacity necessary to serve the growth targets.

- **Maintaining a Compact, Efficient Development Pattern so as to Avoid Costly Extensions of Utility Systems**
  Campus “sprawl” is costly and inefficient in its demand for utility extensions, particularly if growth “leapfrogs” into outlying areas of the campus. Development patterns should give priority to suitable “infill” sites and to growth at campus edges that can be served by efficient, incremental extension of utilities.

- **Making Allowances for “Land-Extensive” Infrastructure**
  Certain elements of campus infrastructure - particularly transportation, parking and storm water management - require extensive land area. Planning for future campus development requires not only that sufficient land is apportioned to those needs, but that the land is configured and located in such a way that it enhances the character and function of the campus. Obvious examples are the removal of parking from key pedestrian spaces and the introduction of natural landscape into the fabric of the campus to mitigate storm water flow.

- **Locating Facilities and Utility Systems to Avoid Costly**
Disruptions in Utility Patterns
There are two sides to this undertaking as a planning philosophy. First is to consolidate major utilities as much as possible in street or open space corridors where future building development will be precluded and where utility access can be maintained. The layout of future development areas should include protected utility rights-of-way. The second consideration is to make a critical assessment of the utility impacts as future building sites are identified. The assessment should consider whether the incremental costs of utility replacements are prohibitive relative to the scale of the project and whether the project creates the opportunity to improve and rationalize the utilities systems in the site area.

• Projecting and Organizing Infrastructure as a Sustainable System
Conservation of infrastructure resources will be a critical factor in the University’s fiscal accountability to its constituencies. Planning for each utility/infrastructure system should incorporate strategies for conservation. Examples could include: renewable on site energy sources to augment power supply; energy performance criteria for building construction; mechanical systems and equipment; gray water recapture for irrigation, operational methods to reduce vehicle use and parking demand; and so on.
3.1.9 Joint Venture Opportunities

Current Conditions
Currently, a trend exists for universities to look to outside resources to develop facilities for use by the institution. Corporate campuses, urban campuses and most recently, student housing, have all successfully been developed in joint ventures between universities and private development.

Auburn University should adopt a policy to actively include, as part of a master plan, the ability to create “out parcels” as possible sites for joint ventures.

Recommendations
Based on the finding in this report and recommendations derived there of, opportunities exist for several joint ventures:
- Student Housing - A current trend in university developed resident housing includes a strategy of limiting capital requirements by land leases to developers and then in turn signing a management agreement.
- Conference Center/Assembly Halls with meeting rooms and office space have long been candidates for such joint ventures. Auburn has similar experience with its own conference center hotel complex.
- Parking structures have also been seen as viable joint venture opportunities to leverage the capital costs of such facilities.
- Transit Systems have traditionally been public/private joint ventures. In the recommendations made by IDEA in this report, all 4 previously mentioned opportunities currently exist and may assist the University in capitalizing on developers’ ability to sell bonds. Through management contracts, Auburn would maintain control of these investments with little or no capital requirement.
Guidelines

• Out-parcels and individual project sites shall be designed to establish a coordinated pattern of use with buildings that inter-relate and create a sense of master planned development within the campus master plan.

• All out-parcels shall be connected to the main development tract and interconnected with each other and adjoining parcels for vehicular/pedestrian travel.

• No more than two out-parcels within the same planned project shall abut each other along primary or secondary street frontages.

• No out-parcel lot shall be less than one acre in size.
3.1.10 Additional Housing

Introduction
During the workshops conducted in the fall of 2000, IDEA identified strong opinions from stakeholders about the atmosphere of the Auburn Campus. The atmosphere being described was one of hospitality, community and a friendly walking campus. These traits are also common in small communities and neighborhoods where families live work and play in close proximity to each other. Casual observation of Auburn's campus seems not to mirror these traits beyond the traditional class hours. The campus population vanishes late in the day and through out the weekend. The campus more closely resembles a commuter campus rather than a student resident campus. Following these observations and during the development of the campus guidelines and recommendations study Student housing began to be a critical factor in re-establishing Auburn's traditional image and character.

Auburn University (AU) does not have an adopted or official plan for its campus housing, either strategic or tactical. Generally speaking, AU considers itself to be a four-year major research and teaching institution. AU is also considered by many to be a “residential campus.” But defining what qualifies a campus as residential has never been explicitly addressed, either by the AU Board or the Senior Administration. It is generally thought that a resident campus should house 20-25% of the undergraduate student population and specifically house a majority of the incoming freshmen class. In Auburn’s case only some 5% of undergraduate students are housed on campus and almost no freshmen men.

As of Fall 2001, AU main campus, at our usual full-occupancy level will accommodate only 17% of the estimated 18,500 undergraduates, specifically 1,477 on the Hill, 940 in the Quad, 260 in Extension, 89 in Noble, and 400 in CDV, totaling 3,166. (We have approximately an additional
140 graduates and graduate families residing in CDV units.)
Regrettably, a sizeable portion of the undergraduate beds, are in two residential areas that urgently need extensive and costly renovation or, more appropriately, replacement. Noble Hall was built in the 1930s and the Carolyn Draughon Village apartments were built in 1959.

**Recommendations**
IDEA is recommending that as part of preserving and enhancing Auburns long term Image and Character, student housing should be seen as a University priority. Further, AU’s current housing management supports a new campus housing initiative. This initiative is to aggressively construct new contemporary planned and programmed undergraduate student housing. At a minimum, 600 beds need to be built immediately to address currently poor housing accommodations on campus (Noble Hall and CDV). Noble Hall will lend itself well into a conversion of 90 individual professional offices. Further to the initiative we would recommend to build new on-campus housing facilities for 1,000 undergraduates over the next several years. IDEA is also recommending that the University pursue options of joint venture development of the proposed student housing as a viable and prudent economic alternative to self-funding student housing.

Such an initiate would enable Housing to better accommodate most of the incoming Freshman class. Presently, 65% of the incoming freshman classes are unable to obtain on-campus accommodations.

**AU Housing proposes (Years 1-3)**
Seek authorization with creative financing to construct new residential spaces (Minimum 600 - Maximum 1000) to house undergraduates. Upon completion and occupancy we would abandon use of Noble Hall (90 beds) and the old Carolyn
Draughon Village (approx. 500 beds). The net gain in beds would vary, dependent on the final new construction number. The primary objective is to ultimately accommodate up to 25% of the undergraduate population, strengthen AU as a truly “residential campus”. Please note: such a plan would free Noble for potential conversion to 90 individual faculty office spaces, conveniently located between the Engineering precinct and the Business precinct.

**AU Housing proposes (Years 5-10)**

A needed full-scale renovation of the CDV extension (262 spaces). IDEA would recommend redevelopment to produce a higher yield from the existing site and provide some 500+ beds) with a joint venture partner. This redevelopment would take the complex out of service for one academic year. A much needed renovation of the Hill Residence Halls done in six phases (taking 15 months each with two phases overlapping in the summer months). No more than 220 beds would be out of service for any one academic year.

**AU Housing proposes (Years 1-3)**

Add bantam kiosks around campus to make dining options more accessible to campus student/faculty/staff. Areas of consideration include the 1st floor, south end of Haley Center; Dudley Commons; an Ag Hill location; Business Building; Coliseum area; and certainly something convenient in the new residential facility. IDEA agrees with the addition of convenient food and beverage locations integrated into the student life activities of the campus. Currently the interior décor and environment is not conducive to the current life style of students at Auburn. The dinning programs should be reviewed in totality and brought up to date with current trends in food and beverage options.
AU Housing proposing (Years 4-8)
With the opening of any new student center/union complex we would concurrently develop and open therein several dining venues/concepts, probably served by one kitchen/preparation area. Space for this initiative is already included in the new union “Facility Program.”

Retail and Bookstore (Years 1-5)
Relocation or redevelopment of the existing bookstore, with any new student center.
3.2 Image & Character Guidelines

“Brand image” relevance to future campus planning
  • Branding context defined
  • Future planning impacts of strong brand identification

Criteria for Land Use
  • Compliance with adopted Land Use Plan

Criteria for campus “Architectural Fabric”
  • Definition of “architectural fabric”
  • Defining the infill building lot
  • Floor area ratio (FAR) requirements
  • Impervious surface ratio (ISR) requirements
  • Building height requirements
  • Setback and building open space requirements
  • Facade articulation requirements
  • Arcade and breezeway requirements

Criteria for campus open space
  • Utilization of existing site features
    ◦ Topography, views and vistas
    ◦ Existing vegetation/ park-like open spaces
    ◦ Campus landmarks and historical sites
    ◦ Existing relevant campus spatial organization
  • “Outdoor room” and gathering space locations defined
    ◦ Categories of “outdoor rooms” established by use
    ◦ Master inventory and program list developed
    ◦ Campus-wide location map prepared

Criteria for circulation and parking for pedestrian use areas
  • Development of campus-wide pedestrian master plan including:
    ◦ Circulation linkages and easements defined
    ◦ Hierarchy established for pedestrian circulation needs

Criteria for circulation and parking for vehicular use areas
  • Development of campus-wide transportation master plan including:
    ◦ Circulation linkages and easements defined
    ◦ Hierarchy established for vehicular circulation needs
• Identification of proposed street closures
• Structured and surface parking areas defined
• Campus-wide bikeway master plan developed
• Mass transit (trolley) routes and stops identified

Criteria for Community Functions
• Program development of campus community functions
• Identification of site locations for community function interaction

Criteria for the Environment
• Inventory of existing natural features
• Identification of active and passive uses in natural feature areas
• Development of master plan showing natural feature use areas including:
  • Trail system linkages and easements
  • Parking areas defined
  • Active and passive use areas identified
  • Land management plan defined
  • Development of campus-wide future reforestation plan

Criteria for Campus Infrastructure
• Inventory of existing campus infrastructure
• Development of campus-wide infrastructure master plan including:
  • Campus utilidor program with locations determined
  • Future sanitary sewer needs with easements located
  • Future utilities needs with easements located
  • Future storm water needs with easements located
4. Architectural Image & Character Guidelines
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Architectural Style
As stated earlier, Neo-Classical variants dominate the campus landscape. The predominance of this style is responsible for the Auburn campus’ scale. The Neo-Classical predominance also contributes to the cohesive fabric of the campus.

Similarities of Scale, Massing, Proportion, Materials and Relationship to Site are significant features that unify the campus in the Neo-Classical tradition.

Based on IDEA’s extensive research, we believe the vocabulary of this Neo-Classic language reflects Auburn’s Image and Character. It is with this vocabulary that we have formulated the following guidelines.

Scale
Academic and residential buildings should be rectilinear, with an average width to depth ratio of 4:1. Height should be limited to no more than three stories. Buildings should have a clearly delineated base, body and cap.

The Base should be delineated by either a brick or rusticated stone foundation, or a clearly articulated water table of brick or limestone with a projecting brick foundation. Either technique provides a strong, stable base on which the body rests.

The Body should be rendered so as to distinguish it from the base; brick is most appropriate for this purpose. Limestone or brick rusticated quoins strengthen the building corners, or corners of projecting pavilions or ells. A belt or stringcourse may divide the ground floor from the upper floors.

The Cap should be a hip roof, a gable roof or combination of the two.
**Massing**
Symmetrical composition of building mass is preferred. The use of gabled or pedimented projecting pavilions, ells, central porticos or combinations of the three achieves the necessary formality while reducing large structures to a more human scale. Important buildings may be further emphasized through the use of cupolas, domes, attic stories and similar elements. Although symmetrical building composition is preferred, asymmetrical composition is not unacceptable (example: the original M.W. Smith Hall).

**Proportion**
Buildings should be long and narrow, with a width to depth ratio of 3, 4 or 5:1. Height should be limited to three or four stories with a foundation level. Subtle visual emphasis should be given to the main or ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing and greater floor-to-floor height on this level; detailing features designed to alter the perceived scale may be employed in lieu of an actual dimensional change. Buildings should employ a clearly delineated base, body and cap.
Materials

In order to ensure a cohesive campus fabric and to assist in the preservation of the established human scale, we recommend the use of brick and limestone for facades, and for roofs: slate, asphalt shingles or metal standing seam.

Brick, coursed in Flemish bond of alternating dark burned half bricks with “Auburn red” full bricks with white mortar is preferred, especially for buildings of particular significance. However, English bond is the most common coursing on campus buildings and is therefore acceptable.

Brick or limestone is acceptable for a rusticated or projecting foundation, quoins on building corners and corners of projecting pavilions or ells and on articulated water tables. Limestone is preferred for horizontal details dividing floors, but an articulated stringcourse is also acceptable.

Limestone is preferred for entrance details and surrounds: window lintels, sills, keystones and details, friezes, cornices and roof details; however, brick is acceptable.

Limestone is preferred for pilasters and portico columns and details; however, brick is acceptable.

Brick, limestone and ceramic or terra cotta tile are acceptable for articulated wall details, cartouches, medallions and other wall, window and door details.
Relationship to Site
A campus plan of today reveals that the placement of buildings without regard for the parameters established by early master-planners results in the loss of quality exterior space. The prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape defines the image and character of Auburn’s built environment.

Architectural Elements

Entrances
Clearly articulated and defined through the use of: an articulated or rusticated surround rendered in limestone or brick; diminutive or monumental portico; pediment, cornice, articulated lintel or frontispiece with pilasters.

Doors
Whether paneled or lighted, doors make an important entry statement. Bottom rails should provide a strong base with side and top rails of a smaller dimension. Style should be compatible with its surround and the style of the building. The use of metal store front doors is not acceptable.

Windows
Sash-type window set in punched openings, clearly articulated and defined through the use of an articulated lintel and/or sill.
Roofs
Hipped or gabled, rendered in slate or standing metal seam.

Roof Details

Cornices
Articulated entablature with projecting cornice, rendered in limestone.

Domes / Cupolas
Recommended for defining significant buildings.

Chimneys
Simple forms rendered in brick.

Lighting
Should be compatible with and reflect the established traditional style of the campus.

Building Graphics
Should be compatible with and reflect the established style of the building, not an afterthought.
Handicapped Accessibility
Wheelchair ramps are an important entry element that should follow the guidelines established for buildings and should be compatible with the building design, not an afterthought.

Free-standing Architectural Elements
Towers should follow the guidelines established for buildings.

Arcades/Breezeways
Column or support elements should have a clearly articulated base, shaft and cap supporting an articulated entablature and projecting cornice, rendered in brick, limestone or wood.

Bus and Trolley Shelters
Should follow the guidelines established for buildings.

ILLUSTRATIONS
NOTE – These standards are conceptual standards indicating design direction intended to preserve and enhance the Image and Character of Auburn University’s Built Environment. Consult the University Department of Building Standards for questions regarding technical specifications and material requirements.
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There is a pervasive sense of natural green at Auburn. Precedents set by early master planners and adopted by university developers stressed a balance between the built and natural environments. Due to the academic and philosophical direction of the university, both formal and natural settings are appropriate depending on proximity to the campus core. Formal Renaissance axial composition is traditionally considered most appropriate for the main campus. Precedents have been set for naturalistic compositions for complexes.

As discussed in the Master Plans general discussion, there are no records of a grand scheme set down by the founders of the university. Attempts to create a landscaping plan came only after accelerating growth forced the need to establish a logical framework for growth. The present campus landscaping loosely follows the philosophy of Frederick Law Olmsted who developed a prototypical layout for land-grant institutions that placed informal building arrangements into semi-rural settings with meandering curvilinear street layouts.

In the 1920’s, schemes provided by the firm of Olmsted’s sons combined the father’s fundamental philosophy with the sons’ formal axial planning, thus setting a precedent for future landscape development. In addition, by this time planners were responding to the impact of the automobile. Its impact on traffic and parking has resulted in the construction of parking decks and extensive student parking lots in the periphery. Landscaping within these areas must respect accepted standards as established by university precedents.

To preserve the sense of natural green at Auburn, a balance between the built environment and the natural environment must be maintained. Due to the academic and philosophical direction of the university, both formal and natural landscaping is appropriate at Auburn, depending on the area-in-question’s
proximity to the campus core; formal axial composition is being most appropriate for the campus core, and less formal landscaping outside of the core. Architectural and landscape details should be of compatible materials and style, reinforcing both the union between the two, and the composition as a whole.

**Recommendations**
IDEA recommends that the Landscape Plan should establish a clear, legible opens space order that connects the various precincts of the campus in a unified way. This should be accomplished by preservation and enhancement of existing signature spaces such as the residence quads, Ross Square, the South College Street forelawns, and the area that contained the Eagle Aviary. It should delineate the open space corridors that will connect major pedestrian open spaces, including well-defined street corridors such as Mell Street and West Thatch Avenue. The plan should identify opportunities for the creation of an “icon” open space that establishes a compelling symbolic identity for Auburn.

IDEA further recommends that the University establish a landscape plan by which to implement and maintain a high quality, natural green environment.
Landscape & Hardscape Guidelines

A. Compliance with adopted Campus Master Plan
   1. Definition of landscape and hardscape elements
   2. “Brand Image” relevance as design guide
B. Utilization of existing site features
   1. Topography, views and vistas
   2. Existing trees and “character” shrubs and ground covers
   3. Campus landmarks and historical sites
   4. Existing relevant campus spatial organization
C. Pedestrian use areas
   1. Pedestrian “outdoor room” design
      a) Defined pedestrian “outdoor room” types
         (1) “Outdoor room” objectives
         (2) Plazas
         (3) Courtyard
         (4) Informal gathering space
         (5) Active and passive green space
   b.) Planting and irrigation criteria
      (1) Planting objectives
      (2) Tree location and canopy requirements
      (3) Decorative and functional planting requirements
      (4) Irrigation requirements
   c) Paving and drainage criteria
      (1) Paving objectives
      (2) Paving materials
      (3) Paving patterns
      (4) General site drainage requirements
   d) Lighting criteria
      (1) Lighting objectives
      (2) Fixture types and materials
      (3) Location and height guidelines
   e) Grading and berming criteria
      (1) Grading and berming objectives
      (2) Grading design requirements
      (3) Berm design parameters
f) Site structures
   (1) Pedestrian gates
   (2) Decorative walls and fences
   (3) Seat walls and seat structures
   (4) Trellises
   (5) Kiosks

g) Screens and buffers
   (1) Screening objectives
   (2) Screen walls and fences
   (3) Planting buffers

h) Site furnishings
   (1) General requirements
   (2) Benches
   (3) Trash receptacles
   (4) Tables and chairs
   (5) Bicycle racks

i) Site signage and graphics
   (1) Signage objectives
   (2) Sign types and scale
   (3) Graphic style
   (4) Sign materials

j) Water features and sculpture
   (1) Objectives and uses
   (2) Locations and scale
   (3) Materials

2. Pedestrian circulation design
a) Defined pedestrian circulation types
   (1) Walkways
   (2) Concourses
   (3) Natural paths

b) Planting and irrigation criteria
   (1) Planting objectives
   (2) Tree location and canopy requirements
   (3) Decorative and functional planting requirements
   (4) Irrigation requirements
c) Paving and drainage criteria
   (1) Walkway paving objectives
   (2) Walkway widths
   (3) Paving materials
   (4) Paving patterns
   (5) General walkway drainage requirements
d) Lighting criteria
   (1) Walkway lighting objectives
   (2) Fixture types and materials
   (3) Location and height guidelines
e) Grading and berming criteria
   (1) Grading and berming objectives
   (2) Grading design requirements
   (3) Berm design parameters
f) Bikeway integration criteria
   (1) Bikeway design objectives
   (2) Bikeway relationship to walkways
g) Screens and buffers
   (1) Walkway screening objectives
   (2) Screen walls and fences
   (3) Planting buffers
h) Site furnishings
   (1) General requirements
   (2) Benches
   (3) Trash receptacles
   (4) Bicycle racks
i) Site signage and graphics
   (1) Signage objectives
   (2) General location guide
   (3) Sign types and scale
   (4) Graphic style
   (5) Sign materials

D. Vehicular use areas
   1. Streetscape design
      a) Defined streetscape easement cross section
         (1) Easement width
         (2) Pavement width and curb requirements
(3) Contiguous walkway width and location criteria
(4) Contiguous bikeway width and location criteria
(5) General easement drainage requirements

b) Streetscape paving and drainage criteria
   (1) Pedestrian crosswalk criteria
   (2) Paving materials
   (3) Paving patterns

c) Streetscape grading and berming criteria
   (1) Grading and berming objectives
   (2) Grading design requirements
   (3) Berm design parameters

d) Streetscape lighting criteria
   (1) Lighting objectives
   (2) Fixture types and materials
   (3) Location and height guidelines

e) Streetscape planting and irrigation criteria
   (1) Planting objectives
   (2) Street trees
   (3) Accent trees
   (4) Decorative plantings

f) Streetscape signage and graphics
   (1) Signage objectives
   (2) General location guide
   (3) Sign types and scale
   (4) Graphic style
   (5) Sign materials

g) Streetscape site furnishings
   (1) General requirements
   (2) Benches
   (3) Trash receptacles
   (4) Bicycle racks

h) Screens and buffers
   (1) Screening objectives
   (2) Screen walls and fences
   (3) Planting buffers
2. Parking area design
   a) Relationship to contiguous buildings
      (1) Orientation
      (2) Size
   b) Parking lot design configuration
      (1) Aisle widths
      (2) Parking space size
      (3) Driveway criteria
      (4) Pedestrian flows
      (5) Provision for motorcycle and bicycle parking
      (6) Landscaped island requirements
   c) Planting and irrigation criteria
      (1) Planting objectives
      (2) Parking island and tree canopy requirements
      (3) Decorative and functional planting requirements
      (4) Irrigation requirements
   d) Pavings
      (1) Surface parking paving materials
      (2) Driveway special paving considerations
      (3) Collector walk special paving considerations
   e) Lighting
      (1) Parking lot lighting objectives
      (2) Fixture types and materials
      (3) Location and height guidelines
   f) Screens and buffers
      (1) Screening objectives
      (2) Screen walls and fences
      (3) Planting buffers
   g) Signage and graphics
      (1) Signage objectives
      (2) General location guide
      (3) Sign types and scale
      (4) Graphic style
      (5) Sign materials
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3. Bikeway design
   a) Defined bikeway easement typical cross section
      (1) Easement width
      (2) Pavement width requirement
      (3) General easement drainage requirements
   b) Relationship to walkways and streets
      (1) Contiguous walkway location and width criteria
      (2) Contiguous streetscape location and width criteria

4. Trolley corridor design
   a) Defined trolley easement typical cross section
      (1) Typical easement width
      (2) Relationship to walkways, bikeways, and streets
      (3) Trolley stop requirements
      (4) Pavement width and curb requirement
      (5) General easement drainage requirements
   b) Planting and irrigation criteria
      (1) Planting objectives
      (2) Tree canopy requirements
      (3) Decorative and functional planting requirements
      (4) Irrigation requirements
   c) Pavings
      (1) Special crosswalk and trolley stop considerations
      (2) Paving materials
      (3) Paving patterns
   d) Lighting
      (1) Parking lot lighting objectives
      (2) Fixture types and materials
      (3) Location and height guidelines
   e) Screens and buffers
      (1) Screening objectives
      (2) Screen walls and fences
      (3) Planting buffers
5. Service drives and loading areas
   a) General design criteria
      (1) Location and configuration
      (2) Driveway requirements
   b) Screens and buffers
      (1) Screening objectives
      (2) Screen walls and fences
      (3) Planting buffers
   c) Lighting
      (1) Service area lighting objectives
      (2) Fixture types and materials
      (3) Location and height guidelines

E. Infrastructure improvements
   1. Location requirements for site infrastructure
      a) Site utilities
      b) Storm water management systems
      c) Sanitary sewer systems
   2. Screens and buffers
Conclusion

A campus plan of today reveals that quality of exterior space and building massing are two of the most important elements in defining the Auburn Character. How these elements interact, the prescribed relationship between buildings and landscape, is a defining element of Auburn’s built environment and, indeed, of the image and character of Auburn University.

Green space reflects agricultural and rural roots of Auburn University. A tour of the Auburn campus today reveals that the design and placement of buildings without regard for parameters established by early designers and master-planers results in the loss of this important defining element of the Auburn character. Often in recent years, respect for the building to site relationship and the preservation of green space has been sacrificed in favor of building program or cost efficiency, a typical situation at American universities during the 1960’s and 1970’s. Unfortunately, a breakdown of the system results in unresolved formality, visually assaulting architectural statements and unrealized potential. Reversing this trend and defining, not redefining, the “Auburn Character“ is the intent of this survey.
6. Student Program
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Introduction

An introduction to the proposed student program is derived from the WTW Architects program book dated March 21, 2000. The program was developed over a two year period with a building committee made up University stakeholders.

A revised program was presented to the University in January 2001, as an addendum. IDEA has, through our scope of work, reviewed the proposed program and made our recommendations.

The primary influence in modifying the student program is the concept of a collection of building versus one common facility. IDEA has defined two distinct programs with the “student union program,” as described in section 1.1.2 of this report.

Program 1 - Student Life (pedestrian-focused facility)

The criteria for identifying student life activities is defined as those activities frequently required by students during the scheduled class day, such as:

- Food and Beverage Services
- Convenience Retail Services
- Student Governance Services
- Bookstore
- Copy Center
- University Mail Services
- Lounges
- Study Halls
- Computer Labs
- Exhibit and Gallery Spaces
- Entertainment and Recreational Facilities
Program II - Ballroom/Conference Facilities (vehicular-focused facility)

Criteria for a large, assembly space, centered around special events typically after daily scheduled class activities. These events are predominantly evening events requiring heavy parking and service requirements. Special events also include:

- Camp War Eagle
- Exhibits
- Performances
- Student Group Events

Defined Program

Rather than redefining a program developed over two years, IDEA has created a program outline with gross square foot requirements for consideration in future programing efforts.

Recommendations

IDEA recommends that the University revisit the program developed for a student village. As a collection of facilities, the program needs to be revisited in this new context. The concept of a University village will expand and enhance the program to include more integrated University services. One example of this integration is the concept of resident housing as part of the village context.

Action: The University should establish a student village committee to modify the proposed program in order to integrate the program within a new student village concept.

Action: The University needs to require that the Master Plan consider the larger impact of a student village on the Master Plan. The village should not be considered merely a facility site, but should be considered the heart of student life on campus.
7. Glossary of Terms

The following list of terms has been devised in order to familiarize the individual with some common terminology that has been used to describe architectural and landscaping elements throughout the Auburn University campus. The glossary includes definitions of terms as referred to in the context of this publication. The pronunciation of each term has also been included for further clarification.
7. Glossary Of Terms

Austere (ô-stir) Having no adornment or ornamentation; bare
Balustrade (‘ba-l&-”strAd) A handrail and the row of balusters or posts that support it
Brand (‘brand) A trademark or distinctive name identifying a product or manufacturer
Cartouche (kär-‘tūsh) An ornamental tablet often inscribed or decorated, and framed with elaborate scroll-like carving
Collegiality (k -lE-jE-’a-l’-tE) Having authority vested equally among colleagues.
Cornice (kôr n s) A horizontal molded projection that crowns or completes a building or wall
Cupola (‘kyü-p&-l&)  
  a: A rounded vault resting on a usually circular base and forming a roof or a ceiling  
  b: A small structure built on top of a roof
Delineate (di-‘li-nE-“At) To draw or trace outside of
Fenestration (fe-n’-strA-sh&n) The design and placement of windows in a building
Georgian (‘jor-j n) The prevailing style of the 18th century in Great Britain and the North American colonies, derived from classical, Renaissance, and Baroque forms
Infrastructure (in-frä-”str&ck-ch&tr) An underlying base esp. for an organization or system
Louvers (‘lü-v’r) An assembly of sloping, overlapping blades or slats; may be fixed or adjustable; designed to admit air and/or rain
Mitigate (‘mi-t&-”gAt) To make or become less in force or intensity; moderate
Morrill Act (mo-’rel  a-kt) An act donating Public Lands to the several State and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts
Nexus (‘nek-süs) A means of connection; link or tie
Neoclassicism (“nE-O-‘kla-s&-”si-z&m) The last phase of European classicism, characterized by monumentality, strict use of the orders
Pedagogical ("pe-d&'gä-'jë-k&l) Characterized by a pedantic formality
Peripheral (p'-ri-'fr'ël) Of minor relevance or importance
Portico (pOri-'ti-"kO) A porch or covered walk consisting of a roof supported by columns; a colonnaded
Quoins ("kOins, 'kwoins) In masonry, a hard stone or brick used, with similar ones, to reinforce an external corner or edge of a wall
Rusticated ("r&st-i-"kAt-ed) To go to or live in the country
Sheaves ("shEvz) A collection of items tied or bound together
Synergy ("si-n' r'-jE) The interaction of two or more agents or forces so that their combined effect is greater than the sum of their individual effects
Tripartite (trI-'pär-"tlt) Composed of or divided into three parts
Village ("vi-lij) An incorporated community smaller in population than a town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronunciation Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a &amp; à as a and u in abut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ä as e in kitten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ö &amp; ë as ur/er in further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ä as a in ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à as a in ace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë as o in mop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a as ou in out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë as ch in chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a &amp; e in bet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë as ea in easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à as g in go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë as i in hit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

218

7. Glossary Of Terms