CORE AREA PLAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE: KENWOOD CAMPUS
This is the second report in the development of a General Plan for the Kenwood Campus.

The development policies recommended in this report were approved by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Campus Planning Committee on March 3, 1960 and by the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents on April 9, 1960.
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I. Foreword

The development of a comprehensive and long-range physical plan for an urban university poses a number of problems which differ considerably from those experienced at a resident institution in the pastoral setting of a provincial college town. The physical layout and visual impression of a campus in the setting of a metropolis is a matter which elicits varied opinions, as are the problems of establishing campus location criteria, the impact of future numerical and physical expansion on the surrounding area and the demand for facilities for extracurricular student activities and parking.

In addition to the above questions, which represent only a few of many physical planning problems and only touch upon the basic question of the academic role of an urban university, two additional pressure factors were encountered in planning for the Kenwood Campus of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. On one hand the university was experiencing a rapid increase in its enrollment resulting in heavy pressure for immediate construction of new physical facilities on presently owned property. On the other hand, little was, and is still, known about the future of the Milwaukee branch of the University in terms of direction and content of academic programs and community services.

Because of the above considerations and the pressing need to establish an outline to guide day-to-day decisions, it was necessary to develop a planning program which would tackle the problems simultaneously from two directions: from the outside in, in the form of a Sketch Plan outlining broad long-range development policies based on locational and area-wide considerations, and from the inside out, in the form of a detailed functional and environmental analysis of the development potential of the existing campus site.

This latter analysis is presented in this document as a plan for the development of the Core Area of the Kenwood Campus. It must be considered an integral part of the Sketch Plan as all major assumptions on which its design is based are interwoven with the development policies outlined in the Sketch Plan. Any changes in the latter will require a reconsideration of the Core Area Plan and vice versa. For reasons of clarity in format and presentation the plans have been separated into two reports. However, it is recommended that the Sketch Plan report be read before this report in order to gain a fuller understanding of the Core Area Plan.

In addition to the planning staff a great number of persons have been intimately involved and have contributed in various ways in developing the plan. Acknowledgement is due first to the former Mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, for his great interest and assistance in the University's development in Milwaukee. In addition, much information was received from various City of Milwaukee agencies, in particular from Mr. Elmer Krieger, Executive Secretary, and Mr. Carl H. Quast, Urban Renewal Planner, of the Board of Public Land Commissioners; Mr. Henry Wantoch, Traffic Engineer, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Traffic Engineering; and Mr. Sol Ackerman, former Urban Renewal Coordinator in the Mayor's office.

Also, many faculty members from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee participated in the formulation of the plan, individually or through the several standing or ad hoc committees dealing with development problems of the Kenwood Campus. And the following administrative officers of the University have been most helpful in submitting basic data required during the plan preparation process. Professor L. J. Links, Coordinator of Institutional Studies, prepared a special report on enrollment potential; Miss I. M. Rozak, Registrar; Mrs. B. Castleman, Director of Housing; and Mr. J. Trover, Superintendent of Building and Grounds, of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, all made their files available to the planning staff.

Last, but not least, I wish to express my, and the planning staff's appreciation to Dr. J. Martin Klotzsch, Provost of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Chairman of its Campus Planning Committee, and Dean Kurt F. Wendt, Dean of the College of Engineering and Director of the Department of University Planning and Construction, whose great interest, counsel and guidance was of invaluable assistance during the preparation of the plan.

Madison, May 1960

Leo Jakobson
Institutional Planner and Associate Professor
of City Planning
Planning Staff Participating
in the Formulation of the
Core Area Plan:

Thomas J. Dyckman, Senior Planner
Richard E. Tipple, Senior Landscape Architect
Thomas R. Favour, Junior Planner
II. Introduction

The Kenwood Campus is located in the northeastern area of Milwaukee, approximately three miles from the central business district, in a residential neighborhood of predominantly large single-family houses. One-half mile to the east is Lake Michigan, one-quarter mile to the west is the Milwaukee River and one-quarter mile to the north is the city boundary and the suburban village of Shorewood.

The Core Area of the Kenwood Campus contains the major land holdings presently occupied by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. It consists of an area bounded roughly by Hartford Avenue on the north, Downer Avenue on the east, Kenwood Boulevard on the south and Cramer Street on the west and is bisected by Maryland Avenue. As stated in the Sketch Plan the instructional core of the University is to be developed within this area in order to accommodate needs of the immediate future while providing for expansion outward from the core in the long-range future.

In general, the Core Area Plan is an attempt to answer definitively the development problems faced by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in its effort to meet the present shortage of physical facilities at the Kenwood Campus as well as to create a physical plan which will meet the needs of an anticipated expanded enrollment.

According to an analysis of existing physical facilities in September 1958, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee is providing only 61% of the assignable instructional space* recommended by the State of Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education for the present enrollment. It should be noted this figure includes existing space used in the Downtown Campus. In other words the UW-M is currently operating at a space deficiency of nearly 40% according to the CCHB standards. Therefore, a most pressing problem at the UW-M is to provide immediate relief due to overcrowding of existing facilities. Certain steps are being taken to correct this immediate problem of over-crowding, e.g. the present construction of the Science Building; the purchase of the Downer Seminary property; and the preparation of plans for a Fine Arts Building, an addition to the Student Union, a General Classroom Building and an Engineering-Mathematics-Physics Building. The Core Area Plan incorporates all these items.

III. Planning Goals and Objectives

The primary goal of the Core Area Plan is to provide the development and design framework for the entire group of buildings to be constructed in the area and to provide unified cohesion of functional land use, circulation and design. The implementation of the design framework requires regulatory controls coordinating land use, circulation, landscaping, building heights and architectural treatment in order to best obtain an aesthetically stimulating and beautiful campus environment.

This primary goal is the basis for a set of planning design objectives which the Core Area Plan attempts to meet. These planning design objectives, inter alia, are:

A. The physical design of the Core Area should provide a three-dimensional illustration of the urban character of the UW-M Kenwood Campus.

B. The Core Area Land should be organized into functionally related academic and non-academic use groupings to provide for the most efficient utilization of space and circulation patterns as well as to provide academic identification.

C. In order to intensively develop the Core Area without creating excessive building coverage but still provide space accommodations for a substantially increased enrollment, consideration should be given to a physical linkage of buildings to avoid wasting land.

D. The organization of open pedestrian spaces should provide opportunities for landscaping contrast, variety and visual stimulus in different sites and at different levels.

E. Vehicular access into the Core Area should not conflict with the major pedestrian circulation. Only a limited amount of convenience parking should be provided in the Core Area.

F. The regulatory controls for plan implementation should provide a measure of flexibility for accommodating the changing needs of the University's building programs.

* For definition of term 'assignable instructional space' see Table A, page 10.
IV. Planning Assumptions

Because of the pressing need for space accommodations, the rapidly increasing student enrollment and the high cost of land acquisition, a low intensity of development was determined as not applicable to the Kenwood Campus site. Therefore, all the major instructional facilities needed for a primarily undergraduate program are to be located within the Core Area.

In order to meet this objective certain clarifications and planning assumptions as to the nature of the instructional facilities to be provided in the Core Area had to be established. These assumptions are as follows:

A. The descriptive phrase ‘instructional’ used in reference to the Core Area means the entire area will be devoted to academic instruction and related uses.

B. Research, per se, is not precluded from the Core Area, but should be limited in scope and conducted in relation to academic instructional departments established in the Core Area.

C. Major research facilities requiring specialized space will be located outside of the Core Area.

D. As noted in the Sketch Plan certain low intensity facilities now located in the Core Area should be removed or relocated in the Long Range Development Plan. These facilities are:

   1. The Laboratory School.
   2. The Plant Maintenance Center.
   3. The Physical Education track and fields and the Baker Field House.
   4. All temporary structures.

E. Certain facilities, non-academic in nature, but related in academic use and providing required services to academic activities will be retained or provided in the Core Area. These facilities are the Student Union and the Administrative Center.

F. Other specialized facilities not mentioned above will be included in or excluded from the Core Area depending upon general academic land use requirements and the particular land use requirements of the specialized facility.
V. Existing Development

A. Physical Characteristics

The Core Area, as outlined on Map 2, comprises a total of 44.6 acres including the Downer Seminary property of 9.6 acres which is presently being purchased. The area slopes gently from east to west without major topographical change in level. Existing tree plantings are in irregular patterns on the periphery for the most part.

The oldest building on the Kenwood Campus, the location of the former State Teacher's College, is the Main Building. The newest permanent buildings are the Union, the Library and the Laboratory School. The Physical Education facilities are rather old. Since the creation of the UW-M only one building, a temporary building, has been erected on the campus. The temporary buildings are an indication of the pressing need for physical facilities to help ameliorate, even on a temporary basis, the shortage of space created by the rapidly increasing enrollment.

The extent of the existing building development in this area is noted on Table C, page 30. The new Science Building and the Downer Seminary are scheduled for occupancy in 1961-62. The total assignable square footage including Downer Seminary and the new Science Building is slightly in excess of 385,000 square feet out of a gross of approximately 600,000 square feet. If the proportion of 41% of gross square footage equals assignable instructional square footage, as established from the CCHE standards, is applied to the Kenwood Campus, the assignable instructional space would then equal approximately 246,000 square feet. The Coordinating Committee for Higher Education recommends 63 square feet of assignable instructional space per day student. Based on the above figure the enrollment should total 3900 students. In 1959 there were 5250 day students.

* See Table A, page 19.
B. Land Use

The existing land use in the Core Area can be organized into four major groupings: Academic, Nonacademic, Physical Education and Athletics, and Open Space. Academic land use is further subclassified into four functionally related categories:

1. The Humanities, Arts and Social Studies.
2. Science and Technology.
3. Library.
4. Laboratory School.

The Academic classifications, see Map 3, are presently located primarily in separate areas within the Core Area thus providing the nucleus for functional separation. The Humanities, Arts and Social Studies group is the dominate use in the eastern half of the Core Area and the Science Building is beginning the development of the Science and Technology group on the western half of the Core Area.

The other Academic land uses shown include the Campus Elementary School, or the Laboratory School, and the Library.

The non-academic uses shown on Map 3 are the Social Services, the Student Union and the Service Facilities, the Heating Plant and headquarters of the Department of Buildings and Grounds.

The Physical Education and Athletics classification is the largest single land use category covering nearly one third of the 44.6 acres in the Core Area, (see Table B, page 14). This classification includes the Baker Field House, the track and football field and other playfields located throughout the Core Area.

The Open Space land use as shown, 16 acres, includes parking and service areas as well as landscaped areas.

### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Square Feet: The gross floor area of a building is the sum of the areas at each floor level included within the principal outside faces of exterior walls, neglecting minor architectural setbacks and projections.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Square Feet: The net square feet of floor area includes all floor space in the interior of a building excluding structural elements such as walls and columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignable Floor Space: The assignable area is the sum of the floor areas of the individual rooms assignable to the agencies housed in the buildings. Excluded are the floor areas devoted to activities such as circulation of general traffic within the building, mechanical equipment rooms, accessible pipe spaces, janitorial closets and public toilets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEFINITION OF TERMS MEASURING PHYSICAL FACILITIES

**Instructional Space:** Instructional space includes classrooms, teaching laboratories, offices (faculty), libraries, auditoriums and miscellaneous rooms used in conjunction with the above.

**Non-Instructional Space:** Non-Instructional space includes research, extension and public service, physical education, laboratory school, physical plant, auxiliary enterprises and inactive space.

From Research Study VI, Survey of Physical Facilities at Wisconsin State Colleges and University of Wisconsin, Fall 1956, and Research Study XXXIII, Part I, A Survey of Physical Facilities at Wisconsin State Colleges and University of Wisconsin Fall 1958. Classrooms and Laboratories, Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, Wisconsin.
C. Circulation

The existing circulation in the Core Area, illustrated by Map 4, can be divided into two basic categories: vehicular and pedestrian circulation. In the vehicular circulation traffic signals, traffic volumes, one way traffic, and curb parking areas are included. Also shown are bus stops, including the shuttle bus stop, which provides service between the Downtown Campus and the Kenwood Campus. The parking facilities show a capacity of 568 spaces of which 381 are metered for student use. The traffic volumes indicated are June 1957 counts. The available later counts shows no significant change in the Kenwood Campus area.

The pedestrian circulation as shown illustrates only the prominent flow pattern. A major pedestrian crossing problem exists at Maryland Avenue, a major thorough-fare, between Kenwood Boulevard and Hartford Avenue. This problem will be intensified upon completion of the Science Building.
VI. Comprehensive Development

As has been mentioned previously, the Coordinating Committee on Higher Education recommends using a figure of 63 square feet of assignable instructional space per day student in order to estimate building needs. While this figure cannot be reviewed as an inflexible standard and should be reexamined during later planning stages, it is used here to estimate the physical space requirements for a day student enrollment of 20,000, the design basis established in the Sketch Plan. Using the standard stated above, 20,000 day students would require 1,260,000 square feet of assignable instructional or 1,600,000 gross instructional square feet. This indicates the magnitude of space required in the primarily instructional Core Area.

The following statements contain the regulations required to implement the Comprehensive Development of the Core Area Plan. The regulations coordinate land use, landscaping, building set-backs, heights and architectural treatment and circulation and are based on the principles, studies and assumptions outlined in the Sketch Plan and on the planning goals, objectives and assumptions outlined in the preceding chapters. Each of the Comprehensive Development maps imposes regulations to insure implementation of the Core Area Plan. Each of these, however, contains a degree of flexibility to allow for change in academic and administrative policy in the development of detailed building programs and in the design of the individual structures. The following sections explain in detail the degree of flexibility allowed in the various regulatory aspects of the plan.

A. Land Use

Land use in the Core Area has been organized into functionally related academic and non-academic groupings according to the Planning Goals and Objectives enumerated in Chapter III. The three major groupings shown are Academic, Non-Academic and Open Space. Academic land use is subclassified into these functionally related categories:

1. The Humanities, Arts and Social Studies.
2. Science and Technology.
3. Library.

The Humanities, Arts and Social Studies group is located in the eastern half of the Core Area and, the Science and Technology group is located in the western half, thus allowing for development of departments which are functionally related in academic instruction. A new centrally located general library is provided on the east side of Maryland Avenue. The Non-Academic uses shown include an expanded Student Union, or Social Services group, (expanded to include eating facilities, theater and additional office space) and a General Administration Center. Certain existing Non-Academic activities and temporary facilities have been removed from the Core Area according to the Planning Assumptions noted in Chapter IV.

The Open Space land use category as shown includes formal and informal landscaped areas as well as parking and service areas.

### Table B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Comprehensive Development</th>
<th>Intermediate Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, Arts and Social Studies</td>
<td>3.8 Acres</td>
<td>11.9 Acres</td>
<td>10.9 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>1.5 ''</td>
<td>8.1 ''</td>
<td>7.5 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>4 ''</td>
<td>1.2 ''</td>
<td>1.4 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory  School</td>
<td>3.8 ''</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>8.7 ''</td>
<td>21.3 ''</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>.3 ''</td>
<td>.3 ''</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Facilities</td>
<td>.8 ''</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>.3 ''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1.1 ''</td>
<td>2.3 ''</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Comprehensive Development</th>
<th>Intermediate Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education and Athletics</td>
<td>13.1 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets (Right of Way)</td>
<td>5.9 ''</td>
<td>5.9 ''</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>5.9 ''</td>
<td>5.9 ''</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Physical Design

The Physical Design plan, Map 6, shows the building masses and general landscaping organization designed to meet the Planning Goals and Objectives stated in Chapter III. For economy of land development and also for the creation of pedestrian precincts or plazas, the buildings, for the most part, are physically linked together. These links can provide for facilities which do not easily fit into the modular pattern of the building mass, such as auditoria and student lounges. The buildings are oriented toward the pedestrian plazas and away from vehicular circulation. The pedestrian plazas are linked to produce both an urban character and a cohesive unity of design as well as a continuous pedestrian setting removed from vehicular traffic conflicts and affording unhampered building access. The two functionally separate academic areas are connected by a pedestrian bridge over Maryland Ave, which completes the linkage of the pedestrian plazas. The pedestrian plazas are designed as formally landscaped areas while the open space on the periphery of the Core Area is designated as informally landscaped. Formal landscaping in this context means large areas of decorative paving, small areas of grass, precise alignment of tree plantings and decorative plantings and the use of reflecting pools, fountains, sculpture and benches. Informal landscaping means large areas of grass, small areas of paving, random and irregular tree planting, shrubs and decorative plants. The informal landscaping of the periphery not only provides contrast with the formal landscaping of the interior pedestrian plazas, but also provides the external link between the Lake Park on the east and Hubbard Park on the riverfront. All service areas are located on the periphery of the Core Area, many with adjacent convenience parking.
C. Building Regulations

The Building Regulation plans further elaborate the controls which implement the design framework for all construction and insure the execution of the Physical Design plan. These regulations specifically relate to building setbacks, heights and general architectural treatment and the delineation of open space, formal and informal landscaped areas. Flexibility in construction and design is provided through a range of controls thus furnishing variation horizontally and vertically as well as in execution of detail.

For purposes of clarity and distinction, the Building Regulations are subdivided into three classifications: Setback and Building Line, Height and Mass and Exterior Architectural Treatment. Each is equally regulatory.

1. Setback and Building Lines

The setback regulations, Map 7, similar to zoning ordinances, outline the area for building development. Two types of regulations are indicated:

a. The setback line, which is the line separating building construction from the street right-of-way line or adjacent property lines. This prevents buildings from encroaching on the open space surrounding the Core Area. Buildings do not have to be built along the setback line, but may not be built beyond it towards the street right-of-way line.

b. The building line, which is the line of building construction in the interior of the Core Area. The first floor or plaza level floor must be constructed along this line to insure the creation of the pedestrian plazas.

Flexibility is accommodated laterally between the two regulatory lines. Thus both building areas and permanent open space are delineated. Two exceptions to the building-line regulations are indicated to illustrate certain special intrusions into the pedestrian plazas which are permitted.
2. Height and Mass

The height regulations plan, Map 8, contains the third-dimensional controls required for effective utilization of the building area. The arrangement of one-two story units provides a background and three-dimensional linkage for the pedestrian plazas. The higher units serve not only as visual focal points in the design but also accommodate facilities which can best utilize vertical space, e.g., offices, libraries, etc. Flexibility is accomplished through a system of ranges of heights, which in turn maintain consistent proportions of scale. The range of building heights also serves to accommodate a variety of building programs. The Comprehensive Development stage of the Core Area Plan provides space accommodations for 14,850 to 18,850 students.
3. Exterior Architectural Treatment

In order to create a coherence and unity of physical design, general architectural facade treatment is shown on Map 9. This indicates the predominant type of architectural treatment based on building mass, building orientation and location and the composition of vistas, enclosure and open space in the Physical Design plan. The three classifications of predominant treatment are:

a. Open to indicate maximum use of translucent, or light, appearing building materials, both in color and texture.

b. Solid to indicate brick and stone surfaces with limited window openings.

c. Decorative to indicate facades where the primary concern should be the decorative and textural effects of surface treatment.

These general terms provide for innumerable possibilities in facade design and detailing.
D. Circulation

The Circulation plan, Map 10, shows the accommodations for vehicular and pedestrian circulation and also the limited amount of convenience parking located on the periphery of the Core Area. The principal features of the plan illustrate the separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic through the regulation restricting all service access to the periphery of the Core Area. This regulation provides unimpeded pedestrian circulation through the plazas from one part of the campus to another. The pedestrian bridge over Maryland Avenue is required to link the pedestrian plazas because the volume of vehicular traffic carried by Maryland Avenue is too large to warrant its closing. The off-street parking facilities provide approximately 350 spaces of convenience parking. The required service areas are not to infringe on parking areas. Additional visitor and temporary parking is provided in restricted curb locations. The bus stop locations indicate distribution points for pedestrian circulation.
VII. Intermediate Development

In order to illustrate the possibilities of staging in the Comprehensive Development, it was necessary to prepare an Intermediate Development phase wherein certain existing facilities are temporarily retained. This is not a separate plan but an integral stage in the Comprehensive Development plan of the Core Area Plan. Consequently, development in the intermediate stage is in conformity with the Comprehensive Development plan and imposes no new regulatory measures.

A. Land Use

The Land Use map, Map 11, illustrates the extent to which the Core Area can be developed while retaining certain existing facilities. The existing facilities which are retained include the Heating Plant (Service Facilities), the Baker Field House, the Physical Education track and many of the fields, the Laboratory School and the Downer Seminary Buildings. As shown, the Humanities, Arts and Social Studies portion of the campus, the area east of Maryland Ave., can be substantially developed before existing structures need be removed. However, the western area of the campus, the Science and Technology portion, is restricted in development by Physical Education and the Laboratory School.

The library use is functionally split between the two segments of the Core Area. The existing library structure in the eastern portion of the Core Area is intended to serve the Humanities, Arts and Social Studies and can be expanded. The Library in the western portion is intended to meet the needs of Science and Technology, if additional facilities are deemed necessary. Each of these structures should be designed so it may be converted to other academic uses when the libraries consolidate as shown in the Comprehensive Development.

The space provisions and holding capacity of the Intermediate Development stage are indicated in Table C.

B. Physical Design

The Physical Design map for Intermediate Development, Map 12, illustrates the extent to which the Core Area can be developed in the interim stage. As shown, a considerable portion of the campus can be developed before removing existing facilities.

From an aesthetic point of view the eastern part of the campus, east of Maryland Avenue, will approach the objectives of the Comprehensive Development in most of its design aspects. The western part of the campus is more restricted in development and only limited design goals can be achieved as long as the Physical Education track and fields are retained. It should be noted, however, that only strict adherence to the plan in its early implementation will ultimately produce an environment which will achieve aesthetic as well as functional quality.
VIII. Development Policies

In order to establish firmly the regulatory intent of the plan and to limit the possibilities for interpretation, the main objectives and proposals have been spelled out explicitly through a series of development policies to be formally adopted by the appropriate University authorities. The recommended policies were presented to the UW-M Campus Planning Committee and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents for discussion and approval. In addition, the plan was presented to the UW-M faculty on December 10, 1959.

The following development policies were adopted by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Campus Planning Committee on March 3, 1969 and by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin on April 9, 1960.

A. General Purpose

The purpose of the Core Area Plan is to provide the physical design framework for the academic core of the UW-M campus. The physical design framework should be comprehensive by showing complete development and should allow for flexibility in individual building programs which are capable of being created in stages. The goal of the Core Area Plan is to create a cohesive and unified instructional campus, functionally organized in a beautiful and stimulating urban environment for academic life.

B. Comprehensive Development

1. Land Use. In order to meet the above stated general purpose, land uses shall be organized in general accord with the Land Use plan.

2. Physical Design. The creation of a beautiful and stimulating environment is dependent upon the successful arrangement and grouping of the three-dimensional forms, i.e., buildings, and the delineation of open space through enclosure and direction which such groupings form. A successful arrangement and grouping of these elements are obtained by the Comprehensive Development plan which in turn serves as the guide for the attainment of this goal. The Core Area shall be developed therefore, in general accord with the Physical Design plan.

3. Building Regulation. The effectuation of a development plan requires certain regulatory measures controlling building heights and masses, building setbacks and building lines, building facade treatment and open space. To insure the effectuation of the Comprehensive Development plan, the Core Area shall be developed in general accord with the three Building Regulation plans.

C. Staging of Core Area Plan

In order to illustrate the possibilities of staging in the proposed comprehensive development, it was necessary to prepare an Intermediate Development plan for the Core Area wherein certain special facilities are temporarily retained in their present location.

D. Intermediate Development

The plan for intermediate development is not a separate plan but an integral part of the Comprehensive Development plan illustrating interim policies on land use and physical design.

1. Land Use. In the Intermediate Development for the Core Area, the Heating Plant, the Baker Fieldhouse and athletic track, the Laboratory School and the Downer Seminary Buildings are retained on their present sites. Again, it is to be noted that this is a temporary solution and these facilities will be relocated and replaced when possible as shown in the Sketch Plan and the Core Area Plan.

2. Physical Design. The Physical Design plan illustrates the physical development of intermediate land use as a stage of the Core Area Comprehensive Development plan and as such shall be the guide for interim development.
### TABLE C

**COMPARATIVE PHYSICAL FACILITIES (Gross Square Footage)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Under Construction or Purchase</th>
<th>Budgeted and Under Planning</th>
<th>Included in 6 yr. Priority List</th>
<th>Additional Space Available According to Inter. Dev.</th>
<th>Additional Space Available According to Comp. Dev.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Building</td>
<td>192,854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Fieldhouse</td>
<td>51,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-51,325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Plant</td>
<td>7,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7,172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7,923</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory School</td>
<td>57,317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-57,317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>41,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>19,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Annex (temp)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-13,847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;E&quot; Annex (temp)</td>
<td>10,847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Seminary</td>
<td>78,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-78,214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Bldg. Stage 1</td>
<td>124,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Bldg. Stage 1</td>
<td>58,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Addn.</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Bldg. Stage 1</td>
<td>96,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr-Math-Physics Bldg.</td>
<td>62,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Bldg. Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69,300*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Bldg. Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Bldg. Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,400*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,400*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Bldg. Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add, Science and Tech. Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add, Hum, Arts and Soc. Studies Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,004</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>196,900</td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>196,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add, Non-Instructional Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additional Space</td>
<td>202,330</td>
<td>245,745</td>
<td>334,833</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>277,000</td>
<td>296,346</td>
<td>639,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total</td>
<td>399,013</td>
<td>601,243</td>
<td>844,888</td>
<td>1,179,841</td>
<td>1,456,841</td>
<td>1,646,190</td>
<td>2,087,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignable Instructional</td>
<td>189,940</td>
<td>233,370</td>
<td>383,301</td>
<td>619,758</td>
<td>867,758</td>
<td>971,658</td>
<td>1,193,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Capacity—Students</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>9,840</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>11,140</td>
<td>14,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOOTNOTES:**

a. Since the future buildings included through the 6 year priority list do not have exact figures programmed at this time, the figures shown are estimates according to current budget proposals.

b. The existing assignable instructional space is computed from actual measurements. All other assignable instructional space figures are computed at a ratio of 70% of the gross instructional space.

c. The present library and its addition are converted to classroom space in the Comprehensive Development stage after the new library is constructed.

d. The holding capacity is based on the recommended CCHE standard of 63 square feet of gross instructional space per student.
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