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Identity and Image

The campus will continue to value its legacy buildings, sites, and trees for both aesthetic and educational purposes, realistically evaluating which should be removed from the inventory and which should be preserved. By filling in and developing around these elements, the campus will achieve an image compatible with and supportive of the teaching, research, and public service missions of the campus. The campus landscape will connect the ... architectural styles and construction materials with the surrounding environment. The 2007 Update continues to embrace the mission of the campus adopted by the Board of Trustees in December 1992:

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

Comprehensive planning for physical improvement and development of the modern campus of the University of Massachusetts Amherst was reflected in the Sasaki, Dawson, and DeMay master plan of the 1960s, shortly after which the long-term physical character of the campus was largely set. The 1993 Physical Master Plan and subsequent area plans are derivative of the Sasaki plan. The 2007 Update is itself derivative, refining the choices for planning for roughly the next twenty years.

A central feature of the Sasaki plan relating to transportation and circulation was never realized, profoundly impacting the 1993 Plan. Sasaki had recommended vacating North Pleasant Street in favor of an East Pleasant Street connector north of the Dakin Farm connecting East Pleasant to North Pleasant, and eventually Route 116.

The campus has adapted to a semi-permanent east-west bifurcation with attendant planning problems. Once implemented, the 1993 recommendation to vacate Stockbridge Road and connect Infirmary Way to Thatcher Road will partially relieve the symptoms, but can never cure the problems the Sasaki plan would have solved. Once implemented, the alternatives recommended in this Update will continue the gradual if imperfect connection of east and west through the East Area.

Planning Assumptions

This Update is based on extending the assumptions from the 1993 Plan, originally predicated on expectations about the year 2010, to 2025:

Demographics

The 2007 Update assumes that the campus population will stabilize around the all-time high figure achieved in the late 1980s, when the campus enrolled 26,500 students. Undergraduates continue to comprise roughly 60% of the population, while candidates for advanced degrees represent 20%. The rest of the population is roughly 5% faculty and 15% staff. The 1993 Plan suggested a national trend toward an older, “more multicultural” student body. As of this writing, the undergraduate student body consists of traditional eighteen to twenty-two year-olds, with approximately the same cultural make-up as was true in 1993. The 1993 Plan foresaw accommodating new “non-traditional” students on and off campus through diversified housing arrangements, teleconferencing and digital communication, and expanded continuing education. The New Student Housing project has made apartment-style living available on-campus. Students continue to seek housing solutions from traditional sources. The 2007 Update contemplates little deviation from the traditional pattern through 2025. Neither the advent of the internet nor the digitalization and miniaturization of communication is likely to alter the delivery of instruction in a way that will impact the physical plan through 2025.

Land Area

The Amherst campus consists of 1,384 acres of land. 33% in Hadley and 67% in Amherst. The 1993 Plan correctly assumed the land area would not significantly increase. This Update likewise assumes the land area will not increase appreciably, although property with strategic importance will be acquired. Following recent construction, sixty-five percent of this acreage remains as open space, with the largest expanses located to the northeast and northwest of the campus core. The campus has ample opportunity to develop sites within its current land holdings. This development can be handled in a manner protecting culturally significant and environmentally sensitive open spaces.

Transportation

Students, faculty, and staff currently utilize a number of transportation modes connecting the campus with neighboring cities and towns, the most prominent of which is the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority, featuring free and low-cost routes. A new Transportation facility will soon be constructed within the transportation complex, supplementing the PVTA’s facilities. This Update assumes that the bus service will continue through 2025 and will expand to meet rider demands, and that the campus will connect with other local and regional transportation routes, including the regional bikeway system. Continuing requirements to improve air quality will combine with new initiatives to reduce carbon emissions, placing increased emphasis on multimodal and alternative means of transportation.

Identity and Image

The campus will continue to value its legacy buildings, sites, and trees for both aesthetic and educational purposes, realistically evaluating which should be removed from the inventory and which should be preserved. By filling in and developing around these elements, the campus will achieve an image compatible with and supportive of the teaching, research, and public service missions of the campus. The campus landscape will connect the campus’s myriad architectural styles and construction materials with the surrounding environment. The 2007 Update continues to embrace the mission of the campus adopted by the Board of Trustees in December 1992:

Mission Statement
University of Massachusetts Amherst

As the system’s flagship campus, Amherst draws students from throughout the Commonwealth, the nation and the world, providing a broad undergraduate curriculum with over 100 majors, and more than 50 doctoral programs. It will continue as a Carnegie RU/VH university (very high research activity) and maintain its presence in Division I intercollegiate athletics; it will continue its efforts to achieve a median ranking among the American Association of Research Libraries; and obtain membership in the American Association of Universities.

The mission of the Amherst campus reflects the University’s mission in the following ways:

- Access. Providing undergraduate education for all qualified students (meeting their fall financial need) in a broad range of areas found in leading public research universities, as well as in graduate programs leading to doctoral or other appropriate terminal degrees in most of these fields.
- Excellence. Maintaining a range of academic offerings comparable in quality to those offered at AAU universities; maintaining national leadership in such areas as creative writing, computer science, engineering, polymer science, linguistics, astronomy, sports management, and hotel
management; and striving for national leadership in other academic areas.

• **Innovation.** Creating new knowledge with a broad program of distinctive research; and disseminating this knowledge through publications, public presentations and professional conferences.

• **Economic Development and Global Competitiveness.** Supporting the economic development of the Commonwealth by providing assistance to small business and industry; encouraging technology transfer; undertaking research in areas of economic importance; and providing the language instruction and other tools necessary for participation in the global economy.

• **Public Service.** Providing public service by meeting formal land-grant responsibilities; serving agriculture; offering assistance to regional cities and towns; and engaging in research and outreach in such areas as public health, environmental safety, transportation, public finance, and education.

• **Quality of Life.** Developing the human and cultural quality of life for the region through a comprehensive arts program; assisting public social agencies to provide improved services to the citizens of the Commonwealth; and promoting the multicultural awareness and tolerance of diversity essential to a pluralistic, transnational society.
In 1864, six Amherst farms totaling 310 acres, nestled within the Connecticut River Valley, were purchased for the site of the new Massachusetts Agricultural College. The Morrill Act of 1862, passed during the Lincoln Administration, enabled the College’s birth by requiring all states to provide public lands for Land Grant Colleges. The purpose of the Act was to promote the “liberal and practical education of the industrial classes for the benefit of Agricultural & Mechanic Arts.” The College opened its doors in 1867, with a community including four faculty members and fifty-six students devoted to a curriculum combining agriculture, science, and liberal arts courses on the eastern slope with westerly views to the hills.

Beginnings

Master planning for the campus began almost immediately. Calvert Vaux and Joseph Richards were employed to design a grand college building. Controversy arose over the placement of the first buildings. The majority of trustees believed the buildings should be sited on the western plateau, known as Chestnut Ridge, now anchored at either end by Munson Hall and South College. The Board of Trustees asked Frederick Law Olmsted, noted landscape architect, to submit a proposal for the building site in 1866. Olmsted instead recommended, consistent with the Vaux/Richards plan, that the buildings be located on the Eastern slope, now anchored by Fernald and Wilder Halls, and modeled after a typical New England village. The Board of Trustees viewed Olmsted’s proposal as an improper response to the assignment, fired him, and sited the college on the Western plateau.

Growth as an Agricultural College

The early, dramatic changes on campus can be attributed to the vision of William Smith Clark, the College’s president between 1867 and 1879. Clark traveled to Hokkaido, Japan, established an agricultural university, and established a cross-cultural relationship still in existence through Massachusetts’ Sister State association with Hokkaido. Clark brought many plant species from his travels to Japan back to the United States. His devotion to developing the grounds brought marked changes to the campus landscape. Specimen trees planted during Clark’s presidency flourish on the campus today. Through Clark’s foresight, the campus environment reflected a rural image, providing an idyllic backdrop for its growth in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

President Clark appointed the first director of buildings and grounds for the University. In 1902, landscape gardening professor Frank Waugh assumed the position. Like Olmsted, Waugh harbored a strong commitment to agricultural education, contending that the college buildings should blend with, and not dominate, the agricultural landscape. Along with Waugh, F.I. Cooper and Warren H. Manning were the first of many planners to organize the campus into groups of buildings, to recognize the potential growth of the college, and to understand the influence the automobile would have on campus development. Although the Cooper, Manning, and Waugh reports were not fully implemented, they did foresee the college’s imminent growth and inspired future campus plans.

In addition to the buildings on the East Ridge and Chestnut Ridge, a third grouping now anchored by Flint Hall to the southwest and East Experiment Station to the northeast followed the arc of Ellis Drive, a roadway no longer running through the campus.

“The individuality of an agricultural college lies in its agricultural setting, not in its buildings, which is a mere piece of apparel to be fitted to the requirements of the agricultural trunk.”

-- Frederick Law Olmsted, 1866
The 1911 Campus Plan divided the campus into upland, midland, and lowland plateaus, with trolley lines connecting many of the major sites. Prescient aspects of the Waugh/Manning plan were proposing a future connector west toward the Connecticut River, maintaining the area around the Pond forever open, and recognizing North Pleasant Street as a dangerous divider between east and west.

The early mission of the campus expanded gradually. Graduate degrees were offered first in 1892, when women students were enrolled for the first time. Housing for women students was not provided, however, until 1905, when Draper Hall was built to serve that purpose. Harold Whiting Cary’s history of the campus vividly describes the institution in the years just before and after the turn of the twentieth century: “The architects of this expanding campus were, unfortunately, drawing plans for the campus as a whole. Their buildings were small, adequate only for research and instructional work of a single department in a college of 500 or 600 students. Functional in design, and plain in appearance, they contributed little to the esthetic appeal of the campus.”

With respect to the origin of the Pond, legend suggests that students dammed the stream as a prank one evening. In addition to acting as a drainage resource, the Pond supported activities like ice hockey and figure skating. The Pond no longer freezes, most likely due to heat transferred from the Fine Arts Center causing the temperature of the water to increase just upstream from entering the Pond.

In 1931, the Massachusetts Agricultural College became the Massachusetts State College. A broader curriculum including the liberal arts combined with an increasing student population to bring changes to the educational program. Frank Waugh, offering a distinctive perspective as a loyal enthusiast for the preservation of the rural character on campus, presented a plan in 1932 reflecting the changing academic program. The early landscape plantings reinforcing Waugh’s vision created a picturesque campus with shade trees and majestic elms lining central roadways. Frank Waugh even suggested the campus meadow be maintained by a flock of sheep, adding to the idyllic quality of campus. His site plan noted, “sight lines and beauty of central space not be interfered with by building program,” recognizing the sacred character of the meadow even in early times.

While male enrollment declined during World War II, military training programs still brought students to the campus, some of whom returned to earn their degrees after the war. At the Executive and Faculty meeting of the Massachusetts State College Board of Trustees held on November 9, 1944, “President Baker recommended that certain areas on the east side of the Campus be set aside for development as a Waugh Arboretum and that their development be under the supervision of the Department of Landscape Architecture”. Source documents have not survived describing or depicting the approved boundaries of the arboretum.

Post-War Expansion

At the close of World War II, demand for college education skyrocketed. In 1947, the Massachusetts State College expanded to become the University of Massachusetts, entering an era of expanded scope, broader curriculum, and a larger physical plant. The passage of the GI Bill opened the doors of higher education to thousands of students, leading to the construction on campus of many permanent as well as temporary dormitories. Enrollment grew from 4,000 students in 1954 to more than 10,000 in 1964, as the leading edge of the baby boom attained the age of traditional college freshmen. Two master plans were produced during the boom years, the first by the consulting firm of Shurcliff, Shurcliff and Merrill in 1953. The Shurcliff plan was designed to accommodate 10,000 students, cluster facilities, provide peripheral parking, and circulate automobiles around the campus core.

According to Cary, “This inclusive plan, which called for the addition of over 300 acres to the 821 then in use, promised to transform the spacious campus into a complex of red brick structures, broad lawns, parking lots, and tree lined roads.” The vision was partially realized: the mix of architectural styles now represented on the campus hardly projects a “red brick” image. Also during this period, a “women’s campus” was organized on the northeastern slope near Adams House. Totman Gymnasium was built as a women’s gym. The Student Union was built. An appealing feature of the Shurcliff plan was the concept of well-defined courtyards in tight building clusters, while the Pond was presented in its open, natural state.
The Modern Era

Enrollment growth overwhelmed the Shurcliff plan in just seven years. The firm of Sasaki, Dawson and De May was hired in 1961 to complete a new master plan for the campus. Sasaki addressed several aspects of the physical plant development, with a major focus on changing from a vehicular to a pedestrian campus. The interior circulation system was reordered to a peripheral system. The widening of Massachusetts Avenue, and the accompanying allée of London Plane trees, typifies the roadway design of the Sasaki proposal. The Sasaki plan provided the framework moving the campus away from its agricultural roots to a distinctly more urban context.

Another remark to be made about the Sasaki plan is that it reflects the modern era in character, the first campus physical master plan truly to represent the era in which it was written. Earlier plans emphasized the rural, agricultural, romantic character of the campus and its setting after those sentiments had passed from contemporary design. Although the first baby boomers were entering elementary school in 1953, the authors of Shurcliff missed the demographic sea change and its implications. Sasaki was on point, as subsequent development demonstrated when the Board of Trustees elected to pursue a program of unflinchingly modern building design. The construction of the Southwest Residential Area, Campus Center, Graduate Research Center, Fine Arts Center, and Du Bois Library in the late 1960s and early 1970s permanently altered the scale and spatial organization of the campus. These buildings are strong symbols on today’s campus, overpowering and sublimating the once picturesque, rural campus. In contrast with the Shurcliff plan, buildings constructed consistent with the Sasaki plan are sited comparatively close to the Pond, tightening the space significantly. The buildings now rival the landscape in importance.

Waugh and Manning had noted that heavy traffic on North Pleasant Street was a problem not only for the campus, but also for the Town of Amherst, which owns the road. Bisecting the campus from its earliest days, and running perpendicular to the natural flow of pedestrian traffic between east and west campus, North Pleasant Street is the most significant unresolved physical planning problem facing the campus. The Sasaki plan proposed a solution, the East Pleasant Street connector, which would have resulted in the closure of North Pleasant Street. In 1969, a joint Town-University Task Force recommended the East Pleasant solution, without subsequent implementation.
The Sasaki Plan provided the framework for much of the current campus form.

Proposed East Pleasant Street Connector
Looking Forward

In 1977, the campus published the Campus Landscape Improvement Project, acknowledging that the campus needed major reconsideration and redesign, and proposing a conceptual framework for design. The key concept to emerge from the Project was the need to reinforce transitional, or “in-between” areas not associated with a particular building. Then, after guiding principles were established in the Campus Physical Master Plan in 1993, a complementary series of area planning documents focused on the fine details of the campus. Following the architectural and enrollment booms of the 1970s, campus planning and building construction slowed until the 1990s heralded construction of the Mullins Memorial Center and the Conte Polymer Science Building.

The campus entered the third millennium with a burst of planning and construction. With an active construction program worth more than $750 million, the campus built Studio Arts and Integrated Science Buildings, a Central Heating Plant, a Recreation Center, and an 860-bed New Student Housing complex. Extensive infrastructure renewal was completed. A Campus Landscape Improvement Plan was commissioned. The stage was set for the 2007 Physical Master Plan Update, as required by policy of the Board of Trustees.
A Strategic Perspective

Introduction

In preparing the 1993 Physical Master Plan, the authors undertook an extensive program of research and data collection to document the physical assets of the campus. Workshops with the campus community were held to articulate the character, image, and issues confronting the University. The research identified the major "systems" to be addressed by the plan and in workshop sessions: (1) transportation, circulation, and parking, (2) campus land use, (3) open space and recreation, and (4) community planning and economic development issues. The findings for the first three systems were replicated by the authors of the Campus Landscape Improvement Plan in 2006.

Position in the Region

The Amherst campus was established in 1863 as the Massachusetts Agricultural College. From that beginning, a five-campus university system has evolved, yet Amherst has always served as the system’s flagship campus. In 1965, the University’s second campus opened 100 miles from Amherst, on the waterfront at Columbia Point, known as the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Five years later, a medical center and teaching hospital — the University of Massachusetts Medical Center — formed at Worcester. Most recently, two additional campuses – Lowell in the northeastern part of the state and Dartmouth in the southeast — were added to the system.

The Amherst and Hadley Communities

The University’s Amherst campus actually occupies land in both Amherst and Hadley. The town of Amherst borders the campus’s north, east and south edges, and the town of Hadley lies to the west. During the academic year, Amherst’s population swells to more than 35,000. This total includes a large number of students, 12,000 of whom live on the campus. These resident students generally leave town for the summer months, producing a dramatic drop in population. The campus relies on Town facilities for its source of water, solid waste disposal, and waste water treatment. The Town of Hadley, with a population of just under 5,000, is largely an agricultural community with a major commercial strip along State Route 9 from the Coolidge Bridge on the Connecticut River to the Amherst town line.

The Amherst Campus

The Amherst campus lies in the Connecticut River Valley of western Massachusetts on 1,381 acres of former agricultural land. The Holyoke Range, the Berkshire and Green Mountain foothills, and the Pelham Hills surround the town of Amherst, providing a spectacular backdrop to the campus. Adjacent expanses of farmland serve as reminders of the school’s beginnings as a land grant college and define its rural image. The campus stands within relatively short driving distances from New York City, Providence, Boston, and other major northeastern cities. Boston, 100 miles to the east, and New York, 175 miles to the south, are reached from the Amherst campus via major northeastern interstate highways (I-90 and I-91/95 respectively).

The five-campus UMass system
Academic Program

The campus’s location near four other colleges serves as a vital asset. Neighboring Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges combine resources with the University through a unique Five-College System. Students attending any of the five colleges may enroll in courses and utilize the libraries at any or all of the schools. Faculty and staff participate in exchanges, collaborations, and joint teaching and research.

The Amherst campus is academically organized into nine schools and colleges. The physical development of the core of the campus has resulted in the clustering of the various schools and colleges into identifiable geographic precincts within the core. There are a few exceptions where colleges have been split among multiple locations. Notable in this category are the College of Natural Resources and the Environment and the School of Education. The colleges and schools on the Amherst campus include: Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Humanities and Fine Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Resources and the Environment, Management, Engineering, Public Health and Health Sciences, Nursing, and Education.

Campus Analysis and Assessment

Natural Features

The campus extends from the top of a glacial drumlin in the east (Orchard Hill) to a glacial lake bed in the west (formerly Lake Hitchcock). Slopes across the campus reflect these land forms. Along the western slope of Orchard Hill, grades average 10% and greater. From the base of Orchard Hill extending westward, slopes level off to 10% and less. A series of parallel north-south terraces steps down to the western campus, which sits on the bed of former glacial Lake Hitchcock. On this lake bed area, grades range between 0 and 5%. Based on slopes alone, the campus’s western half appears most desirable for building construction.
Soils throughout the campus correspond to the physiography. At Orchard Hill, sandy glacial tills predominate, with rock outcroppings appearing sporadically. The former lake bed area contains soils composed largely of sands, silts, and clays. Most of the soils across the campus pose moderate limitations to building construction. The sloping, rocky soils around Orchard Hill and the wetlands along the campus’s western edge present the most severe restrictions to development.

Surface water and wetlands cover 8% of the University’s land. The Mill River at the campus’s western edge, and the Wildwood Brook at the campus’s northern end, account for most of this wet area. Massachusetts State Law protects wetlands from alteration or filling.

The campus contains a diversity of vegetation. Mature forests with heights of over 40 feet cover the summit and western slopes of Orchard Hill. Larger, forested areas abutting the Sylvan dormitory complex and McGuirk Stadium serve as screens, providing valuable habitats for wildlife. Pin oak, linden, and plane tree alleés mark the major campus roads – University Drive, Massachusetts Avenue, Commonwealth Avenue, and Haigis Mall. Specimen trees, many dating over 100 years, grow throughout the campus core. Grand beech, sweetgum, and tulip trees stand as jewels in the landscape.

A composite of the campus’s physical features shows that the lands best suited to future development are located in the campus core, where land has been drained and leveled during development. The severely constrained wetlands are located mostly at the north and west of the campus. Steep slopes appear along the western slopes of Orchard Hill. These areas present the most difficulty to building and road construction.

Transportation, Circulation and Parking

Transportation has historically been a major influence on planning for the campus. The early plan by Frank Waugh featured an internal loop road system to service the rural, agricultural campus. The Sasaki Plan of 1961 was based on the "superblock" concept in which the campus core was defined by a major perimeter road, with service and cul-de-sac roads penetrating the loop. The Governor’s Drive section of this loop road, representing the northern quadrant of the perimeter road, was realigned in 1996, greatly improving perimeter circulation. The North Pleasant Street corridor, bisecting the campus core from north to south, represents a major source of pedestrian/vehicular conflict. The conflicts are most intense in the vicinity of the many bus stops located along North Pleasant Street. Service and delivery vehicles using campus walkways are a perennial problem within the campus core. This is a safety as well as an aesthetic issue as these vehicles cause unsightly, compacted ruts along many campus walks.

Pedestrian Circulation

Within the campus core, major pedestrian corridors run north-south on the eastern and western sides of the Campus Pond. East-west routes traverse the Pond’s northern and southern tips. Pedestrian circulation around the periphery of the campus is less organized. Vehicles compete with pedestrians for space on narrow access roads and cause confrontations where crossing roads is necessary, especially along North Pleasant Street. In recent years, the campus has made progress in improving the accessibility of buildings to the physically disabled. A comprehensive plan is in place for complying with the federal "Americans with Disabilities" Act.

Public Transportation

For 35 years the University has been served by the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority (PVTA), which provides subsidized bus service to the campus, the surrounding communities, and the Five Colleges. This system provides
a safe, efficient, and convenient alternative to private vehicles and represents a major asset for transportation planning and reduction of private vehicles.

Parking

The University parking system covers almost 6% of the total campus. Parking was analyzed in 1993 by dividing the campus into 10 areas to identify where parking surpluses and deficiencies existed. With each new construction project, replacing lost parking in equal number of spaces and comparable proximity to destination becomes more difficult. The supply of parking is generally adequate.

Hideo Sasaki characterized the university parking scheme in 1961 as “a system of small parking lots adjacent to each building” which results in a “great number of vehicles drawn into the center of campus.” Today, much of this parking scheme remains intact, augmented by the addition of several large lots at the periphery of the campus loop road. The small lots contribute substantially to pedestrian and vehicular conflicts and landscape fragmentation by bringing numerous roadways and vehicles into the campus core. Larger perimeter lots, located at the edges of campus, provide efficient parking and enjoy good access to the campus core via the PVTA and campus walkways.

In FY 2007, the campus issued 13,200 parking permits to students, faculty and staff. There are currently 12,600 parking spaces on the campus. Over recent years, the total number of permits has decreased, while the total number of spaces available has increased. While comparisons are meaningful only on a lot-by-lot basis, it is fair to say that the system still has flexibility overall because the oversell rate, already low, continues to decline. Parking within the campus core, roughly one-third of the total, results in ongoing competition between vehicular and pedestrian circulation. The campus still does not have structured parking, although the need for it has been recognized.

Bicycle Circulation

Although bicycles are used by many as a means of transportation to and around campus, there is not yet a fully-developed system of support facilities for bicycles such as bike lanes on major routes to campus, bike paths on campus, and storage facilities. A recently completed Five College bike path links the campus, through the Town of Amherst, with the City of Northampton to the west along the Norwottuck Rail Trail.

Campus Land Use and Infrastructure

The campus is organized around a 400-acre core largely dedicated to academic and research uses. The campus’s six major residential areas and the major parking lots are sited at the edge of the core and on the campus perimeter. Recreation is largely concentrated at the western edge of campus. Although support services are scattered throughout the campus, there is a clear support cluster developed in the northeast sector of the campus.

Most of the academic and administrative uses on the campus are clustered by school, college or administrative division. The College of Natural Resources and the Environment is a notable exception, with buildings literally in every corner of the campus. In planning workshops for the 1993 Physical Master Plan, the “clustered” model of campus building use was identified as desirable since it fosters student and faculty identity, provides efficient use of shared resources, and generates fewer vehicular and pedestrian trips, thereby reducing circulation conflicts. The Campus Building Use Map illustrates how the schools and colleges are distributed spatially around the campus. Also discussed in the workshops was the need to formulate a policy for the future of the campus’s historic buildings and significant landscapes.

Outside the core campus, land uses are generally less intensive. At the northern end of campus, the northwest corner and the Dakin property are not currently in use. These areas represent an important reserve for future development and a buffer from existing adjacent uses. On the eastern edge of the campus, the Tilson Farm parcel contains a mix of support services and academic uses as well as the recycling facility. The Olympia Drive area is lightly used, occupied by two Greek organizations, the Admissions function, and remote parking. The Orchard Hill parcel is presently under-used, since the major equestrian uses were relocated to the Hadley Farm. The southern edge of the campus includes the stadium, surrounded by large areas of open land. The Hadley Farm is located at the southwest corner of the campus and is dedicated to agricultural uses.
The campus contains a significant utility infrastructure including steam, chilled water, storm and sanitary sewer, water, electric, gas and telecommunication systems. These systems are largely independent from one another. Substantial investments have been made in renewing the steam distribution and condensate return systems, with excellent results in energy conservation. Also benefiting from extensive investment is the primary electrical distribution system. Still to be improved are building electrical services, many of which are budgeted for upgrade as of the date of this publication.

Substantial investments have been made in renewing the steam distribution and condensate return systems, with excellent results in energy conservation. Also benefiting from extensive investment is the primary electrical distribution system. Still to be improved are building electrical services, many of which are budgeted for upgrade as of the date of this publication.

Campus Open Space and Recreation

The campus is located in the beautiful and diverse Connecticut Valley landscape. The campus has several types of open space linkages to this regional landscape. At the northeast corner, the campus is connected to an emerging system of protected conservation lands in the Town of Amherst extending to the north and east into the Pelham Hills. At the northern and western sides of campus, a system of wetlands links the campus with the Mill River. To the west and southwest, the campus is connected to substantial agricultural lands, many of which are permanently protected from development through the Commonwealth’s Agricultural Preservation Restriction program.

These linkages provide important opportunities for connecting the campus to the regional landscape and deriving ecological, recreational, and transportation benefits. The campus enjoys many fine views of the surrounding rural landscape, important components of the campus’s identity and image. Arguably, the best of these outward views are located along the Whitmore-to-Library corridor, on Orchard Hill, along Clark Hill Road, and from the northern end of the campus core. All of these views are oriented to the west and should be considered in choosing sites for future buildings or expanding existing structures. In addition, there are important views into the campus from the west approaching the interchange at Route 116.

Open Spaces

On the campus are several important open spaces. The Campus Pond is the symbolic center of the campus and intimately associated with the campus identity. The Rhododendron Garden and the Durfee Conservatory and gardens, Hampden Court, and the William S. Clark Memorial represent the finest designed landscapes on campus. The campus houses an outstanding collection of plants established to support teaching and research, representing an important regional resource.

Recreation

The campus has excellent varsity sports facilities including the Mullins Center, the Warren McGuirk Stadium, the Curry Hicks Cage, Garber Field, the tennis courts, Lorden Field (baseball), the softball field, Rudd Field (soccer) and the outdoor track and field complex. These facilities are clustered on the western edge of the campus core. Intramural recreational facilities are distributed throughout the campus, with a concentration near Boydene at the western edge of the campus. When completed in 2009, the Recreation Center will provide the kind of workout facilities found in private gyms. While most of the campus’s residential areas have some recreational facilities including basketball and volleyball courts, there is a need for more intramural facilities integrated with the residential areas.
Economic Development

The University of Massachusetts influences the economic environment of the surrounding communities, the region, and the Commonwealth in three major ways: 1) payroll and local spending by students, staff and faculty; 2) capital investment in the campus and construction activities; 3) sustained economic development including technology transfer, workforce education, and public service outreach.

As one of the largest employers in western Massachusetts, the funding levels for the campus have a direct bearing on the economic health of the local communities. Changes in enrollments and staffing levels immediately translate into economic impacts in the surrounding areas. Growth at the campus influences housing demand and commercial activity in the Pioneer Valley. Changes in payrolls have a ripple effect throughout the region.

Recent capital investment on the Amherst campus has provided opportunities for private construction companies to bid on campus projects. These impact the region in a positive way with indirect benefits to suppliers, the region’s payroll, and support services.

The University, through research and new technologies, is a prime contributor to the sustained economic development of local communities and the Commonwealth. The campus is also involved in workforce education through on-campus instruction of graduate and undergraduate students, continuing education programs, and worker re-training programs. Public service, outreach, and extension programs work with many industries throughout the state to provide current information, to act in advisory capacities assisting industry, and to interact on a continuing basis to sustain growth.

Community Development

The two primary factors influencing community planning and development activities in the Pioneer Valley have been agricultural and educational pursuits, and the requisite support services for those activities. It appears that these factors will continue to dominate with the addition of commercial development, office/research park development, and tourism-based industry.

As the physical development of the campus unfolds, there are planning considerations at both the local and regional levels. At the regional level, the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission is charged with regional planning, with a particular emphasis on environmental and transportation issues. Compliance with clean air and clean water standards is mandated by federal law. Planning for the campus will be integrated with regional planning currently under way.

Locally, land use planning for the campus and the area immediately surrounding the campus must be coordinated with the Towns of Amherst and Hadley to minimize conflicts, provide sufficient buffer zones and transition uses, and promote compatibility between the campus and surrounding properties. Continuing a dialog with the communities is essential in facilitating the exchange of information, resolving conflicts, and promoting mutual interests for development.

At the campus edge, where campus property is adjacent to community development, much of the campus is presently undeveloped and represents no conflict with existing uses. The main areas where conflicts do exist are located at the north (Farview neighborhood), south (Fearing Street-Sunset Avenue neighborhood) and southeast (Lincoln Avenue and North Pleasant Street), where campus uses are located adjacent to residential neighborhoods.
CHAPTER 4
OPTIONS FOR TOMORROW

Framework

Trends

The 1993 Physical Master Plan posited that student populations are becoming older and increasingly multi-cultural, telecommunications are playing a larger role in education, entrepreneurial enterprises are evolving from faculty research efforts, and public/private partnerships for both research and support services are expanding. The big story in 2007 is the astonishingly rapid advance in technology, and its impact on the delivery of instruction and the conduct of research.

The other trends appear to have proved less influential on the physical campus since 1993. The traditional undergraduate, residential student continues to dominate the applicant, admit, and enroll pools. Faculty members are creating partnerships and transferring technology at rates consistent with the past, and there is great optimism that the rate will accelerate rapidly in the near term.

A Vision from 1993

The University of Massachusetts has achieved national and international recognition for its teaching and research programs. Yet even with its wonderful setting in the Pioneer Valley, the campus itself suffers from a lack of completeness. A successful, world-class university campus is more than a collection of facilities. It is an environment for learning, a special place where a community of students, faculty, staff, and citizens comes together in a joint pursuit to generate, teach, and disseminate new knowledge. This is a lofty charge that is worthy of a well conceived, stimulating, efficient, and beautiful campus.

Improving the physical condition of the campus is an important undertaking. The decision to attend a campus is certainly influenced by its physical appearance and resources. The campus should be a place where students aspire to live, a place of beauty. Providing students with pleasant memories of their experiences on campus can only improve alumni relations by instilling pride for the institution.

The vision is to improve the campus’s physical qualities to match the academic excellence of the University, making UMass a five-star attraction known by each and every resident of the Commonwealth. The campus will be a garden in the valley attracting the top students and best faculty, a place where the quest for knowledge is enhanced by the quality of life. The campus will be a regional destination that attracts visitors from around New England and conferences from around the country.

Possible Goals

1. Develop a campus image that identifies the University of Massachusetts Amherst as the Commonwealth’s flagship University, the leading public University in New England with a strong national and international reputation, and that compliments the University’s heritage and setting in the Connecticut River Valley.

2. Create an environment that supports the mission of the University, provides a high quality of living for students, and inspires excellence in teaching, research and professional service, allowing the University to be an economic engine for the Commonwealth.

3. Integrate new facilities and resources within the campus core in a way that improves existing patterns of land use, circulation, parking, and open space.

Potential Objectives

1. Establish a clear sense of entry and arrival to the campus.

2. Extend the concept of the campus as a pedestrian environment.

3. Preserve and enhance the quality of the landscape surrounding the Campus Pond.

4. Limit the land area devoted to parking in the campus core.

5. Maintain the campus core for academic development, locating non-academic uses on the perimeter.

6. Study the establishment of public/private partnership facilities on campus.

7. Identify areas of campus suitable for development.

A Concept

The major concept for this Update, articulated in the 1993 Plan, is that future academic development be guided by a strong infill policy within the existing campus core to strengthen and improve the campus’s overall physical organization, movement systems and landscape open spaces. This single policy, if properly implemented, directly addresses the plan’s goals and objectives and will:

1. Maintain the campus’s rural setting by filling vacant spaces within the campus core rather than spreading development to the outer limits of campus land.

2. Upgrade and complete the campus core’s edges, specifically the western edge, so that the campus welcomes visitors at all its entrances with a front door image.

3. Create an improved sense of orientation for campus visitors, residents, students, and staff by defining clear pedestrian corridors and human-scaled spaces.

4. Reduce travel time for students and faculty between buildings.

5. Centralize infrastructure, thereby reducing costs to service new facilities.

Infill

Infill is not just the random placement of buildings into vacant spaces on campus. It is a strategic approach, inserting new structures into the existing campus fabric to define a new exterior space, establish a pedestrian corridor, frame a view, and create a new gathering place for students.

A study of three representative areas of campus, the Engineering Quadrangle, the corridor between the DuBois Library and the Whitmore Administration Building, and Southwest Residential area revealed that the ratio of building floor area to ground area (coverage) is between 1.1:1 to 1.15:1. For example, the Engineering Quad consists of three buildings with a gross floor area of 164,684 square feet sited on 3.4 acres of land. This is equivalent to covering the entire ground area with a building 1.1 stories high.

The 1993 evaluation of the core campus’s development potential identified nine possible infill areas totaling 52 acres. To determine the development capacity of the core campus, a conservative ratio of 1 square foot of building area to 1 square foot of ground area was
As recommended in 1993, a campus-wide parking management plan was developed to determine the appropriate parking policies for the campus and to consider the appropriate combination of parking facilities (surface and structure) to meet the parking demands in the future. Input on policies and their implementation is gathered through the Parking and Traffic Advisory Board (PTAB). The parking management plan calls for the periodic re-evaluation of the feasibility of parking structures and the need for additional perimeter lots. As of 2007, the supply of parking spaces on campus is adequate to meet demand.

**Pedestrian Circulation**

As was true in 1993, pedestrian circulation lacks strong organization in 2007 with the exception of the north-south corridor between Whitmore and the DuBois Library. Pedestrian movement currently conflicts with parking, service, and North Pleasant Street, and generally lacks strong physical structure. There is an urgent need for the creation of well-placed corridors to serve as primary pedestrian paths. They should be lined with trees and other physical structures for safety and comfort. In addition, several major crossings along North Pleasant Street should be defined to enhance pedestrian safety, in contrast to the eleven minor crossings that currently exist.

**Vehicular Circulation**

A central element of the 1993 Physical Master Plan, the completion of the campus loop road with the realignment of Governor’s Drive, was achieved in 1996. The alignment added land to the campus core, provided safer and more efficient vehicular movement, and defined the northern campus edge.

Regional circulation impacts the University’s potential for economic development, especially Route 9, which limits the flow of traffic to campus. Since 1993, progress in ridesharing, initiative by the Pioneer Valley Transportation Authority (PVTA) have not reduced the burden of traffic on Route 9, which carries a great deal of non-campus traffic through Hadley to I-91 and Northampton. Work must continue on a multi-modal transportation plan through the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission to ensure continued compliance with Clean Air Act regulations. The campus has become a leader in this area, and should continue to develop initiatives like the Regional Traveler Information Center.

**Parking**

Gradually, as recommended in 1993, parking should be eliminated from the core of the campus (with the exception of handicapped spaces). All such spaces are coveted for their proximity to places of work. Core campus parking areas impede pedestrian movement and occupy valuable sites for new buildings and open space. The displaced parking capacity can only be replaced by constructing a system of parking decks.
Pedestrian corridors and open space should serve as a framework guiding any new building location as the proposed infill policy is implemented. Following this Update, detailed reassessment of the nine area plans is the next logical step. Recently developed planning and design guidelines for the campus landscape and pedestrian circulation system can also be used to attract alumni and external funds. One such method would be to reestablish class walks. The embedding of the class numbers into concrete walkways could help to bring back some of the campus’s history and spirit.

The 1993 Plan observed that strong east-west connections are needed from the residential areas on the eastern edge of campus to the core campus, as well as from the campus core to the new Mullins Center. The latter connection will be achieved through development of the site of the Recreation Center. An important future north-south corridor should be established from the Southwest Residential Area, through the underpass, and continuing north between Boyden and Tobin. This proposed infill area, currently occupied by tennis courts and parking, is an important area for future development. The tennis courts have been replaced next to the Mullins Center, and the site is available for active planning. This is a premier infill site, easily capable of supporting more than 300,000 square feet of building, competing with the Morrills at 350,000 square feet, the Lederles at 500,000 square feet, and the DuBois Library at 400,000 square feet as potentially the most densely developed academic site on campus.

**Service Circulation**

A major problem still exists on campus with service vehicles traveling on pedestrian walkways. The policy of limiting service vehicles on pedestrian ways must be enforced and the same policy adopted for outside vendors as part of any contract agreements.

**Bicycle Circulation**

There is no bicycle circulation system on campus. Few bike racks are provided for parking and there are no designated paths for bicycle riders, leading to conflicts with both vehicles and pedestrians. The needs of this mode of transportation must be addressed through designated travel lanes and parking areas.

As a first step, consistent with a recommendation made in the 1993 Master Plan, the campus has been connected with the Five College Bikeway system along University Drive to the head of the Norwottuck Rail Trail, providing one small component of a multimodal transportation initiative.
Campus Land Use and Infrastructure

The guiding concept for a strategic plan, first recommended in 1993, is that future academic development be governed by a strong infill policy within the existing campus core to strengthen the campus’s overall physical organization, movement systems, and open spaces. By practicing infill, the campus can reserve major undeveloped lands to the North for future needs beyond the timeframe of this plan. An analysis of the campus’s natural and cultural factors in 1993 identified sites in the campus core where infill development could take place. Some of those sites have been employed for building projects, while potential new sites have been identified for this Update.

Subsequent to the 1993 Physical Master Plan, detailed area plans were developed for some of the nine study areas — labeled A through I in the Core Study Map. Each of those specific area plans should be updated as part of the Physical Master Plan update.

Seven of the nine schools and colleges on campus have their departments clustered in close proximity. The major exceptions are the College of Natural Resources and the Environment, which has departments located in all four corners of the campus, and the School of Education, split between two distant buildings. A policy that future expansion be sited in close proximity to the corresponding colleges should be adopted. The space needs for each college and school were updated in the Space Assessment Study in 2004 so that an overall facilities program could be established for the campus.

Buildings

Unlike the building program fueled by enrollment growth in the 1960’s and 1970’s, the options identified in this Update do not respond to increasing enrollments. There is a need for facilities that respond to existing deficiencies, providing modern laboratories and scientific equipment, offering technologically equipped large-format instructional spaces, meeting the evolving support needs of students, and housing a changing library.

The university has a number of older “legacy” buildings which present unique challenges and opportunities.

As recommended in 1993, with the goal of identifying the appropriate disposition of these older facilities, a preliminary facilities assessment was undertaken examining not only the physical structure of each building, but also its historical and cultural significance to the campus. This study of the campus’s older buildings, the Legacy Building Report, was released as a companion to the Building Condition Report in 2007. To enhance this report, the campus is hiring a consulting specialist in historic buildings to conduct a formal architectural and historic assessment of these facilities. This assessment will assist the University in its development of a plan that addresses the short and long term disposition of these buildings.
Utilities

The campus’s utility systems include water, sewer, storm drainage, electrical, steam, chilled water and telecommunications. The steam generation and distribution systems were at capacity in 1993, incapable of supporting future buildings. An engineering study delineated the existing location, condition, and expansion capacity of these systems, and a new Central Heating Plant with capacity for co-generating electricity was proposed for the northwest corner of campus. The 1993 Plan recommended that the future facility be located to the west of Commonwealth Avenue and to the north of Governor’s Drive, where today construction of the plant is nearly complete.

Facility Needs Identified In 1993

Many of the needs identified in the 1993 planning workshops have been built or are under construction as of 2007. In the fourteen years since the 1993 Plan was published, ten of the projects have either been completed, are under construction, or are funded.

Short/ Medium Term Projects:
- Computer Science Building
- Engineering Building (E Lab II)
- Animal Care Facility
- Co-Generation Plant

Long Term Projects:
- Art Building
- Child Care Center
- Continuing Education
- Library Facilities (Learning Commons)
- Life Science Building (Integrated Science Building)
- Recreation Building

Campus Open Space and Recreation

A central principle that guided the development of the 1993 Plan was to improve the quality of student life on campus. Two major physical factors that influence student life are the aesthetic character of the campus and the availability of active and passive recreational opportunities.

Two studies were recommended to address the issues of open space and recreation. The first was the development of planning and design guidelines for the campus landscape and pedestrian circulation system. This recommendation was implemented with the 2006 Campus Landscape Improvement Plan. The second was to conduct a recreation master plan to address the facilities needs for structured and unstructured recreation. This recommendation led to the design and construction of a new Track and Field complex, a Varsity Softball diamond, Rudd Field for varsity soccer, and a Recreation Center (scheduled to open in 2009).

The quality of student life is central to this plan.

Recreation and Athletics

The 1993 Plan and this Update both reinforce the importance of diverse recreational opportunities for all residential areas and varsity sports. Athletics can play an important role in enhancing the image of a university as evidenced by the recent success of the basketball team. Resources should not only be available to ensure the continued success of these teams, but also to provide recreation for the general student body. Recreation fields such as those along Commonwealth Avenue should be viewed as permanent facilities, and not as potential building locations. These facilities are important for recreation, but also serve as an important visual resource.

Negative Icons

To improve aesthetics, the 1993 Plan recommended removing two negative icons which had entered the folklore of the campus: the reflecting pools in front of the Fine Arts Center and the fence around the Library. The reflecting pools were removed as part of the redesign and reconstruction of the Fine Arts Plaza, while the fence around the Dubois Library was replaced by an attractive system of planters and decorative railing as part of the project renovating the Library deck. Other negative icons still to be addressed are service vehicles on walkways and broken, muddy pathway edges which have a direct cause-effect relationship.
The Waugh Arboretum

The 1993 Plan included extensive recommendations for the development of the Frank A. Waugh Arboretum, created in concept by a resolution of the Board of Trustees in 1944, but subsequently undeveloped. The 1993 Plan proposed featuring plants from temperate climates throughout the world and supporting research in horticulture, ecological restoration, and urban forestry. The 1993 Plan recommended a three-tier approach to developing the Arboretum, first by designating an identifiable core area on Orchard Hill dedicated to a permanent collection and accessible to the general public. The second tier of the Arboretum concept was an extension and linkage of the core area throughout the campus following environmentally-constrained lands. Finally, the Arboretum was proposed to include all plantings and gardens on the campus including the Rhododendron and Durfee Gardens, boulevard plantings, the Whitmore and library courtyards, and specimen plantings throughout the campus core. Through this multi-tiered approach, the 1993 Plan envisioned the campus as a complete environment for learning. A superb guide entitled “Walking Tours of Campus Trees and Gardens” was published to inform the visitor’s experience in viewing the many significant specimens on campus.

Economic Development and Community Planning

The 1993 Plan foresaw economic development and community planning as emerging external roles for the University, anticipating that the University would play a significant role in the economic development of the local community, the region and the state. The campus also recognized the need to interact with the adjacent communities and regional planning agencies in developing long range plans for land use, transportation, traffic, and open space. The Amherst campus is the second largest employer in western Massachusetts. Fluctuations in the University's base budget have reverberated throughout the region's economy, from housing to retailing, from purchases of consumer goods to services.

Future investment in the campus may include private sector involvement in the form of privatization of some services, partnerships, joint ventures in development projects and research programs, and philanthropic contributions. To attract these investments, the campus must establish appropriate policies and development guidelines to articulate clearly the opportunities available to these constituencies. Perhaps the largest contributions to economic growth will come from sustained activities including the production of new knowledge in the information age through world class research, technology transfer, workforce education, and ongoing business support activities.

Economic Development

The economic development efforts of the University of Massachusetts will continue to focus on the role of the faculty, public/private partnerships and community relationships. An important role of the faculty is to create new knowledge, to test new techniques, and to develop alternative means with which to improve the nation's quality of life. These activities translate into economic development and need to be supported, nurtured, and stimulated.

The conversion of ideas to products can occur smoothly and efficiently on the Amherst campus. When appropriate, the campus may consider models for joining business and academic activity in a formal manner, both on and off campus.

University-related economic development is dependent upon modern laboratories. It may be appropriate for some of these facilities be housed close to academic offices and laboratories.

University of Massachusetts Amherst faculty are active in more than 120 nations. We must insure that students, faculty and staff can transfer information as rapidly, effectively, and efficiently as global corporations. The University of Massachusetts needs to remain committed to providing its faculty and research staff with the most modern information and telecommunications facilities possible.

The University belongs to the Commonwealth. This is clear to the faculty who are involved in outreach activities related to economic development. These range from Cooperative Extension to Continuing Education and more than twenty research centers, institutes, and groups. The 1993 Plan observed that outreach offices need facilities that are technologically advanced and located in areas that are easily accessible to the public on the perimeter of the campus. Beginning in 2005, outreach facilities were leased in private office buildings adjacent to the campus to make progress toward this goal.

Community Planning

Land use planning for the campus and its host communities must be coordinated to minimize conflicts, provide sufficient buffer zones and transition uses, and promote compatibility between the campus and the surrounding properties. Continuing dialog with the communities is essential to facilitate the exchange of information, to resolve conflicts, and to promote mutual interests for development.

Planning for campus land resources will be integrated with regional and community planning efforts aimed at compliance with state and federal environmental mandates. The campus will work with local, regional and state officials to meet air quality, water quality, and environmental protection requirements.

The private establishment of a research park in existing industrial zones of the Towns of Amherst or Hadley could attract industries affiliated with campus research faculty. Research parks of this nature could advance the personal and professional needs of faculty, bring needed tax revenue to the host Town(s), provide space for spin-off industries, and expand the job base of the region. This last point is important to the University. To attract top rated faculty it is frequently important to address the employment needs of spouses. A strong, professional job base nearby would help meet this need.
CHAPTER 5

EAST AREA PLAN

Introduction

The East Area, alternately known historically as the East Ridge, the Stockbridge Road Area in the 1993 Physical Master Plan, and the East Area in the 1997 East Area Plan has developed significantly since 1993, and in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the 1993 Plan. The fundamental strategy recommended in 1993 for campus development was infill, integrating new academic facilities and improvements within the campus core rather than allowing development to sprawl further from the center. Infill also provides a context for defining open spaces and pedestrian corridors, centralizing infrastructure, and reducing travel times between buildings. The 1993 Physical Master Plan equated the East Area with the land bounded by Eastman Lane, North Pleasant Street, Thatcher Way, and Infirmary Ways. The 1997 East Area Plan expanded the area for analysis to include the acreage contained immediately to the south within the boundaries of North Pleasant Street, Butterfield Terrace, Clark Hill Road, and Infirmary Way.

The East Ridge of the campus along Stockbridge Road was the scene of the first key conflict in the physical development of the campus, that between Frederick Law Olmstead and the Directors of the newly formed Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1866. In 1864, six Amherst farms totaling 310 acres were purchased for the site of the new College. Master planning for the campus began almost immediately. Calvert Vaux and Joseph Richards were employed to design a grand college building. Controversy arose over the placement of the first buildings. The majority of trustees believed the buildings should be sited on the western plateau, known as Chestnut Ridge, now anchored at either end by Munson Hall and South College.

The Board of Trustees asked Frederick Law Olmsted, noted landscape architect, to submit a proposal for the building site in 1866. Olmsted instead recommended, consistent with the Vaux/Richards plan, that the buildings be located on the Eastern slope, now anchored by Fernald and Wilder Halls, and modeled after a typical New England village. The Board of Trustees viewed Olmsted’s proposal as an improper response to the assignment, fired him, and sited the college on the Western plateau.

In 1911, Frank A. Waugh created a visual representation of the campus Olmstead recommended in his written report of 1866. The two surviving features are Stockbridge Road, labeled “Public Road” by Waugh, and Stockbridge House, labeled “President’s House.” The area labeled “Drill Ground and Common” covers approximately sites of Franklin Dining Commons, French Hall and Greenhouses, and Durfee Gardens and Conservatory. One can imagine a very different physical campus had the early buildings been concentrated around this quadrangle.

Not only is Stockbridge Road no longer the main street of the campus, as it was until the 1920s, the road was closed to through traffic in 2007 and is slated for conversion into a pedestrian corridor in 2008. This corridor, a significant north-south path of the campus, is lined by many of the campus’s legacy buildings, host to heirloom trees, and home to some of the most significant landscape elements on the campus, including the Durfee Conservatory and Gardens, and the Rhododendron Garden.

The East Area is comprised of a diverse set of buildings. First, it contains the campus’s newest academic structures, including the Integrated Sciences Building, a renovated and expanded Skinner Hall, and the Studio Arts Building. A second category is the legacy buildings from Wilder to Fernald. Third are the many post-World War II buildings, including the very important Morrill Science Complex. Finally there are the vacant University Apartments and the functionally-obsolete Hills House, anchoring the two ends of a premier future site for a major academic development. Many buildings in the East Area are no longer appropriate facilities for the teaching and research requirements of the departments they currently house. Some should likely be demolished, others repurposed. Planning is currently in progress, for example,
to shift facilities for the Department of Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences to the west side of campus.

**Background Information and Assessment**

The plan for the East Area is based on a comprehensive inventory and assessment of existing features and issues, including topography, views, and open space; building use and significance; and patterns of circulation and parking.

**Slopes**

The dramatic, west-facing topography of the East Area cradled the earliest activities of the campus. Fields and structures were located on these gently sloping hillsides when the Massachusetts Agricultural College was founded. Student market gardens, part of the expansive campus green, and the lowest edge of chestnut forest, vineyards, and orchards covered what is known today as Orchard Hill.

The East Area is a long, north-south terrace defined by ridges. Through its southern and central parts, Stockbridge Road runs along comparatively flat land overlooked by an eastern ridge. Continuing north along Stockbridge Road, the land begins to fall away to the west. Before it was closed, the road descended to join North Pleasant Street at the East Experiment Station, where Ellis Drive formerly joined North Pleasant Street from the west, south of West Experiment Station. The curvature of Stockbridge Road was flanked by the relatively steep slopes of Orchard Hill above and to the east, and more gentle slopes below and to the west. The route formerly followed by Stockbridge Road will be approximated by a new pedestrian corridor linking the Studio Arts Building to the south, through the legacy buildings on the East Ridge, to the Integrated Sciences Building.

**Views**

The dramatic topography described above and depicted by the contour lines on the topographic map is not only a significant constraint for building and road development, but also a great opportunity for views. Many East Area ridge tops and windows offer spectacular views of the Berkshires to the west. Some of the legacy buildings along Stockbridge Road, like Clark and Wilder Halls, were well-situated to enjoy the views before construction of the Morrills severed their western visual connection. Occupants of other buildings on the highest, most eastern edge of the area can still look to the west without obstruction. Other important overlooks bordering the East Area include the Chancellor’s House and the Clark Hill Memorial.

Internal views are also important to the area. The Fine Arts Center’s Grand Walk, just across North Pleasant Street to the west, frames an unappealing view on parking lot number 63.

A fall 2007 studio class in Landscape Architecture will tackle the opportunity presented by the closing of Stockbridge Road. Before the end of 2007, the campus will retain a design professional to develop plans and specifications for the pedestrian corridor between the Studio Arts Building and the Integrated Sciences Building, and the important connectors running east and west through the corridor, carrying foot traffic between the campus core and the residence halls on the East Ridge and Orchard Hill.

**Open Space**

Significant, well-designed open spaces within the East Area include the Rhododendron Garden, Durfee Gardens, and the Waugh Garden in front of Hills. These spaces are used by the campus community for lunch breaks, contemplation or quiet conversation, performances, and outdoor ceremonies, providing a model for the design of other open spaces on the campus.

In the past, much of the East Area consisted of undefined open space, left over from building construction. The Integrated Science Building and the Studio Arts Building projects, currently in construction, each incorporates designed courtyard space. In addition, the planned redesign of Stockbridge Road will develop this pedestrian spine to further enhance the East Area’s open space. The elevation of Thatcher Way above the hillside below permits distant views reminiscent of the open landscapes characterizing the past. Many mature trees in the East Area were planted by President Clark in the late 1800s.
**East Ridge Legacy Buildings**

One of the oldest sections of the campus, the East Area contains many buildings along the path of Stockbridge Road dating to the early 1900s. Despite the accumulation of deferred maintenance and lack of suitability for modern academic program needs, these buildings are important reminders of the campus’s heritage as a land grant institution. Some of these buildings deserve mention because of the roles they have played in campus development or for architectural reasons.

**East Experiment Station**

This Romanesque structure was built in 1889 for agricultural experiments on the relationship between fungal growth and plant disease. The architectural style, delicate scale, and unusual detailing make this an attractive building.

**Clark Hall**

Clark Hall, named for William Clark, third president of the College, was built in 1906 next to Stockbridge House, anchoring the southwestern corner of the salient buildings along the East Ridge.

**Fernald Hall**

Fernald Hall, designed in the Georgian-revival style in 1909, was a state-of-the-art entomology facility in its day. Since no building was sited south of Clark Hall opposite Fernald, its relationship to the other legacy buildings is weak, particularly in view of its separation from French Hall by Franklin Dining Commons.

**French Hall**

Named after the first president of the College, French Hall was built in 1907 for floriculture and market gardening. Its Georgian façade has been characterized as undistinguished, but its importance amplified by its placement directly across from Stockbridge House next to the Durfee Gardens. Built only two years after Wilder Hall, French Hall sits in the center of Olmstead’s Drill Ground and Common, marking the early demise of the “New England Village” planning concept for the College.

**Stockbridge House and the Homestead: The University Club**

Stockbridge House is named for Levi Stockbridge, fifth president of the College. Dating to 1728, the colonial-style saltbox is the oldest structure in Amherst. Joined with another structure moved from nearby, the Homestead, the two buildings comprise the University Club.

**Skinner Hall**

Termed “relatively undistinguished” in the 1997 East Area Plan, Skinner Hall is a Georgian design undergoing a complete renovation and addition to house the School of Nursing, which remains in the East Area and does not move north across Eastman Lane to the Health and Education Area.

**Wildier Hall**

Built in 1905 and named after Marshall P. Wilder, founder of the New England Horticultural Society in 1829 and the State Board of Agriculture in 1852, Wilder Hall is “an eclectic blend of Italianate, Queen Anne, and Prairie Style features,” the first building in the United States dedicated to a program of Landscape Architecture.

**Southern Tip of East Area**

The southern tip of the East Area is bounded by North Pleasant Street, Butterfield Terrace, Clark Hill Road, and Infirmary Way, and is positioned at the intersection of North Pleasant Street and Massachusetts Avenue. At one end stands the University Apartments, largely vacant for perhaps fifteen years. Planning is underway now to vacate the remaining occupied space and demolish. At the other end stands Hills House, a 1950s-era building with serious deficiencies, proposed to be vacated and demolished as well. Structures in between include expendable garages, Gorman House, and a small research administration building. Given its significant size and strategically important location, this site should be reserved for a major building construction project.

**Patterns of Building Use**

The East Area houses functions from seven of the nine Schools and Colleges: Natural Resources and the Environment, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Humanities and Fine Arts, Public Health and Health Sciences, Nursing, and Education. Only Engineering and Social and Behavioral Sciences are not represented in this precinct. A single department, Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences, has facilities in four East Area buildings, as well as five other buildings spread around the campus. Half of the School of Education is in Hills House, while the other half is anchored in Furcolo Hall to the North. The East Area is also home to University Health Services.

Current and future capital planning is focused on rationalizing patterns of building use by assisting the Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences in migrating west in the direction of Stockbridge Hall, helping Education consolidate functions as close as possible to the Health and Education Area (designated in the 1993 plan), modernizing portions of the Morrill complex for wet laboratory applications, and creating a premier site for future development.

The Art Department, which has had space dispersed into six building around the campus (in addition to the Fine Arts Center), including three in the East Area, has consolidated all the outlying facilities into the new Studio Arts Building.

**Utilities**

The roads, open spaces, and parking lots of the East Area cover a complicated system of underground tunnels and pipes carrying lines for utilities, some perhaps 130 years old and poorly marked. The underground infrastructure is comprised of lines for steam, condensate, water, gas, electricity, and communications. Elements of the infrastructure, particularly manholes, come to the surface and become part of the visible landscape. These systems are maintained by either the Physical Plant or Telecommunications.

An extensive program of utility relocation accompanied the building of the Integrated Sciences and Studio Arts Buildings. Major, multi-purpose utility corridors cross the East Area, as depicted on the Utility Plan. North Pleasant Street is also a major utility corridor. The significance of the utility map for physical planning purposes is that large expanses with limited utility encroachment offer the best future sites for infill development. The East Area presents four such sites:

1. parking lot 63:2 behind East Experiment Station
2. the Integrated Sciences Building Phase II site
3. parking lot 62:1 south of the Morrill Greenhouses (often identified as a prime site for a parking deck), and
4. the open space between Hills House and the University Apartments.

**Circulation**

Pedestrian, vehicular, and service circulation within the East Area require clarity, efficiency, and safety. Two or more of these systems intersect in many places in the East Area.
Pedestrian Circulation

While there are few clearly defined routes of pedestrian circulation in the East Area, many paths are oriented from east to west, from the Orchard Hill and Central residential areas, creating a diffused, meandering sense of pedestrian movement. Travelers pass along streets, between buildings, and through parking lots to cross North Pleasant Street to the campus core. Many of the North Pleasant Street crossings are inadequate from a safety perspective. Handicapped access is lacking along east-west routes.

North-south pedestrian corridors include the heavily-traveled east side of North Pleasant Street and the sidewalks along Stockbridge Road. Redesign of the path of the abandoned Stockbridge Road following the construction of the Integrated Sciences Building and the Studio Arts Building offers the occasion for correcting nearly all of these deficiencies.

Vehicular Circulation

The southern tip of the East Area sits at the intersection of North Pleasant Street and Massachusetts Avenue, one of the gateways to the campus. Heavily traveled in both directions, North Pleasant Street carries a significant volume of through traffic between Amherst and North Amherst. Other traffic routes in the East Area are secondary, carrying a lower but still significant volume of mixed traffic.

Stockbridge Road: One of the oldest roads on campus, Stockbridge Road parallels North Pleasant Street, carrying lighter volumes of traffic while providing access to service routes. The road was closed to through traffic in 2007. Service will be rerouted as necessary.

Chancellors Way: This minor vehicle route provides residential and service access to the Chancellor’s House, and functions as a major pedestrian route to Orchard Hill.

Thatcher Way: Hitherto little used, Thatcher Way connects Chancellors Way to Eastman Lane. Soon, Infirmary Way and Thatcher Way will be linked to provide access to Eastman Lane.

Clark Hill Road: Clark Hill Road climbs a steep grade to connect Infirmary Way with East Pleasant Street, curving sharply around the Clark Hill Memorial. The intersection at East Pleasant Street is poorly aligned, with inadequate sight lines. Although this intersection is outside of the East Area, its occasionally impassable condition affects the East Area, particularly in winter. This road is an important east-west connector.

Infirmary Way: Currently a one-way loop providing access to Franklin DC, University Health Services (UHS), and the Central residential complex, a connection will soon be made northward to Thatcher Way, providing access to Eastman Lane. At UHS, Infirmary Way doubles back to the right, passing through Central.

Service Circulation

Conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians occur in the East Area when service vehicles use the sidewalks to access entryways and make deliveries.