ARCHITECTURAL CAMPUS PLANNING PRINCIPLES
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section of the master plan document is to form a basis for the architectural character, composition, and typology of future buildings, groups of buildings and exterior spaces on the University of Georgia campus. This portion of the document aspires to be both a "mirror" and a "lamp." The buildings already existent on the Athens campus were observed, documented, and analyzed in the course of preparation of this study. Thus the suggestions for future architectural interventions made herein attempt to reflect the best architectural traditions evident on campus.

While many aspects of the University of Georgia's campus make it one of the most memorable compositions of buildings and open spaces to be found in the nation, it is not the purpose of this document to replicate the historic core in order to create a new architecture of empty nostalgia. The University of Georgia campus forms a collection of buildings from many different time periods and of various styles. There is not a unique "University of Georgia style" per se, rather the notable buildings built over the course of time, reflect both the needs of the moment and the traditions of architecture compatible with the context of the Athens campus.

It is hoped that the insights gleaned from a reading of this section will enable the campus community to better recognize and understand the architectural traditions of the campus, while simultaneously forming a touchstone for architects, landscape architects, planners, and other design working on future projects. Since innovation is always understood relative to some context, the traditions suggested by this portion of the document are intended to "light the way" for future projects.
EXISTING UGA BUILDING STYLES
VERNACULAR/GEORGIAN/NEO-CLASSICAL

Below are some examples of Vernacular/Georgian/Neo-Classical building styles found on the UGA campus and a brief indication of their characteristics.

Examples
- Old College
- New College
- Phi Kappa Hall
- Chapel
- Demosthenian Hall

Observations
- Domestic scale – unassuming character with exception of the Chapel
- Generally more wall than window
- Visual tension between proportions of opening and wall (i.e., the proportions of the wall are often more dominant than the proportions of window)
- Architectural elements are often integral to the building’s construction
- Vertical bay structure and vertically oriented openings
- Spartan vocabulary, restrained use of ornament
- Pragmatic elements modulate facade (e.g., downspout, chimneys, entrances)
- Facade is not overly “deep” except when a portico element is added to recognize entry
EXISTING UGA BUILDING STYLES
BEAUX-ARTS

Below are some examples of Beaux-Arts building styles found on the UGA campus and a brief indication of their characteristics.

Examples
- Peabody Hall
- Memorial Hall
- Business School

Observations
- Monumental scale compatible with domestic core of campus
- Range of proportion of window to wall
- System of ornamentation may not be directly tied to constructional technique, rather it is tied to broader cultural ideals related to building type (i.e., you know it is a “library” by its appearance, but what you see may or may not directly be related to how it was built)
- Use of sophisticated proportioning systems
- Division into 3 parts vertically and horizontally – clear hierarchy of parts
- Facade is “sculpted” in 3 dimensions as if carved from a block of clay
- Preference for symmetry, however complex overlapping local symmetries are sometimes used to produce localized picturesque effects
- Generally incorporates historical references
EXISTING UGA BUILDING STYLES
MODERN AND TRADITIONAL

Below are some examples of Modern and Traditional building styles found on the UGA campus and a brief indication of their characteristics.

Examples
- Library
- Fine Arts Building Additions
- Sanford Hall

Observations
- A more monumental scale
- Recognition of frame construction techniques in aesthetic of vertical surface
- Often more window than wall or an equivalent proportion of window and wall
- Facade is “layered” as a series of flat, planar surfaces composed within the constraints of a modest dimension.
- System of ornamentation is restrained, however attempts to relate constructional techniques to cultural ideals related to building type (i.e., you know it is a “library” by its appearance, and you have an idea of how it was built)
- Draws inspiration from history and ideas of contemporary life
EXISTING UGA BUILDING STYLES
MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY

Below are some examples of Modern and Contemporary building styles found on the UGA campus and a brief indication of their characteristics.

Examples
- Chemistry Annex
- Georgia Museum of Art

Observations
- Vertical surfaces are less likely to be designed as “facades”
- Overall massing dictates form – buildings less likely to participate in campus space making
- Openings are “slots” or “zones” where wall surface is omitted rather than an incised opening
- Character of building is particular to the whim of the architect, client, or donor
- Building does not necessarily communicate an idea of what it is or how it was built
- Unclear hierarchy of parts
- Scale is indeterminate
- Abstract form preferred over forms of “traditional building” (i.e., roofs, walls, doors, windows, are replaced with horizontal planes, vertical planes, and various kinds of apertures)
- Preference for asymmetrical massing and the picturesque over symmetry
- Notion of the Zeitgeist prevails, history and tradition are devalued – draws little upon immediate physical context
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THE APPLICATION OF AMERICAN CAMPUS PLANNING PRINCIPLES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

The planning principles exhibited on American campuses are truly a unique art form. While the traditions of campus planning in the United States are closely related to attitudes concerning building and the landscape developed between the 16th and 19th centuries in England, France, and Italy, the application of these principles to the built form of the university is an art form, which evolved principally in this country. The close relationship between built form and the landscape is a characteristic of campus planning that is the taproot of this art form. From Thomas Jefferson’s University of Virginia, to Saarenin’s Cranbrook Academy, this tradition remained unbroken until the Second World War.

One of the most readily identifiable characteristics of this tradition was the creation of exterior spaces, which could be likened to interior rooms. In the diagram illustrated in Figure 1, a prototypical room is drawn alongside a university quadrangle of similar proportions. Nearly everyone is familiar with the sense of enclosure and protection afforded by a room’s bounding surfaces – walls enclose space; windows admit light and air while permitting views to the exterior world; doors permit access; and typically there is some element of focus within the room, perhaps a hearth. It is readily evident that every element performs a role supporting the larger notion of “room.” That is, walls alone do not the room make. The interdependency of elements and the specialized tasks they play relegate elements of the room to hierarchical roles in the overall composition. That is a door to the room will serve to frame a view of the room’s principal feature – the hearth, and all along the corners of the room will be subservient to both the former and later elements.

Likewise, the exterior room of a campus quadrangle has features, which might be seen as analogous to that of a traditional interior room. The library may dominate the composition in much the same manner as the hearth, while a pair of buildings axially disposed across the quadrangle from this principal feature might serve the same threshold purposes as that of a door. One might readily see that a successful composition of a college quadrangle requires that the buildings operate in concert with one another. Sometimes buildings are called upon to play more assertive roles that of a “hero,” like the library, or the matching buildings forming the campus threshold. The heroic buildings, however, require substantial amounts of good “soldier” buildings to form the backdrop against which these more assertive buildings might be seen.

In planning and building a new campus or on a portion of an existing campus it is very important to understand the role that individual buildings are required to play. Too many heroic structures would be like a room full of guests all talking at the same time. Too few heroic buildings would be like a party where none of the guests ever arrived — a bit of a bore. In planning a successful campus composition, one seeks to strike a balance between the “heroes” and the “soldiers.” Experience has shown that every trustee, donor, president, dean, every department chair, or faculty member, usually like to view their “new building” as aspiring to be a “hero.” And, while much might be said of the heroic nature of the common foot soldier, it is recommended that the creation of heroic buildings on college campuses be limited to those building types which embody and relate the most universal and lofty aspirations of the entire institution — churches, libraries, places of assembly, etc.
Figure 1

Main Library

Main Library
This building type often performs the role of the common foot soldier, but it may also take on heroic assignments. The generic configuration of the type is that of an elongated rectilinear volume. Most often entry is achieved on the center of one of the long faces, however edge entries, or entry from one of the narrow elevations is also possible (see facade guidelines). This building type commonly aligns its eaves and ridgelines, not the gable end, to the quadrangle thus reinforcing the geometry of this exterior room. A central corridor gives access to the rooms. Typically the corridor is double loaded, however in some instances a single loaded corridor may serve the needs of the program. The length of this building type may vary from 120 feet to 300 feet, while the width of the type is generally in the neighborhood of 45-90 feet. When this type exceeds the 90 foot width dimension natural lighting and ventilation of the interior spaces becomes impossible. Thus, depending upon the actual intended use of buildings of this type, care should be given to the width of the block.

There are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan (Figure 2).

- Illustrates this building type located as a central element on the long side of a campus quadrangle – the building performs both the role of edge definer and central focus.
- Much the same might be said about the positioning of the type in this configuration, however because the building alone forms the edge of the narrow side of a long quadrangle, it tends to take on a more heroic dimension.
- In this instance the type is paired to form both the wall to the quadrangle as well as a threshold to the campus.
- The final illustration of this type in context is interesting because it presents its end elevation to the major quadrangle of the campus while forming the edge of a new quadrangle behind the first building discussed in this drawing.

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are Old College and New College, at other institutions, Nassau Hall, Princeton and Old East and Old West at UNC Chapel Hill. The type might accommodate housing, classrooms, laboratories, administrative activities, and a wide variety of other functions. It is typically the most prevalent variety of building to be found on college campuses. This type along with the Centralized Type form the two essential building blocks of campus architecture from which all other types might be derived.
This building type is often associated with a heroic posture within a campus plan, however, the type might defer to other buildings depending upon its specific context. The general configuration of the type is that of a compact rectilinear volume, however other platonic forms are also associated with this type: circular, octagonal, or other centralized form. Entry is most often achieved on the center of one of the narrow facades and the type most often presents its gabled end to the quadrangle thereby gaining a certain amount of visual attention. Generally the type houses one large open space internally — often conceived of as a space of assembly. The dimensions of the type vary dramatically and should be determined based upon a mitigation of the concerns of the context against those of the building’s function.

There are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, refer to Figure 3.
- Illustrates this building in a central position on the long edge of a campus quadrangle (a position analogous to that of a hearth in a room)
- The positioning of a pair of buildings around a principal campus axis forms both edge and threshold to the quadrangle.
- The placement of the type in this position affords four separate exposures – the building is seen in the round (from all sides). This later placement can present problems in servicing the building if the concerns of use are not properly mitigated against those of the campus context. A chapel or assembly hall might be well served by this location, while a dining hall might not work well with the context given an intensive service component of the program.

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are the Chapel and the Phi Kappa building, at other institutions, the Rotunda at the University of Virginia and Whig and Clio Halls at Princeton. The type might accommodate various assembly activities: chapel, lecture hall, gymnasium, dining hall, etc. When used in conjunction with the Edge Defining Type in a single unified composition an unlimited variety of building forms might be created.
CAMPUS BUILDING TYPOLOGY
THE COMPOSITE TYPE

While many contemporary building programs might not be readily addressed by either the Edge-Defining or the Centralized Types alone, in combination the two building types form the essential characteristics of the Composite Type. It is more difficult to talk about general configurations of this type because the possible combinations and recombination of the basic “building blocks” of typology are limitless. For an insight into the variety of possibilities see, N.C. Curtis, Architectural Composition, Cleveland: Jansen, 1927.

The characteristics of how this building type might address a quadrangle are similar to those outlined in both of the previous two types. Again the actual dimension of the type may vary dramatically, so once again a mitigation of the contingencies of the site against those of building use are highly recommended.

Once again there are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, Figure 4.

- Illustrates the simplest form of the type – a Centralized Type has been joined with two flanking Edge-Defining Types to form an articulated wall to the quadrangle. The central element provides accent to the quadrangle while the flanking volumes carry the “wall” of the space along the edge of the quad.
- This illustration of the type is a much more complex combination of the campus building blocks. A central space of assembly is aligned with the axis of the quadrangle and is used in combination with a series of edge-defining volumes. A forecourt is formed between the campus quadrangle and the central volume, while an automobile forecourt is formed by the wings, which extend downward at ninety-degree angles to the long axis of the quadrangle. To the far right, a service court is formed, and to the top, edge-defining types wrap the centralized volume to form an internal courtyard.
- In comparison to the previous example, this configuration of the type is very tame. In fact, the type is created by relocating the edge-defining elements at 90 degree angles to the position occupied in example one — thus, forming a forecourt. The advantage of this type is that large building programs can be accommodated in this configuration with out dimensionally abandoning a 70-foot maximum building wing width.

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are the Fine Arts Building and the Business School, at other institutions — Bancroft and Mahan Halls at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis. Most complex programs can be accommodated by this typology.
Figure 4
In many cases contemporary programs call for very large footprints to accommodate specialized activities. While the advantage of these large footprints is that many activities can be located in an efficient proximity to one another, the liability is that these types of buildings often become hermetically sealed and connections between interior spaces and the exterior world become severed. Faculty, staff, and students can find themselves living out their entire academic life in these “mega structures” without ever stepping foot outside of their own domain. In short the danger of these “academic malls” are that they often do not contribute in an effective manner to the overall well being of the university. However, when properly designed these big buildings can indeed contribute well to the life of a campus.

Of primary interest is care given to issues of scale and proportion. Wherever possible, the massiveness of the building should be mitigated by elements in concert with the human scale of the campus environment. The Typical Plan in Figure 5 illustrates an Edge-Defining Type used as a frontispiece, or head house, for a much larger building mass. The site section diagrams located above the typical plan drawing also illustrate two techniques for masking the massiveness of the “large footprint” building. The uphill site illustrates a laboratory building nestled into the grade to minimize the impact of its height and girth, while the downhill site illustrates a parking structure carved into the hillside behind an academic building. The upper deck of this later building is then landscaped and treated as a garden terrace.

Again, there are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, Figure 5.
- Illustrates a very large laboratory building, which is flanked by two classroom buildings and headed up by an administrative/office wing, which mediates a connection to the quadrangle.
- Is a center for continuing education, which presents a face both to the outside world (bottom edge) and to the campus quadrangle (right edge). These wings, joined by a rotund element mask the large parking structure located behind. Access to the parking structure is from the extreme right edge of the footprint. It should be noted that care would be given to the surface of the parking structure to create a “handsome” facade in concert with the vocabulary of the campus.
- Illustrates a large student center with large dining halls, meeting rooms, ballrooms, and recreational spaces. The configuration presents a forecourt to the campus quadrangle using two Edge-Defining and one Centralized Type in order to mask the large footprints of the big assembly halls. To the far right a service court provides access for deliveries and waste removal.

Successful examples of this building type are Cabel Hall at the University of Virginia, the Physics and Astronomy Building at Johns Hopkins University, the Student Center at Carnegie Mellon, Barton Hall at Cornell University, and the original buildings on the campus of Duke University.
Figure 5
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Type In Context
MASSING DIAGRAMS

These series of diagrams are intended to suggest the limitless rational combinations and recombinations of the “building blocks” to form more complex compositions appropriate to elaborate programs. Each diagram builds upon the previous drawing suggesting a process of elaboration and combination. Note that the massing is not dependent upon a singular response to issues of symmetry/asymmetry, center/edge, base condition, or roof. Both designers and members of the campus community are encouraged to imagine their own formal inventions as an extension of this exercise.

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8
Each of the facade variations illustrated herein derives from the previously mentioned observation, documentation, and analysis of the UGA campus. The proportions of openings and wall surfaces are derived from UGA traditions and may not be directly applicable to other campuses, however, many of the techniques for creating hierarchical “readings” of the facades are generic in nature.

Typically this study recognizes two generic architectural conditions — that of the wall and that of the frame. Both types are to be found alone and in combination on the UGA campus. Once again, the observations made herein are not an attempt to advocate specific styles, however, it is explicitly the intention of this portion of the document to encourage the development of rationale for the vertical surfaces. Thomas L. Schumacher’s, “Scull and the Mask,” as well as, “The Palladio Variations,” (Cornell Journal of Architecture, New York: Rizolli) are excellent starting points for discussion of facade making themes. Since a building on a college campus is likely to be kept in service for in excess of 100 years, it is important to give the design of facades considerable attention.
This type is derived in part from New College. The aesthetic derives from bearing wall construction techniques. The façade type is characterized by a series of regularly spaced windows of equal dimension. Not only do the windows act as “figure” in the composition of the façade, but the spaces between are also imbued with figural properties. That is, the windows are as interesting to the eye as the wall.

Windows read as discrete architectural elements positioned within the fabric of the wall. The head of the window is characterized by a lintel or flat arch, which occasionally serves as a location for ornamentation. The sills of the window are often stone and project from the surface of the wall. Following the logic of bearing wall construction, the general proportion of each window is that of a vertical rectangle, in this case a square root of two or golden section rectangle. The windows are typically double hung and subdivided into smaller panes.

In this façade type, the ground floor of the building is given special prominence by rustication or by belt coursing. This treatment permits the composition of the wall to relate well to the ground plane. Typical of many buildings on UGA’s campus, the building is capped by a gabled metal roof that is selectively articulated with masonry elements (chimneys, cupolas, etc.). There are examples of very successful buildings on the UGA campus in which the roof is not expressed. Typically, however, these buildings (such as Peabody Hall) terminate the wall with a cornice, or other element, which forms a distinct profile against the sky.
Planar Façade Variations

- In this series all of the openings in the façade are created through the use of equally spaced windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the reading of the wall surface and by adjusting the relationship between the opening and the wall.

Variation A

- This façade uses a “surround” treatment to distinguish the windows on the first floor from those on the ground and upper floor levels. This treatment may be useful in breaking up the monotony of a façade composed of regularly spaced windows. Additionally, the treatment gives distinction to the first story above the ground level as a place of prominence within the building.

Variation B

- This façade uses belt courses and rustication to produce a horizontal effect. This treatment may be an appropriate strategy for making tall facades to appear more in scale with a lower context. Additionally, the treatment may be appropriate when the building is intended at a “background” element in a composition wherein the intention is not to have the eye come to rest on this particular building.

Variation A

Variation B
Variation C
- This façade develops a strong reading of “center” by creating an intersecting gable at the midpoint of the composition. Addition of an attic element and the positioning of chimneys create a strong sense of center. This may be an appropriate treatment when the building is an important element of a group plan, such as the main building of a college, or a prominent building on an open space or quadrangle.

Variation D
- This façade is characterized by a development of localized centers at the extremities of the façade. The result is a dual centered façade. The use of a segmental gable that penetrates the eaves line of the roof, strategically positioned chimneys, and downspout, create an emphasis upon the edges of the overall composition. This treatment may be used in conjunction with elements of Variation C to create a hybrid that emphasizes both center and edge simultaneously. The type may be most appropriate for buildings with multiple entries, for buildings that attempt to downplay their hierarchical importance on a quadrangle or open space, or for buildings, which contain more than one academic department.
This type is very similar to the previous example, however it differs in that the surface is developed in terms of relief or depth of the wall surface. The amount of relief may vary from only a few inches to that of many feet (in the case of a freestanding portico). Through the introduction of relief, a hierarchical reading of the openings (windows and doors) can be developed.
Planar Facade in Relief Variations
- In this series all of the openings in the facade are created through a use of equally spaced windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the degree of surface relief either in front of or behind the dominant wall plane.

Variation A
- This facade uses a modestly scaled series of pilasters in front of the dominant wall surface to create a centralized reading and emphasis upon the entry. An element breaking the roof line (perhaps an elevator core) further emphasizes the centrality of the composition.

Variation B
- This facade creates a large centralized element by “excavating” or carving into the dominant wall plane in order to create a series of vertical openings articulated as pilasters. The vertical scale of this gesture suggests a more monumental and perhaps heroic character than Variation A.
Variation C
- This facade balances emphasis to both center and edge by once again “excavating” the dominant wall plane in order to create a rhythm of pilasters. The cadence of vertical openings is terminated at the left and right of the facade by a reassertion of the dominant plane and the creation of secondary entrances on the ground floor within these zones.

Variation D
- This facade uses modestly scaled elements applied to the dominant plane of the facade in order to create emphasis at the edges of the composition (in this case the center is down played). By covering half of this diagram, one can imagine an asymmetrical application of this technique.
This type is likened to the first example in that there is little relief in the surface of the facade. It achieves its goals in establishing hierarchy by clustering openings of identical proportion and dimension. The type suggests a hybrid of frame and wall characteristics.

Figure 13
Planar Facade with Clustered Openings Variations

- In this series all of the openings in the facade are created through a use of windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the spacing of windows and other openings.

Variation A

- This facade develops a hierarchical reading by means of creating a cluster of windows at the center of the composition. The end bays of the composition terminate the composition by paring windows in order to create figural emphasis.

Variation B

- This facade develops a duality of reading — it emphasizes center through placement of the door and the symmetry around the center, but it creates a tension between center and edge because the large groupings of windows left and right compete for the eye’s attention.
Variation C
- This facade utilizes a more articulated symmetry to create a bipartite composition. The actual center of the facade is distinctly downplayed in favor of development of the dual figure groupings around a vertical axis. Dual doors on the ground level reinforce the notion of a two-part composition.

Variation D
- This facade emphasizes the edge elements through tiers of paired windows located in the end bays. The emphasis upon edge is further advanced by the position of the doors on the ground floor.
This final example is similar to the previous example in that it employs clustering of openings, however it also utilizes modest relief in order to establish hierarchical readings.

Figure 15
Frame Facade in Relief Variations

- Hierarchy is developed by the manner in which the window or opening is surrounded and the degrees to which elements such as spandrels are expressed as materially separate from the actual window openings.

Variation A

- This facade develops a distinct reading of centrality by contrasting the scale of the figure grouping on center with those repetitive bays located to the left and the right of center. The door element is placed on center to further emphasize this portion of the composition.

Variation B

- This facade emphasizes the edge by employing large-scale figure groupings to the extreme right and left of the composition. As in the previous example, doors are associated with the large-scale figures in order to underscore the compositional strategy.
Variation C
- This facade is almost the same as Variation B, however the emphasis upon edge has been played down by utilizing large-scale figure groupings in the central range of the facade. The emphatic statement of edge seen in Variation B gives way to a more subtle suggestion of edge in Variation C.

Variation D
- This facade uses the smaller bays which were prevalent in Variation A in order to create edge emphasis. The end bays containing the doors feature spandrels which are distinguished from the material of the windows, thus presenting a greater degree of solidity and emphasis upon termination of the facade rhythm.
CONCLUSION

Architects commissioned for UGA buildings should not underestimate the challenge of designing within the shadow of the architects of UGA’s early campus buildings. To understand how to integrate a new project into the fabric of UGA’s campus, one needs to read thoroughly the overview of UGA’s history that summarizes the founding fathers’ intentions for the University.

- Stewardship of the land
- Balance of buildings and open space
- Consistent architectural language

The buildings of North Campus relate to one another along connecting axes. Buildings were aligned along open spaces forming an architectural edge enclosing exterior space and creating outdoor rooms. Walks and roads were generally laid out on axes, tying the campus together.

Essential to UGA’s growth is the infilling of future buildings within the existing campus such that clear, memorable open spaces are formed. In this regard, site selection is vital to the success of each new building, and the success to the campus as a whole.

Even more important is the successful integration of new buildings with the broad surrounding context. By definition, a campus is a collection of interrelated buildings and supporting facilities arranged in and around open space. The challenge, then, is for every UGA architect to think globally (campus wide) and to act locally (site specific).

Therefore, in initiating the design process for any building or open space on UGA’s campus, each design team should begin with a comprehensive look at the campus context and history. This first step should include an analysis of the site: its history, pedestrian and vehicular traffic, infrastructure, service, views and vistas, topography, vegetation, massing, and architectural character. In synthesizing this analysis, a primary goal of all building projects within UGA’s campus should be to create clear, simple open spaces and quadrangles that connect to other existing or proposed adjacent spaces. In this regard, buildings should be budgeted to extend their site work as far as is reasonably possible. At the schematic design phase, site plans should show the ground floor plan of the building within the overall campus context and adjacent open space.

These guidelines do not advocate the replication of the original campus buildings in the design of new buildings. Rather, they suggest the continuing evolution of the principles used in those original campus buildings. Using similar scale, proportions, form, materials, and hierarchy one can design in harmony with the existing grounds and buildings.

The design for both grounds and buildings should then refer to these guidelines in the spirit of both recollection and invention. Examples of this attitude can be seen at other campuses, acting as relevant paradigms for UGA’s architects and planners. Some of these examples include the images pictured at right.

In summary, the sustained implementation of UGA’s Campus Plan relies on reestablishing many of the principles that Charles Leavitt and the pre-WW II architects established on UGA’s campus. Leavitt established in his 1906 physical master plan a balance of building and open space, and a stewardship of
the land. Pre-WW II buildings on campus express a consistent, yet inventive architectural language. In this regard, UGA’s grounds and buildings should be like a good academic curriculum combining tradition and innovation.

Founders Memorial Garden

University of Georgia’s North Campus

Physical Master Plan by Charles Leavitt (1906)
SITE CAMPUS PLANNING PRINCIPLES

INTRODUCTION

The UGA Site Campus Planning Principles defines essential features unique to the UGA campus. These design standards contribute to pedestrian safety, way finding, campus iconography, and sense of place. They are important identifying characteristics of the 605-acre UGA campus. The standards are made available here to design professionals engaged on the UGA campus as a way to maximize efficiency and streamline parts of the design process.

The UGA Site Campus Planning Principles defines essential features that not only instruct architects, landscape architects, engineers, and other design professionals of the aesthetic make up of the University of Georgia campus, but also formulates the design criteria for future development, which essentially brings forth continuity and respect for elements that are deemed appropriate.

This section is intended as a guideline of pertinent design principles. Specific construction detail requirements may be found in Standards.
Stone entry gates, masonry piers, decorative iron fences, and lush landscape plantings are all elements the designer can use to define campus edges and property lines. They serve to visually and physically identify the campus boundaries. The campus gateways can be categorized in a hierarchy related to popularity of use. For instance, the historic University Arch gateway on north campus is a primary pedestrian entrance from the downtown central business district. The Herty Mall entrance is another primary pedestrian gateway. Both delineate campus edges to downtown and are traversed by a large number of people on a daily basis. The smaller opening to north campus from Broad Street, east of the Arch gateway is an example of a secondary entrance; therefore the design of the physical threshold is much simpler than the grand example of the Arch or Herty Mall entrance. Still less important or less traveled entrances to campus would be considered tertiary gateways, and will have a much simpler threshold design such as a lush landscape planting on either side of the entry point. On the UGA south campus, a primary gateway is the D.W. Brooks Mall entrance, incorporating an ornamental iron fence and granite rubble stone piers and walls. Traditionally, elements used for gateway construction on north campus include brick, cast iron fencing, and masonry stone. Central and south campus gateways are typically characterized by the use of granite rubble, cast iron fences, ornamental iron fences and lush landscape plantings. The cast iron fences are without exception reserved for the historic north and south extreme boundaries, whereas smaller scale, diminutive brick or stone piers are used along the campus edges in the central precinct. The northwest and northeast regions are newer precincts where gateway edges have not been identified. All proposed gateways and gateway materials should be approved on a case-by-case basis through OUA, taking careful consideration of existing surrounding context.

In addition to material selection, scale and proportion are the other most important design criteria when proposing future campus gateways. Proposed improvements should relate to human scale and existing campus context. Always, campus gateways should incorporate lush landscape plantings of trees and shrubs to further define boundaries and contribute to a pedestrian-scaled environment.
Whether for seating, retaining soil, or as a design feature, proposed site walls should be constructed of natural stone or brick. Grey Elberton granite is native to the Athens, Georgia area and should be utilized for wall construction. Low walls should be constructed entirely of granite rubble, and taller retaining walls should have a granite veneer over their structural components. Specific construction detail requirements for site walls and seat walls can be found in 32 32 29 – Stone Retaining Walls.
GATEWAYS AND EDGES
CAST IRON & ALUMINUM FENCING

Cast iron fencing may be appropriate on North Campus, near historic structures, and in areas of campus that reflect the historic quadrangle layout of North Campus (e.g. D.W. Brooks Mall). If used adjacent to existing wrought iron fencing, care should be given to match the existing. Aluminum fencing is implemented on campus in areas to help distinguish spaces and provide security.
SITE FURNISHINGS
TRANSPORTATION SHELTERS

Bus Shelters should be located where space is available and the volume of riders and traffic patterns justify their use. The shelters should not be obtrusive to their setting and should be illuminated for safety and partially enclosed to offer protection from wind and rain. Seating areas with trash receptacles should be provided within the shelter. Specific construction detail requirements can be found in 10 73 43 – Transportation Shelters.

Transportation Shelter – Health Sciences Campus
PAVING
SIDEWALKS – UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA ROADWAY

Typical pedestrian pathways for University of Georgia owned roadways should be constructed of scored concrete with installations of a tree planting beds along the road’s edge. Brick or granite accents should be used to denote significant locations, such as building entrances and major intersections. Specific construction detail requirements for University of Georgia sidewalks can be found in 32 16 23 – Sidewalks.
Typical pedestrian pathways for Athens-Clarke County owned roadways should be constructed of scored concrete with brick paver accents on edge.
Porous Concrete

Porous Concrete should be used whenever possible as a substitute for traditional paving. The pavement is made out of pieces of gravel and concrete that has holes, which allows the water to flow through. Underneath the pavement is a layer of gravel that will prevent the ground from becoming saturated and flooding. Examples of porous concrete can be found on Waddell Street and Reed Plaza.

Porous Pavers

Porous Pavers are set in sand and gravel beds. The gaps between the pavers are filled with course gravel that allows water to quickly flow through and infiltrate the soil.

Gravel Paving

Gravel paving also allows water to infiltrate quickly. This treatment is suited for paths that will be strictly limited to pedestrian use. The example shown on the left is from UGA’s Herty Field and is made out of recycled crushed brick.

Specific construction detail requirements for porous paving can be found in 32 14 16.13 – Brick Unit Paving - ungrouted.
To supplement the aesthetics of the University of Georgia, brick pavers are used as accents on pedestrian pathways. The use of inscribed “named” pavers is not permitted on campus grounds. Specific construction detail requirements for brick work can be found in 32 14 16.13 – Brick Unit & Porous Paving - ungrouted.

Brick Work – Reed Plaza

Brick Work (Porous Pavers) – Reed Plaza
The use of tactile concrete pavers with truncated domes to denote curb cuts and crosswalks should be employed in order to promote safety at intersections and comply with A.D.A. regulations.
The use of tactile concrete pavers with truncated domes to denote curb cuts and crosswalks should be employed in order to promote safety at intersections and comply with A.D.A. regulations.

Crosswalk and Curb Cuts – Special Collections Library & Hull Street Deck

Curb Cut – Special Collections Library & Hull Street Deck

Truncated Domes – Special Collections Library & Hull Street Deck
Stairs should be constructed of concrete and should have concrete cheek walls. Exterior site stair risers shall be 6” and exterior stair treads shall be 14”. All portions of stairs shall comply with A.D.A. and other applicable regulations. Specific construction detail requirements for stairs and handrails can be found in 05 52 00 – Metal Railings.
PAVING
COMPLETE STREETS

When possible, opportunities to include the objectives and components of complete streets should be included in the project scope.

Complete Streets are safe, comfortable, and convenient for travel for everyone, regardless of age or ability – motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation riders. By routinely responding to the needs of people on foot, public transportation, and bicycles, walking, riding bikes, and riding buses will be safer and easier for everyone.

Complete streets can move more people while using the same amount of road space. Getting more productivity out of the existing road and public transportation systems is vital to reducing congestion. Providing travel choices – walking, bicycling, and public transportation – can reduce the demand for peak-hour travel in cars, the principle cause of daily congestion. A complete streets policy ensures that the entire right of way is planned, designed, and operated to provide safe access for all users.

Benefits
  - Increase Capacity
  - Improve Safety
  - Better Health
  - Economic Growth
  - Lower Emissions
  - Reduce Costs
  - Smarter Growth
  - Provide Choices

More Information
  - http://www.completestreets.org

*Information provided by the National Complete Streets Coalition*
PAVING
BICYCLE ROUTES

Dedicated bicycle routes should be clearly delineated from vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the use of painted lanes and easily recognizable symbols that conform with NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, and GDOT’s Guidelines. Along roads shared with motorized vehicles, a four-foot wide lane should be marked on each side of the pavement where possible. Where the road is too narrow to accommodate two bike lanes, a single lane will be designated. If conditions allow, the single lane will be located on the side of the road that runs uphill with the flow of traffic.

If the opportunity arises, the Design Professional should include bike lanes in their projects. This requirement includes instances where bike lane additions only allow for segments at a time.

University of Georgia 2011 Bicycle Facility Study
https://www.architects.uga.edu/sites/default/files/documents/UGA-Bikes_DRAFT.pdf

University of Georgia Bike Master Plan

Bicycle Lanes – North Campus
PAVING

BICYCLE ROUTES

PURPOSE

- Facilitate Implementation of UGA Physical Master Plan Guiding Principles
- Further Integrate Bike Facilities into the UGA Transportation System
- Promote Safe, Efficient, and Convenient Campus Travel Options
- Encourage Connection with the Natural and Social Environment
- Improve Local Environmental Quality

LEGEND

- Limited Access Vehicles / Bike Shared
- Existing Bike Lanes
- Proposed Bike Lanes
- Recreational Trail
- “Share The Road” Signage
- Shared Pedestrian / Bikes
- Limited Access / Gated Roadway
PAVING
GRASS PAVING

When fire truck or emergency access requires a minimum pathway width that is aesthetically undesirable, grass pavers may be used to keep walk width to a minimum while still meeting code.
SITE SAFETY AND SECURITY
SECURITY BOLLARDS

For use as required to protect buildings from damage by service and emergency vehicles, such as at loading docks and mechanical rooms. For temporary barriers in pedestrian settings, an easy to install, simple post and chain device is required. Specific construction detail requirements for security bollards can be found in 32 39 13 – Manufactured Metal Bollards.

Security Bollards – Hugh Hodgson School of Music & Performing Arts Center

Security Bollards – Building 1516
In light of the recent drought, it has become increasingly important to be proactive in the way UGA manages its natural resources. Rainwater harvesting allows the University to supply water for irrigation, cooling towers, and for toilet flushing even under water restrictions.
Green roofs are encouraged as part of new construction to diminish the urban heat island effect, energy bills, and stormwater discharge. They also create habitat for plants and animals and become an aesthetic enhancement to a building. Although there is currently no standard for green roofs, there are a few that exist on campus that may act as guides for future designs.

Green Roof – Geography & Geology Building

Green Roof – Science Library

Green Roof – Robert C. Wilson Pharmacy Building

Green Roof – Lamar Dodd School of Art

Green Roof – Tate Student Center
Instead of funneling a storm’s first flush into pipes, the following systems slow, capture, or infiltrate water back into the ground.

**Bioretention**

Bioretention systems, also known as rain gardens, are shallow depressions that capture, and then infiltrate water back into the soil. Examples of bioretention systems on campus can be found at Lumpkin Woods along Lumpkin Street, Carlton Street parking lots near the intersection with Sanford Drive, and the Grounds Department at Chicopee.

**Enhanced Swale**

A bioswale has an under layer of sand and gravel that promotes quick infiltration. Rocks or groundcovers can be used as a surface treatment. An example of a bioswale on campus can be found off of Lumpkin Street, directly south of Tanyard Creek.
Fencing
Where fencing is required, either by code or for security purposes, black, vinyl-coated, chain link fence should be used. In regards to each situation, the height of the fence will be determined by the OUA.

Screen Walls
Screen fences should be constructed of brick of a type and pattern that match adjacent buildings.

Specific construction detail requirements for fencing and screening can be found in 32 31 13 – Chain-Link Fences and Gates.
The University of Georgia campus has streets of many sizes and functions. In order to provide a safe and aesthetically desirable walking environment, each general type of street will have a character that suits its function. The street types are as follows: Publicly Accessible Streets at the Edge of Campus, Publicly Accessible Streets on the Interior of Campus, and Limited Access Streets. Wherever possible, the landscape component of a streetscape should utilize a planted strip separating the sidewalk from the edge of the road. In general, streetscapes should have a simple, orderly appearance. Trees should be arranged in a linear fashion with turf or a low groundcover below. Street trees should be native shade trees, such as Oaks, that will grow over or can be pruned above the height of passing traffic. Designers can also utilize the ACC Tree Species list for references. Additionally, complete street guidelines and recommendations from the UGA 2011 Bicycle Facility Study should be incorporated when possible.
LANDSCAPE
GREEN SPACE

Quadrangles are defined green spaces that act as landmarks along circulation corridors (streetscapes). Buildings primarily define the edges of these spaces. The character of these spaces should be park-like, similar to the quadrangles of North Campus. The planting should be ground cover or grass, and shade trees with multiple paved walkways. Building entrances and other focal points should be accented with shrubs, native perennials. Seasonal color beds should be limited and require approval by UGA FMD Ground Department.
LANDSCAPE
NATURALIZED LANDSCAPES

Naturalized spaces on the University of Georgia Campus are defined as areas dominated by informally arranged vegetation that connects the campus with its natural site elements. Landscape design in naturalized areas should utilize a palette of native plants selected for their compatibility with the micro-climatic conditions on the individual site.

Naturalized Landscape – University Health Center

Naturalized Landscape – Lamar Dodd School of Arts

Naturalized Landscape – Lamar Dodd School of Arts

Naturalized Landscape – Lamar Dodd School of Arts