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SUMMARY OF MASTER PLAN PROCESS

The University's planning process consists of two components - campus analysis and program identification.

Program Identification and Institutional Planning
The program identification is based on the University's academic, institutional and financial plans. It will prioritize projects within the framework of the goals established in those documents. This work will identify upcoming building endeavors and establish the size, cost and timing of those projects.

Campus Analysis and Facility Planning
The campus analysis is accomplished through a series of documents produced by the Office for Campus Planning.
A. The Uptown Campus Design Strategy provides an overall documentation of the character and condition of campus, and identifies design guidelines and potential building sites.
B. Subsequent working documents analyze specific campus systems, such as circulation, landscape, lighting, parking and security. These campus analysis documents inventory existing systems and provide specific recommendations for their coherent applications on campus.
C. An ongoing process is outlined to coordinate and manage smaller scale changes to the environment.

Strategy
The Campus Analysis and Program Identification must be used together to establish a process for campus development. However, these elements have been defined separately to create flexibility in the system allowing for changes to the projected program and the timing and order of construction projects. In this way, the goals for development of the campus appearance and character are not dependent upon construction of any particular building project, but can be addressed with the development of every design project.
INTRODUCTION

When initiated in 1994, the new Tulane physical planning process was required to be tactical as well as strategic, to begin immediate review of intense ongoing campus development.

It was also inductive, in order to administer change within a meaningful and long range facilities design management process, while promoting creative design solutions. The goal is to promote a strong, unified and positive image of Tulane.

Flexibility has also been critical, to be able to compliment changing institutional and capital conditions that influence decision making and that eventually lead to comprehensive development programming or University Master Planning.

"The single most important recommendation of this study is that the process of academic, institutional, physical planning should be a permanent feature of Tulane's management. By its very nature, this need cannot be met episodically. Subject to constant internal and external forces, a major university must have the planning capacity to meet and, so far as possible, shape these forces through long-range physical planning. Without a planning process that is constant, comprehensive, and dynamic, individual projects that are themselves worthy can have a detrimental influence on the overall campus fabric."

... from a report prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs and the School of Architecture on "Tulane University Comprehensive Planning", June, 1981.
I. THE UPTOWN CAMPUS DESIGN STRATEGY
This base document includes the following:
- Identification of campus zones and description of their character
- Statement of planning principles
- Analysis of campus issues such as programmatic zoning, organizational patterns, land use, circulation, parking and campus image
- Condition of existing buildings
- Location of potential building sites with recommendations for their physical development
- Summary of the history and use of each campus building and its relation to the campus environment

II. WORKING DOCUMENTS
Individual systems analyses include the following. Other documents will be added as necessary.

1. Landscaping Plan
- Goals for campus landscaping
- Analysis of existing planting and paving patterns and materials
- Recommend identification of local and regional plant materials
- To foster the campus environment as an educational landscape, an arboretum
- To emphasize uniqueness of our region and provide a special and personal signature
- To reduce grounds maintenance
- To promote principles of "sustainability"
- Recommendations for landscape improvement projects with projected cost information
- Analysis of quality of outdoor spaces - Location and identification of elements of landscape furniture, including benches, tables, vending machines, telephones, kiosks, trash cans, bike racks, etc. with recommendations for standards of type and placement
- Identification of effect of utility systems on landscaping, particularly with respect to location of underground steam lines and potential for watering systems

2. Parking Master Plan
- Inventory of existing parking capacity
- Estimate of required parking capacity using two methods of analysis:
  - Comparison of existing supply and demand
  - Comparison of parking to other critical campus land uses
- Recommendations for potential changes in parking count, location, policies, etc.

3. Circulation Master Plan for Bicycles, Service Vehicles and Pedestrians
- Goals for accommodating bikes, service vehicles and pedestrians.
- Location of existing routes and zones of conflict between the systems.
- Proposal of alternate routes and systems including parking locations for bikes and service vehicles
- Recommendations for policies for implementation, promotion and policing of routes.

4. Master Lighting Plan
- Goals for exterior lighting of campus
- Analysis of existing conditions including light quality and types and location of light fixtures with suggestions for standards and potential improvements
- Recommendations for lighting installations, modifications, programs, policies and standards
5. Campus Identification Plan
- Review of exiting campus signage
- Identification of signage types
- Campus signage standards

6. Open Space/Recreational Plan
- Location and use of existing open spaces, with identification of relevant programmatic, scheduling, image or other issues or conflicts in use.
- Identification of physical requirements and standards for each use, including required area, size, frequency of use
- Recommendations for physical improvements amid policies

7. Campus Environmental Issues
- Identification of goals and principles for improving matters that affect the campus ecology: energy and pollution management; improving circulation and pedestrian qualities; developing sustainable landscaping and building design recommendations and construction techniques

8. Campus Accessibility Plan
- Review of campus including all exterior spaces, buildings and facilities for compliance with the ADA amid ADAAG and identification of areas of noncompliance
- Recommendations for modifications, including priorities and projected schedules and costs

9. Security Conscious Design Plan
- Goals that foster a safe and secure campus
- Analysis of potential physical means of addressing security goals, including issues related to visibility, definition of boundaries, creation of community and sense of ownership, etc.
- Analysis of campus conditions with respect to goals
- Recommendations for physical improvements to achieve goals
- Recommendations for policies as appropriate

10. Building Facilities Audit
- Review of current physical condition of campus buildings and facilities including review of the various systems, components and elements of each building as they affect the immediate site, exterior structure, interior structure, handicap accessibility, health, fire, and life safety codes, hvac, plumbing and electrical service
- Analysis of utility service levels, consumption, efficiency and recommendations as appropriate
- Recommendations for immediate repairs, medium and long range improvements, including cost estimates

11. Infrastructure Plan
- Review of existing utilities: system types, organization, capacity, maintenance, location, etc.

- Analysis of effect of existing conditions on campus environment, i.e. effect of equipment on physical appearance of campus, effect of capacity on service levels, etc.
- Recommendations for upgrades and improvements with priorities, projected schedules and costs

12. Plan for On-Campus Housing
- Building Locations and Physical Associations
- Development Strategy Program
- Assessment of adequacy of number of on-campus beds
- Area and Building Development
- Identification of Issues to improve Street-scape and Exterior Areas

13. Project Planning Opportunities
- An on-going summary of projects, proposals and concepts likely to influence the intermediate and long range development of the campus environment
The document is the primary component of the master plan for the university. It provides the framework for analysis of any future building or environmental project; and, when combined with an elaboration of the projected programmatic needs of the university, creates an outline or forecast of campus development for the foreseeable future. In addition, it identifies design strategies to improve the overall campus outdoor spaces.

The document is not considered to be static or unchangeable. It is expected that new information will be incorporated as projects are studied and developed and that further sections will be added to the document.

This document provides a comprehensive design analysis of the Tulane uptown campus. The document is organized as follows:

**Description of Campus** - a narrative identifying the location of campus and describing the character of its major areas.

**Planning Principles** - summary of recommended planning guidelines for campus development.

**Campus Analysis** - written and graphic studies of zoning, organizational patterns, land use, circulation, parking and campus image, with recommendations for improvements.

**Condition of Existing Buildings** - ranking of existing buildings and hierarchy of preservation.

**Potential Building Sites** - identification of potential building sites and preliminary design guidelines for building on the sites.

**Appendix A : Summary of Existing Buildings** - summary of history of existing buildings as well as description of their relation to the campus environment and to their current function.
The original version of this document was prepared by the Tulane University Office of Campus Planning with the guidance of the Steering Committee for the Office of Campus Planning.

The Planning Office was established to be the University agent responsible for the process of facilities planning and design for the University. The Planning Office is the University agent responsible for initiating planning and environmental design activities.

The Steering Committee was created as the advisor to the process, and the activities of the Planning Office. It was created to give authority to the planning and design process, to provide a forum for communication to demonstrate the advantages of collective effort and reinforce the fundamental benefits of working in community, and to advise the Board of Administrators in all matters concerning the Uptown Campus environment.

Special recognition to:
Mr. H. Mortimer Favrot, AIA, chair of the Steering Committee
who has guided the process from inception to completion

Henry Fry, Resident Architect
Director of Campus Planning
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1. Gibson Hall
2. Tilton Memorial
3. Dinwiddie Hall
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6. Norman Mayer Building
7. F. Edward Hebert Hall
8. Robert C. Cudd Hall
9. Social Work Building
10. Stanley Thomas Hall
11. Civil Engineering
12. Mechanical Services Building
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15. Lindy Boggs Center
16. Engineering Shops
17. Alee Fortier
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Tulane University's uptown campus accommodates the undergraduate and graduate programs in Liberal Arts and Sciences, Architecture, Law, Business, Engineering, and Social Work as well as the University College. The campus also provides housing for undergraduate and graduate students, facilities and spaces for recreational sports and athletics, locations for public performances and exhibitions, and offices for administrative personnel.

The Medical School and Tulane Medical Center are located separately on a site in downtown New Orleans. The university also has sites at the Hebert Center in Belle Chasse and the Delta Primate Center in Covington. The university has recently leased or acquired off-site locations for expansion: University College conducts courses in Jefferson Parish (Elmwood); staff offices of Institutional Advancement have moved to an office building about three miles from campus (Medical Arts building); and the property formerly belonging to Rohm's Florist on River Road is the new home of the Purchasing Department.

**Location in the City**
The uptown campus of Tulane University is located on an irregular tract of land extending from St. Charles Avenue to Claiborne Avenue. The area is called the university district due to the presence of Tulane and of Loyola University, which lies adjacent to the south section of the Tulane campus. The surrounding neighborhood is primarily residential, including large single family mansions, modest single family homes, doubles and multi-family apartments. Most of the residences in the area are late 19th century and early 20th century wood frame buildings often with intricate architectural detail. There are small scale commercial areas nearby, specifically to the north across Claiborne Avenue and to the west along Freret and Maple Streets and at Carrollton Avenue. The scale of the campus has, for the most part, been developed to be compatible with the adjacent neighborhood, tending towards moderately sized buildings and intimate rather than monumental spaces. The campus is adjacent to Audubon Park - one of the primary outdoor recreation areas in the city - which extends from St. Charles Avenue to the Mississippi River.

**Location of Four Areas of Campus**
The historic development patterns of the university are evident in the organization and character of the campus as it exists today. The original tracts of land purchased by the university in 1891 and 1893 formed a triangular site with a frontage of approximately 575' along St. Charles Avenue; the rear limit of the property was located at the intersection of the side boundaries. The shape of the property, a long, thin wedge, was typical of land division along the Mississippi River because it allowed for the maximum number of properties to have access to the river for water and transportation. The first buildings of the Tulane campus - Gibson Hall, Richardson, F. Edward Hebert, Civil Engineering and the lower floors of Mechanical Engineering and Mechanical Services - were erected on the southern section of this property, between St. Charles Avenue and Freret Street. In 1903, the university purchased an additional piece of land extending from Freret Street to Claiborne Avenue and five years later, in 1908, Newcomb College purchased the campus along Broadway Street. The first Newcomb buildings - Newcomb Hall, Josephine Louise House and the Newcomb Art Building - were built in 1918. These two original areas of development - the front campus and the Newcomb campus - retain to this day the strongest sense of place and most identifiable character of any part of the
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uptown campus. The rest of the campus can be subdivided into two parts - the middle campus which lies between Freret and Willow Streets and the back campus located between Willow Street and Claiborne Avenue. ¹

Character of Spaces
Front Campus
The front campus is distinguished by its architectural character and its pedestrian scale. Most of the buildings in this zone were designed by New Orleans architects and constructed in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century. They share a common palette of materials - limestone, red, orange and tan brick, slate roofs - and a common language of architectural detail. Arched window and door openings are typical, particularly at the southern end of the quad. Building articulation addresses a range of scales and includes details ranging in size from the monumental stair and entry porch to the individual building component, the single brick, stone block or window mullion. Buildings generally have multiple public entries with quad side entries marked by prominent exterior stairs or architectural detailing. The buildings are for the most part compatible in scale - with three to five floors typical - in proportion and in massing. Architectural styles include the Richardsonian Romanesque of Gibson Hall, the Elizabethan style of Dinwiddie, and the Dutch and Italian Renaissance revival styles of Social Work and Alcee Fortier. Newer modernist buildings, particularly Stern Hall, undermine the coherence of the area by their variation in scale, detailing and massing.

The front campus is a pedestrian scale zone; streets and parking lots are located behind buildings at the campus edges so that the interior quad is protected from vehicular traffic. The buildings form the edges to the quad and, with the exception of Gibson Hall, their public facades are turned inward. The character of the quad varies from one end to the other. South of Hebert and Richardson Halls, the paths run in diagonals cutting the lawn into relatively small areas of grass. Randomly placed trees provide an overhead canopy. North of Hebert and Richardson, the quad narrows; and the paths align orthogonally, providing edges for a rectangular lawn. Tree placement reinforces the edges of the lawn.

The existing character of the front campus should be preserved as it exists, particularly in the southern section of the zone. Any new buildings or additions should be designed to be compatible to the old ones in scale, proportion, massing and materials. The pedestrian character of the area should be maintained.

Newcomb Campus
The buildings of the Newcomb campus have a unity and coherence of design due to the strength of the original master plan developed by New York architect James Gamble Rogers. The buildings share a set of materials made up of red brick, terra cotta roof tile

¹ The Board of Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund has formally defined the Newcomb campus to include the area and buildings described above as well as the Newcomb Dean’s House, Warren House and Caroline Richardson Hall. These last three buildings may be discussed as part of the middle campus; this is not intended to negate their formal association with Newcomb College, but rather is done in response to their close physical association with the other buildings and spaces on the middle campus.
and limestone trim. The earlier buildings - Newcomb Hall, Josephine Louise House, Newcomb Art, Newcomb Gym and Dixon Hall - were designed with consistency, in a restrained classicist style. These buildings employ a range of scales similar to that seen on the front campus. They use a common set of architectural details, including rectangular window openings, hip roofs, generous roof overhangs, and a strong stone cornice line typically at the level of the second floor.

Dixon Annex (1984) reiterates some of these elements and a scale and placement similar to the older buildings to create a successful modern intervention into a historical context. The Theater and Dance Building (1995) is even more successful capturing the spirit of the Newcomb’s original buildings and campus in a contemporary design. The Chapel is more of an architectural anomaly in terms of its asymmetrical massing, simplified detailing and object like siting.

The Newcomb buildings create two exterior quads with Newcomb Hall as the focal point of both. The quad on the west side of Newcomb Hall has a pedestrian scale similar to that of the front campus. Sidewalks cut diagonals through the grass to tie the outdoor space and the buildings together into a unified environment, and informal planting of trees defines smaller subspaces and provides an overhead canopy for the quad. The quad on the east side of Newcomb Hall
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is separated from the surrounding buildings by the automobile traffic and parking lane at Newcomb Circle. The edges of the quad are reinforced by the ordered planting of oak trees.

The unity of the Newcomb campus is reinforced by the placement of its buildings. The Rogers' master plan arranged buildings symmetrically about an axis running through Newcomb Hall from Broadway to Newcomb Boulevard; this principle has been realized through the alignment of the building edges of Dixon Hall, Dixon Annex and the Wildenberg Art Center from one side of the quad to the other. In addition, the buildings around Newcomb Quad are unified by the use of berming around all the buildings with the exception of the Chapel. The integrity of the overall context takes precedence over the individualism of any single building. The character of Newcomb should be preserved as it exists. Any new buildings must be compatible with the original ones in scale, massing, style, and architectural detail and should be placed to reinforce the definition of the quads. The exterior spaces should be maintained, but, if and when possible, the automobile traffic and parking should be removed from Newcomb Circle in order to allow the buildings and the outdoor space in this area to be more closely integrated.

Middle Campus

The development of the middle campus has taken place over most of this century. It contains buildings of a wide variety of architectural styles ranging from the classicism of Jones Hall to the modernist style of the University Center and Howard-Tilton Library. Architectural details, forms and materials vary greatly from building to building, though many of the buildings use red brick as a dominant material. There is a great variation in building heights, with the tallest buildings generally located along south and east edges of the area. Many of the newer buildings omit the middle scale details found in the front and Newcomb campuses.

The organization of the middle campus (considered here to also incorporate the Newcomb campus) is defined by the street grid of McAlister Drive, Newcomb Place, Newcomb Circle and Drill Road. Sidewalks align with the grid except in the dormitory area east of McAlister Drive where the walks form diagonal connections as necessary between buildings. Tree planting reinforces the organizational grid by creating allees at McAlister Drive, Newcomb Place and Newcomb Circle. The grid structure supports the mix of pedestrian, bicycle and automobile circulation in the middle campus; however, the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the sidewalk and street systems, creating frequent and sometimes dangerous conflicts of use. The middle campus contains a large central open space made up of the University Center and Newcomb Quads. This open space provides a formal connection between McAlister Auditorium and Newcomb Hall; but, as at Newcomb Circle, the space is isolated by the placement of automobile access and parking along the quad edges. Additional open spaces are formed by the pattern of individual buildings surrounding interior quads with buildings forming buffers between streets and quads. Building edges often create other partly defined, small exterior spaces.

The variation in building styles, scales and forms in the middle campus should be balanced by strong connecting systems to unify the area. Consistency and uniformity of street treatment, landscaping, tree spacing and exterior lighting are required to tie together the disparate architectural styles. Additional buildings in the middle campus should be compatible with adjacent buildings, but more importantly, should be integrated into the campus environment by siting to create and strengthen outdoor spaces and circulation systems. This area of campus offers the most potential for increasing building density to allow for facility expansion.
**Back Campus**
A large section of the back campus was developed after the demolition of the Tulane Stadium in 1980. Many of the buildings are similar to each other in architectural style, materials and details. Aron Apartments, Reily Center, Wilson Center and the Diboll Complex share a post-modernist style and a use of concrete block, glass block and metal building trim painted teal green and red. Typical architectural details include rectangular openings, round columns, and ground level colonnades. Rosen House, built in 1959, has a stripped down modernist style.

The scale of this area is geared towards automobiles and athletic functions, not towards pedestrians. The scale of light fixtures, signage, and exterior spaces is inappropriate for pedestrian use. Buildings are largely object-like in geometry and isolated from exterior context; they do not work to form public exterior spaces. In general, the systems connecting buildings - landscaping, sidewalks, signage, etc. - are weak and inconsistent. A pedestrian movement system with appropriately scaled elements should be developed for this area.

Any new buildings should contribute to the creation of pedestrian exterior spaces and connections; repetition of existing architectural styles and building materials is neither sufficient nor necessary to make additional buildings contextual. An example of this is the new Willow Street Dormitory, whose design strengthens the pedestrian precinct and scale of the back campus. The building also engages open spaces of smaller scale to extend patterns of the front and middle campuses.

The connection of the back campus to the middle campus is maintained south of Reily Recreation by the continuation of McAlister Drive and of the tree planting pattern along the street edges. This connection weakens north of the Reily breezeway because McAlister Drive - the main axis and connector street of campus - ends in front of Reily. In addition, the sidewalk system behind Reily is incomplete.

The back campus contains a large percentage of open space; however since most of this space is programmed for specific athletic uses, it has been fenced and walled off and is inhabited only sporadically by programmed users. The open spaces are isolated from general use and separated from general circulation zones.
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Zoning Status and Regulations
According to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of New Orleans, most of the uptown campus is located in a district zoned RM-4. Adjacent city blocks in which the University owns property are zoned RM-I and RD-2.

Zoning District RM-4
Purpose: A multi-family residential district created to allow for various types of residence, including apartment hotels. Also allows for accessory commercial uses such as restaurants and shops. Permits high population density. Signs and access to commercial facilities are limited to maintain residential character. This district allows for institutions of higher learning.

Maximum Height: None
Maximum FAR: 4.00
Minimum Open Space Ratio: 0.10
Minimum Depth of Front Yard: 20'
Minimum Aggregate Width of Side Yards: 30% of lot width; need not exceed 20'
Minimum Depth of Rear Yard: 20'

Parking Requirements: For universities: "One parking space for each 4000 square feet gross floor area for all buildings, structures and uses except fraternities...where one parking space for each 350 square feet of gross floor area is required."

Zoning District RM-1
Includes block at Howard Tilton Library and Freret, Audubon, and Zimple Streets.
Purpose: Multi-family residential district to maintain low to medium residential density and also allow for a variety of housing types. Limits to population density and building heights are established to maintain compatibility with single-family residential development in the area. Some community facilities are permitted.

Maximum Height: 40'
Maximum FAR: 0.30 one family; 0.60 multi family & non residential
Minimum Open Space Ratio: 0.40
Minimum Depth of Front Yard: 20'
Minimum Aggregate Width of Side Yards: 20% of lot width; need not exceed 12' residential or 20' non residential.
Minimum Depth of Rear Yard: 20'

Parking Requirements: Varies by use. See code. 1 space per 350 gross square feet of building area required for fraternities and sororities.

Zoning District RD-2
Includes block at Plum, Broadway, Willow and Audubon Streets and block at Freret, Calhoun, S. Robertson and the Law School.

Maximum Height: 40'
Maximum FAR: None
Minimum Open Space Ratio: None
Minimum Depth of Front Yard: 20'
Minimum Aggregate Width of Side Yards: 20% of lot width; need not exceed 12' residential or 20' non residential.
Minimum Depth of Rear Yard: 20'

Parking Requirements: Varies by use. See code.

Zoning Changes
Zoning Changes require separate public hearings - one before the City Planning Commission and one before the City Council.

A goal of the planning process is to facilitate future considerations to enact changes and positively affect the quality of the surrounding neighborhood.
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Goals for Campus Development
1. Provide the physical facilities necessary to achieve programmatic goals of the university; i.e., to support the teaching and research functions of the university and to facilitate the non-academic activities of the university community.

2. Develop a high quality campus appearance to reflect and represent the high standards of achievement fostered by the university and to serve as an incentive in student and faculty recruitment.

3. Create an environment which is high in amenities, safe, convenient and accessible to all.

Summary of Planning Principles
1. Consider the entire campus as a whole when addressing issues of physical planning. This principle does not deny or negate the existence and value of special areas such as the front campus and the Newcomb campus, but recognizes that all areas of campus need to be tied together into a recognizable whole.

2. Preserve the existing character and the historic buildings of the front campus and the Newcomb campus. Identify the middle and back campus areas as appropriate for increased building density.

3. Reinforce and preserve the existing pattern of quads with separate buildings surrounding open spaces. Develop a strategy for linking outdoor spaces with built and landscape elements which act as passageways or gateways between spaces.

4. Design campus edges, outdoor spaces, and building entries to help ensure the safety of the campus community. Consider means of controlling access to campus, especially at night.

5. Establish circulation zones to separate different methods of transportation. Give priority to pedestrian circulation in interior sections of campus, especially in the front and middle campuses. Locate automobile circulation and parking and service zones at campus edges.

6. Create a more coherent campus image across all campus zones. Maintain architectural continuity among buildings within a single quad, especially in the front and Newcomb campuses. Variation in image and appearance should occur between different quads and different areas of campus.

7. Group complementary functions around quads to minimize functional conflicts and foster unity of image. Maintain pattern of mixed uses at the larger scale of the campus areas, as in the existing mix of academic and administrative in front campus and the mix of academic and residential in middle campus.

8. Design campus edges and entries to clarify location and boundaries of campus and to present a positive image of the university in the city fabric. Buildings located on campus edges should reinforce the positive image of the university to the city.

9. Promote acquisition of additional property to expand campus boundaries to corners of Broadway and Freret and Broadway and Willow Streets.

10. Design campus development to be sensitive to adjacent neighborhoods; make appropriate modifications in scale at neighborhood edges.

11. Respect concentrations of academic functions at the front and Newcomb sections of campus. Consider reinforcement of a third academic area at the Monroe Quad, to complement the Business and Law Schools.
PLANNING PRINCIPLES

12. Use infill buildings to reinforce predominant architectural concepts when appropriate, and to foster unity in areas with disparate architectural designs.

13. Promote campus accessibility by designing, constructing and altering campus buildings and facilities to be accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) using the requirements and standards of accessibility outlined by the Americans with Disability Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).

14. Emphasize qualities of positive behavioral design. Promote qualities of physical and psychological conditions that encourage personal interaction and promote favorable impressions.

Landscape Planning Principles
1. Design the entire campus landscape to create a unified image using the concept of the campus as an arboretum with smaller botanical gardens. Emphasize Louisiana native plants to increase the visual association of the campus with New Orleans.

2. Maintain and augment as necessary the existing pattern of tree planting creating canopies over pedestrian areas in the front and Newcomb campuses and marking street and circulation axes in the middle and back campuses.

3. Provide access to all buildings and exterior spaces and means for circulation of all campus users. Separate pedestrians from automobiles and bicycles. Separate service vehicles from other users either by locating service access routes away from other circulation routes or by scheduling service activity to occur at off hours.

4. Unify the campus appearance through the consistent, high quality application of exterior lighting, signage, street furniture and other exterior systems.

5. Make the campus legible; provide a clear sense of direction and orientation for campus users through judicious installation of campus directional maps and consistent, high quality, visible signage.

Building Planning Principles
1. Accommodate the specific functions of the individual building program. At the same time, maintain flexibility recognizing that each building belongs to the University and may need to be adapted for other uses in the future.

3. Create and enhance adjacent exterior spaces by using building edges to define small and large scale outdoor spaces.

4. Design buildings to relate to the principles of architectural culture, history and climate response characteristic to New Orleans.

5. Encourage the highest quality of architectural design by utilizing an architectural selection process that places a high value on creativity as well as experience.
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Academic Facilities

The front and Newcomb campuses form the academic centers of the university, with additional academic facilities located along Freret Street and at the south end of McAlister Drive.

Recommendations

1. Maintain use of front and Newcomb campuses as academic centers.

2. Consider reinforcing the academic zone in the area of the Business and Law Schools by replacement of Monroe and possibly Sharp Halls or their conversion from undergraduate dormitories to academic and/or administrative use.

3. Consider expansion of the Newcomb academic zone to Broadway Street. Additional performance facilities on the Zimpel Quad would compliment and support existing use. Consider conversion of Josephine Louise House for academic use.

4. Designate the Central Building or its site as appropriate for conversion to academic or broader institutional use.
**Administration**
Administrative functions are scattered throughout campus with Gibson and Newcomb Halls used as primary locations for academic administration.

**Recommendations**
1. Continue use of Gibson and Newcomb Halls as centers of academic administration and instruction.
2. Consider development of a concentrated location for other administrative functions. Administrative service functions could be grouped together in a new facility along Freret or Willow Street near Broadway or in Monroe Hall if reconverted.
3. Eliminate scattered use of dormitory space for administrative and staff functions unrelated to student services.
4. Locate community serving functions along McAlister to reinforce high pedestrian activity, human scale and encourage increased personal communication.
Current Administrative Locations

1. Gibson Hall
   President
   Provost
   Sr. Vice President for Operations and CFO
   Sr. Vice-President for Institutional Planning and Administration
   Registrar
   Admissions
   University Counsel
   Research & Project Administration

2. Richardson Building
   Computer Services

3. Robert C. Cudd Hall
   Paul Tulane College

4. Mechanical Engineering Building
   Financial Aid
   Counselling & Testing

5. Central Building
   Controller
   Payroll
   Treasurer
   Accounting
   Other

6. University Center
   Student Affairs

7. Telecommunications Building

8. Irby House
   Residence Life
   Housing

9. Phelps House
   Accounts Receivable
   Student Loans

10. Zemurray Hall
    Bureau of Administrative Services

11. Newcomb Hall
    Administration
    Alumni

12. Physical Plant Building
    Physical Plant Department
    Office of Campus Planning

13. Diboll Complex
    Department of Public Safety
    Human Resources

14. 2510 Calhoun Street
    Annual Giving

15. Reily Recreation Center
    Auxiliary Services

16. Bruff Commons
    Auxiliary Services
Athletics & Recreation
Athletic and recreation buildings are located in the back campus, with recreational use of quads throughout campus.

Recommendations
1. Maintain consolidation of athletic uses north of Reily Student Recreation Center.

2. Recreational use of quads in front and middle campus areas may need to be reduced or consolidated to allow for development of new buildings.

3. Recommend relocation of basketball arena to free Central Building for another use.
**Athletics and Recreation**
Quads are currently used for the following recreational purposes:

- **J. Bennett Johnston**
  - ROTC drills

- **University Center Quad**
  - football
  - soccer
  - softball
  - lacrosse
  - rugby
  - cricket
  - ROTC drills
  - TGIF parties
  - student fairs
  - homecoming
  - pep rallies
  - summer camp
  - Special Olympics

- **Newcomb Quad**
  - sports, as above
  - ROTC drills
  - Newcomb Art festival
  - summer camp
  - Special Olympics

- **Monroe Quad**
  - informal recreation

- **Butler Quad**
  - informal recreation

- **Bruff Quad**
  - soccer
  - football
  - ROTC drills
  - special events
  - childrens camps

- **Zimpel Quad**
  - informal practice for sports
  - summer camp

- **Brown Field**
  - all sports and events as above
  - special events
  - only lit field
Dormitories
The majority of the dormitories are organized in a ring around Bruff Commons, which contains student service facilities such as a dining hall, post office and laundry. Other dorms are located along the east edge of campus, at the corner of Willow Street and McAlister Drive and at Newcomb College.

Recommendations
1. Reinforce the pattern of dormitories surrounding Bruff Commons; reuse Old Doris Hall or its site for a dormitory or for a compatible function.
2. Consider reuse of Monroe and Sharp Halls or their sites for academic, administrative functions, or other types of residential applications. These sites are distant from the main group of dorms surrounding Bruff Commons.
3. Consider conversion of J.L. House for academic use. This site is isolated from other dormitories; however, the building has a strong historical identity as a dormitory. J.L. could also serve as a highly identifiable component of a residential college in this section of campus.
4. Consider relocating graduate student housing from Rosen House to a new location to make this site on a major roadway available for a more public use. Consider potential for use of Sharp or its site for graduate housing.

5. Encourage Bruff Commons as a market place and community center for campus residents. Its location is central to most of the dormitories, and 24 hour function could add a sense of vibrance to benefit community and general social ambiance.
Public Facilities
Public facilities are located throughout campus, and especially concentrated in the middle campus.

Recommendations
1. Locate public facilities at easily accessible sites adjacent to adequate parking areas. Consider development of additional parking convenient to Dixon Hall and Dixon Annex.

2. Consider improvements to signage, access and landscaping to identify locations of public facilities especially at campus edges.

3. Consider location for a campus welcoming center, to present a coherent and strong first impression of Tulane.

1. Library
2. Food Services
3. Performance Areas
4. Alumni House
5. Chapel
6. Reily Recreation
7. Amistad Research Center
8. Hebert Foundation
9. Fogelman Arena
10. Newcomb Art Gallery
11. Athletics
12. Parking Garage & Conference Facilities
13. Post Office
Service
Physical plant service functions are concentrated in the area bounded by Audubon Street, Plum Street and Willow Street, and are set back from Newcomb Place to prevent public visibility. Transformer vaults are scattered throughout campus.

Recommendations
1. Maintain concentrated grouping of existing plant facilities.

2. Create a system of paths for service access which will minimize interference of service vehicles with other campus users.

3. Investigate all utility systems to coordinate locations of utility infrastructure to minimize interference with campus use during repairs, system modifications, avoid conflict with future development, etc.

4. Where possible, transformer vaults should be integrated into building forms. Locations as at the Arts and Sciences and Boggs/Mechanical Engineering are inappropriate because the vaults are highly visible and compromise potential use of public outdoor space.
Street Grid
The location of the street grid is a primary determinant of the character of campus areas. The external grid of the front campus allows buildings and outdoor spaces to define the character of the area because traffic and cars are held at the campus periphery. An internal grid dominates the character of the middle campus; here the street grid creates distinguishable blocks of ground with cars and parking lanes separating adjacent areas.

The internal street grid controls placement of secondary systems such as sidewalks, light poles, trees, and signs which are arranged to align with street axes. The external grids allow for freer placement of these elements.

The location of the street grid is a determinant of building orientation and of the location of the public and service sides of buildings. With an external grid, public and service facades are separated in areas such as the front campus. With an internal grid, the orientation of public facades to the streets conflicts with use of streets for service access.

The extension of the city street grid into the middle campus at Plum and Zimpel Streets allows for service access to the buildings of
the Newcomb campus.

Recommendations

1. Reduce use of internal streets by private automobiles as the opportunity arises to improve the quality of the campus environment for pedestrian users.

2. Design new buildings and renovations to support the use of external streets for service access.

3. Improve the overall streetscape of McAlister Drive; this street provides the primary connection between public and student parking at the Diboll Complex and the academic, public and residential facilities of campus. Improving the function and appearance of the main pedestrian route of campus would significantly upgrade the quality of environment and image of Tulane, psychologically shorten the distance of travel, and improve campus security.

4. Improve scale and detailing along Plum and Zimple Streets, to provide better definition as entrances into campus and as exterior territories of campus.

5. Develop a service street along the Eastern border of campus between Freret and Calhoun streets incorporating parking and lessening vehicular dependence on McAlister Drive.
Tree Placement
Random dispersion of trees in the front campus and at the Broadway side of Newcomb Hall creates canopies for ceilings to these outdoor rooms. Alignment of trees along internal and external streets reinforces the axes of streets and the street grid in the middle campus and in the back campus between Willow Street and the Reily Recreation Center.

Recommendations
1. Empty spaces should be filled with saplings as a top landscaping priority. When existing trees are removed, plant new trees as necessary.
2. There is a need for additional tree planting in the back campus; the current lack of shade is unbearable in summer months. Additional trees can also help give human scale and texture to this area.
3. Regular planting of trees along campus edges should be reinforced by addition of trees where necessary. All species of plant materials should be selected and patterned (as alleys of live oaks) to emphasize distinct qualities of the region.

Their placement should be determined as part of a comprehensive landscape plan for this area.
Outdoor Spaces
Campus has large and small outdoor spaces - quads and courtyards. Courtyards are often located adjacent to quads to provide a small scale intimate outdoor space overlooking a larger public outdoor space. East-west axis of quads links the campus from Newcomb Hall to McAlister Auditorium. Newcomb Place and McAlister Drive and the parking along their edges interrupt this connection visually and physically. Restrictions to physical expansion of campus require quads to accommodate multiple functions - recreational sports, ROTC maneuvers, special events, etc.

Recommendations
1. Improve links between spaces using built or landscape elements to create transitions between adjacent outdoor areas; create a network of open spaces rather than a collection of isolated outdoor areas.

2. Improve character of the outdoor spaces along Zimpel and Plum Streets and in the pedestrian zone between Reily and Wilson. Visually defining Zimpel and Plum as part of the campus will help improve security in these areas.
Definition of Quads
The front campus quad edges are established by building facades. The character of the quad varies from one end to the other due to the shifting relation of buildings to the center line of campus, and the change in patterns of walkways and tree placement.

Bruff, Butler and Monroe quads are defined by buildings on four sides each; the Broadway quad is defined by buildings on three sides only.

Newcomb and U.C. quads are defined by street edges and rows of parked cars. This condition tends to physically and visually isolate the quads from adjacent buildings.

Recommendations
1. Remove parking as possible. The open space at the south west corner of U.C. quad adjacent to Newcomb Dean's Residence weakens quad form.

2. Construction at Zimpel Quad would strengthen definition of Newcomb and Broadway quads, increase the presence of university along Broadway, and provide a buffer between the quads and commercial businesses on Zimpel Street.
Building Density
These ratios compare aggregate building footprints to overall land area in the zones noted. Figures are approximate.

Front Campus
Overall: 24%
Subsection A: 20%
Subsection B: 32%

Newcomb Campus
Overall: 24%

Middle Campus
Overall: 22%
Subsection C: 29%
Subsection D: 40%
Subsection E: 36%
Subsection F: 25%

Back Campus
Overall: 23%

Although this built/ground ratio is the lowest on campus, the area seems more densely built because most of the open space is used as parking lots and as programmed recreational space. The amount of general open space is low.

Recommendations
1. Maintain density similar to existing in front and Newcomb campuses.
2. Allow for increased density of development in middle and back campuses.
**Building Set Backs**

*With the exception of the Newcomb campus, building set backs have not been treated consistently along street fronts.*

**Recommendations**

1. Set back guidelines should be established to strengthen the campus image along public streets and to unify interior campus zones.

2. New buildings should typically be sited to promote consistency or unity along the affected street edge.

**Preferred Set Backs**

- Freret Street - 60'±
- McAlister Drive - varies
- Drill Road - 35'±
- Newcomb Place - 35' - 45'±
- Newcomb Circle - 30' - 35'±
- Broadway Street - 35'±
- Willow Street - 35' - 40'±
- Ben Weiner Drive - 12'±
Existing Building Set Backs
Approximate distance from building facade to curb edge. Range of distances indicates irregular building footprint or that building is not parallel to street line. Measurements must be verified to match specific set backs.

St. Charles Avenue
Tilton Memorial : 90 - 100'
Gibson Hall : 190 - 235'
Dinwiddie Hall : 155 - 160'

Freret Street
Percival Stern : 45 - 60'
Howard Tilton : 27 - 30'
Jones Hall : 85 - 87'
Central Building : 60'
Navy Building : 73 - 75'
Law School : 40'

Drill Road
Warren House : 35'
Johnston House : 35'

Willow Street
Student Health : 30'
Doris Hall : 42 - 45'
New Doris Hall : 35'
Butler House : 40 - 45'
Phelps House : 50'
Zemurray Hall : 45 - 48'
Aron Residences : 35 - 50'

Claiborne Avenue
Rosen House : 55 - 65'

Broadway Street
Rogers Chapel : 35'
J.L. House : 35'

Newcomb Circle
Dixon Hall : 30'
Dixon Annex : 25'
McWilliams Hall : 25'
Newcomb Art : 35'
Woldenberg Art Center : 35'

Newcomb Place
Howard Tilton : 25'
Dixon Hall : 43'
Newcomb Art : 40'
Caroline Richardson : 33 - 35'
Infirmary : 30'
Jones Hall : 66'
Newcomb Dean : 40'
Warren House : 40 - 45'
Old Doris : 45'

McAlister Drive
Central Building : 15 - 20'
University Center : 15 - 35'
Mayer Residence : 40'
Butler House : 40'
Navy Building : 10'
Goldring Woldenberg : 98 - 110'
Cunningham Observatory : 70'
McAlister Auditorium : 85 - 88'
Irby House : 48 - 50'
Bruff Commons : 40'
Phelps House : 50 - 58'
Aron Residences : 40'

Ben Weiner Drive
Aron Residences : 27 - 55'
Parking Garage : 12'
Reily Recreation : 12'
Wilson Center : 48'
Turchin Stadium : 28'

McAlister Extention
Reily Recreation : 6'
Diboll Complex : 12'
Building Heights
Tallest buildings occur along Freret Street and Claiborne Avenue.

Recommendations
1. Tall buildings should be grouped together to prevent them from overpowering smaller buildings and adjacent outdoor spaces.

2. The location and design of tall buildings should be sensitive to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
# CAMPUS ANALYSIS - LAND USE

## Approximate Building Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Front Campus</th>
<th>Middle Campus</th>
<th>Back Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Hall</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilton Memorial</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie Hall</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>48'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Memorial</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>55-70'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Building</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Mayer Building</td>
<td>46'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Edward Hebert Hall</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Building</td>
<td>51'</td>
<td>39'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Thomas Hall</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>48'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Services</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Labs/Workshop</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs Center</td>
<td>123'</td>
<td>85'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allee Fortier Hall</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern Hall</td>
<td>76'</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science Bldg.</td>
<td>72'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newcomb Quad</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb Hall</td>
<td>67'</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Chapel</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Louise House</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldenberg Art Center (#82)</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldenberg Art Center (#83)</td>
<td>57'</td>
<td>49'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Annex</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td>32-40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Hall</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>33'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Building</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinmann Hall</td>
<td>55-105'</td>
<td>55-105'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldring Woldenberg</td>
<td>107'</td>
<td>85'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham Observatory</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlister Auditorium</td>
<td>62'</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps House</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruff Commons</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irby House</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Hall</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Hall</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson House</td>
<td>44'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemurray Hall</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Building</td>
<td>56'</td>
<td>44'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Hall</td>
<td>56'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb Dean</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren House</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td>23-31'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Hall</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Doris Hall</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Lounge</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler House</td>
<td>82'</td>
<td>82'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Tilton Library</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Richardson</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant Building</td>
<td>29'</td>
<td>29'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellenore P.McWilliams Hall</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Residences</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td>38'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circulation
Sidewalk and street system accommodates passenger cars, service vehicles (trucks and carts), shuttle vans, pedestrians and bicyclists.

Recommendations
1. Develop a system to separate users by modes of circulation wherever possible. In particular, consider strategies to avoid vehicular-pedestrian conflicts.
2. Define routes and parking locations for service vehicles. Physically separate service from general campus circulation and, when possible, schedule service work for off peak hours.
3. Define routes and storage locations for bicycles.
4. Improve the streetscape of McAlister Drive; this street provides the major pedestrian connection from parking at the Diboll Complex to academic, residential and public facilities of the middle and front campuses.
5. Improve the visual and physical relationship of both sides of Freret Street between Newcomb Boulevard and Engineering Road.
6. Provide pedestrian pathway system
throughout the campus that is safe, comfortable, logical, fully accessible to individuals with disabilities, and of coordinated appearance. Install a permanent walk between Reily and the Goldring Tennis Complex.

7. Develop a more defined pedestrian route from the Reily Center breezeway to the Wilson Center. Improve planting and sidewalk connections for pedestrian circulation along Ben Weiner Drive.

**Parking**

*Existing parking is located along campus streets, in surface lots and in one parking garage. Existing arrangement provides some, though often not enough, parking spaces near all campus buildings.*

*Use of internal campus streets - McAlister Drive, Newcomb Place and Circle, and Drill Road - for automobile access and parking creates conflicts of use with pedestrians and impedes visual and physical connections across the middle campus.*

**Recommendation**

Develop a system of peripheral parking, and remove parking from internal streets. Increase definition of campus boundaries so that the point of arrival is perceived to be at the campus gate rather than at the building door.
**Campus Entrances**

Major pedestrian entrances to campus are located on St. Charles Avenue, Broadway and Freret Streets; major automobile entries are from Freret, Willow Street and Claiborne Avenue. Pedestrian and auto entrances overlap and conflict in many locations, especially at the intersection of Freret and McAlister Drive.

**Recommendations**

1. Separate major automobile and pedestrian entrances from one another to prevent conflicts of use. Recommend redesign of the McAlister Drive entrances at Freret and Willow Streets. Though the location of parking should be clear, parking lots should not be prominently visible from major public entries.

2. Place campus identification signs and campus directories at major entrances to make the campus legible to new visitors. Sign placement should be integrated with landscaping, paving, and site furniture.
Campus Edges
Recommendations
1. Establish design strategies for marking campus edges. Identify public edges by use of wrought iron fences, developed planting zones, ornamental lighting and special sidewalks. Private edges can be marked by consistent fencing and planting. All campus edges do not need to be treated identically, but they should create a unified and recognizable definition to the campus.

2. Consider expansion of campus by purchase of additional property to Broadway Street.

3. Redevelopment at Claiborne Avenue should create a stronger public image.

4. Consider methods of securing the campus edges at night.
**Views**

**Recommendations**

1. Major public views of campus, including the St. Charles Avenue view of Gibson Hall and the Broadway Street view of Newcomb Hall, should be enhanced by landscaping and lighting.

2. View along McAlister Drive between Freret Street and Reily should be reinforced by improvements to the systems which mark the street edges, including landscaping, lighting, sidewalks, signage, street furnishings etc., and by improvements to the street surface. The angle of the road near Freret (at the Navy Building) disrupts the view through campus; potential development concepts for a terminus to the view at this end of the street should be considered.

3. The view between Newcomb Hall and McAlister Auditorium is interrupted by traffic and parking along McAlister Drive and Newcomb Place; remove parking along internal streets as possible.
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Ranking of Existing Buildings
The following categorizations are based primarily on the relationship of the individual buildings to the campus environment as a whole, and secondarily on the relation of the structure to its current or potential use. Refer to descriptions for each building in the Summary of Existing Buildings in Appendix A.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES
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Location of Major Potential Building Sites

Site A: Engineering Complex
Site B: Monroe Hall
Site C: North and East Sides of Newcomb Dean Residence
Site D: Zimple Quad
Site E: Freret, Audubon, Zimple, Howard Tilton

Site F: Plum, Broadway, Audubon, Willow
Site G: (Physical Plant block) Plum, Audubon, Willow, Newcomb Boulevard
Site H: Monk Simons Building/ Monk Simons & Favrot Parking Lots
Site I: Rosen House

Note: These sites are mostly appropriate for major new development. The list does not include smaller sites that might be appropriate for building expansions, e.g. the back of the Pocket Park.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Site A: Engineering Complex

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Academic, specifically for engineering and/or science departments

General:
Construction of a new building in this area would require demolition of existing structures, possibly including Mechanical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Mechanical Services, Engineering Workshops and Graduate Labs. These buildings are inefficient and not of great architectural significance. Although Mechanical Services and Mechanical Engineering are two of the older campus buildings, they have been so greatly altered that their historic significance has been largely lost. Stanley Thomas and Civil Engineering are architecturally and historically important buildings and should remain.

The design of the buildings on this site must be responsive and sensitive to the historic character of the front campus and should make an architectural transition from the old front campus buildings - specifically Stanley Thomas and Civil Engineering - to newer buildings such as Boggs and Stern Hall. The building mass should be articulated as multiple volumes to avoid the construction of a single mass which would be overwhelming in scale to the other buildings on the front campus.

Set Backs:

North Side:
To be determined.

South Side:
To be determined.

East Side:
Siting should reinforce built edge of Engineering Road; consider alignment with Civil Engineering and/or Boggs.

West Side:
Siting should reinforce edge of existing greenspace; consider alignment with Stanley Thomas and/or Boggs.

Building Orientation:
Public entry from the west via the quad. Service entry from the east via Engineering Road. Building geometry should be aligned with the orientation of Stanley Thomas, Boggs, and other buildings in this area.

Building Height:
To be determined. Building height may not exceed the height of Boggs - 85' to top of wall and 123' to top of roof. Building height should be reduced at the south end of the site in order to relate to the height of Stanley Thomas - 48' to top of wall and 73' to top of roof. The recommended height for new campus building projects should generally not exceed 50' in height, exclusive of roof configurations, to continue the significant and comfortable scale of the existing campus.
Outdoor Spaces:
Building design should create small scale outdoor spaces or courtyards adjacent to the quad.

Materials and Details:
Materials and details must be sensitive to the historic image and character of the front campus. Preferred facade material will match the brick and stone used on other buildings in this section of campus. Rectangular window openings should be used and proportioned through the use of trim and mullion details to create a human scale. Entry on the quad side should be architecturally articulated, perhaps through the use of arched openings and/or a monumental stair as used on other nearby buildings. Consider the potential for preserving and reusing existing brick walls with historic significance.

Landscape:
To be determined. Include new major trees in this area.

Estimated Site Area:
33,000 s.f.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Site B: Monroe Hall

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Academic and/or Administrative

General:
Monroe Hall is generally considered to be a poor building for dormitory use; its size, organization and condition create an institutional sense of anonymity inappropriate for student living. In addition, the construction of the Business School and the Law School buildings on two sides of the Monroe Quad have reduced the residential character of this area.

Two options for the structure have been proposed: renovation for administrative/institutional use and replacement with a new building. The following guidelines apply to the second option.

Set Backs:
North Side:
To be determined. Consider relationship to siting of Goldring-Woldenberg.
South Side:
To be determined. Consider relationship to siting of Goldring-Woldenberg.
East Side:
To be determined. Maintain at least 20' to property line to accommodate a service road behind the building.
West Side:
To be determined. Maintain quad width of approximately 125' - 150'.

Building Orientation:
Primary public entry from west side via quad. Service entry from east side via continuation of Weinmann Road.

Building Height:
To be determined. Maximum should not exceed Goldring-Woldenberg Hall and the Law School, 105' - 110' in height.

Materials and Details:
To be determined. Consider use of brick for facade material to relate to the Law School, Goldring-Woldenberg and Sharp.

Landscape:
Maintain open quad to west side of building, using building form to shape and define quad. Create small scale intimate open space adjacent to building as buffer between building and quad.

Estimated Site Area:
80,000 s.f.
### Site C: North and east sides of Newcomb Dean Residence

**Preferred Programmatic Use:**
Academic, Student Service or Public Facility

**General:**
The existing undeveloped open site at this location detracts from the coherence and definition of the U.C. and Newcomb Quads and from the clarity of the grid structure at the intersection of Newcomb Place and Newcomb Circle. This condition could be addressed through development of a building and/or formal landscaping at this site. Recommend a building at the east side of the Dean’s Residence with formal garden at the corner of U.C. quad and Newcomb Place.

**Set Backs:**
- **North Side:** Align building facade with north facade of U.C.
- **South Side:** To be determined. Maintain a minimum distance of approximately 20' from north side of Newcomb Dean Residence if building extends to the west side of the site.
- **East Side:** To be determined. Maintain access to the U.C. service area.
- **West Side:** To be determined. Maintain a building or distinct landscaping edge at approximately 40' from the Newcomb Place street edge to relate to the Newcomb Dean Residence, Dixon Hall and Warren House. Maintain a minimum distance of 20' from the rear of the Dean’s Residence.

**Building Orientation:**
Public entry from west side via Newcomb Place and north side via U.C. Quad. Service entry to be from southeast corner via Library Road. Align building geometry with orientation of the University Center and Newcomb Dean Residence.

**Building Height:**
30' - 35' to relate to heights of U.C. and Newcomb Dean Residence.

**Materials and Details:**
To be determined.

**Landscape:**
Maintain row of oak trees along Newcomb Place. Create a strong planted and/or built edge to define the U.C. Quad. Maintain an open space adjacent to the Newcomb Dean Residence, preferably as a formal garden to the north side of the house.

**Estimated Building Site Area:**
12,000 s.f.

**Estimated Potential Building Area:**
24,000 - 36,000 g.s.f.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Site D: Zimpel Quad

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Academic and/or public facility, preferably for use by an arts department; Theater and Dance recommended.

General:
The original design of the Newcomb campus by James Gamble Rogers called for a mirror image of J.L. on this site; however, the location and design of the Chapel precludes the possibility of development of a symmetrical arrangement of buildings for the quad. Nonetheless, design for this site should contribute to the development of a balanced arrangement of building masses and to the completion of the definition of the quad. Relocation of the chapel should be considered in the development of this site.

Set Backs:
North Side:
To be determined.
South Side:
To be determined.
East Side:
Align with east façade of J.L.
West Side:
35° ± to match Chapel and J.L.

Building Orientation:
Primary public entry from north side (quad side); secondary public entries can be accommodated from east and west sides. Service entry from south side via Zimpel Street. Align building geometry with J.L. and Newcomb Hall.

Building Height:
Preferred building height would match J.L.: 40° ± to cornice line and 52° ± to roof peak. Taller areas, if required, should be buried within the building mass. In no case should the building height exceed that of Newcomb Hall: 52° ± to cornice line, 60° ± to roof peak at the wings, and 67° ± to center roof peak. (Heights measured from top of berm.)

Outdoor Spaces:
Building should create a small scale outdoor space or courtyard overlooking the quad. See precedents of plaza at south side of J.L. and courtyards at west side of the Woldenberg Art Center and east side of Ellenore P. McWilliams Hall.

Materials and Details:
Primary building material to be red brick to match Newcomb Hall, J.L., Dixon, and Woldenberg Art Center. Brick color should match Ellenore P. McWilliams Hall.

Use vertical rectangular window openings comparable in proportion and placement to other buildings on the Newcomb campus. Consider use of other details typical of Newcomb: arched openings at entries, low hip roofs, large roof overhangs, prominent cornice lines at level of second floor.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Landscape:
Extend use of berming as at other Newcomb buildings to this site. Maintain 3 oak trees along east side of site. Align sidewalk along east side of building with longitudinal axis of Newcomb Hall.

Estimated Site Area:
27,000 s.f.

Estimated Potential Building Area:
81,000 - 108,000 g.s.f.
Site E: Freret, Audubon, Zimpel, Howard-Tilton

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Public or administrative facility. Possible academic use, especially if use related to Howard-Tilton Library. Recommend development of parking at this site to serve public facilities in this area of campus.

General:
Development of this block requires purchase of five properties not currently owned by the University (as of March, 1999) as well as a zoning change from RM-1 to RM-4.

Set Backs:
All Sides:
To be determined.

Building Orientation:
Primary public entry from south side via Freret Street. Service entry from north side via Zimpel Street.

Building Height:
To be determined; height along street edges should not exceed 60' ± - the height of Howard-Tilton Library.

Materials and Details:
To be determined.

Landscape:
Continue row of oak trees along Freret Street edge to match planting between Newcomb Place and Calhoun Street.

Estimated Site Area:
50,000 s.f. maximum. Prefer smaller building footprint to allow for open space in the block and to respect the surrounding buildings and neighborhood. Campus patterns of separate buildings surrounding open spaces should be considered in design.

Estimated Potential Building Area:
200,000 g.s.f. maximum by New Orleans Zoning Ordinance in regard to floor / area ratio.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Site F: Plum, Broadway, Audubon and Willow
Alternate A: Maintain Newcomb Nursery and Daycare
Alternate B: Develop entire block; replace Newcomb Nursery and Daycare.

Preferred Programmatic Use:
To be determined. Potential for administrative, service/support or public facilities, or possibly for development of a residential college with J.L.

General:
Development of this block requires purchase of four properties not currently owned by the University (as of March, 1999) as well as a zoning change from RD-2 to RM-4. Alternate B would require relocation of Newcomb Nursery and Daycare functions.

Set Backs:
All Sides:
To be determined.

Building Orientation:
Primary public entry from the west via Broadway and from the southeast via the Audubon Street extension connecting to Newcomb Quad. Service entry from the east via Audubon Street.

Building Height:
To be determined. Buildings should be sensitive to transition to lower scale residential neighborhood across Willow and Broadway. Maximum height should not exceed J.L. House (40-52")

Materials and Details:
To be determined. Building design should relate to image of Newcomb campus to extend and unify the campus presence along Broadway.

Landscape:
Use landscaping elements including trees and other plant materials, fencing, light fixtures, light quality, signage, etc. to reinforce unity of campus image along Broadway and Willow Streets. Create internal open space as an organizing element for the block.

Estimated Site Area:
Alternate A: 38,000 s.f. maximum. Prefer smaller building footprint to allow for open space within the block.
Alternate B: 55,000 s.f maximum. Prefer smaller building footprint to allow for open space within the block.

Estimated Potential Building Area:
Alternate A: Approximately 152,000 s.f. maximum.
Alternate B: Approximately 220,000 s.f. Sizes determined by New Orleans Zoning Ordinance in regard to allowable floor area ratio. Prefer smaller footprint to allow for open space within the block and to respect surrounding buildings and neighborhood. Campus patterns of separate buildings surrounding open spaces should be considered in design.
Site G: Southwest corner of Audubon, Willow
Alternate A: Maintain the Healthcare Building
Alternate B: Develop along Willow Street from Audubon to Newcomb Boulevard. Replace the Healthcare Building.

Preferred Programmatic Use:
To be determined. Potential for academic, administrative, residential, medical, parking applications, and mixed uses.

General:
Development of this site requires relocation of Physical Plant garage, service vehicle parking, miscellaneous storage, and "Logistics". Replacement of those facilities should involve reasonable replacement cost while providing a campus site. The disadvantage would be increased travel to provide maintenance.

Setbacks:
Identify with projections of adjacent conditions (in the same blocks and across streets).

Building Orientation:
Depends on function. Elevation(s) along Willow must respect patterns and architectural qualities of the (residential) neighbourhood. Inclusion of

would replace the Healthcare building. As an entry focal point to the Newcomb campus, the function and appearance of a new facility here could have a valuable identity with Newcomb College.

Building Height:
Maximum of four floors.

Landscape:
Maintain scale and character of neighbourhood streetscape.

Estimated Site Area:
Alternate A: 34,000 s.f.
Alternate B: 52,000 s.f.
Site H: Monk Simons Building: Favrot & Monk Simons Parking Lots
Alternate A: Parking lots only
Alternate B: Parking lots and Monk Simons Building site

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Recreation, Athletics, Parking

General:
Development on this site should involve demolition of the Monk Simons building; its architectural style is not compatible with adjacent facilities and its siting is inconsistent with the placement of more recent buildings in this area of campus.

Set Backs:
North Side:
To be determined. Consider location of a service alley on this side of the building.
South Side:
To be determined. Consider location of a service alley on this side of the building; alternately, new construction on this site could be seen as an addition to the Reily building.
East Side:
Recommend 12' from Ben Weiner Drive to match setbacks of Reily Recreation and the Diboll Parking Complex.
West Side:
To be determined. Building siting should relate to the geometry of Reily Recreation and should allow for and contribute to the development of a pedestrian space between the Reily breezeway and the Wilson Center.

Building Orientation:
Major entries will be from the east side via Ben Weiner Drive and the west side via the pedestrian space extending from Reily to Wilson. The east entry will have opportunity for a more public character; the west entry will be more oriented toward campus traffic. Service should occur via a service alley located either on the north or south side of the building which will be accessed from Ben Weiner Drive. Align building geometry with orientation of Reily.

Building Height:
To be determined. Building height should not exceed height of Reily, approximately 50' - 55'.
POTENTIAL BUILDING SITES

Materials and Details:
Recent design of buildings north of Willow Street has made heavy use of smooth and split face concrete block as a facade material to create a unity of campus appearance in this area. However, use of a single building material is not necessary to make a building contextual and other options for facade materials may be considered.

Landscape:
Planting along east side of the building should contribute to the development of a continuous street character along Ben Weiner Drive. Match tree planting and spacing as well as sidewalk alignment at this edge.

Estimated Site Area:
Alternate A : 34,000 s.f.
Alternate B : 42,000 s.f.

Estimated Potential Building Area:
Alternate A : 102,000 - 136,000 g.s.f.
Alternate B : 126,000 - 168,000 g.s.f.
Site 1: Rosen House

Preferred Programmatic Use:
Public facility, ancillary uses

General:
New construction at this site will require relocation of graduate housing currently accommodated in Rosen House. Housing administrators have indicated that graduate students prefer housing that is physically separated from undergraduate dorms; however, their housing should be more closely connected to other university functions.

Set Backs:
North Side:
Recommend 50'+. Distance between building and Claiborne Avenue should be sufficient to accommodate a formal landscape at this public edge of the university.
South Side: To be determined.
East Side: To be determined.
West Side: At least 20' from property line to allow for a service road.

Building Orientation:
Primary public entry from Claiborne Avenue; primary campus entry from Ben Weiner Drive. Service entry should be accommodated by service alley at west property line.

Materials and Details:
To be determined. Quality of building materials and details must be appropriate for a building which has high public visibility.

Landscape:
Maintain existing tree planting along Claiborne Ave. edge. Planting along east side of the building should contribute to the development of a continuous street character along Ben Weiner Drive. Match tree planting and spacing as well as sidewalk alignment at this edge. Landscape design at the north side of the building should be sufficiently developed to be appropriate for site with high public visibility. Development at this site should relate to other public edges of the campus by similar use of plant materials, fences, light fixtures, light quality, signage, etc.

Estimated Site Area:
90,000 s.f.

Estimated Potential Building Area:
200,000 s.f.
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Summary of Existing Buildings
Summary of Existing Buildings
This summary considers the relationships of the campus buildings to their environment and their function. It does not specifically address the physical condition of buildings or issues related to building codes, life safety codes or the Americans with Disabilities Act.

1 Gibson Hall
History
Constructed 1894
Architects: Harrod and Andry
Building Area: 72,632 gsf
Relation to Campus Environment
Gibson Hall provides the primary public image of the university. It is the first and oldest building on the campus and its neo-romaneshque architectural style is symbolic of the tradition and history of Tulane.
Siting of the building provides closure for the front quad. Symmetrical organization enhances formality of the building and establishes center line of front quad.
Relation to Function
Spaces in Gibson were designed for and are appropriate for administrative and academic use. The building location on a major public street and at the end of a primary academic quad reinforce this mixed use.
Recommendation
Preserve building exterior and interior organization. Maintain mixed use of academic and administrative.

2 Tilton Memorial
History
Constructed 1902; Enlarged 1907
Architect: Andry and Bendernagel
Building Area: 28,603 gsf
Relation to Campus Environment
Tilton Memorial presents an important public image of the University on St. Charles Ave. It is the most highly articulated of the neo-romaneshque buildings, with intricate stone carving and decoration. The building site completes the southwest corner of the front quad.
Relation to Function
Tilton Memorial currently accommodates academic and public functions, including Economics, the Murphy Institute and the Amistad Research Center.
Tilton was originally built to house the university library and includes stack space beautifully designed with glass floors and skylights and areas appropriate for large reading rooms. It was used by the Law School from 1941 to 1971.
Interior
The building originally included an impressive two story, skylit lobby space which was stripped and subdivided in a renovation.
Recommendation
Preserve building exterior. Maintain a library or collection use at least in north wing to preserve stack area. Restoration to recapture the spatial quality and architectural detail of the interior spaces is recommended.

3 Dinwiddie Hall
History
Constructed 1923; Enlarged 1927
Architect: Moise Goldstein & Associates
Building Area: 49,644 gsf
Relation to Campus Environment
Dinwiddie presents an important public image of the University on St. Charles Ave. Its architectural style is complementary to and compatible with Gibson Hall and the other original buildings of the front quad. The building sitting completes the southeast corner of the front quad and creates an edge for the courtyard between Dinwiddie and Gibson.
Relation to Function
Dinwiddie is currently used by Geology, Biology and the Middle American Research Institute. It was originally built as a science building, and has housed various academic departments over time, including sociology, German, law and journalism.
Recommendation
Preserve the building exterior. Maintain use as an academic facility.
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4 Richardson Memorial

History
Constructed 1908
Architect: Andry and Bendermagel
Major interior renovation 1986, School of Architecture faculty - John P. Klingman,
Design Coordinator
Building Area: 50,126 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Neo-romanesque architecture style similar to Gibson Hall. Richardson Memorial partially defines the east edge of the front campus.

Relation to Function
Richardson Memorial houses the School of Architecture. It was originally built to accommodate the coursework for the first two years of the School of Medicine curriculum. Spacious rooms in the north and south wings are appropriate for laboratory or studio use.

Recommendation
Preserve exterior of building and interior organization and use by the School of Architecture.

5 Richardson Building

History
Constructed 1894; Enlarged 1908
Architect: Harrod and Andry
Building Area: 36,307 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Angled sitting corresponds to placement of Hebert Building and helps shape the front quad by reducing the width of the quad near its center. Architectural style similar to Gibson, though executed in orange brick instead of stone.

6 Norman Mayer Building

History
Constructed 1942; Enlarged 1949 (North wing and third floor)
Architect: Diboll, Kessels
Building Area: 30,212 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Neo-romanesque architecture style similar to Gibson Hall. Norman Mayer partially defines the west edge of the front campus.

Relation to Function
Norman Mayer currently accommodates the English and political science departments; it was constructed as a facility for the College of Commerce and Business Administration. Spaces are appropriate for a mix of classrooms and offices.

Recommendation
Preserve the building exterior. Maintain use as an academic facility.

7 F. Edward Hebert Hall

History
Constructed 1894
Architect: Harrod and Andry
Enlarged 1979
Architect: Diboll, Kessels
Building Area: 25,132 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Angled sitting of the building is mirrored by Richardson and helps shape the front quad by reducing the width of the quad near its center. Architectural style similar to Gibson, though executed in orange brick instead of stone.

Relation to Function
Hebert is currently used by the history department, and by the Hebert Foundation. It was originally designed to house the physics department; the building was oriented toward the direction of magnetic north to facilitate use of instru-
ments by the department. Spaces are appropriate for a mix of classrooms and offices.

**Recommendation**
Preserve building exterior. Maintain use as an academic facility.

8 **Robert C. Cudd Hall**

*History*
Constructed 1902
Architect: Andry and Bendernagel
Restored 1999: Trapolin Architects

*Building Area*: 16,251 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The Robert C. Cudd building partially defines the west edge of the front campus. Its architectural style and use of materials are similar to the Social Work Building and compatible with the other old buildings of the front campus.

*Relation to Function*
The building as originally designed housed the campus refectory and consisted of one large dining room surrounded by porches with kitchen and service space on the Law Road side of the building.

**Recommendation**
Preserve the building exterior. Maintain use as an academic and administrative facility.

9 **Social Work Building**

*History*
Constructed 1902
Architect: Andry and Bendernagel

*Building Area*: 16,460 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The Social Work Building partially defines the west edge of the front campus. It has a thin footprint to counterbalance the wider development of the engineering buildings at the east edge of campus and to maintain green space in the middle of campus. The building is architecturally similar to Cudd Hall and compatible with the other old buildings on the front campus.

*Relation to Function*
The building was constructed as the first dormitory for campus. It has a tripartite organization with load bearing walls at its third points; it contained six two bedroom suites per floor, one on either side of its three stair halls. The spaces have been greatly altered to accommodate classrooms and offices; the center stair hall has been removed.

**Recommendation**
Preserve the building exterior and maintain academic use.

10 **Stanley Thomas Hall**

*History*
Constructed 1911
Architect: Andry and Bendernagel

Fourth floor added 1929
Architect: J. Herndon Thomson
Renovated 1998: Waldemar Nelson

*Building Area*: 34,320 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
Stanley Thomas is architecturally similar to the other older buildings of the front campus. It is sited north of Richardson, and helps define the change in geometry of the quad caused by the angled orientation of Richardson and Hebert. The building partially defines an outdoor courtyard to its cast towards Civil Engineering. The Engineering Shops, built along the north face of the building, are architecturally and formally incompatible with Stanley Thomas.

*Relation to Function*
The building was constructed to house the College of Technology and contains spaces appropriate for classrooms, labs and offices.

**Recommendation**
Preserve the building exterior and maintain use as an academic facility.

11 **Civil Engineering**

*History*
Constructed 1894
Architect: Harrod and Andry

*Building Area*: 11,094 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
Civil Engineering is one of the four original buildings constructed on the
Tulane campus and is architecturally similar to Gibson Hall. It is located on the east edge of the front campus along Engineering Road. Its placement with relation to Stanley Thomas and Richardson isolates the building from the quad. The building partially defines a courtyard to its west towards Stanley Thomas.

**Relation to Function**
The building originally housed the College of Technology and was designed to accommodate classrooms, labs and offices.

**Recommendation**
Building renovations should seek a return to original conditions and preserve the building exterior. Maintain use as an academic building.

**12 Mechanical Services Building**

**History**
Constructed 1894
Architect: Harrod and Andry
2nd floor added 1949
Architect: Goldstein, Parham, and Labouisse

**Building Area:** 27,367 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Mechanical Services partially defines the east edge of the front campus; it is located behind Stanley Thomas, the Engineering Shops and Mechanical Engineering, and so is not visible from the quad. The ground floor of the building was one of the first buildings constructed on campus; however it has been so altered and changed by additions that its historic significance is largely lost.

**Relation to Function**
The building was designed to accommodate classrooms and labs.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building or demolish in connection with a complete redevelopment of the engineering complex between Stanley Thomas and Boggs. Maintain academic use of this zone.

**13 Chemical Engineering**

**History**
Constructed 1949
Architect: Goldstein, Parham and Labouisse

**Building Area:** 9,159 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Chemical Engineering partially defines the east edge of the front campus. It is located at the edge of Engineering Road and set behind a small open space between Mechanical Engineering and Boggs; it has limited visual impact on the campus from the quad side.

**Relation to Function**
The building was designed to accommodate lab space similar to its current use.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building or demolish in connection with a complete redevelopment of the engineering complex between Stanley Thomas and Boggs. Maintain academic use of this zone.

**14 Mechanical Engineering**

**History**
Constructed 1894
Architect: Harrod and Andry
Additions and modifications 1949
Architect: Goldstein, Parham and Labouisse

**Building Area:** 18,501 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Mechanical Engineering partially defines the edge of the front quad near Freret Street and helps form a courtyard to its north also bounded by Chemical Engineering and Boggs. Though Mechanical Engineering was one of the original campus buildings, it has been so altered by the addition of a second floor and by a new facade facing the quad that its historical value is largely lost.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building or demolish in connection with a complete redevelopment of the engineering complex between Stanley Thomas and Boggs. Maintain academic use of this zone.
15 Lindy Boggs Center

**History**

Constructed 1987
Architect: Waldermal S. Nelson & John Desmond and Associates

**Building Area:** 109,188 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**

Boggs defines the west edge of the front quad at its Freret Street end. Its design makes reference to architectural elements used on the older campus buildings, but simplifies the detail and omits the middle scale elements. Its massing and its height are out of scale with other buildings of the front campus.

**Relation to Function**

Designed to accommodate current mix of offices, classrooms and labs.

**Recommendation**

Maintain building and its current use.

16 Engineering Shops

**History**

Constructed 1958
Architect: Freret and Wolf

**Building Area:** 3,555 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**

The Engineering Shops are located between Stanley Thomas, Mechanical Engineering and Mechanical Services on the east side of the front campus. The building abuts the north side of Stanley Thomas and compromises the symmetry and proportion of that side of Stanley Thomas. It is significantly smaller in scale than neighboring buildings, and its placement confuses the organization and continuity of the engineering zone.

**Recommendation**

Consider demolition in connection with a complete redevelopment of the engineering complex between Stanley Thomas and Boggs. Maintain academic use of this zone.

17 Alcee Fortier

**History**

Constructed 1908
Architect: DeBuys, Churchill and Labouisse
Renovated 1998: Wilson Architects

**Building Area:** 9,327 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**

Alcee Fortier partially defines the west edge of the front campus. It has a thin footprint to counterbalance the wider development of the engineering buildings at the east edge of campus and to maintain green space in the middle of campus. The building is architecturally compatible with the other old buildings on the front campus.

**Relation to Function**

Fortier was constructed as a dormitory for medical students. It contained single bedrooms organized on either side of a central corridor. The building has been greatly modified to accommodate classrooms and offices currently used by the Center for Bio-Environmental Research.

**Recommendation**

Preserve the building exterior and maintain academic use.

18 Merryl and Sam Israel, Jr.

Environmental Science Building

**History**

Constructed 1999
Architects: Wilson Architects and Payette Associates

**Building Area:** 50,000 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**

The ESB was located to present a new termination for the North end of the front quad. Elements of the building's design are related to surrounding buildings providing a contemporary but harmonious application at this important location.

**Relation to Function**

The building was designed to provide teaching and research laboratories, classroom and office facilities, primarily for university sciences. It is located next to the main science building of campus (Stern Hall), and the Engineering complex. This location encourages additional renovations within Stern, as has occurred in Alcee Fortier hall.
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Recommendation
Maintain the building and use.

19 Percival Stern Hall
History
Constructed 1971
Architect: Curtis and Davis; and Thompson B. Burk & Associates
Building Area: 175,071 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Stern Hall constitutes a barrier separating the front campus from Freret Street. Pedestrian passage is heavy through a breezeway of impersonal and hard detail.

The building's modernist architectural style is inconsistent and incompatible with the other buildings of the front campus and its scale and massing are overwhelming to the older buildings in this area.

Relation to Function
Stern was designed to accommodate offices, classrooms and labs similar to its current use. The science departments occupying the building are currently short of space. The building was structured to accommodate two additional floors.

Recommendation
Maintain the building or replace it altogether. Additions would only aggravate its current incompatibility.

25 Joseph M. Jones Hall
History
Constructed 1941
Architect: Moise Goldstein and Associates—Professor N.C. Curtis, School of Architecture, Designer
Renovated/Restored 1998: Curtis, Riddick and Heipel, Architects
N.C. "Buster" Curtis, Jr, Designer, and Henry H. Fry, Campus Architect
Building Area: 106,069 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Jones Hall marks the northeast corner of the intersection of Newcomb Place and Freret Street and has a high degree of public visibility from Freret. It has a generous setback from Freret Street similar to the setbacks of the Central Building and Navy ROTC. It partly wraps a courtyard on its north side. The building is architecturally similar to the buildings of the Newcomb campus and compatible with other older buildings on the front and middle campuses.

Relation to Function
Jones Hall was originally designed to house the university library with six levels of stack space on its east side and large reading rooms on the west and south sides. It was renovated to accommodate the law school in 1971; the reading rooms were converted to classrooms or cut up for offices and most of their architectural detail was lost. The building was returned to library and academic use in 1998.

Recommendation
Maintain the exterior appearance and the character of the interior spaces. Maintain library and academic use.

26 Newcomb Dean’s Residence
History
Constructed 1925
Architect: Paul Andry
Building Area: 3,500 gsf (est.)

Relation to Campus Environment
The Dean’s Residence is located on Newcomb Place. It reads as a residual residential structure on a street now more densely developed for campus use. The building is out of scale with other campus buildings and its siting with large rear and side yards is out of character for the university. The setback of the building from the south edge of the U.C. Quad compromises the definition of this primary open space.

Recommendation
Consider potential for additional built development in this area through building or more formal and structured development of outdoor space. See analysis of potential building sites.
29 **University Center**

*History*
Constructed 1959
Architect: Curtis and Davis
Renovated: 1985
Architect: Henry Fry, Resident Architect

*Building Area*: 141,986 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The U.C. is located on the west side of McAlister Drive at the U.C. Quad and partly defines the south edge of the U.C. Quad. The buildings in this zone of the middle campus - U.C., Central and Jones - are relatively large and square in footprint and occupy a large percentage of the land in this zone. They do not define an interior quad; the residual space between the buildings is occupied by the pocket park.

*Relation to Function*
The U.C. contains student service spaces including the bookstore, food service, copy center, travel center, computer lab, student organization offices and offices for the Vice President for Student Affairs. The spaces on the first floor of the building are organized around a wide corridor which runs from the pocket park to the U.C. quad and acts as an interior public street connecting these two outdoor spaces.

*Recommendation*
Maintain the building and student service use. Develop existing terraces on the second level. Consider major addition/renovation.

30 **Central Building**

*History*
Constructed 1933
Architect: Armstrong and Koch

*Building Area*: 60,884 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The Central Building marks the northwest corner of the intersection of Freret Street and McAlister Drive and, along with the U.C., it defines the edges of the Pocket Park. It has a strong presence on Freret St. It is compatible in use of materials and scale with Jones Hall and has some architectural similarities with the Navy Building and the Law School; it does not share this image affinity with Stern Hall across the street.
The building has a generous set back from Freret similar to Jones and Navy, but it is set tightly against the sidewalk along McAlister and so prevents straightening of the west edge of McAlister.

*Relation to Function*
The Central Building houses the university basketball arena. It was designed to also include athletic offices and two sets of locker rooms; these areas have been renovated to accommodate offices for the treasurer, accounting, payroll, budget, controller as well as athletics.

31 **Navy R.O.T.C. Building**

*History*
Constructed 1912
Architect: DeBuys, Churchill and Labouisse

*Building Area*: 15,153 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The Navy Building marks the northeast corner of the intersection of Freret Street and McAlister Drive. Its placement requires McAlister Drive to bend and narrow at its intersection with Freret and prevents a direct line of sight through campus from this primary campus entrance. The building's scale is significantly smaller than other campus buildings in the area. Brick color is not typical for the Tulane campus.

*Relation to Function*
The building was constructed to house the university gymnasium. It has been altered by the addition of offices on the mezzanine and on part of the gym floor. The building is currently occupied by Navy R.O.T.C.


**APPENDIX A**

**Recommendation**
This prominent site would be more appropriate for a public or academic use. Consider reassignment of the building or redevelopment of this site, including realignment of McAlister Drive.

32 **Weinmann Hall**

*History*
Constructed 1993
Architect: Hartman, Cox

*Building Area:* 151,000 gsf (est.)

*Relation to Campus Environment*
The Law School has a prominent public location on Freret Street; it is the easternmost building of the campus on Freret and marks the beginning of Tulane property for those travelling uptown on Freret. The building’s situating along Freret is set much closer to the street edge than the Navy and Central Buildings and Jones Hall. The building design creates two courtyards and a pedestrian connection from the northwest corner of the building to McAlister Drive.

38 **J. Blanc Monroe Dormitory**

*History*
Constructed 1963
Architects: Diboll, Kessels; Koch and Wilson

*Building Area:* 114,100 gsf

*Relation to Campus Environment*

Monroe is located along the east property boundary of the middle campus and defines one edge of the Monroe Quad. It is one of the tallest buildings on campus, but its height is balanced by the development of other taller buildings such as Goldring-Woldenberg and the Law School at this quad. The building’s modernist architectural style is seen in several other dormitories on the middle campus.

**Recommendation**
The building size and density of occupancy is inappropriate for an underclass dorm; the building does not foster development of a sense of community among students because of the number of occupants, the isolation of the floors from each other (vertical circulation via elevators), and the lack of functional communal space. The building has significant deferred maintenance and needs for upgrading.

**Recommendation**
The use of the building for undergraduate housing should be discontinued. Recommend conversion to an institutional use or demolition to allow for a new facility at this location.

39 **Goldring-Woldenberg Hall**

*History*
Constructed 1985
Architect: Concordia Architects

40 **Cunningham Observatory**

*History*
Constructed 1941
Architect: Favrot and Reed

*Building Area:* 2,876 gsf
Relation to Campus Environment
The observatory is sited on the east side of McAlester Drive. Its set back from McAlester is similar to that of McAlester Auditorium. The building is significantly smaller than other campus facilities and has a distinctive form derived from its function; these characteristics make it read as a small object rather than as an element of the street edge.

Relation to Function
The building was designed to house the observatory telescope and also includes one classroom.

Recommendation
Preserve the building and maintain current use. The building could potentially be moved to another location on campus.

41 Telecommunications

History
Constructed 1985
Architect: Larry Hammill Case

Building Area: 4,166 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
The building was located between Monroe and Sharp dormitories because the ground area was available and the result was considered to have minimum impact on the campus environment. It represents the physical center of campus communications; most of the underground campus wiring goes through this facility.

Relation to Function
The building was designed to accommodate its current users.

Recommendation
Maintain the building and existing use. Consider relocation of the function to accommodate expansion and to allow physical (vehicular) access to service the buildings of Monroe Quad.

42 Sharp Hall

History
Constructed 1959
Architects: Koch and Wilson; Diboll, Kessels

Relation to Campus Environment
Sharp is located on the east property line in the middle campus. The building is L-shaped in plan with one wing defining the north end of Monroe Quad and the other wing placed along the property line. The building create an outdoor space at the intersection of the wings. The height of the building and its architectural style are similar to Monroe Hall and appropriate for the middle campus.

Relation to Function
Building size and density are high, though the design of the building - its division into two wings - helps to reduce the experience of the building to a more appropriate scale. Corridor lengths in each wing are too long and anonymous and the appearance of the interior public spaces and corridors is monotonous and depressing.

Recommendation
Consider opportunities for renovation, conversion to another form of housing (suites, apartments), or conversion to another use.

43 McAlester Auditorium

History
Constructed 1940
Architect: Favrot and Reed

Building Area: 25,360 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
McAlester Auditorium is located on the east side of McAlester Drive at the intersection of McAlester Drive with the U.C. Quad. It marks the east end of the open space formed by the U.C. and Newcomb Quads and provides a terminus to the view from Newcomb Hall across these quads. The generous set back from McAlester reinforces this connection across the quads by isolating the building from the street edge. The building’s materials and details are compatible with older campus buildings.

Relation to Function
The building is used for a variety of assembly purposes. It has until recently been used to accommodate graduation exercises; however graduations have been relocated off campus to a larger
facility. It also includes spaces used by the Music Department.

**Recommendation**
Preserve building exterior. Modify interior as necessary to maximize potential uses.

### Irby House

**History**
Constructed 1954
Architects: Freret and Wolf; Andry and Feitel; Ricciuti and Stoffle.
Preliminary designs by Buford L. Pickens, John W. Lawrence, George A. Saunders, and John Rock of the School of Architecture faculty.

**Building Area:** 57,976 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Irby is located on McAlistier Drive to the north side of McAlistier Auditorium. The building partially defines the south edge of Bruff Quad; it is mirrored by Phelps House which is located on the north side of the quad. The building’s modernist design is suitable for this zone of campus which contains buildings of various architectural styles.

**Relation to Function**
Building design uses principles of regional architecture, specifically exterior circulation and galleries; execution of design is of good quality. Galleries are wide enough for use as both circulation and balcony. Building is organized around groups of four adjacent double rooms sharing a bathroom. Lack of well developed and properly located communal space hinders development of a residential community.

A portion of the ground floor of Irby is used to accommodate offices for Housing and Residential Life.

**Recommendation**
Maintain building. Consider conversion to four room suites containing three bedrooms and a living room. Relocate non residential functions from first floor to another location. Improve community spaces.

### Paterson House

**History**
Constructed 1951
Architect: Koch and Wilson
Renovated 1996
Architect: Koch and Wilson

**Building Area:** 29,683 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Paterson partly defines the east edge of the middle campus; it also helps form the east edge of Bruff Quad. The building forms a semi-private courtyard on its east side. The building has little public visibility. The building is similar in size and scale to other buildings around Bruff Quad, but significantly smaller than Sharp Hall to its south.

### Zemurray Hall

**History**
Constructed 1949
Architect: Herbert Benson

**Building Area:** 21,444 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Zemurray is located on Willow Street at the east property line of the middle campus. It partly defines the east side of Bruff Quad. The building has a public presence on Willow Street; however, this street edge is underdeveloped and inconsistent and the university boundaries are unclearly marked. The building is similar in size and scale to other buildings around Bruff Quad.

**Relation to Function**
The building contains a large common space but it is not well used because it is physically isolated from the dorm rooms. The building corridors are narrow and the room size is inappropriate for double
occupancy.

**Recommendation**
Renovate the existing building by converting bedrooms to single occupancy, or replace it with a new residential facility.
Relocate copy center from the building and renovate public spaces for residents of Zemurray and Phelps.

47 **Phelps House**

**History**
Constructed 1954
Architects: Freret and Wolf; Andry and Feitell; Ricciuti and Stoffle.
Preliminary designs by Buford L. Pickens, John W. Lawrence, George A. Saunders, and John Rock of the School of Architecture faculty.

**Building Area:** 57,976 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Phelps is located on Willow Street at McAlister Drive. It has prominent visibility along the public street but more minor impact on McAlister. The building partially defines the north edge of Bruff Quad; it is mirrored by Irby House which is located on the south side of the quad. The building's modernist design is suitable for this zone of campus which contains buildings of various architectural styles.

**Recommendation**
Maintain building. Consider conversion to four room suites containing three bedrooms and a living room. Relocate non-residential functions from first floor to another location. Improve community spaces.

48 **Bruff Commons**

**History**
Constructed 1963
Architects: John Lachin; Favrot and Grimbball Associates

**Building Area:** 33,629 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Bruff is located on the east side of McAlister Drive. It is sited fairly close to the street line and is oriented with its facade parallel to the street; other buildings on this side of McAlister are typically set farther back from the curb and canted away from the street line.
The building defines the west edge of Bruff Quad. It is in the center of a ring of dormitories extending from Newcomb Place to the east property line and Willow Street to Drill Road.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building and type of use. This building could be considered as suitable for major modification if functional requirements warrant expansion or alteration to student services, although the site should be maintained for this use. Improvements should be made to the space between the building and McAlister Drive; modifications made to the service area at the north side of the building to better screen it from view; and landscape improvements of strong and intimate scale and detail added to the south side.

52 **Pierce Butler House**

**History**
Constructed 1963
Architect: Burk and Lamantia

**Building Area:** 67,576 gsf
APPENDIX A

Relation to Campus Environment
Butler is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of McAlistar Drive and Willow Street and partially defines the north edge of Butler Quad. The building has major entrances from its east and west sides, with services located on Willow Street. Butler is taller than other buildings in the area and it is stylistically unlike other campus buildings, its difference is somewhat negated by its location in an area of campus which contains a wide variety of building styles and masses.

 Relation to Function
The building is not considered to be successful for undergraduate housing. Overall density of occupancy is acceptable; however, building height and vertical connection via elevators discourage development of a sense of community. Elevator lobbies are small and grim. In addition, the communal spaces above ground level are located in the center of the building plan and have no opportunities for natural lighting. The placement of the elevator/service/bathroom functions in the middle of the building effectively isolates rooms on the east side from those on the west.

Recommendation
Maintain housing at this site. Consider potential for renovation or interior conversion to accommodate a different type of housing unit or specific segment of the population. Consider also potential for replacement of the building.

55 Katherine & William Mayer Residences

History
Constructed 1997
Architects: Perkins & Well
Building Area: 80,000 gsf (prox.)

Relation to Campus Environment
Mayer is located at the northwest corner of McAlistar Drive and Drill Road. It defines the south side of Butler Quad. The building is compatible in scale and massing and similar in siting to Warren House.

Relation to Function
The building design uses principles of regional architecture, specifically exterior circulation and galleries. The solution is well suited to the middle campus and the U.C. Quad.

56 Warren House

History
Constructed 1928
Architect: Diboll and Owen
Enlarged 1952
Architect: Richard Koch

Building Area: 53,486 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Warren is located at the corner of Drill Field Road and Newcomb Place; the original building fronted on Newcomb Place and the addition forms a wing along Drill Road. The building partially defines the boundaries of Butler Quad and creates a small courtyard in the joint between the original building and the newer wing. The building style and use of materials are complementary to the Newcomb buildings across Newcomb Place.

Relation to Function
Warren is considered to be a popular and successful undergraduate dorm, in all likelihood because of the quality of the architectural design and level of maintenance/renovation. The plan arrangement of the building and variation in room size, fenestration, etc. allow for individuality between rooms. Location of common space adjacent to primary building entry and connection of common space to exterior courtyard are successful.

Recommendation
Maintain building and use as a dormitory.

57 Doris Hall Lounge

History
Constructed 1958

Building Area: 2,205 gsf
Relation to Campus Environment
Doris Lounge was designed as part of a complex with New Doris and with a renovation to Old Doris. The buildings create a courtyard between them; the courtyard is divided by covered walkways, exterior stairs and ramps which connect the buildings and reduce and constrain the usable area of the outdoor space. The building's modest scale and modernist style make it unobtrusive in the campus environment.

Relation to Function
Doris Lounge provides study and gathering space for residential students in adjacent dormitories and includes a small kitchen for their use. One room of the building has been recently converted to a laundry. The facility is greatly underutilized.

Recommendation
Renovate the area around Doris Hall, Doris Lounge and New Doris or replace Doris Lounge and New Doris and build new housing integrated with Old Doris. In the case of renovation, simplify and remove covered walks and ramps to increase usable area and attraction of the courtyard between these buildings.
Consider Doris Lounge as a possible location for other student functions, such as a small dining area, to increase use of the building.

58 New Doris Hall

History
Constructed 1958
Building Area: 28,588 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
New Doris is located along Willow Street near Newcomb Place. It forms part of the boundary of the middle campus and is highly visible to the public. The building was constructed along with the Doris Lounge and renovation of Doris Hall and, with these buildings, forms a courtyard shared by these dormitory residents; the usable space of the courtyard is compromised by the system of stairs, ramps and covered walkways connecting the buildings. New Doris also helps to define an outdoor area between Butler Hall and Doris Lounge which connects to the Butler Quad.

Relation to Function
The building design uses principles of regional architecture, specifically exterior circulation and gallerie; execution of the design is not of high quality. Galleries are too narrow for use other than circulation. Building is organized around four adjacent double rooms sharing a bathroom. Communal space is in a separate building, Doris Lounge. Building capacity is low.

Recommendation
Renovate along with Doris Lounge and Old Doris or replace New Doris and Lounge and build new housing integrated with Old Doris. In the case of renovation, simplify and/or remove covered walks and ramps to increase usable area of the courtyard between these buildings.

59 Doris Hall

History
Constructed 1925
Architect: Francis J. MacDonnell
Building Area: 10,582 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Doris is located at the north end of Newcomb Place at its intersection with Willow Street. The building was designed with a prominent entry from Newcomb Place, but this entry has been closed and entry to the building has been relocated to the east side via a courtyard formed between Doris, New Doris Hall and Doris Lounge. This courtyard contains a confusing jumble of covered walks, stairs and ramps which reduce and confine the usable exterior space. The renovation of the building and the relocation of its entry have compromised the spatial organization and architectural character of the building and the creation of a linked complex of the three buildings in this area has
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jeopardized the building’s autonomy.

Relation to Function
The building was designed as a dormitory for Newcomb College, and originally included a house mother’s suite, living room, dining room, kitchen on the first floor and bedrooms on the second floor. The basement was used for laundry, storage and boiler rooms. The first floor has been altered to create additional bedrooms and the communal spaces have been eliminated. The building is in poor condition and currently unsuitable for occupation.

Recommendation
Renovate the building if possible. Maintain housing or housing related function at this location. Consider potential for renovation in conjunction with replacement of New Doris and Doris Lounge, using Old Doris as a physical/functional frontispiece for a new complex.

Howard Tilton Library

60

History
Constructed 1968
Architect: Nolan, Norman and Nolan

Building Area: 215,348 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Howard Tilton is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Freret Street and Newcomb Place. The building is prominent from both streets and has high public visibility from Freret Street. The building’s modern architectural style is dissimilar to its immediate neighbors, but appropriate for the eclectic range of styles used in the middle campus. Its scale, especially in terms of its footprint is larger than most other campus buildings. Its siting with respect to Freret Street is compromised by its size; the building is set much closer to Freret than other campus buildings and it therefore hinders development of a unified street edge to mark this public exposure of the campus. The building is also set closer to Newcomb Place than other buildings.

Relation to Function
The building was designed to accommodate construction of four additional floors to allow for expansion and growth of the library collection.

Recommendation
Maintain building and library use. Consider potential for library expansion, through the addition of two floors and/or through development of property on the west side of the building. Addition of four floors to the existing building would aggravate the discrepancy of scale between this building and other campus and neighborhood buildings.

Dixon Hall

68

History
Constructed 1929
Architect: Emile Weil, Inc.

Building Area: 51,888 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Dixon Hall is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Newcomb Place and Newcomb Circle and at the end of the southern wing of buildings defining the Newcomb Quad. It is architecturally similar to the original buildings of the Newcomb campus and through its massing, materials, scale, detail and siting helps define and unify the Newcomb campus.

Relation to Function
The building was designed to house the music department and contains performance, practice and office spaces.

Recommendation
Preserve the building exterior and its current use. Renovate building interior.

Dixon Performing Arts Center

69

History
Constructed 1984
Architect: Leake Associates

Building Area: 25,457 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
The Dixon Annex is one of only three buildings constructed on the Newcomb campus since the 1920’s. The materials, details, massing and scale of the build-
ing are successfully manipulated to make the building compatible with the Newcomb campus though the building still maintains its architectural individuality. The building's siting corresponds to the placement of Newcomb Gym on the opposite side of Newcomb Circle and so enhances the organizational principles of the original Rogers master plan for the Newcomb campus. Dixon Annex creates an outdoor courtyard on its east side next to Dixon Hall, which reinforces the campus pattern of small private outdoor spaces adjacent to large quads.

**Relation to Function**
Dixon Annex was designed to supplement the spaces used by the music department in Dixon Hall and to accommodate a small performance space for theater.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building and existing use.

---

73. **Rogers Memorial Chapel**

**History**
Constructed 1976
Architect: Desmond, Miremont

**Building Area:** 5,017 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Rogers Chapel is located on the Newcomb campus between Newcomb Hall and Broadway Street. The building's siting and its distinctive form make the building incongruous to the organization and image of the Newcomb campus. Its architectural style and lack of intermediate scale detail also make the building stand apart as different from its neighbors.

**Relation to Function**
The building provides space for non-denominational religious services and small public assembly functions.

**Recommendation**
Consider potential for development on Zimpel Quad to integrate the building better into the organization and patterns of the Newcomb campus.

---

74. **Newcomb Hall**

**History**
Constructed 1918
Architect: James Gamble Rogers

**Building Area:** 91,921 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Newcomb Hall is the functional and architectural center piece of the Newcomb College; it is located between the two open quads which define the organization of the Newcomb campus. The building is one of the original three built for Newcomb and designed by James Gamble Rogers who created the master plan for the college. Its architectural style and use of materials and details set the standard for the image of Newcomb.

**Relation to Function**
The building was designed as the administrative and academic center for Newcomb College and has continued to be used for similar purposes although many of the original spaces have been subdivided to accommodate larger numbers of offices. It currently contains spaces used by the departments of psychology, philosophy, communications, sociology, math, Spanish, French, Italian, history, German, classical languages, and Spanish and Portuguese.

**Recommendation**
Preserve the building exterior. Maintain academic use and use as the administrative headquarters for Newcomb College.
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75  Josephine Louise House
    History
    Constructed 1918
    Architect: James Gamble Rogers
    Building Area: 61,205 gsf
    Relation to Campus Environment
    J.L. is one of the original three buildings of the Newcomb campus and was
designed by James Gamble Rogers who created the master plan for the college.
It defines the north side of the Broadway Street quad and has a prominent public
visibility along Broadway. The building is architecturally similar to the other
original Rogers buildings - Newcomb Hall and Newcomb Art - as well as to
Dixon Hall, Newcomb Gym and Newcomb Pool which were built shortly
after the first three. These buildings define an architectural style which was
intended to be visually identifiable as referring to Newcomb.
    Relation to Function
    J.L. was the original dormitory for Newcomb College. It is currently
considered to be one of the most suc-
cessful and popular dorms, in all likeli-
hood because of the architectural
character of the original design and
quality of maintenance and renovation.
In addition, the dorm has well designed
and often used community spaces. The
building is physically isolated from the
rest of the undergraduate dorms and
from student service facilities.
    Recommendation
    Preserve the building. Consider potential
for development of a specialized residen-
tial program in this building (for example,
a residential college or academic dorm
combined with the relocation of the
Newcomb Center for Research on
Women). Consider also conversion to
academic/administrative use. Relocate
university maintenance functions out of
the building.

82  Woldenberg Art Center (West Wing)
    Renovated to become the Woldenberg
    Art Center in 1997
    Architect: Hartman Cox
    This wing of the Woldenberg Art Center
    was originally constructed as two
    buildings, the Newcomb Gym and the
    Newcomb Pool:
    Newcomb Gym
    History
    Constructed 1923
    Architect: Frank G. Churchill
    Building Area: 34,157 gsf
    Relation to Campus Environment
    The Newcomb Gym was designed
    shortly after the construction of the
    original Newcomb College buildings
    and is similar to them in massing, use of
    materials and detail.
    Relation to Function
    The building has been converted to
    accommodate offices and a lecture
    facility for art history instruction for the
    Art Department.

77  Newcomb Nursery School
    History
    Constructed 1958
    Architect: John Dinwiddie
    Building Area: 6,326 gsf
    Relation to Campus Environment
    The Newcomb Nursery is located at the
corner of Audubon and Plum Streets
behind J.L. and on the edge of the
Newcomb campus. It has little environ-
mental effect on the campus; however, if
this block is considered for campus
expansion, then the relationship of the
Nursery to the campus will be redefined.
    Relation to Function
    The building was designed for its current
function.
    Recommendation
    Maintain the building and its existing
use. If this block is considered for
 campus expansion, then the appropriate-
ness of the building and the location of
the nursery at this site should be re-
evaluated.
Originally constructed as the Newcomb Pool, this building was designed shortly after the construction of the original Newcomb college buildings and is similar to those buildings in use of materials and detail, though smaller in scale. It was built as an addition to Newcomb Gym, converting that building to an L-shaped plan and creating an open space at the north west corner of Newcomb Quad.

Relation to Function
The building was converted for use as a sculpture studio to accommodate the Art Department.

Recommendation
Maintain the buildings use.

83 Woldenberg Art Center (East Wing)
Renovated into the Woldenberg Art Center in 1996
Architect: Hartman Cox
Constructed 1923 as the Newcomb Art School
Renovated to add the Glass Studio 1986
Building Area: 34,157 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
The Newcomb Art Building is one of the original three buildings of the Newcomb campus and was designed by James Gamble Rogers who created the master plan for the college. It defines the north east corner of Newcomb Quad and has a prominent public visibility along Newcomb Place. The building is architecturally similar to the other original Rogers buildings - Newcomb Hall and J.J. - as well as to Dixon Hall, Newcomb Gym and Newcomb Pool which were built shortly after the first three. These buildings define an architectural style which was intended to be visually identifiable as referring to Newcomb.

Recommendation
Maintain the building and use.

84 Caroline Richardson Building

History
Constructed 1958
Architect: Robert Cummins
Building Area: 20,060 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
Caroline Richardson reinforces the western street edge of Newcomb Place; it is located at the end of Plum Street and partly defines an outdoor area at the end of Plum St. which is used by the Art Department. The building modernist style is appropriate for the middle campus which contains buildings of a wide range of architectural styles; but, despite the use of brick as a facade material, the style prevents a visual association of this building with the other buildings of the Newcomb campus.

Relation to Function
The building was designed to provide a food service location for the Newcomb campus. It currently accommodates a library on the ground floor and the Newcomb Center for Research on Women on the second floor.

Recommendation
Maintain the building.

85 Physical Plant Building

History
Constructed 1929
Architect: Emile Weil
Enlarged 1963
Building Area: 22,372 gsf

Relation to Campus Environment
The Physical Plant Building is located behind Caroline Richardson Hall in the block bounded by Newcomb Place, Plum Street, Audubon Street and Willow Street. It is not visible from any major public areas of campus and has limited impact on campus environment.

Relation to Function
The building was originally the laundry and boiler house for Newcomb College.
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It has been expanded and enlarged through the addition of a second floor and currently accommodates trade shops on its ground level and administrative offices on the second floor.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building and existing use.

86 **Power Plant Building**

**History**
Constructed 1958

Architect: Paul Charbonnet

**Building Area:** 27,752 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The building is located on Plum Street in the block bounded by Newcomb Place, Willow and Audubon Streets. It is at the edge of the developed campus area and has low public visibility.

**Recommendation**
Maintain this and other plant service facilities in this area where they are not highly visible; do not occupy land or buildings that are more appropriate for more general use functions and accommodate service vehicles at an edge (rather than center) of campus.

88 **Physical Plant Garage**

**History**
Constructed 1968

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The building is located in the center of the block roughly formed by Newcomb Place, Audubon Street, Plum Street and Willow. It is not publicly visible.

**Recommendation**
Maintain this and other plant service facilities in this area where they are not highly visible; do not occupy land or buildings that are more appropriate for more general use functions.

90 **Physical Plant Department**

87 **Grounds Building**

**History**
Constructed 1980

**Building Area:** 3,054 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The building is located on Audubon Street in the block bounded by Newcomb Place, Willow and Plum Streets. It is at the edge of the developed campus area and has low public visibility.

**Recommendation**
Maintain this and other plant service facilities in this area where they are not highly visible; do not occupy land or buildings that are more appropriate for more general use functions.

92 **Health Services**

**History**
Constructed 1959

Architect: Burke, LeBreton and Lamantia

**Building Area:** 12,942 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Health Services is located on the corner of Willow Street and Newcomb Place on a site with high public visibility. The building reads as an object building not well integrated into its context with no formal or material relationships to other buildings nearby. The style of the building is appropriate for the eclectic range of building images in the middle campus; however, the location of an object building on the campus edge impedes the development of a coherent edge and public image for the university.

**Recommendation**
To be determined. Health Services could potentially be relocated to another campus location and this site and/or building could become available for another use.
96 Willow Street Dormitory

**History**
Constructed 1999
Architects: Scogin, Elam & Bray

**Building Area:** 140,964 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The building's location at the Northwest corner of the intersection at Willow Street and McAllister Drive supports the pattern of existing dorms, and is appropriate to the residential neighborhood to its West. General characteristics of the building (setbacks, colors, and architectural details) differ from general campus conditions, and attract specific attention.

**Relation to Function**
Three of the four buildings have central courtyards; the fourth is linear in shape to parallel the rear property line of the adjacent neighbors.

98 Aron Student Residences

**History**
Constructed 1985
Architect: Lyons and Hudson

**Building Area:** 135,474 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Aron is located on the north side of Willow Street between McAllister and Ben Weiner Drives. The dormitory is designed as a complex of buildings arranged around an interior courtyard. The building in effect creates its own private quad; it is functionally isolated from other buildings and spaces in this zone of campus, and yields a moderately low density.

**Relation to Function**
Aron is a popular apartment style dormitory for upperclassmen. Suites contain single bedrooms, bathrooms, living rooms and kitchens.

**Recommendation**
Maintain building and housing use.

103 Collins Diboll Memorial Complex

**History**
Constructed 1993
Architect: Kessels, Diboll, Kessels

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The Diboll Complex is located in the back campus on Ben Weiner Drive; its siting on this street matches the set back of Reily and helps to define this street edge and create the sense of a dense, urban street front. The building forms the east edge of a recreational playing field to be developed between McAllister Drive, Reily and Aron.

**Relation to Function**
The building contains office space partially occupied by the Department of Public Safety and Department of Human Resources and Conference Services on the first floor, and five levels of parking garage above.

**Recommendation**
Maintain building use.

106 Reily Recreation Center

**History**
Constructed 1987
Architects: Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum and S. Stewart Farnet Associates

**Building Area:** 123,000 gsf (est.)

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The building is located in the back campus. It is sited perpendicularly to the axis of the back campus and extends from Ben Weiner Drive almost to the west property line. The building effectively divides the southern portion of the back campus - Aron, the parking garage, playing field and parking lot - from the northern section which is almost exclusively used for recreation and athletics. This strategy contains and defines the athletic zone, but also inhibits the potential for development of non-athletic functions north of Reily. The building interrupts circulation patterns through campus, and provide an unrevealing conclusion of McAllister Drive.

**Relation to Function**
The building was designed to accommodate its current use of recreational sports activities; use of the building could support expansion of some facilities.

**Recommendation**
Maintain the building and existing use.
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107 Monk Simons Building

**History**
Constructed 1978
Architect: Sizeler and Muller
**Building Area:** 18,024 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Monk Simons is located in the center of the back campus, away from public streets and public view. The building is poorly sited; it disrupts the axis of pedestrian traffic from Reily to Wilson, and it would interfere with development on the Favrot and Monk Simons parking lots. The building’s design - specifically its windowless walls and use of metal siding - is incompatible with the campus image.

**Relation to Function**
The building contains spaces used by ROTC and computer services. The facility is inappropriate for office use due to its lack of natural light and its propensity for flooding.

**Recommendation**
Consider demolition of the building to allow for additional development in this area and improvement of the circulation path and exterior spaces between Reily and Wilson.

111 Wilson Athletic Center

**History**
Constructed 1988 - 1989
Architects: I. William Sizeler, Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum
**Building Area:** 72,302 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Wilson is located on Ben Weiner Drive in the back campus. The building is designed around an interior atrium and has a strong internal focus; it makes little reference or contribution to the campus environment. The building set back from Ben Weiner does not match the siting of other buildings on this street. Its external covered walkways do not reference or support important or continuous lines of movement through campus, but act more as compositional elements to support the geometry of the individual building design. The use of concrete block for exterior skin copies the previous use of this material at Aron and Reily in an ineffective and superficial effort to create a unified image for the back campus.

**Recommendation**
Maintain stadium. Consider potential for redevelopment of the entire section of the back campus from Reily to Claiborne Ave.

112 Turchin Stadium

**History**
Constructed 1990
Architect: I. William Sizeler
**Building Area:** 1,970 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The Turchin stadium was constructed around an existing baseball field. The field location near the north end of the back campus ends the axis of pedestrian movement set up from the Reily breezeway to Wilson and effectively isolates and disconnects Rosen House from the campus fabric. The placement of the stadium facade along Ben Weiner does not correspond to the siting of other buildings on this street and undermines the sense of unity of this street edge. The use of concrete block for exterior skin copies the previous use of this material at Aron and Reily in an ineffective and superfi-
ineffective and superficial effort to create a unified image for the back campus.

**Recommendation**
Maintain stadium. Consider potential for redevelopment of the entire section of the back campus from Reily to Claiborne Ave.

### 113 Tony Sofio Baseball Pavilion

**History**
Constructed 1999
Engineer: Ivan C. Mandich, PE
Architectural Advisors: John Klingman & Henry Fry

**Relation to Campus Environment**
Adjacent to the left field foul pole of the baseball field, 30’ from the neighbors’ property line. The building divides the athletic areas of football and baseball.

**Relation to Function**
This building was designed as a batting practice facility.

### 116 Charles Rosen House

**History**
Constructed 1959
Architects: Goldstein, Parham and Labouisse; Dreyfous, Seiferth, Gibert

**Building Area**
136,566 gsf

**Relation to Campus Environment**
The Rosen site has a prominent public visibility on Claiborne Avenue; the building forms the public image of the university on this major street. The building is architecturally unrelated to other campus structures. The building site also includes a triangular exterior spaces on the south side adjacent to Turchin Stadium; this space contains the laundry and boiler house buildings for Rosen as well as an outdoor playground for children. The outdoor space is poorly organized and maintained and conflicting uses, such as children’s play areas and building loading zones, are not sufficiently isolated from each other. Rosen is isolated from the residential and academic zones of campus by its placement on the north side of the athletic zone.

**Relation to Function**
Rosen provides housing for graduate students. Units range from one to three bedrooms to accommodate single students, married couples and families with children.

**Recommendation**
Consider potential for redevelopment of this site to house a more public facility which would present a better image of the university to the city and a use which would not be compromised by distance from the primary activity zones of campus. Redesign the outdoor space to the south side of Rosen.
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