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I. INTRODUCTION
I. INTRODUCTION

“...[W]e’ll remain true to our legacy (and our promise) as we grow and adapt in ways that are informed by who and what we are, and value.”

-- College President Stephen Emerson, February 2008

“The master plan will serve as a living document and decision making tool, providing guidance for the development of the college well into the future. The plan will balance our ambitions for academic and institutional development with our commitment to sustaining the physical beauty of the campus and its buildings. The plan aims to be comprehensive, historically responsive and environmentally proactive and to take into consideration what Haverford College has been in the past, where it is today, and where it sees itself going in the next quarter of a century.”

-- from the Haverford College Master Plan Website

VSBA has been invited to be the planners for this living document. Our mandate, as we understand it, is to develop a plan rooted in a deep understanding of the institution’s history and mission, its opportunities and constraints, and goals and objectives for its future -- one that can help Haverford become more positively and cohesively what it is.

What overall planning framework can result in a coherent set of landscapes and buildings, provide opportunities for future growth, and retain the capacity for individual places of great beauty?

What follows is Phase I of our study. As an overview, a “once-round-lightly,” it is intended to sketch out the scope of the study and to lay the groundwork for future stages of the planning process. It is presented for comment and input, and as an invitation to participate in the plan.

A. PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

Over the last five years, the College has completed the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center and the Gardner Integrated Athletic Center, projects that have transformed aspects of College life and altered patterns of activity and circulation campus-wide. The College has chosen to survey a broad picture, to understand this recently augmented campus as an integrated whole and to plan purposefully and strategically for future phases of development.

B. PLANNING APPROACH AND PROCESS

We have approached the campus planning process as a series of interrelated tasks whose goal is to propose strategies and a vision for the long term future and to obtain consensus among the College’s constituent groups. We have recommended a process of analysis and design that:

• defines the major objectives of the project
• describes alternative means of achieving them
• advises the client groups on the choice between means and, that choice made,
• suggests plans for implementation over time.

We believe this process should be reiterated several times at different scales and level of detail, making the overall master planning process a circular one. This, the first iteration, attempts an initial definition of the overall campus, its aspirations, opportunities, problems, issues and options. Following phases will cover much the same territory, but at different scales and in greater detail.

1. Phase I

In this first task of our study we have collected data and begun to analyze and synthesize what we are learning about the campus. Our assumptions are based on preliminary data received from the College, published materials, our own observations and from our first discussions with over 350 people across the College community.

In “Learning from Haverford” (in Section II), we attempt to engage and understand the campus’ “many landscapes,” broadly defined to include all aspects of the physical campus – buildings and spaces, exterior and interior – and all facets of its architectural and landscape character.

Our assembled data and analyses are incorporated under the headings “Mission, Goals, Opportunities, Problems, Issues and Options” – which we abbreviate MGOPIO – in Section III. This format can provide a framework for the findings and recommendations of the plan.

Although an important purpose of Phase I is to bring issues and options – as we now understand them – to the fore, it is too early for resolution of issues or recommendations between options. These will require a deeper understanding of particulars and input from the Steering Committee and the broader College community.

2. Future Phases

The first task of the next phase of the plan begins with the presentation of Phase I, as we ask “Have we got it right?”

We expect to continue to plan in a cyclical manner in subsequent phases, moving from general statements of overall purposes to fairly detailed options related to action and design (“design” defined broadly – there can be policy as well as physical design in the campus plan).
C. KEY CONCERNS

Key areas for next phases of development, as we now understand them, include the performing and visual arts; office, research and teaching spaces for faculty and students, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences; and student activity and social spaces. These specific concerns are related to broader development questions for access, linkage, growth and conservation, as well as needs the College has for:

- Preserving and maintaining its heritage of historic buildings, while updating them to serve the needs of a constantly-evolving institution.
- Preserving and maintaining a beloved landscape.
- Providing greater degrees of accessibility, especially to those with impaired mobility.
- Space for community activities – at many different scales, from the scale of an individual department or residence hall floor to campus-wide.
- Environmental stewardship.

D. SOME OVERARCHING THEMES

Common threads of our discussions so far include:

**Community.** Almost everyone we’ve talked with so far has spoken about the sense of community at Haverford: “[T]he Haverford experience creates a feeling and commitment to the broader life-long community not found on other campuses.”

There is the need for more places for students, faculty and staff to come together, in order to support the Haverford ideal of intellectual interaction. In addition, there is a need for spaces for faculty-to-faculty and – particularly – student-to-student interaction.

**Intimacy and breadth.** There is both an acknowledgement that “our smallness is our strength” and a desire for a wider range and variety of activities and options.

**Change and permanence.** How should the physical campus change, in order to be in alignment with the College’s present way of life and its aims for its future? The physical campus bears witness to the College’s beginnings, and to each successive wave of change – from an all-male, Quaker school to a diverse, international and coeducational liberal arts college. Which physical elements and characteristics are permanent and fundamental to the Haverford identity, and which changeable?

**Growth and preservation.** The physical campus has not yet fully accommodated previous waves of College growth. For example, many of the social spaces in dormitories have been converted to bedrooms, and community gathering spaces – including the Dining Center, which was designed for a campus of 750 students – now serve a much larger population. No further growth in the student body is expected for the foreseeable future but other kinds of growth – of activities, of faculty – are being considered. How should campus facilities support these? To what extent should campus facilities accommodate or limit long-term growth?

**Sustainability.** What should be Haverford’s approach to sustainability and environmental stewardship? The College’s sustainability initiatives, though substantial, are seen as “fragmented.” How should these be coordinated, augmented and integrated into campus life?

**Realignment of uses.** In some areas of campus, like the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center, activities and uses are located in ways that support interaction and integration. In others – the Whitehead Campus Center and Stokes were often given as examples – adjacencies and proximities are less intentional and vital than vestigial and pragmatic. How should activity locations and adjacencies be re-imagined and realigned to help meet the College’s aims?

Are these themes the right ones? Which others should be central to the plan?

E. NEXT STEPS

We now step back and ask: are our findings correct? What opportunities and options are emerging as patterns become visible? We welcome your input as we continue our analysis and formulation of alternatives.

Your input will help us understand in greater detail the College’s aspirations, plans and programs, and may lead us to new sources of information. These will help us develop a next round of options for the physical campus, based on a deeper understanding of aspirations and realities.

Perhaps we have, so far, managed to set down only the obvious – what “everybody knows.” If so, we hope the act of putting in one place and sharing it can give rise to new understandings, perhaps to realizations not previously reached, and provide a basis for future discussions.

Comments on this report can be addressed to: masterplan@haverford.edu.
II. LEARNING FROM HAVERFORD
II. LEARNING FROM HAVERFORD

A. CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT

Since its beginnings, Haverford has grown from a community of a few dozen members to a College with 1169 students, about 135 faculty and 380 other staff. In some ways, it is less remarkable that the campus has changed so much than that it has retained so much of its early character over the years.

1. A Brief History

The committee charged with finding a property on which to develop what was to become Haverford College sought, “in the first place, a healthy situation – not one which may be so occasionally, but which has acquired a long-established reputation for salubrity – and even the neighborhood free of malaria – may I add, both moral and physical; near enough to the city to admit of easy and daily access; and thirdly, that it must be in the immediate vicinity of a Meeting for worship…”

Such a place was found in the Rees Thomas farm in Haverford Township, “a situation of endless charm and loveliness… possess[ing] in a high degree a simple, quiet, never failing beauty.”

The Haverford campus has changed profoundly since its 1833 inception, yet the most iconic view of the campus remains that of Founders Hall on its grassy slope, and the combination of native woods and carefully tended Romantic landscape is still held dear by faculty, staff students and alumni. The image of Haverford is deeply rooted in this integration of buildings and landscape.

Contemporary views of the College over the course of its history – some perhaps idealized – help trace the history of campus development:

- The founders erected the institution’s first building near the high point of the site, facing south with a porch overlooking the sloping fields. Early images (fig. 2) show Founders Hall against a backdrop of woods – left as a buffer to the surrounding neighborhood – with open lawn and rows of trees in the foreground. From the long porch, one looked south onto “a farming country with numerous woodlands and orchards as left by the Welsh owners after 150 years of development.”

- Planting plan sketches (1834 or 1835, see fig. 3) by English landscape gardener William Carvill describe the basic elements of the early campus: gardens and a greenhouse on the same orthogonal grid as Founders Hall, tree-lined lanes, and groups of trees. A serpentine path wound from a crossroads on axis with the entrance of Founders Hall (roughly in the location of Ryan Gym) south to Featherbed Lane and the farm buildings – including Woodside Cottage – beyond. The sketch indicates the beginnings of present-day paths and lanes – including Harris Road, parallel to the short edge of Founders, and Walton Road, slightly askew. Oval drives at the south and east entrances to Founders accommodated turning carriages.

- As shown in an 1878 planting plan (fig. 4), new buildings – Barclay Hall (Addison Hutton, 1877) and Alumni Hall (1856), the nucleus of the present library – were built on the same grid as Founders Hall. (The greenhouse had burned down in 1855.) An irregular path led west to the Observatory.

- Chase Hall (1888) and Whitall Hall (1896, now demolished) were built on the grid established by the earlier buildings; the construction of Ryan Gymnasium (1899) on axis with and facing Founders established the southern edge of Founders Green. This edge was later reinforced by the construction of the Hall Chemistry Lab (1910), Sharpless Science Hall (1917) and Hilles (1929).

2. Rufus Jones, Haverford College: A History and an Interpretation, 1933.
• The first two sections of Lloyd Hall were built in 1899. Roberts Hall (1902) and the Haverford Union (1909) followed, aligned with Barclay. These buildings, with later sections of Lloyd (1913 and 1916), established a loose sort of quadrangle, interlocked with Founders Green.

• Maps from 1900 show the construction of houses along College Avenue, College Lane and College Circle. "The College now completed arrangements with professors as to dwelling houses. The large and well-planted grounds gave fine sites for such dwelling, which sites were supplied free of rent. The professor built his own house, the plan being approved by the Board, with an agreement that should he leave, the College would purchase his equity at a fair amount...”

• In 1903, the old Haverford Grammar School (Furness, Evans and Company, 1885) was converted into a dormitory, and given the name Merion Hall (now known simply as 10 Railroad).

• Illustrations of the campus from its centennial in 1933 (fig. 5) show the gates from Lancaster Turnpike and from College Avenue, and the pedestrian bridge – labeled "the bridge of sighs" – over Railroad Avenue. Carvill’s serpentine path is shown, passing between Hall and Ryan Gym on its way between Woodside and Founders Green. By 1933, the playing fields had been developed and the Morris Infirmary (1912) had been constructed, but the area north of Founders and Lloyd remained largely wooded. Walton Road, straight and tree-lined, extended to College Avenue, connecting it with Featherbed Lane; an east-west path linked Cope Field with Walton Road and the track beyond. The Power Plant (1906) was located on the far (south) side of this path.

• An aerial photograph from around 1940, taken from the south, shows the developing campus. The south facades of Hall, Ryan, Hilles and Sharpless faced the “back” of the campus; the Power Plant, now in the midst of the developed campus, was then near its southern edge. A finer, denser, more residential development pattern can be seen in the distance, beyond a buffer of trees and the neighboring Haverford School.

• A drawing of the campus in 1947 (fig. 7) shows the tennis courts moved west of Walton Field to make way for the construction of Leeds and Gummere. (This drawing, though labeled a map, may be a projected plan; according to other sources, some of the buildings shown -- though accurately depicted -- had not yet been built.) The construction of Stokes (1963), Gummere (1960-1964) and Leeds (1952-1955) continued the process of developing loosely defined, interlocking quadrangles, and made less direct the connection between campus greens and the playing fields to the west. The Field House and a large parking lot marked the southern edge of the campus core; like Gummere and Leeds, these were oriented to the same grid as Walton Road and the fields, slightly askew from buildings to the north. Some of the woods behind Founders Hall had been cleared for a parking lot.

• Aerial photographs from the late 1960s show many changes in both the campus and the surrounding area. Lancaster Avenue had become a coarse-grained commercial strip with large expanses of parking, and the surrounding residential neighborhoods (save for the parcel just west of the Haverford Park Apartments) had become more fully developed. On campus, two of the North Dorms were oriented to the Founders Hall grid; Comfort was built askew, to accommodate topography. The houses on Duck Pond Lane were been picturesquely sited in their sloping topography as well. A large parking lot behind Lloyd occupied the site of the current Dining Center.

• The acquisition of the Haverford Park Apartments in 1974 forestalled the construction of new dormitories, and added the first significant amount of (nearly) contiguous land to the campus in three quarters of a century. (Haverford College made the decision to become fully co-educational in 1980.)

• Major buildings of the last two decades – the Marshall Fine Arts Center (1986), the Whitehead Campus Center (1993), the Facilities Buildings (1999), the new wing of the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center (2001) and the Gardner Integrated Athletics Center (2005) – have been built on the Walton Road grid, although Walton Road itself has become curvilinear south of Leeds and diverted around Woodside Cottage.

2. Haverford within the Community

The maps on pages 8 and 9 illustrate the growth of Haverford College within its surrounding area. They show the subdivision over time of farms and estates to create a largely residential suburban community, with a commercial corridor along Lancaster Avenue.

This development was spurred on, in part, by easy access to the area. At the time of the College’s founding, the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike had been in operation for more than three decades, and a rail line ran directly north of the College, along what is now Old Railroad Avenue. Over time, a new rail line was established on the other side of Lancaster Pike, and the old line was abandoned. The Route 100 rail line (to Norristown and Philadelphia’s 69th Street Terminal), along the western edge of College property, became operational around 1909.

fig. 7. Haverford College 1947 (Source: Haverford College Archives)

fig. 8. Aerial view of Haverford College, c. 1968 (Source: Haverford College Archives)

fig. 9. Haverford College Landscape Plan, WRT, 1983
1833: Haverford School Association is formed
1833: A 198 1/2 acre farm site in Haverford is purchased.
1833: William Carvill is selected to design the first campus plan

1830: College closes
1845: College reopens
1863: Alumni Hall completed (today's Magill Library)
1877: Barclay Hall completed

1870: 51 Students
1877: 68 Students
1948: 535 Students
1961: 461 Students

1855: Work is begun on the Nature Trail
1930: Duck Pond transformed from weedy pool into usable pond
1930: Work is begun on the Nature Trail
1948: College reopens
1950: College reopens
1880: Chase Hall completed
1904: John S. Cope guides campus restoration

1900: 121 Students
1905: 160 Students
1926: 249 Students

1980: The first co-educational class arrives at Haverford
1926
1980: 1,045 Students
2005: 1,168 Students

1968: McGill Library expanded and renovated
1969: Dining Center opens
2008: Douglas B. Gardner Integrated Athletic Center opens

EVOLUTION OF HAVERFORD AND SURROUNDINGS

HAVERFORD COLLEGE
Campus Master Planning

Base Map Source: http://www.lmls.org; Google Earth
Information Source: http://www.lmls.org; Google Earth

Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, Inc. April 7, 2008
1. Pinetum
2. Carvel Arch
3. Duck Pond
4. Arboretum
5. College Lane
6. Founder's Green
7. Cope Field
8. College Circle Housing
10. Japanese Garden
11. Barclay Beach
B. FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Since beginning our work on the project, we’ve learned the term “Haverbubble.” While no doubt this protected quality derives mostly from the sense of community and scholarship at the College, it is well-supported by the physical campus.

1. Campus approaches and entrances

The core of the campus is almost invisible from the surrounding streets and neighborhoods. Traveling west along Lancaster Avenue, one looks first not for the stone markers or signs (which are easily missed) but for the tops of trees along this commercial stretch of the avenue. To walk or drive down College Lane is an act of decompression, and the lane ends, significantly, not in a grand building but in the rich landscape of Founders Green. The asymmetry of the Lane – with beautiful large houses on one side of the tree-lined drive and open fields (and a duck pond!) on the other – saves it from self-importance and sets it apart from most other axial approaches on college campuses.

Upon reaching Founders Green, the robust Romantic landscape – with gently sloping topography, verdant lawn and important specimen trees – is complemented by loosely arranged quadrangles of buildings of diverse styles. Here, the domestic scale of the approach buildings gives way to a more institutional scale. Founders Hall – at the top of the hill and the “head” of the quad, albeit asymmetrically – modestly but firmly commands the Green. This Green feels – to a visitor, at least – like the center of all things Haverfordian. West of Walton Road, this landscape gives way to playing fields, and the Pinetum beyond.

Like the Lancaster Avenue entrance, the entrance from College Avenue is marked by simple stone gates. Walton Road has been extended beyond its original terminus at Woodside Cottage (and altered to accommodate construction of Gunmereg) to become part of a loop road around a pedestrian campus core. Passing between the playing fields and the campus core, the road offers views of the fields, the Pinetum and the treetops beyond to the west, and side or rear facades of buildings to the east. Walton feels more casual than College Lane, parallel to and more closely connected to fields than to buildings; it’s also rougher around the edges, lined with parking tucked between large trees.

Most parking is located outside the loop road, on the southern side of campus in large parking areas whose existence helps enable the campus’ lush landscape and pedestrian core. Also outside this loop is the Facilities complex. Unintended consequences of this band of service outside the core, however, include marking the edge of campus with a sea of parking and increasing the perception of Haverford College Apartments, already an outlier to the campus, as “beyond the edge.”

2. Campus buildings

With faint praise, a 1911 architectural journal noted of Haverford’s campus, “Of all the buildings one can say that they do nothing to spoil the charm of the landscape, and this is high praise as such things go and still more as such things went,” offering modest praise only for Roberts and Lloyd. Founders Hall, the journalist notes, is “not at all noteworthy exteriorly.”

Time has proven otherwise, of course, and the gentle authority of Founders Hall, its sturdy yet mellow materials, and its welcoming front porch are integral to the physical identity of the College. The journalist was right in one regard, however: their settings in the landscape are fundamental to the appeal of Haverford’s buildings. The gently sloping topography and loose arrangements of buildings allow wonderfully incomplete, picturesque views of campus structures and landscapes, and contribute to the Romantic qualities of the campus.

Other campus buildings defer, in their locations and orientations, to the gently imposing Founders Hall. Those in and near the core are a rich mix of textures and types. They include turn-of-the-20th-century domestic buildings, the chapel-like Magill Library, the Victorian Gothic Barclay, the Modern Dining Center and what one writer called “stripped Greek Revival” of Lloyd, Union, Roberts, Ryan and Sharpless. Hilles, designed by the distinguished Philadelphia firm Mellor and Meigs in what’s been called a “French Provincial” style, seems intriguingly out of place – grandly elegant, with leaded windows and a forecourt rather than the friendlier porches and democratic porticoes of other campus buildings.

---


8 Ibid.
The Field House, once near the edge of the developed campus and now near its geographic center, makes problematic the connections between Founders Green and newer development to the south – but at least from the Green it is mostly out of sight. (Can it be viewed, perhaps, as a placeholder for a future increment of growth of the sciences?)

Newer, larger buildings – the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center, the Whitehead Campus Center and the Gardner Integrated Athletics Center – have been built to the south, within an expanded loop road. These buildings appear, in their configurations, to assume the future demolition of the Field House.

3. Orientation and Axes

Most Haverford College construction follows one of several organizing principles:
- related to the grid of the original Founders Hall; most buildings at the “upper” campus core are organized this way.
- parallel or perpendicular to Walton Road; for example, the playing fields, the Field House, Gummere, Leeds, and the buildings toward the southern edge of campus.
- related to streets; for example, the houses along College Avenue, College Lane and College Circle.
- related to topography; for example, Comfort Hall and the Duck Pond Lane houses.

How should future growth be organized? How might this vary by location?

4. Campus Landscape

The campus landscape is a tended arboretum and encompasses – among many other elements – playing fields, academic greens, wooded areas, and a pond. It draws visitors of all ages to the campus to run, walk and play (and feed the ducks!) and contributes immeasurably to the quality of life of the Haverford community. Its qualities and features are described in Section II.C.

C. LANDSCAPE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS

Andropogon Associates

The natural environment – the woods, the pond, the creek, the pastoral sweeping fields with scattered groves of trees, is one of the main stays of the sense of place for Haverford’s campus. Understanding how these elements come together to create the setting for the campus is critical to making informed decisions about how to appropriately integrate new development into the campus landscape.

1. Geology [see Geology map p. 15]
- The campus lies on the Wissahickon Formation, a complex of metamorphic schist, gneiss and quartzite. This is a stable bedrock, generally well suited for foundations.
- Bedrock excavation is moderately difficult and will likely add to construction costs where building design intersects shallow bedrock.
- Groundwater flows readily through fissures in the bedrock, and well yields are typically high, so springs and seeps are likely in low-lying areas and slopes.

2. Hydrology [see Watershed and Hydrology maps pgs. 16-17]
- The campus sits in the headwaters of the Cobbs Creek watershed. The campus, through its land-use and land-management decisions, helps set the stage for the health and quality of the creek downstream. In this respect, the College is not an oasis but an integral part of the regional hydrological system.
- Cobbs Creek is classified as an impaired stream: a stream which does not presently fulfill its potential for supporting aquatic life or providing for public use.
- Current issues of concern in the Cobbs Creek watershed include: high variability of water flow, resulting in the deepening and destabilization of stream channels; loss of aquatic habitat; high levels of fecal coliforms; potentially high concentrations of heavy metals.
- The variability in channel flow is a result of development within the watershed, since development typically diverts rainwater to storm sewers and reduces the groundwater recharge that is the basis of stable stream flow. Stewardship initiatives in the management of stormwater runoff can help offset this process.
- High fecal coliform levels in stream water are typically the result of combined storm and sanitary sewer outflows, dry weather sewage sources, and waste from pets and wildlife (such as geese).
- The campus drains to three tributary creeks within the Cobbs Creek system: a creek that runs through the center of the property (including the pond), a second smaller creek that has its origins in springs below the Whitehead Campus Center and GIAC, and a third creek just west of Haverford Road.
- Portions of the creeks are buried (see pgs. 17 and 21) but the hydrology of the creek still exists below the surface of the landscape. Groundwater still moves to these low points in the landscape (although the levels may have changed as the campus developed), and the creeks still flow in the buried pipes.

3. Landform and Physiography [see Elevation, Slope, Aspect and Landform maps pgs. 18-21]
- Most of the core campus is gently sloping. Steeper slopes are associated with the stream valleys and the open areas to the west of the pond. Development for both buildings and athletic fields has also created a series of terraces separated by shorter, steeper slopes. While the general topography within the main campus spaces presents few challenges to universal (ADA) access, traversing the steeper grade transitions between campus spaces may create local difficulties.
- The highest topographic point on campus is north of the Dining Hall. From this point the land slopes in three directions: east to the pond, south to the minor tributary creek near the Orchard Lot, and west toward Haverford Road. There is a second terrace, or minor promontory, at the east end of Feathered Lane.
- The most natural, intact topography is associated with the pond and out-flowing stream. The land around the athletic fields and newer athletics buildings has been altered for facility construction; with care, traces of an older secondary stream corridor may be seen beneath the Gardner Integrated Athletic Center (GIAC). Traces of this secondary stream corridor are also visible in the soils map.
4. Soils [see Soils map p.22]

- Soils are typically deep and, with a few exceptions, well drained. Poorly drained soils are associated with the stream floodplains, adjacent upland slopes, and tributary swales.
- Soil reports are prepared by individual counties. In some cases, individual reports use different soil labels; soil boundaries also represent the best judgment of the soil scientists and so soil type boundaries may not match in all cases. For this reason, soil names and classifications for the Haverford College property change slightly between Montgomery and Delaware counties.

5. Vegetation [see Vegetation map p.23]

- The campus has a rich heritage of mature trees, many of which are either state champions (largest individual of its species in the state) or are original to the initial campus design. These trees are a valuable resource – both to the campus as a physical symbol of its history and traditions, and to the larger community, in which trees of this great age (175+ years) are relatively rare. Additionally, for the campus environment, maintaining the continuity of the mature trees is important; the time needed to replace these heritage trees, if they were lost as a group, would span many generations of Haverford students. From a larger environmental perspective, our region is on the cusp of significant environmental change, both as a result of climate change and of new, introduced pests and diseases. In this context, such old specimens represent an important genetic resource and a heritage that may be increasingly difficult to replace.
- Most significant areas of forest on the campus are associated with the stream corridor.
- Smaller patches of forest create a buffer along the northern edge of campus and the upstream side of the pond. These woods help frame and define the pastoral (reptontian) views from Lancaster Ave, College Lane, and Barclay Beach.
- Groves of trees – former forest canopy trees or horticultural plantings – also frame the edges of the campus to the west and south, creating a park-like edge to this portion of the campus. Taken as a whole, the woods that frame the property help create an illusion of separation from adjacent land uses.
- The potential of the woods to support and showcase woodland plant communities is based partly in the overall size and shape of the woods. The Vegetation – Potential Habitat map shows the possibility for providing viable growing conditions for woodland wildflowers and other forest plants based on a broad-brush application of these principles (also assuming understory were restored in some cases). Furthermore, larger, more compactly shaped woodlands are generally more stable and viable in terms of their overall health; large, intact woods are less likely to be stressed by invasive exotic plant species and less likely to need intensive management to remain healthy. [see Vegetation – potential map p.24]
- The woods at the south-east portion of the campus property, along the west branch of the creek, are of good quality in comparison to most other wooded areas on campus. This judgement is based on the relative size and compact shape of the wooded area, and on the relative size and abundance of native tree species; these factors speak to the probable overall health and stability of the woods.

6. Landscape spaces and sequences [see Landscape Zones and Landscape Spaces maps pgs. 25-29]

- The campus may be viewed as a sequence of distinct landscape patterns, or zones (see landscape Zones map). These landscape patterns are a reflection of land use, topography, vegetation type, and architectural pattern. The historic campus is distinctive with its terraced quadrangles, older buildings, and mature specimen trees. The pastoral landscape, woods, athletic fields, and small-scale residential housing (all green tones on the map) combine to create the natural setting that frames the developed campus. Cobbs Creek is visible as a green corridor that runs north-south through the eastern half of campus. The clarity of these patterns is part of what gives Haverford College its distinctive sense of place.
- Also evident on the Landscape Zones map is the gradual expansion of the campus outward from the historic core. To the north, to the south (near the South Parking lot and Grounds Buildings), and to some extent along Duck Pond Lane, the recent campus expansion is starting to ‘nibble away’ at the original framing open space. In this respect, the Haverford is on another cusp of change: past development has been largely in keeping with the overall pattern / spatial organization of the campus, but additional development along the same lines will begin to make significant changes to the overall balance and inter-relationship of these landscape patterns. This Master Plan represents an opportunity to make coordinated decisions about the most appropriate pattern and direction for new development.

7. Environmental Structure Plan [see preliminary Environmental Structure Plan p.30]

- The environmental structure plan puts the highest priority on the woods and riparian areas associated with the stream corridors and pond [darkest green tone]. These areas are important for their hydrological benefits to the watershed, for their habitat value, and for their more sensitive topography (typically steeper slopes). These environmental benefits could be enhanced, but they do have considerable value in their current condition.
- The environmental structure plan puts a high priority [medium green tone] on upland mature woods (not connected to the stream corridors); open spaces (not woodland) that are associated with the stream corridor by virtue of their topography and/or drainage characteristics, and that could be managed to enhance the quality and value of the stream corridor; other locations where drainage is concentrated; other significant steep slope areas.
- The environmental structure plan indicates other campus areas of significance [light green tone] for the value of the vegetation. This value may be related to the heritage value of individual trees, or related to the buffering / screening value of the trees as a whole.
- The environmental structure plan also indicates other landscape spaces of visual significance in terms of the view or open pastoral quality of the campus landscape. These places are noted in yellow.
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- GeC2, CgA2, MhC2: very deep, well-drained upland soils, moderately eroded
- GeB2, GeB, Me, MdB: very deep, well-drained upland soils
- GnB, GnB2, GsB2: very deep, moderately well to somewhat poorly drained, upland soils
- Ha, Mn, We: deep, poorly drained floodplain soils
- Ch: very deep, moderately well to somewhat poorly drained floodplain soils
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D. CAMPUS PATTERNS

A college campus comprises layer upon layer of complex patterns, some readily apparent, others less discernable. In what follows, we have mapped some of these patterns as they exist on campus today. By analyzing them – displaying them, comparing them, disaggregating them, recombining them – we hope to discern principles for their future development.

1. Precincts and Land Use (See pgs. 32 and 33)

At Haverford, campus activities are grouped, loosely, into residential enclaves, academic concentrations, and athletics and recreational zones. Defining discrete precincts can be hazardous, as the subtle complexities of a pluralistic campus are misrepresented by homogeneously colored “goose eggs.” With this in mind, we offer a conceptual diagram of activity precincts followed by more analytical land use maps, aggregated and disaggregated by use.

2. Classroom and Office Concentrations, Residences and Recreation (See pgs. 34-39)

By identifying the location and relative size of classrooms, laboratories and studios, one can gain a picture of some of the primary daily activity generators of the College. Diagramming where students and faculty study and learn and overlaying these on their dining, sleeping and recreating patterns can provide a basis for locating other activities and services and give a better understanding of desire lines and circulation paths.

Comparing these maps of classroom concentrations, dormitories, and faculty offices can give some idea of the Haverford way of life for students and faculty.

3. Transit

On pages 40 and 41 are maps of the larger neighborhood and region, showing transit connections from Haverford’s campus to Philadelphia, Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr and beyond.

4. Pedestrian and Automobile Circulation and Accessibility (See pgs. 42 and 43)

The existing pattern of pedestrian ways is mapped and combined with roadways, parking, and pedestrian and service entrances to buildings. Then pedestrian circulation patterns, vehicular routes and parking layouts can be analyzed in relation to physical and environmental patterns already diagrammed.

5. “Nolli” Plan (See p. 44)

To understand the flow of public space, from the outside into and through the public areas of private buildings, we use the “Nolli” plan (named after the Italian architect’s famous map of mid-18th century Rome). The map shows delicately rendered entry level plans of each campus building, set on the “macramé” of exterior pedestrian paths.

The “Nolli” plan highlights pedestrian movements across campus and to and through buildings. It shows the “street through the building” and the relationship between public and private both indoors and out. Additional patterns can be added, such as symbolic green spaces, building entrances and service locations, in order to analyze more complex relationships.

6. Buildings by Age (See p. 45)

Mapping existing buildings by age begins to suggest locations of the greatest concentrations of historic buildings; these areas are sometimes adapted to house new uses, bringing new life to the campus core.
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III. MGOPIO: OVERVIEW
III. MGOPIO: OVERVIEW

A. MISSION OF THE COLLEGE

Here, we reproduce, as a preamble to the MGOPIO of the plan, Haverford College’s published Statement of Purpose (http://www.haverford.edu/catalog/purpose.htm):

Haverford College is committed to providing a liberal arts education in the broadest sense. This education, based on a rich academic curriculum at its core, is distinguished by a commitment to excellence and a concern for individual growth. Haverford has chosen to remain small and to foster close student/faculty relationships to achieve these objectives.

The College’s rigorous academic program is flexible in form and content to meet the needs of individual students, and rests on the assumption that the able students who come here will use their capacities fully. Haverford’s faculty is noted for its strength in both scholarship and teaching, and its members expect to transmit to students their enthusiasm and high standards. The faculty members are teaching at an undergraduate college of arts and sciences by choice and they expect to learn, as well as to teach, in this close relationship with undergraduates.

The full resources of the College, in and out of the classroom, are designed to promote the personal and intellectual growth of students. Through an ambitious program of visiting lecturers and cultural activities, a conscious effort to recruit faculty and students representing diverse backgrounds and perspectives, student self-governance and service programs, an athletic program focused on participation and the scholar-athlete, and through day-to-day living in a residential community, the College seeks to broaden and enrich each person’s development. Students are asked to give of themselves, even as they draw new strength from others. We seek to foster the pursuit of excellence and a sense of individual and collective responsibility throughout the entire environment.

Haverford strives to be a college in which integrity, honesty, and concern for others are dominant forces. The College does not have as many formal rules or as much formal supervision as most other colleges; rather it offers an opportunity for students to govern their affairs and conduct themselves with respect and concern for others. Each student is expected to adhere to the Honor Code as it is adopted each year by the Students’ Association.

Haverford College, while a non-sectarian institution, has Quaker origins which inform many aspects of the life of the College. They help to make Haverford the special college that it is, where the excellence of its academic program is deepened by its spiritual, moral, and ethical dimensions. These show most clearly in the close relationship among members of the campus community, the emphasis on integrity, in the interaction of the individual and the community, and in the College’s concern for the uses to which its students put their expanding knowledge.

How should this be related to the College’s mission statements for its campus master plan?

B. PLAN OVERVIEW

1. Mission and Goals of the Plan

- Provide physical space in buildings and landscapes that helps the College move closer to its ideals of community, intellectual interaction and seamless integration of all aspects of campus life.
- Identify, preserve and augment buildings, landscapes and patterns of activity central to Haverford’s identity – what makes Haverford, Haverford – while updating them to serve the needs of a constantly-evolving institution.
- Maintain the intimacy of the campus, while allowing for new activities, new programs and a growing faculty. Key needs include:
  - Arts facilities and venues – music, fine arts, theater and dance – that promote integration of the arts across the campus.
  - Student activity spaces, including a campus “living room,” places for performances, student organizations, interfaith worship and “hanging out.”
  - Office, research and teaching spaces for faculty and students, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences, that allow flexibility and innovation within and across disciplines and activities.
  - Accommodations for 25 to 35 new faculty members in departments across the College over the next five to seven years.
- Provide greater degrees of accessibility, especially to those with impaired mobility.
- Provide space for community activities – at many different scales, from the scale of an individual department or residence hall floor to campus-wide.

- Promote sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- Allow flexibility to accommodate multiple options for future growth. Even though no growth of the student body is anticipated, buildings in the near term should not limit long-term options.
- Strengthen existing institutional ties, particularly those with Penn and with Philadelphia art and music institutions. Do these have implications for the physical campus – for example, making the link to the train stations more important?

2. Opportunities

- A planning process that promotes an understanding of the campus as a whole can help prioritize the many needs competing for Haverford’s resources and provide a framework for meeting them while strengthening the overall cohesion and identity of the campus.

- Haverford’s small size lends itself to conversation among campus constituents about planning; these conversations could lead to alternatives that straddle – or fall between – traditional boundaries between disciplines, departments or divisions, to benefit the entire Haverford community.

3. Problems

- “There is not enough space on campus for shared intellectual experience.” Some sense a lack of connection between Haverford’s principles, philosophy and ideals and actual student life. What kinds of spaces, and patterns of circulation and activities could help?

- The effects of previous waves of growth and change – including the change from an all-male to co-educational institution – are still felt. For example:
  - There are few social spaces in dormitories: some living rooms in the suites and other residence hall common spaces have been converted to bedrooms. In Gummere, seventy percent of common spaces are currently used as bedrooms.
  - Buildings like the Dining Center and Magill Library, built for much smaller student populations, have been outgrown.
  - The Haverford College Apartments – where about one-third of the student body lives – feels far from the campus core and less supervised than other dormitories. Although some students like living there, many feel that their configuration does not foster community life in the Haverford tradition.
4. Issues

We list here some questions that appear central to the plan:

- Where is the center of life on campus?
- What is meant by “community” at Haverford, and what kinds of spaces are needed for the College community—and communities—to flourish?
- How should desires and needs for new activities and space be balanced with preservation, particularly of the landscape?
- How should the campus sustain its intimate character, while expanding its range of activities?
- “We are groping our way toward a more seamless campus life.” What should be the relationship between academic and social life on campus? How can the campus master plan help foster a greater degree of intellectual interaction?
- What activities and spaces could serve the entire Haverford community? What campus communities and subgroups exist? How should these be accommodated in the plan? What combinations of uses would help draw people—faculty, students and staff—together?
- What role should the Library play in the intellectual and social life of the College? Should the Library be integrated with faculty offices and seminar space? With other activities?
- Members of the community have remarked that Haverford often seems sparsely populated; centers of activity are absent or hard to locate. What kinds of spaces and activities would make campus life more vibrant?
- How should the arts be integrated into the campus? Should there be a primary locus for arts activities, or should these be present across the campus? How should the arts relate to each other, and to existing academic departments and Centers?
- How should variety—in a range of activities, for example, or in the number of academic departments—be related to the size of the College, and to the capacity of the physical campus?
- To some, on-campus faculty housing is an integral part of what makes Haverford special: “Our faculty housing is a concrete detail that distinguishes us from our peers.” To others, it is a vestige of a past way of life. What models of faculty housing are appropriate today? Societal changes and increasing demands on faculty have made the traditional ideals of student dinners and classes in faculty homes largely a thing of the past. At the same time, on-campus housing allows faculty members to be present and visible members of the campus community, and to relate to each other as neighbors as well as colleagues. What role should on-campus faculty housing continue to play in the College? Where should it be located?
- What uses, and combinations of activities, should be located at the campus core? To some, the existing model of living, studying and playing “cheek by jowl” is an important part of the Haverford experience. Others wonder whether some uses—housing, for example—might be relocated from some central locations.
- Should there be one dining room or two—or even more? While some feel that a single dining hall is important to Haverford’s sense of community, many envy the variety of dining options at Bryn Mawr.
- Where should next increments of building occur? What new buildings, is structured parking an option?
- Should academic departments be kept together or distributed? How should faculty of different kinds of groups—affinity or religious group space, for example, or places for faculty to gather, or for students to “hang out”—as well as the need for “all folks, all segments of our community” to come together.
- What uses, and combinations of activities, should be located at the campus core? To some, the existing model of living, studying and playing “cheek by jowl” is an important part of the Haverford experience. Others wonder whether some uses—housing, for example—might be relocated from some central locations.
- Should academic departments be kept together or distributed? How should faculty offices be related to each other, to Centers, and to teaching space?
- Should the College consider expansion beyond its present borders?
- What is an appropriate model for a relationship between Haverford College and the surrounding community? Should stronger links from campus to the community be considered, and if so, how should these be created?
- What should be Haverford’s approach to sustainability and environmental stewardship? The College’s sustainability initiatives, though substantial, are seen as “fragmented.” Much more could be done, and what is being done could be made more visible. How should efforts be coordinated, augmented and integrated into campus life?
ARE BETTER LINKAGES BETWEEN ATHLETICS AND CAMPUS CORE DESIRED?

KEY

- Problem Linkages
- Desired Linkages
- Desired Linkages?
- Existing Linkages to be Improved?

SOME DESIRED AND PROBLEM LINKAGES

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Campus Master Planning

Base Map Source: Haaverford College Facilities Mgmt.

Information Source:

Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, Inc.

April 7, 2008
5. Options

The maps and diagrams in MGOPIO I are some notions of the College’s overall options. They are what we have heard at meetings or what have occurred to us during fact-gathering and analysis. They have not been tested; nor are they related to each other. What should grow from them, and from the response to this Overview, is a larger sense of where the real options lie. Then, over the course of the plan, these can be combined into a set of realistic, internally consistent options that represent valid choices to be made about campus development.

- **Rethinking the Center.** Should there be one, overarching center of campus, or two? Where should the center(s) be? Options include:
  - Enhancing the traditional center of campus -- around Founders Hall, Founders Green and the Dining Center – by locating new, campus-wide uses there.
  - Shifting the campus’ center of activity south, to acknowledge the growth of the campus and the shift of the “center of gravity” in that direction. Physical components of this option could include new, campus-wide uses in Ryan Gymnasium and in the location of the existing Field House.
  - Augmenting the primary center while developing smaller activity nodes elsewhere on campus.
  - Creating two main centers of activity, one perhaps centered around Founders Hall and the Dining Center, and the other closer to south campus.

- **Rethinking the Perimeter.** Most of Haverford’s campus is surrounded by a landscaped buffer, creating a protected and intimate campus interior. Some College properties – most notably, the Haverford College Apartments – lie outside this buffer. What should be the relationship of the campus to its surroundings? Options include:
  - Rethinking and re-landscaping HCA, to include it within the campus buffer.
  - Strategically engaging with the surrounding neighborhood, perhaps at Lancaster Avenue, with more apparent signage, pathways and – perhaps – building.

- **Avenues of Growth.** Options could include one or a combination of avenues of growth:
  - Adaptive reuse of existing buildings, or additions to existing buildings.
  - Infill within the campus core. Sites include the present locations of James and Parker, for example, or the area around Ryan Gym and the Locker building.
  - Extension of the campus core east and west. This could include new building, for example, on or near the softball field; replacing the Orchard Parking Lot; or, along Old Railroad Avenue near the North Dorms.
  - Extension of the campus core south. This would include replacement of the South parking and — perhaps — the eventual relocation of Facilities.
  - Replacement of existing buildings, for example, those at HCA, James and Parker, or the Duck Pond Lane Houses.

---

fig. 11. Rethinking the center

---

fig. 12. Options for the green landscape buffer
AT THE HISTORIC CORE:
Individual buildings forming loose quadrangles

ALTERNATE 1:
Change of use within existing buildings

ALTERNATE 2:
Selectively add to or alter existing buildings within the core

ALTERNATE 3:
Continue a similar pattern and density at the edges of the core

ALTERNATE 4:
Insert new buildings within the existing configuration to increase density

ALTERNATE 5:
Introduce new patterns of growth outside of the core
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C. AESTHETICS, DESIGN AND PRESERVATION

1. Mission and Goals

• Preserve important historic buildings and landscapes, especially those central to the image of Haverford, while making them more functional, up-to-date and accessible.

• Design new facilities that add to the beauty, amenity and utility of the campus; integrate new and old into a coherent whole.

• Contribute to an atmosphere that is welcoming, engaging and inherently communal, while also providing quiet spaces for individuals and groups to think, study and meditate.

• Preserve a “Reptonian Romantic” aesthetic in the campus’ landscape. Identify and mark for preservation key “moments” of the experience of the landscape and grounds. For example, consider maintaining the asymmetry of College Lane with small-scale buildings on one side and open space views on the other.

• Balance the desire for increased density with a desire for preservation.

• Consider ways of aligning maintenance standards for HCA with those of the rest of campus.

• Make recommendations for choosing and displaying public artworks.

2. Opportunities

• Haverford’s combination of Quaker aesthetics – simple, solid buildings – and Romantic collegiate landscape is unusual, if not unique. Older buildings have been preserved, giving the campus a sense of history and place. Sensitive adaptation of existing buildings and thoughtful additions to the campus could reinforce this sense of place, while bringing new vitality and utility to the campus.

• The Butler style Field House remains a physical impediment to campus paths and an aesthetic misfit for campus.

• The walk from parking lots to campus destinations does not compare with the experience of the drive from the Lancaster Avenue gate to the edge of Founders Green.

• Some members of the College community report feeling distanced from the process of selecting and placing public art works on campus.

• The lack of easy-to-read signage can make finding and navigating the campus difficult for visitors.

3. Problems

• Some say, “Haverford is perceived as a dead campus.” What kinds of spaces and activities would make campus life more vibrant?

• The vocabulary of most Haverford campus buildings – stone walls with punched window openings – does not lend itself easily to transparency, or to making indoor activities more visible.

• The “Butler” style Field House remains a physical impediment to campus paths and an aesthetic misfit for campus.

4. Issues

• How should the College determine its priorities for preservation and reuse? How should aesthetics and historic preservation be balanced with costs and pragmatic concerns? There are some buildings and landscapes that “nearly everyone” would agree are worthy of preservation: Founders Hall or Founders Green, for example. Others provoke more disagreement, for example:

--- The meadow within the Pinetum is viewed by some as an important natural landscape, and by others as a prime building site.

--- Some view 10 Railroad as subpar faculty housing requiring replacement, while others see in the Victorian Furness and Evans building a vestige of the College’s early history – the former Haverford Grammar School and, later, Merion Hall dormitory.
-- The wooded area south of Gummere is viewed by some as an important landscape contributing to the character of the campus, and by others as a key building site.

• What should be the aesthetic of new buildings and of additions? Some members of the Haverford community have expressed great affection for the campus buildings’ simple shapes and consistent use of stone, while others have expressed a desire for greater transparency in newer buildings. What factors should guide decision-making?

• How should density in the academic core be increased while maintaining important open spaces?

• What should be the role of art on campus? How should art be chosen and displayed?

• What is the campus’ evolving landscape aesthetic? Members of the community noted a continuing role of Quakerism, with plainness and simplicity as aesthetic guidelines. Should the campus remain the way it is, enhance its Reptonian Romantic qualities, or experience some change?

• What are the aesthetic implications of an increased presence for sustainability efforts? How might recycling and compost bins or other infrastructure be incorporated in the campus landscape in a way that is both educational and aesthetically satisfying?

• How should new buildings or additions be designed to relate to existing buildings, while allowing more visibility between inside and outside and letting in more natural light?

5. Options

Options for aesthetics, design and preservation will grow out of the “Learning From” studies described in Section II.B and from choices made between the options suggested in other sections of this MGOPIO. These choices will themselves be determined, in part, by their likely aesthetic impact on the physical campus.

Here we present some preliminary considerations regarding how design might relate to pragmatic decisions facing the College; these might lead to but are not yet options.

• **Patterns of Growth.** Should future building create interlocking quadrangles, or are new patterns of growth – particularly outside the center, and related to topography or other natural feature – appropriate?

• **Transparency.** More transparent buildings – or parts of buildings – could help enliven the campus and make the activities within more apparent and accessible to all.

• **Graphics.** Clear and beautiful signage – inside buildings as well as out – related to pathways and building entrances can help tell the “story” of the College and facilitate wayfinding.

• **Integration of art.** What kinds of public art – permanent or temporary – are “right” for Haverford’s campus? How should these be integrated into the campus’ Romantic landscape?
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D. ACTIVITIES, FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND SPACE USE

1. Mission and Goals
   • Create or reinforce activity patterns that promote the Haverford ideal of an intellectual community, and establish activity relationships that will help to improve the quality of life for students, faculty and staff.
   • Provide community spaces at various scales—places to socialize within an academic department or dormitory floor, for example, as well as places for the whole Haverford community to come together. Maintain a sense of intimacy on campus while increasing activities and options.
   • Balance the desire for more flexibility and more space with desires for a more sustainable campus and preservation of important campus landscapes.
   • In the near term (0-7 years?), provide:
     -- Accommodations for 25 to 35 new faculty members in departments across the College over the next five to seven years.
     -- Additional student housing, in order to decant student beds and restore communal space in existing dormitories.
     -- An appropriate number of “right-sized” classrooms to accommodate current teaching methods and technologies.
     -- Maintain diversity of housing options for students and support student social life and interaction in dormitories.

2. Opportunities
   • The planned increase in faculty could be an opportunity to reconsider how faculty offices are located in relation to their departmental colleagues, peers in other departments, academic centers and teaching spaces.
   • The Library's need for updating and renovation could be an opportunity for reconsideration of its role in the academic life of the campus, and new ideas for supporting current methods of learning, teaching, research and collaboration.
   • Societal changes and increased demands on faculty time have changed the role of on-campus faculty housing; this could be an opportunity to consider new forms of faculty housing.
   • Places on campus that bring people together—the Gardner Integrated Athletics Center, the Coop, and the CPGC and Lunt Cafés, for example—could provide models and a foundation for the creation of a campus-wide system of community space.
   • The interactive, common space in the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center (KINSC) could provide a model for interdisciplinary space in other areas of study.
   • Departmental space that works well—for example, Economics in Stokes or Math in KINSC—could be models for future spaces.
   • Zuhrow Commons could provide a model for 24-hour study and social space. What other spaces should support 24-hour use?
   • Ryan Gym—"the most coveted space on campus"—could provide space for activities near the center of campus.
   • How should the old science library in Stokes, currently used for storage, be reused?
   • E-haus, the environmental theme house recently created at HCA, could be a model for future theme houses.
   • Long-term thinking about the Field House could help the College imagine vibrant connections and new uses at the south end of campus.

3. Problems
   • There are few places on campus for people to come together; a need for a “campus living room” at a campus crossroads has been noted.
   • Some departments are “bursting at the seams;” and even the relatively new KINSC was not designed for growth.
   • Some adjacencies within buildings—the Campus Center and Stokes, for example—are less intentional and vital than vestigial and pragmatic.
   • There are insufficient social spaces in dormitories: some living rooms in the suites and other residence hall common spaces have been converted to bedrooms.
   • Student organizations have little space on campus; that which exists is largely in out-of-the-way places.
   • Although it houses some popular spaces—like the Coop—the Whitehead Campus Center’s location, design and combination of uses are not particularly student-centered.
   • Although the single dining hall has many supporters, some feel it is unwelcoming.
      "[T]he dining hall can be very intimidating. Some people sit in the same place every day, within formed groups. It feels awkward going in… Bryn Mawr's dining feels more like a family experience."
   • Magill Library was last expanded when the College was one-third Haverford’s present size. There is not enough storage, not enough learning space or space for students and faculty to do research. Furthermore, the facility was not designed for the way academic libraries are used today. Although some like it the way it is, others note that it is unwelcoming, has poor lighting, uncomfortable furniture and “fluorescent lights humming.”
   • There is a need for increased and improved visual and performing arts space—for both academic and extracurricular programs.
   • Faculty report a need for more mid-size classrooms (30 to 45 students).
   • Increasing the campus population by 250 to 300 people could, according to Township officials, strain the capacity of

SPECIFIC FACILITY NEEDS
from initial planning conversations

Many of the conversations we’ve had have highlighted the need for new or improved facilities:

- student social spaces
- faculty offices
- student housing
- guest rooms for visitors
- seminar, classrooms and meeting spaces
- fine and performing arts
- disciplinary space for Humanities and Social Sciences
- storage
- new forms of faculty housing
- improved dining facilities
- natatorium
- turf field
- more efficient administrative offices

fig. 18. Specific facility needs
Some other, more specific problems have also been identified:

-- Biology and Psychology are both overcrowded, and the present size of the KINSC could be a limiting factor in future growth.

-- There are not enough faculty offices, classrooms or administrative support spaces in some academic buildings – Hall, for example.

-- The Writing Program does not have a permanent home.

-- The Economics Department, in Stokes, feels isolated from other academic departments; also, the department’s space cannot accommodate planned expansion.

-- To some, the location of Admissions is not particularly welcoming or auspicious, and the department is too large for its present space.

-- Storage space campus-wide is insufficient, and there is no system for weeding out abandoned items in student storage areas.

-- Some on campus (including representatives from the faculty, student and staff populations) report toilet rooms that are too few, inconveniently located, inaccessible to those with mobility disorders, and in poor or outdated condition.

---

### Classroom Use - Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM USE - FALL 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KINSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Question Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Instructional Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpless Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geest Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founders' Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magill Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside Cottage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Size of Class Sections - Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF CLASS SECTIONS - FALL 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*fig. 19. Capacity of Registrar Scheduled classrooms Fall 2007*

*fig. 20. Classroom Use Fall 2007*

*fig. 21. Size of Class Sections Fall 2007*
4. Issues

- What kinds and locations of space would make campus life more vibrant? How should activity locations and adjacencies be reimagined and realigned to help meet the College’s aims?
- What channels of growth should be reserved for the expansion of existing departments or activities, or for the establishment of new activities?
- What is the role of faculty housing on campus? How should faculty housing be provided? Should it be located on campus, or off? In houses, townhouses or apartments?
- What should be the role of the Dining Center in campus life? Should there be one, improved dining hall, or two? What functions and activities should take place in the Library? How should the Library relate to other facilities for the arts, humanities and social sciences?
- What sort of functions or programs might benefit from a location in the Whitehead Campus Center? How might use of the building benefit from a different combination of programs?
- Both faculty and students have described a need for separate academic and extra-curricular space for performing and fine arts. How should these spaces be integrated into the campus? For example, should new music practice rooms be placed in one location, distributed throughout the dorms or placed in several locations elsewhere on campus?
- Could any shortages of classroom space be relieved through policy changes? Morning classes are notoriously unpopular for faculty and students alike. Also, classes are restricted in the 4-7 pm hours, allowing students to participate in sports and extra-curricular activities without compromising academics. This constricted schedule creates pressure for classroom space in the later morning and early afternoon. How can optimal use of the College’s classroom space be achieved?
- How should competing potential uses for Ryan Gymnasium and the old Science Library in Stokes be evaluated?
- How should student housing options be located and configured?
- Where might the Field House—intensively used, especially in winter months, and vital to Haverford’s athletic programs—be relocated? What new development in its place could help make programmatic and physical linkages between areas of campus?
- What should be the short- and long-term uses of HCA? Should a new dorm be built elsewhere for freshmen while HCA continues to house upperclassmen? Should HCA be demolished and redesigned for other uses?
- Should the Link and Locker Building be repurposed or demolished? Should James and Parker Houses be renovated or replaced?
- Should computing on campus be organized in a centralized location, or should it feature satellite email and printing kiosks? How do the benefits of satellite computing locations weigh against the added administrative burden?
- How might a future expansion of the student body affect campus facilities and systems? What are the limiting factors?
- What new functions or activities should be considered? For example, should Haverford build a natatorium for potential intercollegiate sports and recreational use?

5. Options

- How should academic, residential, cultural, recreational and administrative uses be distributed throughout the campus? What combinations of uses might create a more lively intellectual climate on campus? What belongs at the center? Options might consider:
  - How should faculty housing be provided? Could some of the housing—particularly along College Lane and College Circle, and perhaps on either side of the College Avenue entrance to campus—be converted to other uses? Should faculty housing along Duck Pond Lane be demolished, and the sites used for other purposes?
  - Should some administrative uses be relocated from the historic center of campus?
- New Place(s) for the Arts. Should new or improved arts facilities be located in one area of campus or should they be components of a campus-wide system? (How) should spaces for the performing arts? (How) should spaces for student activities, practice and productions be related to academic arts departments? How should existing spaces for the arts be incorporated into a plan? Options for new space include:

Options will be informed by the Arts Consultant’s report.

- New Student Activity Spaces. Should student activity space be located primarily in one building, or distributed among several? Should new spaces, like a “campus living room,” be located in a building with other, non-student uses? Locations mentioned include:
  - Ryan Gymnasium.
  - In Founders Hall, related to spaces in the Dining Center.
  - Space in a series of existing houses, similar to Cambrian Row at Bryn Mawr (but closer to the campus core).
  - An expanded Campus Center.
  - New building near the campus core.
  - In an adapted Dining Center, relocating dining.

What other possibilities exist?

- New Loci for the Humanities and Social Sciences. Some options for academic centers— including space for offices, faculty and student research, and teaching—could include:
  - A center of activity incorporating improved and expanded space in and around Stokes, Chase, and Magill—perhaps related to space in Gest, Founders and, possibly, Morris Infirmary. This would require relocating some administrative offices, perhaps to existing faculty houses along College Lane or elsewhere.
  - A center of activity around (and perhaps between) Hall and the Ryan Gymnasium.
  - Academic space in the existing faculty housing along College Circle.
- Other opportunities. Existing buildings that have most often been mentioned as candidates for demolition include the Field House, the Haverford College Apartments, and— to some degree—the houses on Duck Pond Lane.
- What options might be available if the Field House were relocated from the center of campus? What new relationships and patterns of circulation and activity could be developed? Some conceptual options are diagrammed on pp. 62.
OPTIONS: SITES FOR NEW BUILDINGS
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-- What options might be available if the Haverford College Apartments were redeveloped? What opportunities would exist for creating better connections between this area and the rest of campus? Might the existing stream (now underground in pipes) be “daylighted” as part of an environmentally sensitive approach to the site? How should sustainability -- which could favor maintaining the existing buildings – be considered? Conceptual options are diagrammed on pg. 63.

-- For what uses might the area around Duck Pond Lane be considered? Student housing? Townhouses or apartments for faculty? A new academic area?
E. LANDSCAPE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS

1. Mission and Goals

- Maintain the intimacy and the natural beauty of the campus – its pastoral and quiet wooded character
- Support the health and viability of the natural systems on campus – the woodland communities, the hydrology of the streams and pond – so that they may contribute to the health of the living communities that depend on them, and continue to delight, educate and inspire the academic community at Haverford.
- To become a model of sustainability and environmental stewardship.[more specifics discussion is needed on what this means]
- Support the health and viability of the arboretum’s horticultural collection
- Reconnect to the history of the campus and raise awareness of historical landscape features and spaces
- Maintain a friendly and welcoming relationship with the local community
- Provide for clear, logical way finding throughout campus for visitors and service people.

2. Opportunities

- Enhance the sequence of views as seen from the campus loop road (both directions) and main campus spaces.
- Contribute to the improved health of the Cobb’s Creek watershed through more effective management of stormwater on campus. While some portions of campus demonstrate good management practices, other areas have drainage challenges that remain unresolved.
- The pond would benefit from a water quality management plan. This might include enhancing the margins of the pond with low-growing native vegetation that would help improve water quality; deterrents for the large flocks of geese which defecate on the adjacent lawns; and measures to reduce bank side erosion.
- The campus woods would benefit from a strategic management plan aimed at promoting the abundance of native plant species and the habitat value of the forest plant communities. Healthy woodlands are generally more aesthetic and support a better variety of wildlife and recreational activities.
- The small tributary creek which lies between the Orchard Parking Lot and the South Parking Lot has its headwaters entirely within the campus. A stormwater management program, emphasizing infiltration and water quality, would make a well-defined case study and could be clearly evaluated for its success in the adjacent creek.
- Provide a turn around at the east end of Carter Road, or reestablish a vehicular link between Lloyd Hall and the south side of Barclay Hall.
- Create a more visible but still park-like presence on Lancaster Avenue.
- Provide clearer signage throughout campus.

3. Problems

- Landscape is often an afterthought in new construction projects.
- Lack of awareness of historic trees and features on campus.
- The woods on campus show little regeneration by native species: saplings are either few to absent and the understory is often dominated by non-native species such as Norway maple, honeysuckle, and multiflora rose. Without the successful development of new young native tree saplings, over time the native forest canopy will decline. In this urbanized context, maintaining healthy woods is not a matter of ‘leaving nature alone’ but of strategic management initiatives aimed at supporting native plant species over the competing invasive exotics.
- The small west branch of the on-campus creek shows much evidence of irregular, ‘flashy’ flows in the deepening of the creek channel and the steeply eroded cut banks. This is almost certainly an unintended result of campus development, as impervious surfaces increase and groundwater recharge decreases.
- The main branch of the on-campus creek (below the pond) has a more variable channel. Portions of the channel are relatively stable, with less recent downward erosion than the smaller tributary creek to the west. Other portions show more lateral erosion of the side banks; the constricted stream corridor allows little room for natural meander movement over time. There are a series of old, low-head dams along this section of the creek which may help to mediate the downward erosion of the channel, but which may also contribute to a decline in water quality.
- Drainage of runoff on campus is a concern in some areas. In many cases, the soil is unable to fully absorb and infiltrate the rainfall in large storms; in other cases, runoff is concentrated through grading design and then either puddles or begins to erode adjacent slopes.
- The large numbers of geese that congregate on the wide lawns surrounding the pond almost certainly contribute to the fecal coliform problems in Crum Creek. This problem is exacerbated by the lack of native vegetation around the banks of the pond, which might otherwise filter runoff flowing off the lawns.

4. Issues

- To what extent should new building locations reinforce the current landscape patterns (i.e. unfolding landscape spaces and view sequences)? At what point / situation is a change or a new pattern warranted or desirable?
- To what extent should the existing campus core densify, in order to avoid change to views of the sweeping lawns, fields, and woods?
- To what extent should the Arboretum focus on its history and traditional collection (horticultural trees) and to what extent might it also expand its educational mission and collection to include the native plant communities (such as the woodland and meadow communities)?
- Are young tree plantings sufficient to replace natural loss of mature trees over time? Should there be a coordinated ‘succession’ plan for campus trees? Would some important groves or spaces benefit from additional tree planting?
- To what extent should the landscape master plan attempt to restore previous features of the Carvill Plan, such as the serpentine walk or specific groves of trees? To what extent should such restoration projects be literal, or to what extent should they be adaptive?
- To what extent should the campus be a model for sustainability and environmental stewardship? How should environmental stewardship be weighted in relation to other issues such as convenience, pragmatism or tradition?
- What are the important characteristics of the nature trail? Is being open and park-like sufficient? Should it include small areas of meaningful habitat and opportunities to see wildflowers, birds and wildlife? If additional campus development is to take place near the nature trail, how much adjacent open space is important in order to maintain the essential ‘natural’ experience? [see Vegetation – potential map p. 25]
• To what extent can educational programs, interpretive signage and other outreach efforts be used strategically to move the community towards a deeper understanding of environmental stewardship, so that management on the part of the college efforts – such as Norway Maple removal – are seen in the context of a larger plan?

• Landscape design contains a diversity of materials and details for walks, curbs, edgings, and site furniture. Which designs and materials are most indicative of Haverford’s identity? Which perform best in terms of maintenance? Durability? Other factors?

5. Options

• Enhance the core forest along the stream corridor, to maximize their environmental benefits for the water quality within the stream, native plant and bird habitat, and recreation. An enhancement strategy would consider: strategic understory expansion to consolidate existing woods, avoiding further fragmentation of the existing forest area, invasive species removal, strategic replanting of native trees to promote canopy regeneration, stormwater runoff control, and possibly limiting deer browse impacts. [see Environmental Structure Map p. 30 and Vegetation-Potential Habitat map p. 24]

• Consider continuing to site new buildings on the inside of the loop road, within the existing academic core of campus. Continue the pattern of pedestrian quadrangles into the southern portion of the academic core. Relocate parking from (portions of) the South Lot, Orchard Lot, and Walton Road to a new, discretely sited structure, and re-green the pastoral spaces that ring the periphery of the core campus. [see Landscape Option A, fig. 22]

• Alternatively, extend campus academic core into the South Parking Lot and Greenhouse / Faculty Pool site. In this scenario, the campus loop road would take you through the south portion of the developed campus rather than consistently skirting the perimeter. [see Landscape Option B, fig. 22]

• Alternatively, consider siting new buildings on the north and west side of Duck Pond Road. This location has minimal impact to existing mature forest (woods in this location are relatively young and already fragmented by development), and is potentially a visually discrete location close to the academic core of campus. [see Landscape Option C, fig. 22]

• Alternatively, site selected new buildings on ‘low visibility’ sites within the existing open space, outside of the current academic core of campus. Use strategic screening and woodlot enhancement to direct important views discretely past these sites, so that the pastoral quality of the campus setting is maintained. [see Landscape Option C, fig. 22]

• Consider diversifying plantings around perimeter areas of campus: the nature trail, buffer zones (current perimeter groves with grass below) and near-woods areas. Greater diversity of cover types – reducing lawn in favor of low wildflower meadows, savannah (trees + meadow) and young forest – would help reduce stormwater runoff, improve water quality in creeks and pond, help improve regional air quality and local microclimates, and improve opportunities for wildlife viewing.

• Implement stormwater Best Management Practices on a ‘case study’ basis, to test and refine runoff control strategies in a manageable way. Emphasize runoff management as a series of small interventions near the sources of the problems (the divide and conquer scenario) over a single large project further downslope.

• Consider multiple options for controlling the impact of geese on the quality of the lawns and water in the pond and stream.
F. ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY

This discussion augments the discussion of landscape and natural systems in Section II.C. above.

1. Mission and Goals

• The previous College President signed the American College and University Presidents’ Climate Commitment. How can the College’s efforts to “develop a comprehensive plan to achieve climate neutrality” inform our current planning?

• “A Vision for a Green Haverford” delineates the College’s overarching goals for sustainability, and can help inform our plan. (See text box.)

2. Opportunities

• The need to renovate some of the campus’ most historic buildings could provide an opportunity to make them more energy-efficient.

• The College has already established recycling and composting programs, and other initiatives that include sustainability themed student activities, car sharing and using green cleaning products. These could serve as foundations for continued and enhanced sustainability efforts.

3. Problems

• What impediments to creating and implementing a plan for climate neutrality exist?

4. Issues and Options

• Who coordinates the College’s sustainability efforts?

• How should A Vision for a Green Haverford be reflected in our planning? What sustainability efforts are already underway or under consideration?

• How should the College weigh conflicting goals? For example, how should a demand for increased parking on campus be balanced with the institution’s commitment to carbon neutrality? How should the desire to limit teaching hours be balanced with the desire to limit new building?

• What environmental policies and practices are in place at other institutions, and what can Haverford learn from them? Colleges and universities widely considered to be environmental leaders have made significant institutional commitments to sustainability:

  -- At Middlebury College, where environmental studies and awareness have been part of the institution’s strategic vision since 1994, a Campus Sustainability Coordinator supervises student employees and interns. The college diverts 60% of its waste from landfills through recycling and composting; buys 100% recycled, chlorine-free copier and printer paper; and uses “green” cleaning products. Middlebury is constructing a biomass facility to generate power from locally harvested wood chips.

  -- At Dartmouth, the sustainability staff includes one coordinator, 7 paid interns and over 50 ECO volunteers. The College estimates that it saved $210,000 in 2006 through campus-wide conservation efforts, lowering building temperatures, turning down thermostats when buildings were unoccupied, and sponsoring student dorm challenges to reduce energy consumption. Posters in every campus building providing information on the amount of energy, water and steam used for that building are updated monthly.

  -- At Harvard, where 26 LEED building projects have been completed or are in design, the Green Campus Initiative employs a full-time director, two assistant directors and sixteen staff members, all trained in sustainability principles to be explicitly recognized in its annual budgeting process. The University runs its entire fleet of diesel vehicles on bio-diesel fuel, and its EmPower campaign encourages people to sign an online pledge to conserve power in their offices.

• As part of a larger sustainability plan, modest changes can have an impact on resource consumption:

  -- Harvard University and Tufts, among other institutions, installed “Vending-Misers” on vending machines to reduce energy consumption. Tufts estimates that energy consumption by those machines has been cut in half, and that the payback period is one to two years.

  -- Swarthmore limits student parking permits to 110-115 per year, limiting paved space and the number of cars on campus.

  -- How should the College communicate the steps it is taking toward a more sustainable campus? What information should be on its website, and how should this be coordinated?

  -- Could Haverford share resources – perhaps even including the services of a sustainability coordinator – with other local institutions?

  -- There is an opportunity to redevelop the HCA site, “daylighting” the stream through its center and redeveloping two distinct areas that might accommodate faculty homes, student dormitories, Facilities, or some other functions.

  -- Golf carts are commonly used on campus to reduce the impact of service vehicles. Could the College further reduce use of service vehicles or increase efficiency of the fleet?
A VISION FOR A GREEN HAVERFORD

I.) Community Literacy

a.) Curriculum and course offerings to include environmental content available to all students
b.) Training programs for employees in the incorporation of environmental practices in the workplace
c.) Visiting speakers sponsored by academic departments, discussing environmental topics in a wide range of disciplines
d.) Publications by the college to raise awareness of Haverford's environmental situation and the state of the global environment
e.) Outreach to the neighboring community on environmental issues

II.) College Practices

a.) Active and conscious consideration of the environmental impacts of policy decisions, and attempts to avoid environmental degradation where possible
b.) Consideration given to open position candidates with experience and/or willingness to learn environmental practices, where applicable
c.) Environmentally responsible investments
d.) Responsible purchasing practices

III.) Campus Operations

a.) Energy planning, use and consumption
   i.) Energy-efficient lighting and heating including passive solar sources where applicable
   ii.) Utilizing energy-efficient computers, photocopiers, lab equipment, etc.
   iii.) Efficient college vehicles, including the possibility of alternative fuel vehicles
   iv.) Sustainable energy sources such as solar, geothermal, etc. when feasible
b.) Water conservation

IV.) Additional Goals

a.) Work with the Educational Policy Committee to consider: (1) environmental justice as a component of the College's Social Justice requirement; and (2) addition of environmental content to the Haverford curriculum that will enhance the Environmental Studies Concentration offered at Bryn Mawr College
b.) Incorporation of green principles into all future planning and construction projects
c.) Attaining a widespread environmental awareness at Haverford and in the community
d.) Cultivation of natural environments and wildlife habitats on campus
e.) Recognize the Committee for Environmental Responsibility as the key locus to facilitate implementation of the green plan. Faculty and staff appointments will be made by the president and student appointments by Student's Council. The CER will meet with the president at least once per semester to discuss plans and aspirations.

Areas of Interest

i.) Installation of water-efficient appliances such as shower heads, toilets, washing machines, etc.
ii.) Water recycling techniques such as gray water recycling
iii.) Natural water purification methods such as bio-filtration
c.) Waste reduction, disposal and processing
i.) Use of post-consumer and recycled paper, plastic and metal when feasible
ii.) Reduction of disposable materials such as Styrofoam, paper, plastic, etc.
iii.) Reinforcement of existing recycling policies
d.) Grounds management
i.) Environmentally friendly groundskeeping techniques, including "organic" practices and materials, when feasible
ii.) Preservation of indigenous plant and animal life
iii.) Erosion control
iv.) Reducing the impact of parking areas and vehicular traffic on green space, drainage, etc.

Statement of Principles

As an institution founded on socially responsible Quaker principles, Haverford has a deep concern and respect for all communities of which it is a part, both social and ecological.

As a college whose goal is "educating to lead, educating to serve," Haverford seeks to educate its students towards an awareness of global concerns and the desire to address them.

As an institution privileged to be a leader among liberal arts colleges, Haverford has the responsibility to set a positive example of forward thinking and stewardship of the environment for other colleges to follow.

In accordance with these principles, Haverford affirms that environmental concern will be a part of its daily operations, from administrative decisions, to maintenance of facilities and grounds, to the curriculum offered to students.

(fig. 23. A Vision for a Green Haverford (Source: www.haverford.edu/administrative/president/green.htm))
G. CIRCULATION, TRANSIT AND PARKING

1. Mission and Goals

- Consider all forms of transportation – pedestrian, automobile, bicycle, wheelchair, service trucks, golf carts and emergency vehicles – in the plan. Create better orientation and access throughout campus.
- Promote the use of public transit. Provide better, more amenable and more easily visualized connections between the campus and neighboring transit stations.
- Improve accessibility for those with mobility impairments, in campus parking lots, pedestrian pathways and within buildings.
- Provide adequate parking without significantly changing the character of the campus.
- Allow for sensitive restoration of historic buildings, while improving accessibility and wayfinding.

2. Opportunities

- The Master Plan can provide an opportunity to improve circulation on campus—including vehicular and pedestrian access—and remove barriers to desired and needed paths.
- Haverford’s relatively small campus could provide additional opportunities for parking within a five-to-ten-minute walk of most destinations.
- Considering parking needs of various user groups when relocating some activities and departments to provide more functional and efficient adjacencies could help provide better relationships between parking demand and location.
- Promoting bicycle and mass transit use could be part of a larger, campus-wide sustainability effort. The campus’ location near public transit, and its offering of Philly CarShare vehicles, could provide a good foundation for further efforts.

3. Problems

- Parking for many seems inconvenient, especially those working at the north end of campus. On such a compact campus, even a five-minute walk can feel “too far.” At the same time, there is a widely-held feeling that landscape should not be sacrificed for more parking—“a blight on campus.”
- Convenient parking is needed for performances at Marshall Auditorium in Roberts Hall, and for any future arts venues.
- Making a left onto Lancaster Avenue from College Lane can be difficult (some feel it should be prohibited). During summer camp drop-off, up to 60 cars can be backed up on College Lane.
- Turning out of Carter Road onto Old Railroad Avenue is a challenge, especially when the road carries pick-up and drop-off traffic for the Haverford School. Sightlines, in part because of the topography, are also problematic.
- Some outside vendors making deliveries have trouble finding or navigating the campus. Service and deliveries can be difficult at loading docks, notably at the dock at the Dining Center.
- There are no designated bike lanes on campus or on nearby public roads.
- Although the College has made progress toward creating a more accessible campus, accessibility for those with mobility impairments remains an issue throughout much of the campus. Many campus buildings, including dormitories, are not fully accessible.
- Students, faculty and staff talked about the campus’ limited accessibility (and hospitality) to those with mobility impairments. For example, one faculty assistant spoke movingly, and regretfully, about having to tell a prospective student in a wheelchair that she could not physically enter Woodside Cottage, home of the English department.
- Even the Office of Disabilities Services, on the third floor of Founders, is difficult to reach in a wheelchair.
- Some students have lived in Barclay all four years due to limited accessible housing options.

The terms of the United States Department of Justice settlements with Swarthmore College, the University of Chicago, and Colorado College could be used as guidelines for setting priorities for improvement. Those terms, compiled from press releases issued by the Department of Justice, are that the institution will:

Ensure that all buildings and facilities in which programs, services, and amenities are offered to the public and the college community meet the accessibility criteria in the agreement, unless participation requires advance notice or registration;

Ensure that those services and programs that do require advanced notice or registration are located in (or relocated to) an accessible location in the event that a person with a disability registers;

Submit an accessibility plan for review to the Department by [date], outlining how the college will comply with the agreement, after conducting architectural surveys and seeking public comment;

Update its campus-wide emergency evacuation, sheltering, and shelter-in-place plans for individuals with disabilities;

Ensure that its transportation services, including its fixed-route campus-wide bus system and its Late Night Van service, meet the requirements of the ADA by [date];

Ensure that 3 percent of the units (and adjacent toilet rooms) in its student living facilities are accessible and dispersed among the facilities; and ensure that, in addition, a reasonable number of housing facilities has an accessible entrance, first floor common area, and toilet room that is usable by a visitor with a disability;

Display information on its website by [date], identifying accessible routes through the campus, accessible parking areas, accessible entrances to buildings, and accessible spaces within buildings;

Post signs at facility entrances and toilet rooms identifying those that are accessible and, at inaccessible entrances and toilet rooms, directing individuals to the nearest accessible entrance or toilet room;

Provide assistive listening systems and devices for people with hearing impairments in lecture halls, meeting rooms, auditoria, and other assembly areas.

Correct violations of the new construction standards for accessibility by [date].

(Please note that not all terms apply to all three institutions.)

fig. 24. Terms of the United States Department of Justice settlements with Swarthmore College, the University of Chicago, and Colorado College (Source: www.usdoj.gov)
4. Issues and Options

Here, we frame some issues to help guide the work of our traffic and transportation consultants, URS Corporation, in Phase II of our study:

• How should convenience, cost, and sustainability be considered in a transportation plan for Haverford College?

• How could the College encourage more use of public transit? How should the College make easier access to SEPTA Route 100, R5 and buses? What new paths or sidewalks could promote transit use? How would the cost of a peak-hour shuttle compare to that of building additional parking?

• How should the College plan to better meet the needs of those with mobility impairments? (A summary of the Department of Justice’s settlements with three colleges and universities is included here for reference, fig. 24)

• Should parking on campus be located at grade or in a parking structure? Could concerns about safety, cost and visual impact of a parking structure be adequately addressed?

• Should the College consider further limits on student parking? For example, restricting student parking permits to a limited number per year could help limit paved space and the number of cars on campus.

• Is the Blue Bus stop in the “right” location? What would be the implications of adding additional stops? Should the Blue Bus be coordinated with public transit?

• What should be the elements and character of a wayfinding and signage system?

• Some in the community have suggested completing a campus loop by reopening Harris Road to vehicles, or by creating a new road east of Barclay and Roberts, while others express a great desire to maintain a pedestrian-only campus interior. Some suggest widening Carter Road to accommodate two-lane traffic, but there is also a desire to maintain the nature trail in this area. How should the real but competing needs for service efficiency, pedestrian amenity and landscape preservation be brokered?
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

In this document we have set out facts, identified patterns, and begun the process of discerning possibilities and options. We have tried to outline the key themes and issues of planning for Haverford's campus, seeing them in terms of the history and future of the College, but also in terms of its intangibles - its academic mission, its aspirations for student life and community.

We now step back and ask: are our findings correct? What opportunities and options are emerging as patterns become visible? We welcome your input as we continue our analysis and formulation of alternatives.

Your input will help us understand in greater detail the College's aspirations, plans and programs, and may lead us to new sources of information. These will help us develop a next round of options for the physical campus, based on a deeper understanding of aspirations and realities.

Perhaps we have, so far, managed to set down only the obvious - what "everybody knows." If so, we hope the act of putting in one place and sharing it can give rise to new understandings, perhaps to realizations not previously reached, and provide a basis for future discussions.

Comments on this report can be addressed to:
masterplan@haverford.edu

OR

Haverford College
Facilities Management -- Master Plan
370 Lancaster Avenue
Haverford, PA 19041