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I. INTRODUCTION
I. INTRODUCTION

Bryn Mawr College has chosen to update and re-evaluate its 1997 Outline Concept Plan as it completes its Challenging Women campaign and prepares for a new president. A revised and updated Concept Plan can provide a renewed framework for making decisions, accommodating expansion or change, and setting priorities among projects. In this report, which marks the end of our study, we outline our impressions of the campus and our interpretation of its development, describe the changes made since our 1997 plan, and sketch out our understanding of Bryn Mawr’s aspirations, issues and opportunities related to campus development.

A. KEY CONCERNS

What kinds and combinations of new and reconfigured spaces linked to new, existing or expanded uses can provide effective, gracious and well-related accommodations for the College in the years ahead? Several specific concerns have been identified around which cluster many of Bryn Mawr’s key planning issues:

- **Improving facilities for the sciences.** Although areas in Park Science Center have been incrementally improved in recent years, much of the building is outdated, there are few places for people to come together, and its infrastructure is taxed by current requirements of scientific teaching and research. In addition, a growing number of Bryn Mawr students are studying science: more than one-third of Bryn Mawr undergraduates major in science and a significant percentage major in mathematics.

- **Improving facilities related to athletics and well-being.** Athletics facilities that compare unfavorably to those of Bryn Mawr’s peers have been identified as a major concern by many. Bryn Mawr’s Plan for a New Century calls for expanded opportunities in athletics, and notes the College’s need to meet the expectations of students raised in the wake of Title IX. In addition, Bryn Mawr’s Health Center is outdated.

- **Renovating Thomas Hall, and making Taylor Hall accessible to those with physical disabilities.**

- **Considering the potential impact of moving the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research to the campus core.** The plan should consider opportunities for optimizing available teaching space, faculty and staff offices and parking near the campus core. Other impacts of selling the GSSWSR property – including the loss of a gym and practice fields, as well as effects on long-term growth strategies – should also be considered.
• Improving student and residential life.

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, and planning for its continuation beyond the expected life span of current plantings.

• Providing greater degrees of accessibility, especially to those with impaired mobility.

• Space for community activities and “hanging out” – within departments and campus-wide.

• Environmental stewardship.

This report is based on data from the College, published materials, our own observations and our discussions with over 120 members of the College community.

B. BACKGROUND TO PLANNING

1. Recent Developments: A Quick Review

When we studied the campus in 1997, the Chemistry addition to the Park Science Center was Bryn Mawr’s newest building, Rhys Carpenter Library was under construction, and a major renovation of Rhoads dormitory was about to be undertaken.

Over the intervening years, total College enrollment has remained relatively stable.

Meanwhile, a number of projects anticipated by the 1997 plan have been accomplished:

• A renovation and addition converted the Owl bookstore to the Benham Gateway Building, welcoming visitors to campus.

• Ely House, the former home of Admissions, was demolished.

• Bettws-Y-Coed was renovated and restored to house Psychology and Education.

• Dalton was completely renovated, with a small but significant addition, to house the social sciences including anthropology, economics, political science and sociology.

• A new Facilities building consolidated related departments and allowed the removal of incompatible uses from the basements of dormitories and other buildings.

• Parking on the Merion-Morris block was reconfigured, and a new pedestrian path was built around Wyndham to Pembroke Arch.

• The service areas around Canaday and Rhoads were reconfigured and redesigned to provide a more amenable pedestrian experience.

Still to be accomplished are:

• Renovation of Thomas Hall.

• Acquisition of properties described as strategic by the plan – including the property between West House and Pen-Y-Groes, the property between the Graduate School of Social Work and Brecon, and properties between Russian and Arncliffe. Of these, which are still “key?”

• Restriction of through-traffic access to Merion Avenue. Is this still a College priority?

• Improved pedestrian street crossings, especially New Gulph at English-Russian Houses.

• Crosswalks at Bettws-Y-Coed.

In addition to the changes anticipated by the Outline Concept Plan, a donor’s generosity made possible the conversion of faculty housing along Roberts Road to student-centered uses (Cambrian Row) and a multicultural center was established in an adjacent building. A stormwater management plan resulted in the construction of the pond behind Rhoads.

The Campus Heritage Preservation Initiative, funded by the J. Paul Getty Foundation, evaluated the historic fabric of the campus and described its evolution, and an Academic Feasibility Study and Master Plan (2000) considered the future of several buildings at the campus core. In 2004, the College’s Campus Landscape Advisory Group produced a series of policies and recommendations for preservation and development of the landscape. Our current planning should be informed by these, and by recent and planned developments:

• Glenmede has been sold; the new owner plans to take occupancy in May 2008.

• Renovations and an addition to Goodhart are in design stages, with construction scheduled to begin in late Spring 2008.

• Plans for the renovation of Guild have been put on hold.

• An addition to the Gym is in preliminary planning stages.

• The sale of the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR) property to Lower Merion Township is being considered.

• Partial renovations of the Biology wing of the Park Science Building are underway.

• The future disposition of the two vacant houses adjacent to Cambrian Row is under review.

• The acquisition of a building in Center City Philadelphia to house and educate students is being considered.

• Lower Merion Township has approved the limited use of apartments on Montgomery Avenue by Bryn Mawr students.

2. Campus-Wide Principles

We include here, from our 1997 report, a statement of campus-wide principles for overall patterns of use and expansion. From our discussions across campus, we understand that these remain valid, and that the College’s growing sense of environmental stewardship should also be represented in plans for the campus. In addition, synergies with Haverford College should be explored.

• Understand and work with the campus’s evolving development patterns and preserve its diverse architectural heritage.

• Locate activities to help reinforce existing patterns that serve the College’s mission and policies, strengthen linkages between related uses, and support the character of the buildings and landscape inside and outside the campus core.

• When expanding, continue Bryn Mawr’s parallel traditions of building at the perimeter, adapting existing buildings and spaces to new uses, and crossing perimeter streets to build some new buildings.

• Realign physical adjacencies with academic policies and pedagogical intentions, and continue to do so as priorities shift.

• Promote activity patterns that enhance academic programs and the quality of student life and encourage interaction and vitality on campus.

• Promote activity patterns that encourage interaction and vitality within buildings.

• Preserve and reinforce important landscapes.

• Strategically acquire key properties as they become available.
• Continue the pattern of vehicular circulation at the perimeter. Define the new campus gateways.
• Adapt paths to changing uses and circulation patterns.
• Locate uses to meet the College’s current needs and support its present priorities, and also leave open options for the future.
• Prepare and continuously update a phasing plan that relates immediate needs, goals, and actions to middle and long-range aspirations and intentions.

3. Principles for Campus Heritage Preservation

We include here, from the 2004 Campus Heritage Preservation Initiative, a list of campus heritage principles "developed to strengthen Bryn Mawr’s historic campus and guide the College as they continue to confront increasingly complex development issues."

1. Reinforce Iconic Campus Identity – The design of the Bryn Mawr campus has fostered more than a century of unique rituals and traditions, as well as inspired the highest levels of scholarship. Today, the campus fabric is the tangible image of this accumulated history, and inseparable from the identity of the College.

2. Address the Campus as a Whole – The impact of any development project is not restricted to its project limit line; it affects the overall character and historic integrity of the entire campus. Project-oriented landscape development tends to fragment the larger campus. Therefore, utilizing a holistic preservation model will protect the distinguishing qualities of the College campus.

3. Recognize the Campus as an Interdependent System – Historic preservation is not solely about the conservation of physical fabric or isolated objects. Its main purpose is to define and strengthen the sense of a place as a system. Changes in one area inevitably affect other parts of the campus system, regardless of the scale or type of the development. Systems are vertical and horizontal, physical and cultural.

For example, an addition to a building on a hill can create more stormwater runoff, which causes change in the landscape, and in turn can affect the condition, character and integrity of the valley below. The reciprocal effects of campus systems on one another need to be defined, studied and incorporated directly into the design process.

4. Invest in Excellence & Quality at all Levels – The College's core value – the striving for excellence in women's education – is partly communicated by innovative and exciting programs and facilities, and partly by the permanence and quality of the campus's historic fabric. The best projects in Bryn Mawr's history have not only addressed the campus as a physical whole, but integrated an understanding of architecture, landscape, and a sense of history and tradition. The achievement of design excellence and lasting value requires the employment of the greatest talent, vision, and expertise available, with a global understanding of the place and the role of the project in it.

-- Campus Heritage Preservation Initiative, Andropogon Associates and George Thomas Associates, 2004

In addition, recognizing and preserving the variety of building scale and type has been identified as a good by members of the Campus Planning Committee.

4. Bryn Mawr College Landscape Policies

We include here, from the 2004 document produced by the Campus Landscape Advisory Group, a list of major recommendations related to the landscape:

• Continuously review and update a description of present landscape conditions and identification of immediate and longer-term needs for preservation, restoration or replacement.
• Continuously monitor outside contractors’ performance.
• Require that landscape maintenance and upkeep support the College's goals for sustainability: "Bryn Mawr College will work toward the goal of preserving and maintaining its historic landscape and grounds using integrated pest management techniques. This approach seeks to minimize applications of chemical and other non-organic materials for weed and pest control in order to protect the environment."
• More effectively integrate the landscape into the academic curriculum and student life.
• Continue to protect the open greensward of the campus, and encourage coherent, consistent systems of signage, path materials, lighting and other landscape ornamentation.
• Offer interested donors opportunities to support Bryn Mawr’s landscape, including a special endowment fund for landscape maintenance and preservation, naming opportunities, and other gifts consistent with the College’s identified needs and priorities.
• Continue the Campus Landscape Advisory Group to review implementation of the Campus Landscape Policies.

C. NEXT STEPS

This report is presented as a tool for making decisions and setting priorities.
Campus and Surrounding Roads

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
Campus Master Planning

Base Map Source: Google Earth
Information Source: Google Earth

Key
- SEPTA RAIL LINE
- SEPTA RAIL STATION
- MAJOR ROADS
- HIGHWAY
- BRYN MAWR COLLEGE BOUNDARIES
- OTHER INSTITUTION BOUNDARIES
- BLUE BUS ROUTE
- TRI-COLLEGE SHUTTLE ROUTE
II. THE BRYN MAWR CAMPUS
II. THE BRYN MAWR CAMPUS

Here, we adapt and expand a section of text from our 1997 report, and update it to reflect changes made in the interim and the College’s current concerns.

A. PLACE AND PRECINCT

The Bryn Mawr campus embraces a variety of qualities that make a rich and complex whole. This variety and richness must be articulated to be capitalized on.

The central and original campus is topographically a plane whose configurations of trees, buildings, and paths are essentially orthogonal in their forms and relationships, and fit on the three sides of an orthogonal street layout.

To the west, in beautiful contrast, is an undulating topography of lawns and woods, a Romantic valley landscape bordered by streets, straight and curving. Here the campus layout becomes geometrically complex as it conforms to the landscape, but part of the sloping topography is modulated to accommodate rectangular and level athletics fields. Houses at the southern and western edges relate to the street and the suburban community beyond.

Along New Gulph and Roberts Roads and the block south of Merion Avenue are new institutional buildings, former residences, and parking areas.

On campus, two academic architectural traditions are combined: the one of the American college perceived as a consistent whole, forming a kind of pedestrian superblock separate and distinguished from the surrounding community; the other of the urban Continental university, melded into the streets and spaces of the town to form an institutional precinct rather than a separate campus.

The Bryn Mawr campus is in and of the community, yet it is distinguishable as a place with its own perimeter and identified entrances. Within the core, Collegiate buildings and landscapes give image to Bryn Mawr’s heritage and traditions. Fuori le mura – outside the walls – the campus is a pattern of distinguished old houses and landscapes, interspersed with some newer buildings (figs. 1 and 2). This peripheral area, more delicate in character than the academic core, is a Romantic landscape where relationships between uses are more loosely woven.

fig. 2. Aerial Photo 1925 (Source: Bryn Mawr College Archives)

fig. 3. Map of Bruges (detail) showing dense core and Fuori le Mura, 1562
B. “LEARNING FROM BRYN MAWR”

The first built increments of a long-range campus plan can define the basic ambiance and fundamental relationships on campus and condition subsequent growth for years after the plans themselves have been altered or abrogated.

Bryn Mawr has had at least two such plans: by Frederick Law Olmsted and Ralph Adams Cram. Through these plans and the early Cope and Stewardson buildings, good basic decisions were taken that established or reaffirmed architectural character, forged important functional linkages and delineated directions for growth.

Here we identify some lessons we could learn from the existing Bryn Mawr campus.

1. Character and Image

The picturesque long views of the campus – for example, the layers of towers visible from Merion and Wyndham – is offset by rich detail that is visible only upon closer inspection. Goodhart’s ironwork and the Jacobean ornament on the mostly Collegiate Gothic Thomas are but two examples. The original buildings are primarily stone, but the newer perimeter buildings – the Gym, Haffner, and Park Science – are largely brick, and the campus encompasses a variety of materials and styles in the houses it acquired. The long vistas, large green, and mature trees of the College landscape are at the core of the campus’s appeal. Paths and walks are practical and unpretentious; lighting fixtures and benches are mostly attractive and not precious.

2. Patterns of Growth

The College’s first building, Taylor Hall, was sited within the campus landscape at the apex of the hill. By 1890, though, the pattern of defining the edge of campus along streets had been established by Merion, Dalton, Denbigh and Radnor Halls. The construction in 1894 of Pembroke Hall, designed by Cope and Stewardson (who had also designed Radnor and Denbigh) dramatically ratified this approach, adding an east-west axis and defining the campus’ southern edge for more than half a century (fig. 1).

Olmsted’s 1895 plan (fig. 3) extended the campus north to Roberts Road (with the exception of the northwest corner) and indicated additional linear dormitories extending from Pembroke west along the southern and western edges of the campus, broken only by an “audience hall” at the eventual location of Goodhart. Dormitories and a lecture hall were proposed for the Gulph Road edge of campus as well. A library was proposed at the eventual location of Thomas Hall. (It is interesting to note that Olmsted’s plan shows vehicular access via an interior ring road; only the buildings along Gulph are presented with primary access along perimeter streets.)

Rockefeller Hall (Cope and Stewardson, 1897-1904), Goodhart Hall (Mellor, Meigs and Howe, 1924-1928), and buildings along the original north-south axis continued the definition of the perimeter, and Thomas Library joined Taylor Hall (one of the first campus buildings) in the campus “interior.”

Ralph Adams Cram’s 1934 plan – which hangs in Taylor Hall (fig. 5) – introduced a denser, more formal series of quadrangles of different sizes connected by paths. The central axis through Pembroke arch was terminated by a laboratory building west of Radnor; Radnor and the proposed laboratory formed the northern boundary of the plan. The demolition of Taylor was indicated to preserve the formality of Cram’s green quadrangle. A large campus gate was placed at the intersection of Merion and Yarrow, and a chapel, infirmary and dormitory were proposed for the south side of Merion (at the eventual location of Haffner). The plan seemed to suggest that the interior of the campus between Pembroke and the northern terminus be closed to vehicular traffic.

Over the years, the campus grew beyond the planned core through annexing former private residences across perimeter streets. The Merion-Morris block was annexed incrementally but completely by the College. Bryn Mawr established toeholds for development across Roberts and New Gulph, and further afield at the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research on Airedale Road and at Glennede, about one-half mile east of the campus. (Glennede has been sold, and the College is considering selling the GSSWSR property as well.)

Bryn Mawr grew as well by more intensely using, reusing, and adding to its existing buildings.

3. Patterns of Use

There is a tradition on campus, begun by Cope and Stewardson, of defining the perimeter of the core with dormitories, with academic facilities interspersed and at the center. This pattern of uses helped to create the intimate
scale of the campus. It was maintained by Erdman and Haffner Halls even as they expanded the limits of the campus, (see page 17) and it could help inform the location of future buildings. Brecon, built in 1947, loosely followed this pattern but was set back from Roberts Road. (Diagrams on pages 20 and 21 illustrating locations of residential uses, dining halls, and nightlife highlight Brecon’s isolation from other campus uses.)

Dining halls are in three dormitory buildings. Other student services – including mailboxes, the bookstore and a retail café – are in the Campus Center, on the major north-south pedestrian axis linking the Science buildings to the academic core. Another café – the Lusty Cup – has been established across the Green, in Canaday.

The Gymnasium and athletic fields are concentrated in the valley in the northwestern part of campus, in the general area suggested by Olmsted’s 1895 plan and indicated in the earliest topographical plans of the campus.

The President, Provost and undergraduate Deans are in Taylor Hall, the first, and most central, Bryn Mawr building. On the Merion-Morris block, houses converted to office use form a zone of administrative functions. Facilities uses are grouped in a new building on the western edge of the main campus block. Other administrative uses are located throughout the campus.

4. Circulation

Vehicular circulation is largely limited to public roads at the perimeter of the core, and to Merion Avenue, which was at the edge of campus and now runs through it. Parking and service entrances are mainly from Roberts, New Gulph and Morris. This arrangement has permitted the development of a green, pedestrian-friendly campus interior, but it has also created problems as the College has grown; for example, difficult connections to uses beyond the core.

At one time cars entered the campus through Pembroke Arch and early plans show a ring road within the campus interior. The pedestrian system has been longer-lived. A 1895 topographical survey (fig. 3) indicates walkways connecting buildings within the core – including Radnor, Merion, Taylor, Denhigh, Dalton and Pembroke – and continuing to campus entrances at Pembroke Arch and the corner of Merion and Yarrow (the eventual location of Rockefeller Arch). The configuration of these paths has hardly changed over time, even though relationships between buildings and between the campus and its perimeter have been altered by changed uses, the addition of new buildings, and increased parking and service requirements.

5. Space Use

A resourceful practicality at work at Bryn Mawr has found new uses for existing buildings as College needs have shifted: the Campus Center, for example, is a former Gymnasium and the swimming pool became the Bookstore. A dance studio, drafting room and language laboratory are located in former dining halls, and student activity spaces are located in former faculty houses.

As a result, buildings are intensively used, the costs of operating additional buildings are not incurred, and alumnae fondly remember, for example, doing laps in what is now the Bookstore. Two recent building reuse projects – Dalton and Bettys-Y-Coed – include additions, which include unprogrammed spaces for impromptu discussions or for just “hanging out” – the kinds of incidental activities that help define and enrich a community, and that are missing in some of Bryn Mawr’s other buildings.

6. Landscape

The landscape at Bryn Mawr helps make the campus a place where, in the words of a first-time visitor, “everywhere you look seems like a picture from a College brochure.” The character of landscape spaces is closely related to the campus’ varied topography: rectilinear quadrangles at level areas along New Gulph and Merion, and romantic landscapes in the valleys to the north and west. Coe Lee Robinson Roesch’s 1991 master plan for the campus identified important landscape spaces, including large scale spaces – like The Green, Senior Row and the quadrangle greens – and Rhoads Beach, as well as more intimate landscapes such as Thomas Cloisters and the Taft Garden. There are problem landscapes as well, particularly around service and parking areas. In some areas, the rolling hills and lawns that give the campus its visual appeal make for awkward pedestrian links to uses outside the core, particularly across the valley to the western portion of campus.
C. ORGANIZATIONAL AXES

Over the course of this study we have mapped existing College-wide systems of circulation, use, and landscape, in part to study how these meet (or don’t meet) campus needs today.

A strong north-south axis exists in the palimpsest of Lombaert Avenue. Along it, Senior Row leads from Pembroke Arch north, running beside a steep valley. Another double row of trees lies on the axis from Pembroke Arch to the main entrance of Erdman. (We believe this relationship will be even better when the two conifers obscuring the view of Pembroke Arch are removed.) This axial arrangement once served the most important College gateway, at Pembroke Arch (the former intersection of Merion and Lombaert), but other access points are more commonly used today and, for most of its length, this axis is a vista more than a circulation route; it gives little access laterally and leads to few destinations, as it is contained within campus boundaries by Erdman at the southern end, and Ward, Schwartz and a steep slope to the north. A subset of the major visual axis is created by the slope of the campus, from Taylor northwest to the playing fields and Cambrian (formerly Faculty) Row. This too is visual and does not reflect in circulation patterns.

Other, more workaday axes parallel Senior Row. The path to the east extends from Park Science, past the Campus Center, to Dalton and across Merion Avenue to Cartref and the Health Center. The path to the west of Senior Row begins at a secondary entrance to Pembroke past Thomas and Canaday down a steep slope to the Gymnasium, and back up a steep slope to the Roberts Road crosswalk to Brecon. Since Cambrian Row and Multi-Cultural House were developed, this path has increased in use and importance — but students tell us that these uses still feel far from the center. (In our meetings with students, they called it the “walk through the Valley of Death.”) An east-west path parallel to Roberts Road passes along the campus side of Multi-Cultural Center and Cambrian Row; this path could be extended to the now-vacant buildings north of Schwartz Gymnasium. How might this path — or another along Roberts Road — help make better connections to West House?

The east-west path axis along Merion Avenue has newly renovated academic buildings — Dalton and Bettws-Y-Coed — at each end. Views of Perry House visually extend this axis eastward. Could new uses on the Perry-Arnecliffe property take advantage of this existing path?

An east-west path begins at Merion Gate, extends along Merion and Rhoads Drives, passes the entrance to the Lusty Cup, and ends at Goodhart and Rockefeller Halls. Unlike the major north-south axes, this one meets the campus periphery at both ends, and extends across Merion Avenue to Bettws-Y-Coed. It also offers the possibility of extension across New Gulph Road to the area between Russian and Arnecliffe (not all of which is owned by the College) to the east. This path has been improved since the 1997 Concept Plan, particularly around Rhoads and Canaday. Further knitting together areas along this path could help improve the campus entrance from Merion Gate and also help make Goodhart feel more central. How might the planned improvements to Goodhart alter or intensify circulation patterns in this area?

Another workaday path roughly parallels the Merion-Goodhart path, formed by a series of entrances — including secondary ones — to academic buildings, including Dalton, Guild, Taylor, and Thomas, and leading to Rockefeller Arch. The new addition to Dalton has helped crystallize the eastern end of this path, and the renovation and addition to Bettws-Y-Coed has given it an important western terminus.
D. CONNECTIONS AND PROBLEM CONNECTIONS

Some of the campus’ most loved characteristics – its rolling topography, distant views and setting within a suburban community – make connections from the core to outlying areas – and between outlying areas – problematic:

Schwartz Gymnasium and Cambrian Row. The same topography that allows spectacular distant views of Cambrian Row and its vegetated slope from Senior Row makes getting there cumbersome and exaggerates the Row’s distance from the campus core.

West House. At present, none of the major axes described above extends to the area around West House. This area, at the corner of Roberts and Wyndon, feels disconnected from the rest of the main campus block, and there are no sidewalks connecting it to Cambrian Row or Brecon. There are no direct paths leading from the campus core to this area, and routes from the fields or Cambrian Row are interrupted by the tennis court fencing (except for one narrow, uninviting passageway). Could relocating the tennis courts and replacing them with “inward” (campus) facing development help link this area to the rest of campus?

Brecon-Batten-Longmaid. Batten House and Longmaid are nestled in the wooded slopes of the site. Owing to topography and the deep setback from Roberts Road, even Brecon feels remote, not only from the campus core, but also from the Gym and Cambrian Row, just across Roberts. In addition to improved street crossings and paths, what patterns of development could help link the two sides of Roberts Road?

English House and Russian Center. These buildings – truly fuori le mura – are nestled into Morris Woods, and the perception of their separation from the campus core is part of their charm. Still, the physical connection across New Gulph is indirect and inaccessible to those with mobility impairments. Improved paths – to the main campus and, if possible, to the Arnecliffe-Perry block – should be part of any plan for the parcel’s future.

Park Science. The parking lot between Park Science and the back of Radnor adds to the sense of separation between Park and the campus core. In the future, a new academic building between Radnor and Park could help connect the Science center to the academic core – but it might make sense to reserve that site until there is a need for a new facility related to the sciences.


Arnecliffe and Perry. The views toward campus from the Arnecliffe-Perry site – and the views of Perry House from Merion Avenue – provide some perceptual connection to the campus. Reinforcing this connection could help make this site a more integral part of campus. An improved crossing of New Gulph – perhaps incorporating an all-way stop – could help link the site to the campus core and the Merion-Morris block. A sidewalk along the east side of New Gulph, if allowed by the Township, would help make better connections to the English-Russian property as well. (A sidewalk could require some segments of retaining wall to mitigate the slope.)
pre-1894
1896-1909
1910-1924
1925-1939
1940-1954
1955-1964
1965-1979
1980-1997
1997-2008

New Buildings
- TAYLOR Hall, 1887
- MERION Hall, 1885
- RADNOR Hall, 1887
- DENBIGH Hall, 1891
- DALTON Hall, 1893
- GYMNASIUM
- LOW BUILDINGS (building in this location appears on 1894 topographical map)
- SUPERINTENDENT’S COTTAGE and Workshop
- GYMNASIUM, 1883

Acquisitions beyond perimeter
- CARSTENS (President Rhodes House, 1884)
- ORIGINAL CAMPUS – 32 acres between Merion, Roberts, Gulph, and Yarrow
- 9.55 acres plot west of Yarrow added, 1897?

Additions to existing buildings
- DEANERY expanded, 1890
- DEANERY rebuilt, 1907
- THOMAS wing added, 1940

Change of activities of buildings
- Former faculty
  - The DEANERY
  - YARROW
  - Building south of Yarrow

Change of activities of parts of buildings
- OLD GYMNASIUM, 19007
- BUILDINGS BETWEEN AND AROUND CARSTENS and CARSTENS (plan)

Demolition
- Old Gymnasium, 19007
- BUILDINGS BETWEEN AND AROUND MELFARIAN and CARSTENS (plan)
- LOW BUILDINGS (lower Science lot)

Circulation and Parking
- Lombard Street closed between Merion and Gulph
- Yarrow Road north of Merion annexed and demolished, 1893
- Drive from Merion gate makes a rectangular loop extending north of Rhoads.
- The Deanery driveway does not connect with the main campus drives.
- Pedestrian paths are very similar to present situation, except that there is a path interrupting the Green.

Landscape
- Trees along Mount street retained (eventually Senior Row)
- Playing fields added, 1907
- SUMMER GARDENS (Katharine By Tiffany Memorial Garden), 1929
- Trees along campus maintained

Campus Plans
- Galvani Van’s landscape plan, 1882
- Frederick Law Olmsted plan, 1895
- Ralph Adams Cram plan, 1925
- Douglas Orr plan, 1956

Parcels Sold
- fig. 10. Development Patterns of the Campus.

This chart includes examples of types of change and development undertaken by the College, but is not comprehensive.
Dates are approximate, and have been extrapolated from drawings, aerial photographs, and other sources.
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1. View from Cambrian Row of Rhoads
2. View from Senior Row of Cambrian Row
3. View from Labyrinth of Cambrian Row & Athletic Fields
4. View from Rhoads Beach of the pond
5. View of Rhoads from Merion Avenue
6. View of Senior Row
7. View of Pembroke Arch from Erdman Hall
8. View from Perry House
Vistas, Landmarks, and Iconic Greens
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1. View of the Gateway Building

2. View of Rockefeller Arch

3. View of Goodhart Hall along Merion Ave.

4. View at the intersection of Wyndon Ave. and Roberts Rd.

5. View of Brecon from Roberts Rd.

6. View of vacant house and Multicultural Center

7. View at the intersection of New Gulph and Roberts Rd.

8. View along New Gulph

9. View at the intersection of New Gulph and Morris Ave.
Existing Precincts by Use
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Student Residence Occupancies
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Gateways

The College is viewed by the public in many different ways. How visitors approach the College and the experience of entering the College should be memorable.

Another consideration is what images of the college could be used for promotional purposes. The "Postcard" of the campus are spaces where parents might photograph the students or where yearbook images are taken.

KEY

- BRYN MAWR COLLEGE FACILITY
- ROAD AND PARKING LOTS
- PATH
- PUBLIC/HIGH VOLUME GATEWAY
- CAMPUS/LOW VOLUME GATEWAY
- POSTCARD VIEWS

Gateways/Postcard Views
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April 25, 2008
Sacred Spaces

The College is steeped in traditions. Many of the traditions and ceremonies use outdoor spaces. A partial listing of these spaces is outlined below.

1. Senior Row
2. Morris Woods
3. McBride Arch
4. Rockefeller Arch
5. Cherry Walk
6. Thomas Cloisters
7. Sunken Garden
8. Taft Garden
9. Labyrinth
10. Taylor Steps
11. Marian Grove
12. Rhoads Beach
13. Erdman Allée

Sacred Spaces
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Traditions
Every college campus has time-honored traditions. Below is a partial list of Bryn Mawr’s.
1. Hoop Races
2. May Day
3. Commencement
4. Ringing of bell at end of exams and Step Sing
5. Garden Party
6. Lantern Night

Tradition Spaces
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
Campus Master Planning
Base Map Source: 
Information Source: 
April 25, 2008
III. MGOPIO: OVERVIEW
III. MGOPIO: OVERVIEW

Here, we present the Mission, Goals, Opportunities, Problems, Issues and Options (MGOPIO) of the plan. Selected options are described in Section V of this report.

A. COLLEGE MISSION

Here, as a preamble to the MGOPIO of the plan, we reproduce the College’s published mission statement:

The mission of Bryn Mawr College is to provide a rigorous education and to encourage the pursuit of knowledge as preparation for life and work. Bryn Mawr teaches and values critical, creative and independent habits of thought and expression in an undergraduate liberal arts curriculum for women and in coeducational graduate programs in arts and sciences and social work and social research. Bryn Mawr seeks to sustain a community diverse in nature and democratic in practice, for we believe that only through considering many perspectives do we gain a deeper understanding of each other and the world.

Since its founding in 1885, the College has maintained its character as a small residential community which fosters close working relationships between faculty and students. The faculty of teacher/scholars emphasizes learning through conversation and collaboration, primary reading, original research and experimentation. Our cooperative relationship with Haverford College enlarges the academic opportunities for students and their social community. Our active ties to Swarthmore College and the University of Pennsylvania, and the proximity of the city of Philadelphia further extend the opportunities available at Bryn Mawr.

Living and working together in a community based on mutual respect, personal integrity and the standards of a social and academic Honor Code, each generation of students contributes to and sustains a self-governing society within the College. The academic and co-curricular experiences fostered by Bryn Mawr, both on campus and in the College’s wider setting, encourage students to be responsible citizens who provide service to and leadership for an increasingly interdependent world. -- Approved December 1998

B. PLAN OVERVIEW

1. Mission and Goals of the Plan

Key themes and goals of the plan are that it:

- Preserve and maintain the beautiful historic core campus and landscape in ways that support the mission of the College and foster “the unique traditions and distinctive qualities that set this institution apart.” (excerpt from Plan for a New Century)
- Support a diverse community of undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and staff, and provide opportunities for social interaction and communal activities.
- Plan for academic facilities that support “the scholarly community” and foster innovation, collaboration and creativity.
- Plan for student life facilities that attract, support and foster well-rounded, disciplined and healthy students.
- Plan facilities and landscapes that help attract and retain students, faculty and staff of the highest caliber.
- Support a safe and amenable pedestrian campus experience, while increasing accessibility and meeting the needs for access, parking and service.
- Foster environmental stewardship on campus, and plan for facilities, policies and practices that move the institution toward its aim of climate neutrality.
- Foster innovation without significant expansion in the near term, and identify channels of growth and expansion for the long term. (excerpt from Plan for a New Century)

2. Opportunities

- A planning process that promotes an understanding of the campus as a whole can help prioritize the many needs competing for Bryn Mawr’s resources, and provide a framework for meeting them while strengthening the overall cohesion and identity of the campus.
- Widespread admiration of – and affection for – the beautiful historic core and landscape could help build support for preservation and rehabilitation. (On the other hand, these sentiments could make even necessary change controversial.)
- Multiple connections to the city and region could reinforce Bryn Mawr’s identity as an intellectual and cultural resource, and provide students with a greater diversity of experience.
- Continued cooperation with other colleges and universities – including the bi-college agreement with Haverford – could help inform the plan.

3. Problems

- Patterns of campus growth have resulted in a series of small enclaves separated from the campus core by busy streets. How can these parts be related and connected to form a more coherent whole?
- The historic campus core requires extensive maintenance and upgrading to keep in working order, but has limited opportunity for creating new spaces.
- Lower Merion Township regulations, particularly their limits on impervious surface, limit campus development – particularly on the Merion-Morris and West House parcels, which are already over the limits, and at the core.
- The lovely hilly landscape, which offers beautiful vistas, limits the campus’ ability to accommodate buildings and athletics fields, and makes accessibility problematic for people with mobility issues. In addition, the vistas create a sense that the western portion of campus is far away.
- Several campus buildings – including historic buildings like Thomas, Goodhart, and Taylor, and “new” buildings like Park Science and Schwartz Gymnasium – require significant investment in infrastructure to meet current standards for safety, accessibility, comfort and/or use.
Key
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- **POTENTIAL TO CHANGE**
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4. Issues and Options

Here we list some themes and questions that could be central to the plan:

- How should campus facilities encourage communal activity, while also allowing for private study and reflection?
- How should the campus plan combine a clear framework for growth with long-term flexibility? How should preservation and conservation be balanced with growth?
- Expansion within the core is limited by Township impervious surface regulations; expansion to the east and south are limited by the Baldwin and Shipley campuses, respectively.
- How should the campus use the limited area available for infill on the central campus block(s)? For what uses should this finite resource be reserved? For example, should administrative uses be moved from Cartref and Helfarian to free those buildings for academic use?
- Should campus expansion be northward, toward the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR)? The development of Cambrian Row suggests northward expansion, but even Brecon feels “too far” for many in the Bryn Mawr community.
- Should the campus expand to the east, with new uses near Perry, Arnecliffe, Russian and English? How could Bryn Mawr more fully use – and connect – these steeply sloped, wooded sites?
- Should close but non-contiguous properties be considered for some administrative uses? Or should administration move across New Gulph to free Cartref and Helfarian for academic uses? What other uses could be located away from the center?

Some further thoughts on property acquisition are included in Section V.

- How should areas outside the central core be linked to the center and to each other? What mix of uses and activities should be in each area? How should the campus precincts – fuori le mura – outside the walls – differ in use and “feel” from the campus core? What attributes should they share? How can they be better connected to the core while making the most of their distinct characteristics?
- How should conflicts between program uses, preservation cost be brokered? How should the College’s finite resources be spent?
- How will the planned renovation of Goodhart influence campus patterns of use, activity and circulation?

C. PRESERVATION, MAINTENANCE AND CHARACTER

1. Mission and Goals

- Preserve and maintain the beautiful historic core campus and landscape that helps support Bryn Mawr’s academic and social mission and “the unique traditions and distinctive qualities that set this institution apart.”
- Sensitive restore historic buildings while accommodating new uses, modernizing infrastructure, and meeting current standards for safety, security, accessibility and comfort.
- Create mechanisms to increase funding for scheduled maintenance of existing buildings, potentially preventing the need for more extensive restoration and rehabilitation work in the future.
- Continue to build new buildings that are designed with durable and sustainable materials that require minimal maintenance, and endow each new building to cover maintenance costs.

2. Opportunities

- The beautiful historic core and landscape elicit a strong emotional response from students, faculty, staff and alumni, providing strong support for preservation
- The Facilities Department created a 10 year look ahead diagram to highlight the conditions of the existing buildings as well as an extensive maintenance and repair log detailing the work required.
- As buildings are renovated, their functions can be reviewed and reconfigured to allow better adjacencies.

3. Problems

- The historic campus core requires extensive maintenance and upgrading to keep it in working order, but has limited opportunity for creating new spaces.
- Thomas and Taylor, in particular, are in need of restoration and renovation. So, too, is Goodhart. A project is underway to complete renovations to Goodhart by August 2009.
- The importance to the College’s mission of many uses housed in historic buildings – and a lack of swing space – makes vacating buildings for extensive renovation problematic.
- In some places, existing plantings have encroached on historic buildings, causing additional building deterioration. However, these plantings are seen by many as important components of the campus image. How should affection for the plantings and the condition of the buildings be balanced?

4. Issues and Options

- Some of the smaller, less iconic buildings on Bryn Mawr’s campus – for example, the Pagoda and former houses like Helfarian and those along Roberts Road – nonetheless contribute to the character of the campus and its edges. The cost of renovation could, in some cases, exceed that of accommodating uses in new buildings. How should value be assigned to these structures, and priorities be set for their preservation, renovation or removal? How should preservation and aesthetics be factored into decision-making?
- How should the historic value “scores” assigned by the Campus Heritage Preservation Initiative be considered in decision-making?
- How should preservation and conservation be balanced with growth? -- Expansion within the core is limited by Township impervious surface regulations; expansion to the east and south are limited by the Baldwin and Shipley campuses, respectively.
- Should the campus expand to the east, with new uses near Perry, Arnecliffe, Russian and English? How could Bryn Mawr more fully use – and connect – these steeply sloped, wooded sites?
- Should close but non-contiguous properties be considered for some administrative uses? Or should administration move across New Gulph to free Cartref and Helfarian for academic uses? What other uses could be located away from the center?

Some further thoughts on property acquisition are included in Section V.

- How should areas outside the central core be linked to the center and to each other? What mix of uses and activities should be in each area? How should the campus precincts – fuori le mura – outside the walls – differ in use and “feel” from the campus core? What attributes should they share? How can they be better connected to the core while making the most of their distinct characteristics?
- How should conflicts between program uses, preservation cost be brokered? How should the College’s finite resources be spent?
- How will the planned renovation of Goodhart influence campus patterns of use, activity and circulation?

C. PRESERVATION, MAINTENANCE AND CHARACTER

1. Mission and Goals

- Preserve and maintain the beautiful historic core campus and landscape that helps support Bryn Mawr’s academic and social mission and “the unique traditions and distinctive qualities that set this institution apart.”
- Sensitive restore historic buildings while accommodating new uses, modernizing infrastructure, and meeting current standards for safety, security, accessibility and comfort.
- Create mechanisms to increase funding for scheduled maintenance of existing buildings, potentially preventing the need for more extensive restoration and rehabilitation work in the future.
- Continue to build new buildings that are designed with durable and sustainable materials that require minimal maintenance, and endow each new building to cover maintenance costs.

2. Opportunities

- The beautiful historic core and landscape elicit a strong emotional response from students, faculty, staff and alumni, providing strong support for preservation
- The Facilities Department created a 10 year look ahead diagram to highlight the conditions of the existing buildings as well as an extensive maintenance and repair log detailing the work required.
- As buildings are renovated, their functions can be reviewed and reconfigured to allow better adjacencies.

3. Problems

- The historic campus core requires extensive maintenance and upgrading to keep it in working order, but has limited opportunity for creating new spaces.
- Thomas and Taylor, in particular, are in need of restoration and renovation. So, too, is Goodhart. A project is underway to complete renovations to Goodhart by August 2009.
- The importance to the College’s mission of many uses housed in historic buildings – and a lack of swing space – makes vacating buildings for extensive renovation problematic.
- In some places, existing plantings have encroached on historic buildings, causing additional building deterioration. However, these plantings are seen by many as important components of the campus image. How should affection for the plantings and the condition of the buildings be balanced?

4. Issues and Options

- Some of the smaller, less iconic buildings on Bryn Mawr’s campus – for example, the Pagoda and former houses like Helfarian and those along Roberts Road – nonetheless contribute to the character of the campus and its edges. The cost of renovation could, in some cases, exceed that of accommodating uses in new buildings. How should value be assigned to these structures, and priorities be set for their preservation, renovation or removal? How should preservation and aesthetics be factored into decision-making?
- How should the historic value “scores” assigned by the Campus Heritage Preservation Initiative be considered in decision-making?
- How should preservation and conservation be balanced with growth? -- Expansion within the core is limited by Township impervious surface regulations; expansion to the east and south are limited by the Baldwin and Shipley campuses, respectively.
- Should the campus expand to the east, with new uses near Perry, Arnecliffe, Russian and English? How could Bryn Mawr more fully use – and connect – these steeply sloped, wooded sites?
- Should close but non-contiguous properties be considered for some administrative uses? Or should administration move across New Gulph to free Cartref and Helfarian for academic uses? What other uses could be located away from the center?

Some further thoughts on property acquisition are included in Section V.

- How should areas outside the central core be linked to the center and to each other? What mix of uses and activities should be in each area? How should the campus precincts – fuori le mura – outside the walls – differ in use and “feel” from the campus core? What attributes should they share? How can they be better connected to the core while making the most of their distinct characteristics?
- How should conflicts between program uses, preservation cost be brokered? How should the College’s finite resources be spent?
- How will the planned renovation of Goodhart influence campus patterns of use, activity and circulation?

fig. 11. Bryn Mawr Student Population Growth
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D. CIRCULATION, ACCESSIBILITY AND PARKING

1 Mission and Goals

- Create safe, auspicious and accessible pedestrian routes between campus activities, including those outside traditional campus boundaries.
- Create better physical linkages across the valley between the campus core and the western portion of campus.
- Promote the use of bicycles and public transit.
- Provide adequate parking without significantly changing the character of the campus.
- Continue to improve wayfinding on campus, both inside buildings (particularly Park Science) and outside.
- Allow for sensitive restoration of historic buildings, while improving accessibility and wayfinding.
- Where possible, create accessible routes in the landscape between buildings.

2. Opportunities

- The sidewalk required by the Township for the Goodhart renovation could prompt the College to consider extending perimeter sidewalks. Providing sidewalks along perimeter streets could help improve pedestrian safety and help link areas of campus – for example, between Brecon and West House.
- Creating a long range accessibility plan could help set priorities for future building and landscape renovations.
- Paving selected mud paths could improve pedestrian safety, accessibility and landscape maintenance.
- Cooperating with the Township to build structured parking near the Bryn Mawr train station could meet some of the College’s needs with minimal impact on the campus landscape.
- The rolling landscape could, perhaps, be used to help mask new parking structures.

3. Problems

- Pedestrian connections across perimeter roads to uses that have “jumped” the traditional campus boundaries are difficult, potentially dangerous, and largely inaccessible to those with impaired mobility.
- There are no sidewalks along New Gulph or Roberts Road, and few elsewhere on the campus perimeter.
- Some connections that look easy in plan are complicated by steep terrain. For example, pedestrian access from the campus core to the Gym, or to West House, is difficult and requires multiple, steep changes of grade.
- Mud paths have been worn across Merion Green, but new paved paths in this area are controversial.
- There is at least a perceived shortage of parking, but some students and others are concerned that providing more parking would result in more cars on campus. This shortage would be magnified with the integration of the GSSWSR into the main campus.
- There are few “good” spots for a parking structure – especially near areas where demand is high. The most-often mentioned site, the lower Science parking lot, might otherwise be used for expansion of the Sciences in the long term, and is considered too far from the core for some users. What other sites should be considered?
- The hilly landscape makes accessibility problematic for those with impaired mobility. Most campus buildings, including dormitories, are not fully accessible.
- The most accessible dormitory building – Rhoads – is in a difficult-to-access area of campus. Dormitory access – including universal access to common rooms – is desired for both students with mobility impairments and for those who have families and friends with disabilities.
- Many important College administrative functions – including the President and undergraduate Deans – are located in Taylor, which is not accessible to those with impaired mobility.
- Accessible connections to some parts of campus rely on using an automobile.

4. Issues and Options

- Should structured parking be considered? Some options are considered in Section V.D.
- How should uses be allocated to buildings to allow the most public functions to be in accessible locations?
- Could demand for parking be reduced? Some options are discussed in Section V.D

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.

- 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. 12. Terms of the United States Department of Justice Settlements with Swarthmore College, the University of Chicago, and Colorado College (Source: Department of Justice Website)
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E. LANDSCAPE

1. Mission and Goals

• Preserve and maintain a beloved landscape, and plan for its continuation beyond the expected life span of current plantings.
• Continue to follow, and advocate, the policies and procedures established by the Campus Landscape Advisory Committee for preservation and maintenance. (See Section I.B.)
• Continue to accommodate the many College traditions in the landscape including May Day, Hoop Race, Lantern Night, Illumination Night and Alumnae reunions.
• As noted by the Grounds Department in 2004, goals include “updating the inventory of campus trees” and “originating a program of removing invasive trees that are impeding the health and growth of native and specimen trees on campus.”
• Create guidelines for the landscape including plantings, hardscapes and lighting for a more consistent appearance. Continue to follow and monitor existing guidelines for signage.
• Improve the athletic fields and provide, to the extent feasible, more recreational opportunities.
• Provide opportunities for outdoor classroom and study space.

2. Opportunities

• The campus has many unique large specimen trees and plantings. How should their value be communicated and reinforced?
• More extensive use of native plantings and perennials in colorful planting beds could help attract wildlife, could be better environmentally than non-native species, and could perhaps be coordinated with teaching.
• Working with the science faculty could help create sustainable practices for the landscape and campus and coordinate areas for experimentation.
• The pond helps filter some of the campus and Township’s water runoff, and also serves as a “common focal point for biology, chemistry, geology and cities, encouraging interdisciplinary work.” How could it be more fully integrated into the campus landscape?
• Morris Woods offers many large specimen trees and is also used for teaching. There have been discussions about foresting some of the trees – what are the arguments for and against?
• In 2004, the Grounds Department noted an opportunity to “clean up the grounds dump site and transition it into a functioning recycling/storage area for materials.” Could this also be an opportunity to make the College’s sustainability efforts more apparent?

3. Problems

• Some of the existing large trees are in decline and toward the end of their lifespans.
• Without a plan for tree renewal, the long-term preservation of Senior Row could be in jeopardy.
• As described in Section C, overgrown vegetation threatens the condition of some of the campus’ historic buildings.
• There are some exotic and potentially invasive species on the hillside adjacent to Cambrian Row. How could these be phased out and replaced with native plantings, while still providing multiple seasons of color?
• The existing athletic fields are undersized and have poor drainage, limiting their usability. Also, there is no place to sit and to watch events taking place on the fields. Limited flat space on campus makes fitting athletic fields and spaces difficult.

4. Issues and Options

• The landscape of the core campus is majestic, yet intimate, and the open greensward has largely been preserved. How should the more Romantic character of the landscape fuori le mura – outside the “walls” of the core campus – be developed as use of these areas intensifies? What landscape traits should these areas have in common? How should they be different?
• Should the campus become an arboretum? Would this help attract support for the landscape maintenance endowment envisioned by the Campus Landscape Advisory Committee?
• How are funds for pruning and maintaining trees allocated? Careful maintenance can extend the life of a tree; without it, a tree can be lost forever.
• A plan is needed to allow for careful staggered replacement of trees nearing the end of their lifecycles, including those on Senior Row. Such a plan should preserve the appearance of the campus and maintain the canopy where possible. Beyond replacing invasive species with native plantings, should all of the trees be replaced in kind or should different types of planting be considered?
• How should the many memorials on the campus be woven into the landscape?
• Exterior furniture on campus is mostly limited to park benches. What other types of seating could be added to allow for more collaborative type spaces outside? Picnic tables? Movable chairs? Adirondack chairs?
• The existing landscape is maintained through an outsourced contract. How close is the contract to achieving the College’s goal of “preserving and maintaining its historic landscape and grounds using integrated pest management techniques…in order to protect the environment?” What changes might be necessary to achieve this goal?
• There are a number of exterior sites on campus used for campus events. How well do the spaces meet the needs of these events? Is more infrastructure needed at these locations?
• How could important landscapes – for example, Thomas Cloister, or the areas used for Alumnae events – be made more accessible?
• A comprehensive landscape plan would provide direction for the maintenance and improvement of Bryn Mawr’s outdoor spaces.

Next steps, as suggested by the College’s landscape consultant, could include:

-- Creating maintenance zones for campus which outline the level and intensity of appropriate landscape maintenance.
-- Reviewing site drainage patterns and developing best management practices to correct problem areas.
-- Setting priorities for improvement of physical and visual qualities of specific landscape areas, and developing cost estimates for use in raising funds for these potential “postcard views.”
-- Reviewing landscaping along perimeter roads, removing invasive plants and improving embankments with native trees, shrubs, groundcovers and perennials.
-- Reviewing screen plantings at parking lots for site orientation/wayfinding clues and safety.
-- Repairing areas of erosion and and wash-outs.
-- Repairing the campus path system, replacing broken, cracked and missing pavement areas.
-- Repairing “cow paths” where people are using short-cuts across lawn areas.
-- Providing tree and shrub replacements at foundation of buildings – creating subtle massings for visual interest (not “parsley around the pig.”)
-- Installing a sub-layer of vegetation in Taft Garden under over pruned plantings.
-- Improving soil in planting beds, provide new topsoil and mulch.
F. ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY

1. Mission and Goals
   - President Vickers has 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?
   - How should Bryn Mawr College’s Green Plan Statement of Goals be augmented? What current practices could provide a foundation for the College’s plan?

2. Opportunities
   - How could the expertise of the Environmental Studies faculty help guide sustainable practices for the landscape and campus? Could this effort be incorporated into the curriculum?
   - How could student interest in environmental issues help the College create and implement a plan for sustainability, and inform our current planning?
   - The Bryn Mawr Facilities Department is already actively reviewing energy consumption and looking at ways to reduce consumption through technology. How should this plan be expanded?
   - Could the integrated strategic, financial and physical planning and collaborative decision-making that resulted in Bryn Mawr’s stormwater management pond be a model for other projects with large-scale environmental impact?
   - The need to renovate some of the campus’ most historic buildings could provide an opportunity to make them more energy-efficient.

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 the College’s priorities be reflected in our planning?
   - What options are already being considered?
   - Should the College consider pursuing LEED accreditation for future projects? If so, at what level?
   - 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? Should more fuel-efficient buses be considered?
   - What environmental policies and practices are in place at other institutions, and what can Bryn Mawr 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 back temperatures 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, as well as forty student employees. In 2004, the University committed to six 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 convinces 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.
     - Dartmouth saw a reduction in water usage after replacing outdated washing machines in dormitories with high-efficiency front-loading units.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE’S GREEN PLAN STATEMENT OF GOALS

I. Environmental literacy and education
   A. Integrate environmental knowledge into all relevant disciplines, where practicable
   B. Expand undergraduate environmental studies course offerings
   C. Encourage environmental research opportunities
   D. Expand opportunities for using the campus as a laboratory for environmental studies
   E. Provide opportunities for the entire community to participate in environmental education initiatives

II. Greening our campus operations
   A. Reduce campus waste
   B. Institute environmentally responsible purchasing policies
   C. Maximize energy efficiency
   D. Make environmental sustainability a priority in building planning, campus land-use, and transportation

III. Campus and community
   A. Work to make the Bryn Mawr community a role model for the Larger community
   B. Maintain an environmental center for students, staff, faculty, and administrators
   C. Make public our commitment to environmental responsibility and education
   D. Recognize achievements as a community and work to increase community involvement
   E. Seek to create effective alliances with neighboring educational institutions

fig. 13. Bryn Mawr College’s Green Plan Statement of Goals
G. STUDENT LIFE

1. Mission and Goals

- Preserve, augment and add interior and exterior spaces that help build the Bryn Mawr community of students, faculty and staff by providing natural places in buildings and landscapes for people to meet. These places can (and, in many cases, do) exist at various scales – the scale of a class or College, for example (Merion Green during May Day), a building or department (the lounges in the Dalton stair tower) or a small conversation between individuals (a pair of seats in the landscape, perhaps).
- Preserve the character of existing housing – fondly thought of by students, alumnae and potential students – while making it more accessible and amenable. Identify potential locations for future housing, and possibly consider broadening the range of housing units to include more self-contained suites and apartment-style units.
- Provide more opportunities for students to interact with faculty, and encourage faculty to be part of the community beyond their work.
- Provide opportunities for recreation and outlets for creativity, including spaces for making art; practicing and performing music, dance and theater; and exercising and playing sports.

2. Opportunities

- The importance to students of “living with friends” could help influence decisions about what kind of housing to build when it is needed. Students want privacy – single rooms or two-room doubles – but also communal spaces, including places to cook with friends. The configuration of rooms above Pembroke Arch was mentioned as a possible model.
- Some of the earlier dormitories on campus – like Merion, Radnor and Denbigh – are both institutional and domestic in scale, with friendly front porches and lawns. Living rooms and libraries add to this sense of domesticity, and dining halls – originally, one in every dorm – add to this sense of communal living. How should this Bryn Mawr model be adapted to new residence halls?
- Meeting potential need for new housing could help add density and “critical mass” to an outlying area of campus – building on residential communities near Brecon or Perry, for example.
- The wide hallways in some of the existing dormitories were described as “pluses” in terms of building community and “hanging out” together.
- Rhys Carpenter Library was described to us as “where everyone wants to be at night.” Administrators (who were also alumnae) shared memories of the Thomas Great Hall before its renovation as a place to go to talk or study, and for incidental meetings between students and faculty. What lessons can we learn from these spaces?
- The new program pairing students and staff members and encouraging them to learn from each other could lead to new ways of using existing spaces, or to the need for new kinds of space.
- Edward Larrabee Barnes, as paraphrased by one of the administrators we spoke to, described Bryn Mawr as a place where one student could lean out a window and call to another on the ground. Maintaining this intimate scale could continue to help connect the Bryn Mawr community.
- Planning for improved athletic facilities (See Section V.B) could give rise to opportunities for spaces that help build community and support creative activities, while promoting health, wellness and fitness. Improving Park Science could provide similar opportunities to build community.

3. Problems

- Much about the physical campus reinforces the notion of Bryn Mawr as a place to (only) study. There are few places for parties, for example, and little communal outdoor seating. There are few places to “just hang out.” Where these spaces exist – for example, in Dalton and Bettws-Y-Coed, how well are they used?
- Cambrian Row feels to many very far from dorms and academic spaces, and better physical connections should be a priority to encourage still more students to take advantage of its first-rate facilities.
- There are few – if any – places for non-majors to dance, perform music or theater, or make art.
- Some of the dormitories present particular challenges. For example, many feel that Erdman is “cold,” that its hallways do not foster social interaction, and that its common spaces are oversized and difficult to use.
- Residents in Brecon must travel across campus to Erdman for breakfast – particularly inconvenient for those whose first class is in Park Science.
- Students feel that the furnishings in the dormitories are outdated, inflexible and uncomfortable. This applies to individual rooms and to common spaces. Furniture in some renovated common spaces has been described as “too sedate, formal and ladylike.”
- Students noted that the heat in their rooms isn’t always adequate, and that laundry and bathroom facilities are outdated. Maintaining a large number of historic buildings while keeping them online during the school year is a challenge.

4. Issues and Options

- The dining system is an integral part of the Bryn Mawr experience, but those who live in Brecon are far from the nearest dining hall. Is there some density of students living northwest of the campus core that would make a dining hall (or perhaps a breakfast café) there feasible or desirable?
- Should a café be included in the Schwartz Gym improvement project?
- What kinds of places in the landscape could help encourage more interaction? Picnic tables rather than park benches?
- How can Cambrian Row be made to feel more “central” to campus? By more direct paths or a bridge over the valley separating it from the campus core? By adding more housing – or other uses – nearby? Should program changes be contemplated?
- What types of alternative housing should be considered in future student housing? Some feel that smaller clusters of rooms with shared communal space would encourage students to interact. These might include shared kitchens, to allow students to cook for each other on weekends and for special events. (Cambrian Row offers a kitchen but the distance and policy of signing up ahead of time limit its use.)
- Should residential life staff live in dorms? Currently, they do not, but some administrators feel that returning to such a model would help students deal with the stresses of living away from home. What physical changes would be required?
- Should more faculty housing be provided on campus, particularly for new faculty? Some report seeing faculty who live on campus or nearby much more frequently than those who live at a distance.
- Could large-scale artwork – perhaps additional tapestries – be added to common spaces in Erdman? What other additions could make the spaces feel more “home” while respecting the character of this architecturally significant (if somewhat unloved by its inhabitants) building?
IV. MGOPIO: SUBAREAS AND KEY CONCERNS
IV. MGOPIO: SUBAREAS AND KEY CONCERNS

A. WELLNESS, RECREATION AND ATHLETICS

1. Mission and Goals
   • Plan for student facilities that attract and support well-rounded, disciplined and health-conscious students.
   • The Plan for a New Century calls for “expanding opportunities in athletics” to “meet the expectations” of students and to “continue to attract many of our most disciplined and accomplished applicants.”
   • Create places that support not only fitness and athletic competition, but also wellness, community and creativity.

2. Opportunities
   • Bryn Mawr’s long tradition of encouraging (and requiring) women to participate in athletics could help engender support for improved facilities. In meetings with students, there was a groundswell of support for improved or new athletics facilities – from non-athletes as well as from a very enthusiastic group of student athletes.
   • Re-imagining the Gym and its surrounding areas could help create a better connection to the northwestern portion of campus. This concept was demonstrated to the community by a previous study for an addition to the Gym.
   • The prominent, visible location of the athletics fields could – with the addition of seating, perhaps built into the hillside – help reinforce the idea of collegiate sports as a community-wide activity.
   • The desire to reorient the tennis courts to a north-south orientation could lead to options for better connections between Cambrian Row and the area around West House.
   • Incorporating wellness and expanded opportunities for recreational activities in an athletics facility could benefit not only athletes but the entire community.
   • The existing landscape could potentially accommodate a jogging path.

3. Problems
   • The existing gym facility does not compare favorably to those of peer institutions, and may be discouraging prospective students. At the same time, the College has indicated that an entirely new facility would not be financially feasible for at least the next two decades.
   • The route from the academic core of campus to the Gym requires multiple changes of grade and feels to students like a “trudge through the Valley of Death.” The route is particularly difficult to students with mobility issues, including those heading to the Gym for physical therapy.
   • Parts of the existing athletic facility – the locker rooms and pool, for example – are in poor condition.
   • Spaces in the existing gym are being taxed beyond capacity. For example, when classes are held in the fitness room, that space is off-limits to others; demand for its use by teams, dance majors, classes, co-curricular activities and individuals overlap and often conflict.

B. SCIENCE

Park Science is very unlike most other Bryn Mawr buildings owing to its large size, its development through successive additions, and its “double H” configuration. It is far (by Bryn Mawr standards) from other academic buildings, and off the east-west axis of academic buildings that extends from Bettws-Y-Coed to Dalton.

1. Mission and Goals
   • Create a science facility that is welcoming, user-friendly and easy to navigate; that reflects and communicates the quality of science education at Bryn Mawr; and that proclaims – to current and prospective students and faculty and other building users and visitors – the institution’s commitment to educating women in the sciences.
   • Nurture an interdisciplinary community of science faculty, undergraduates and post-baccalaureates; provide teaching, research and social spaces and adjacencies that promote interaction across traditional boundaries.
   • Create adequate numbers of flexible, right-sized teaching spaces to meet the growing demand for science education at the College.
   • Provide classroom and teaching laboratory types and sizes that reflect current pedagogies and enrollments, and that are also flexible enough to support anticipated (and some degree of unanticipated) change and growth over the next ten to twenty years. Classrooms and labs should have appropriate technology, with plenty of board space.
   • Provide up-to-date, flexible infrastructure and systems capable of supporting science activities and equipment building-wide.
   • Create a gathering space that allows the community to interact and to showcase research.

2. Opportunities
   • The poor condition of many of Park Science’s spaces and systems offers an opportunity to rethink the building in a more holistic way.
   • A phased renovation or overall master plan could be an opportunity to continue to “tear down the walls” between disciplines.
   • The magnitude of recent investment in certain spaces within Park could lead to a commitment to improve conditions elsewhere in the building.
• The growing trend toward “green” science buildings – including the Science Center at Swarthmore – could help inform the design of new or reconfigured space in Park. The building could also be incorporated into the curriculum.

• The current public displays of mineral collections – and their popularity – could give clues to how the sciences might be communicated in Park.

• Some storage in Park Science could be decanted, freeing up valuable space.

• The new large classroom at the Science Center at Swarthmore is used for other college events and brings people from outside the science community to the building. Could this – a classroom located near community space and available for other uses in off-hours – be a model for Bryn Mawr?

3. Problems

• Park Science was created wing-by-wing and planned discipline-by-discipline; the physical structure, as it is today, encourages boundaries and hinders collegiality and interdisciplinarity. There are no central spaces for people to come together, and no pathway through the building that links all spaces – instead, there are a number of “dead ends” leading to exits. That all floor levels do not extend to all wings further complicates navigation through the building.

• Faculty are using up-to-date teaching methods in a building with labs and classrooms designed for decades-old pedagogy.

• Communal spaces, like lounges, are missing or inadequate. Materials in corridors and other public spaces are outdated and worn.

• Teaching functions in some locations – like the basement – feel “hidden away” and remote.

• Classrooms are not plentiful or large enough to support the growing interest in the sciences. Science faculty report having to walk to Bettws-Y-Coed to teach because of the shortage of classrooms in Park.

• Park Science Building has been renovated incrementally over the years, leading to a great disparity in conditions.

• The library should be easier to find from all areas of the building.

• Park’s infrastructure appears to be inadequate: heating and cooling systems are not consistent; ventilation in some spaces is inadequate; lighting and acoustics are less than ideal. Building systems do not adequately support computer servers, autoclaves, freezers and other equipment.

• Faculty office sizes differ among disciplines – often because of availability rather than need.

• Classrooms are often locked after hours, making them unavailable for student use.

• There is no central computing facility.

• Restrooms and water fountains are too few in number and/or inconveniently located.

• Accessibility and ergonomics in the building are poor. The elevators are at the periphery and some do not connect all floors. Additionally, the labs are not designed for accessibility or for women’s stature. Often the students have to stretch to reach in the labs.

• There are no convenient food options. Faculty members often eat at their desks because there is nowhere to sit. Students working long hours often skip meals because nothing is convenient. Also the snack machines are “horrible.”

• There is no main entrance or gateway to the building. When visitors first come to the campus they often cannot find the Park Science building, let alone a particular space. Should a more visible entrance be created facing the campus or towards the parking lot?

4. Issues and Options

• How should the need for space in Park Science be brokered among disciplines (and interdisciplinary programs)? How should enrollment, research needs, and traditional boundaries be factored into decision-making?

• Could Zubrow Commons at Haverford’s Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center – with which many at Bryn Mawr are familiar – provide a model for shared space?

• Could some less lab-intensive disciplines – perhaps Math and Computer Science – be located in a different building? If so, where?

• What kinds of gathering space are needed, within disciplines and building-wide? Smaller lounges with whiteboards, computers and comfortable seating? A larger shared space with mailboxes and a place to grab a cup of coffee or a bite to eat?

• How far away in time is the need for entirely new space beyond that available in Park Science – five, ten years? Should the College “reserve” space near Park Science for a future addition?

• How should computing be integrated into teaching spaces? Will Bryn Mawr ever issue laptops to students or require their use? How can spaces be made flexible enough to adapt to potential changes in policy or practice?

• How should the physical facilities communicate science to building users and visitors? What should one see from the corridors? How transparent should the labs and classrooms be?

• How should the College display its science collections including the mineral collections, antique instruments, and molecular models? How could it showcase current research?

• To what locations could less-used storage be decanted? How could active storage be better incorporated near classrooms and labs?

• How could outdoor classrooms with blackboards be incorporated?

C. GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

We have not yet met with representatives of the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR) to discuss their goals, issues and space needs, including those related to a potential move to the campus core. The following MGOPIO, then, is still preliminary.

1. Mission and Goals

• Consider moving the GSSWSR to the main campus to integrate more fully with the rest of the College’s curriculum.

• Make decisions about the future of the GSSWSR property based on both near-term needs and long-term plans for potential expansion.

2. Opportunities

• If the School is brought to the main campus, there could be more collaboration with other academic departments, and more potential to share teaching spaces.

• The Township has expressed interest in acquiring the current GSSWSR property for use as playing fields. How might this affect future growth? Could the College negotiate a transfer of impervious surface rights to other properties it owns? Might some shared use of the fields be negotiated?

• By purchasing one additional piece of residential property, the College could own contiguous properties west to the GSSWSR, allowing a connecting path.
3. Problems
- The building is in poor condition. MGA Partners’ 2000 Academic Feasibility Study and Master Plan outlined code deficiencies in the building, and noted the condition of the building: “All [exterior] walls require general cleaning, significant repointing, and some stone replacement. Cracks in the concrete vaults of the Cloisters must be pinned. Brick masonry chimneys require rebuilding and repointing. The leaded glass windows of Thomas Library exhibit serious deterioration...The condition of the roofs and flashings is generally poor, and few of the many roofing materials are historically appropriate...With minor exceptions, all building systems require replacement and upgrading.” Deterioration has continued since the study (although some of the chimneys have been rebuilt).

- Could rethinking when classes are offered and how classrooms are assigned help accommodate at least some GSSWSR classes on the main campus? Will new classrooms be required?
- In addition to the GSSWSR, the property includes a small gymnasium and part of a rugby pitch shared with the School of the Holy Child. If the property is sold or redeveloped by the College, athletics facilities – already in short supply – would be reduced.

(Options are described in Section V D.)

D. THOMAS HALL

1. Mission and Goals
- Renovate Thomas while maintaining the character and qualities that make the building special.
- Create adequate numbers of flexible, right-sized teaching spaces, faculty offices and meeting rooms.
- Provide better conditions for College collections, and locate them in a way that facilitates their use as teaching tools.
- If feasible, provide a stronger connection between language faculty and the language lab, currently in Denbigh.
- Make the Great Hall a more welcoming, inviting and flexible, right-sized teaching spaces, faculty of ces and meeting rooms.
- Provide better conditions for College collections, and locate them in a way that facilitates their use as teaching tools.
- If feasible, provide a stronger connection between language faculty and the language lab, currently in Denbigh.
- Make the Great Hall a more welcoming, inviting and flexible, right-sized teaching spaces, faculty of ces and meeting rooms.

2. Opportunities
- Carefully located uses in a renovated Thomas, together with renovations to Goodhart, could help establish new linkages between the buildings – and perhaps with the Taft Garden and Rockefeller as well.
- Adjacency to Canaday Library could allow the two buildings to be programmed in tandem, perhaps with some shared spaces.
- Some academic offices have been decanted from Thomas to the renovated Dalton Hall, and the Career Development office has been moved to the Campus Center. To what extent have these moves alleviated the space crunch in Thomas? How can uses in Thomas be reconfigured to more fully meet the goals of the College? MGA Partners’ 2000 Academic Feasibility Study and Master Plan could provide a useful starting point for discussion.

4. Issues and Options
- What role, if any, might the GSSWSR site play in future campus expansion? Is the campus expanding westward? The development of Cambrian Row suggests that it might be, but even Brecon feels “too far from the center” for many members of the campus community. Would more student residences near Brecon alter this perception of distance?
- According to the GSSWSR’s website, the School has 16 faculty members and 16 administrators and staff (including 4 who are also faculty members), plus 3 computer lab teaching assistants. If the GSSWSR relocates, should it move as a unit, or should its faculty be integrated with those in other academic departments who share academic interests? For example, should faculty whose primary interest is in clinical studies be located near clinical psychologists and those whose primary interest is policy be located with economists and political scientists? Where should its administrators be located?
- It is estimated that 20 to 30 offices would be needed on the main campus to support GSSWSR faculty and staff. Is there existing space that could accommodate some of them? New construction will probably be needed to support this move. Could projects be sequenced so the same space could provide “swing” space for the Thomas and/or Taylor renovations in advance of the GSSWSR move?
4. Issues and Options

- Some highlights of MGA Partners’ 2000 Academic Feasibility Study and Master Plan study for Thomas Hall include:
  - Prominent, publicly accessible homes for the Center for Visual Culture and the Center for International Studies.
  - New public spaces in the old stack space of the Art, Archaeology and Cities Library and in the space of classroom 110, overlooking the Cloister.
  - Office space for the Humanities and Language departments, including Russian (currently located in the Russian Center), plus 9 classrooms and seminar rooms.
  - Space for the Language Learning Center, currently located in Denbigh.
  - A new 2,000 square foot Taft Pavilion classroom, fully equipped for digital and film projection and able to seat 160-170 people, connected to both Canaday and Carpenter Libraries.
  - A project combining the central plants of Thomas and Canaday.
  - Improvements to the Cloister and Great Hall.
  - Wheelchair access at the front of the building, via a small ramp at the southeast door, and two new elevators to obtain access to the third floor and the Great Hall.

From our discussions so far, it seems that most, if not all, of these needs remain current. In our discussions with faculty, a desire for a consolidated museum and/or repository for the College’s collections has been expressed. (The 2000 report indicates that such a space should be planned for either Thomas or Canaday, though it is unclear from the summary report whether either building could accommodate the collections; space in Thomas does not appear to have been reserved for this use in the plan.) Faculty members have also expressed a desire for a larger, 300-seat classroom.

- What alternatives exist for swing space during a major renovation?
- Which, if any, departments should move to another location?
- Is there a desire to create a closer physical connection between departments in Thomas and those in English House or the Russian Center?
- What desired adjacencies exist?
- Could some of the collections be stored and displayed elsewhere in a better environment? How could these be made more accessible?
- Could a new language lab be located nearby – either within Thomas or in Canaday?
- Should a museum for the Colleges collections be considered?

- E. TAYLOR HALL

1. Mission and Goals

- Renovate Taylor while maintaining the character and qualities that make the building special.
- Provide accessibility to the physically disabled.

2. Opportunities

- Students express great affection for Taylor’s classrooms and for the character of the building.

3. Problems

- The building is not accessible to the physically disabled.
- The building requires extensive exterior envelop repairs and restoration.
- Structural concerns include possible deterioration of wood framing members due to water infiltration over the years and differential settlement between the main building and the tower.

4. Issues and Options

- What alternatives exist for swing space during a major renovation?
- Which, if any, uses should move to another location?
V. OPTIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
V. OPTIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

In this section, we essay some options for Bryn Mawr's campus – first by considering possible development strategies for key parcels, then by considering potential strategies for meeting identified needs.

As the requirements for campus development intensify, how should Bryn Mawr grow? Development at the core is limited by impervious surface requirements, but campus expansion is limited by the Baldwin School to the south, by the Shipley School to the east, and by a church and residential neighborhoods to the west and north. Within these parameters, what options exist?

A. OVERVIEW: AREAS FOR GROWTH

Our 1997 plan included a simple ideogram of Bryn Mawr's growth options – consolidation at the core; emphasis on satellites; or a mixture of both. Over the past decade, the College has consolidated academic uses in and around the core, and located student activities farther from the center. What patterns of development make sense for the next decade and beyond?

The next phases of physical development could meet important programmatic needs; protect views and preserve important historic buildings and landscapes; and create better connections to parts of the campus that feel remote or disconnected. On pages 56 and 57, we illustrate some options for the next stages of growth in areas of the existing campus that seem to us underutilized or disconnected from the rest of the campus – the Batten-Brecon-Longmaid parcel, the area around Arnecliffe and Perry, and the area around West House.

1. Growth within the core

a. The Main Campus Parcel and the Gateway Block

The diagram on page 53 indicates the additional development – including building and paving footprints – allowable without exceeding Township's impervious surface requirements. Only about 8,400 square feet of impervious surface allowance remain in the Main Campus parcel; development on the Gateway block already exceeds current limits.

However, there is still some potential for change at the core. For example, development could occur by changing uses in existing buildings. For example:

- Cartref, Helfarian (minus the trailer) and perhaps even the Pagoda could become an academic enclave – "outside the walls" but closely related to uses in Dalton. (Administrative uses currently in those buildings would be relocated, perhaps further from the academic center.)
- Canaday Library could be reconfigured to support new and evolving uses.
- The two existing houses north of the Gym could be used for student housing – perhaps “theme” housing – or for another use compatible with the adjacent Multicultural Center and Cambrian Row. (Such a use could bring 24-hour life along the path to Brecon.) Would this building, perhaps with an addition connecting them, be suitable for use as a Health Center?

Development could occur by replacing existing parking or other paving with new building.

- For example, an academic building could be located between Radnor and Park Science. (Structured parking, or off-site parking, would be required to maintain existing parking counts.)
- Or, new residence halls, a fitness center, or other student-oriented activity could be located on the site of the tennis courts. Development could be oriented toward the “inside” of the campus, creating connections to Cambrian Row and beyond. (This would require the relocation of tennis courts, perhaps to the Brecon site.)
- The small area of pavement west of the Gym is a placeholder for future development.

New buildings could replace existing buildings within the same parcel. This option should be evaluated from a preservation as well as development perspective.

- The Infirmary, for example, could be replaced by a new Health Center or academic building of similar footprint.
- The existing vacant houses north of the Gym could be replaced by a single building of similar footprint in that location, or elsewhere on the main campus block.

Also, Ward was designed to accommodate an additional future level; this could be used for additional Facilities or other administrative offices.

Is it feasible, if the GSWSR property is sold to the Township, to negotiate the transfer of impervious surface allowances to other areas of campus? If so, this would allow significant new construction on the main campus.

b. Property Acquisition

Acquiring the “missing tooth” between West House and Pen-Y-Groes would give the College much greater flexibility in developing the property along Wyndon Avenue, although impervious surface regulations would limit the total amount of development: the acquisition would give the College the opportunity for more continuous, but not necessarily more, development.
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2. Growth to the east

The College owns two large but unconnected parcels of land across New Gulph Road.

a. Arnecliffe-Perry-Healy

Although the site includes areas of unbuildable steep slopes, impervious surface regulations would allow about 44,000 square feet of new impervious development on the Arnecliffe and Perry property. With an improved crossing at New Gulph – perhaps incorporating an all-way stop – this area “outside the walls” could be closely linked to uses in Dalton and Cartref. Views of the campus core from this property support a perception of proximity. If a sidewalk could be built between this site and the English-Russian site, more of the campus could be safely (and perhaps, with re-grading, more accessibly) linked.

Options for development of the Arnecliffe-Perry-Healy site include:

- Building along New Gulph, following the campus pattern of development along perimeter streets.
- Building along the serpentine drive between Perry and Arnecliffe. Building in this location could be more Romantically sited and landscaped, in keeping with the character of the property fuori le mura.

Potential uses for the Arnecliffe-Perry site include:

- A new academic hub along New Gulph Road near Arnecliffe, perhaps incorporating the existing studio space, would provide new academic uses near the existing core, and almost directly across from Dalton. (Would academic and residential uses be a positive combination on the site?) This option could be particularly transformative if developed in tandem with new uses in and around Cartref and Helfarian.
- New residential building between Perry and Arnecliffe would add to the critical mass of housing on the site, and would provide residences near existing dining halls.
- Moving administrative uses to the site – perhaps to a re-purposed Arnecliffe – could free up space in Cartref and Helfarian for other uses but would displace faculty apartments. Do other options for faculty housing exist?

b. English-Russian

Although not actively managed, Morris Woods is being used for research and study by the science department. It is one of the few remaining forested sites in the area, and its preservation limits the developable area of the English-Russian site. With better connections to the campus core and a more intensely developed Perry-Arnecliffe site, this property could become a more integral part of campus.

c. Property Acquisition

Should the College consider acquiring the properties between the two parcels? Owning the two properties closest to New Gulph would allow good connections between the College’s existing parcels; owning the entire area between the parcels could provide development opportunities far into the future, while still allowing enough land for a buffer between the College and other residential development. Major College growth in this direction could prompt thoughts of developing building “fronts” along New Gulph and perhaps even extension of circulation patterns via a (delicate) pedestrian bridge across New Gulph.

3. Growth to the west, within the main campus block

The area around West House feels far from the campus core and disconnected from the nearby fields and Cambrian Row. Steep slopes, a lack of pedestrian pathways and the fenced tennis courts, in particular, discourage physical and perceptual connections between this area and the rest of campus.

In this parcel, impervious surface exceeds allowable limits, and so any new development would come at the expense of existing impervious surface area.

Development in this area could be related to that of Cambrian Row, adding to the critical mass of uses (and users) there. Student housing and, perhaps, even a new fitness or wellness center could be located here. New buildings could follow the existing pattern of development along perimeter streets and more Romantically arranged toward the campus interior in keeping with the undulating topography.
1. Parking Structure (about 100 spaces per level; would replace 109 existing spaces)
2. Residential Building - 3 stories plus basement at 6500 gsf/level = 26,000 gsf (about 65 to 75 residents) would require relocation or incorporation of existing electrical sub-station
3. Residential Building - 3 stories plus basement at 6500 gsf/level = 26,000 gsf (about 65 to 75 residents)
4. Residential Building - 3 stories plus basement at 6500 gsf/level = 26,000 gsf (about 65 to 75 residents)
5. Tennis Courts
6. Parking
7. Fitness Building with bridge across gym and path to Cambrian Row
8. Residential or Wellness Building - 3 stories plus basement at 9600 gsf/level = 38,400 gsf (about 100 to 120 residents)
9. Administrative Building - 3 stories plus basement at

4. Growth to the north

a. Batten-Brecon-Longmaid

Although the site includes steep slopes and a stream, and is partially located in a flood plain, impervious surface regulations would allow about 66,000 square feet of new impervious development on the Batten-Brecon-Longmaid block. Additional pedestrian traffic across Roberts Road would increase the existing need for a better crossing.

- New student housing in this location would add to the critical mass of housing on the site, perhaps lessening the sense of isolation at Brecon and Batten and offering a wider group of users for Cambrian Row. With more students on site, a breakfast cafe in this location might be more feasible, eliminating the trek to Erdman for Brecon residents.
- Tennis courts and perhaps even a fitness center could be added to the site creating a Bryn Mawr-like mix of uses, and extending campus life across Roberts Road. (At least some of the current track and field practice space could be displaced by this option.)
- Some administrative offices could be decanted to the site.
- It is conceivable that at some point in the future a new Gym might become feasible. The Brecon-Batten-Longmaid site could accommodate a new two-story facility, tucked into the hillside to mitigate its necessary bulk and allow views into the trees beyond. At that time, reuse of the Gym site could be considered for structured parking at grade, hidden from view by topography and tennis courts, turf, or a green planted roof above.

Should Batten and Longmaid remain? How should the College weigh the costs and benefits of these buildings?

b. GSSWSR Site

Although steep slopes and a bisecting stream limit use of the GSSWSR site, some options for development do exist, primarily on the site of the existing building and parking lot, - assuming that the GSSWSR moves to the campus core. If alternative field locations could be identified, development would also be possible on the field. Are there College uses that require proximity to campus but not contiguity? Are administrative offices or long-term student parking possibilities? Could the Thorne School and perhaps the Child Study Institute be located there, allowing alternative development of the West House site? Is the site too remote for tennis courts? Although the site is just large enough to accommodate a regulation-size track, the location of steep slopes and a stream would make the construction of a track impractical at best.
c. Property Acquisition

The acquisition of one property between the two parcels would make development of the Batten-Brecon-Longmaid property more flexible by filling in the missing corner of this almost-rectangular site, and would allow a path through to the GSSWSR site. (Without further development of the Batten-Brecon-Longmaid site, it is unlikely such a path would get much use.

The acquisition of the additional four properties west of Brecon could be beneficial in the long term, but – given the untapped potential on the Brecon-Batten-Longmaid site – need not be a high priority.

B. WELLNESS, RECREATION AND ATHLETICS

The College has program needs related to health and wellness, including more suitable space in the Health Center; new locker rooms, meeting spaces and offices in the Gym; and new fitness and multipurpose spaces. In addition, the existing Infirmary building is outdated and in poor condition; the Gym, too, is outdated and in need of new environmental systems.

We understand that complete gym replacement is not financially feasible at this time, and is unlikely to be so for at least the next fifteen or twenty years. How, then, should the Gym be renovated? How should fitness facilities be added to the campus? Should the Infirmary be renovated (or rebuilt) in its existing location, or should it be moved elsewhere, perhaps co-located with a fitness center to create a new “wellness center?”

In any case, improvements to the Gym – particularly the locker rooms, pool area and mechanical room and systems – are needed. In addition, it might be possible to bring light and transparency to the facility by replacing the wood panels in the façade with fixed or operable windows. A Gym renovation could dramatically improve the character and quality of the space but is unlikely to result in additional program space.

How, then, should needed program space be added? Options to be considered, alone or in combination, might include:

- Additional space elsewhere on campus, if feasible. Are there any functions that could be met in other nearby space? For example, could some offices be located in the now vacant houses along Roberts Road, perhaps connected to the Gym by a pedestrian bridge? (Could this use justify the cost of renovating the buildings and building a bridge?) If the Denbigh language lab is relocated to Thomas or Canaday, could a new multi-purpose room/dance studio take its place?

• An addition to the Gym.
• A new building in the vicinity of the Gym.

Some potential locations for building related to athletics and health are described below.

1. Fitness Center Locations

A fitness center could accommodate exercise and multipurpose spaces, and perhaps a health bar café. (A cafe in the north part of campus could even serve as a breakfast option for Brecon residents.)
a. Addition West of the Gym

An extension west of the existing Gym, modified from previous studies by Buell Kratzer Powell, could incorporate a bridge across the student-dubbed “valley of death.”

**Pro:**
- This option could help make better connections between the campus core – particularly the area around Canaday and Thomas – and Cambrian Row. (It may also be possible to build only a bridge, perhaps with field storage underneath, to accomplish this aim with much more minimal investment.)
- Depending on the size of the addition, the addition could serve the need for multiple program needs; the fitness center and Gym could share locker rooms.

**Con:**
- This option could preclude enlarging the field by extending it eastward.
- Owing to the existing layout of the Gym, with the pool on the west side, a considerable amount of the addition at would be dedicated to circulation.
- Adding to the Gym could limit future flexibility by reducing the feasibility of eventually replacing the Gym, if that is desirable.

b. Addition South of the Gym

A modest extension south of the Schwartz Gym could incorporate a bridge between the addition and the existing building. (This option is based on a sketch by the College Architect.)

**Pro:**
- This option could help make better connections between the campus core and the Gym.
- Depending on the size of the addition, the addition could serve the need for multiple program needs; the fitness center and Gym could share locker rooms.

**Con:**
- This option would require building on very steep slopes.
- Adding to the Gym could limit future flexibility by reducing the feasibility of eventually replacing the Gym.
- This option would not provide additional locker rooms

2. Health Center

a. Existing Location

The existing Infirmary could be renovated, perhaps with an addition; alternately, it could be replaced by a new building.

**Con:**
- The Merion-Morris block is already over its capacity for impervious surface, so any additional footprint would need to be offset by removal of paving or building.
- Swing space would be needed during construction.

b. Near Cambrian Row

A new Health Center could be located near Cambrian Row or the Gym, on its own or in tandem with a new fitness center, in the locations described above for the fitness center: in a Gym addition, along Roberts Road, on the tennis court site or near Brecon.

**Pro:**
- The Health Center would continue to be near the core of campus, and easily accessible to a large number of residential students.

**Con:**
- There is the potential to create a “wellness center” or “wellness precinct” centered around athletics, the health center, and the student activities at Cambrian Row.
- The Health Center would be farther from the core of campus; this disadvantage could diminish over time, if new dormitories were built nearby.
C. SCIENCES

The sciences at Bryn Mawr have been identified as an area of planning focus, as has the desire for facilities to help promote interdisciplinary collaboration, allow programmatic growth, and remain flexible as pedagogies and technologies change over time. How can the Park Science Center help achieve these goals and celebrate the learning and teaching of the sciences?

The College has made significant investments in Park Science building, and we understand that its complete replacement is unlikely to be financially feasible in the foreseeable future. Although a complete and detailed analysis of the building is beyond the scope of our study, we present here some first thoughts about options. These could form the basis for discussion and a comprehensive master plan of the facility.

On the pages that follow, we present a range of options for renovating and adding to Park that illustrate different planning strategies and phasing opportunities for short and long range visions. Which option, or combination of options, might best meet Bryn Mawr’s goals, summarized below?

- Allow near and long term flexibility.
- Promote interdisciplinary sciences.
- Create a clarity of wayfinding and sense of spatial hierarchy.
- Provide the right mix and locations for labs, classrooms, offices and shared amenities and social spaces.
- Provide a range of classroom and laboratory layouts and types to suit a variety of teaching styles and departmental demands.
- Accommodate demands for both college classrooms and departmental classrooms.
- Take into account the impact of construction of renovation and new additions on the students, faculty and researchers using the facilities.

Option 1: NEW FACE OF THE SCIENCES

A new building on the southeast corner of Park connects programs in adjacent buildings and creates a new front door to the sciences – visible and accessible from campus. It provides a communal gathering space, where students and faculty pass on their way to their labs and classrooms. It also accommodates program options, including new labs and offices, classrooms, or a relocated department. This option does not rely on renovation of existing facilities, which will likely be required within the complex. Current wayfinding challenges and limited opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration within may not be addressed as comprehensively as in other options.

Option 2: HEART OF THE SCIENCES

Parts of the central, north/south building is renovated as a clear and easily visualized organizing spine for the complex, where interdisciplinary collaborations are encouraged and interior “front doors” to each department and Collier Library are located. This is the new heart of Park, where the main entrance from campus as well as connections between floors and across disciplines will occur. An addition of classrooms, shared by all departments, could be added. As departmental programs need relocation to accommodate new functions, additions or other campus locations will need to be identified.
Option 3: STREET OF THE SCIENCES

In this option a new building is located along New Gulph Road, with capacity to accommodate incremental swing space and long term programmatic growth of labs, classroom and offices. Programs can be relocated and renovation of existing spaces within Park occur with the capacity provided by this new building. An interior atrium provides a linear organizing element to the complex, where students and faculty can gather, study, and interact, surrounded by science teaching and learning. Classrooms can occupy former lab space and new construction can accommodate new labs, with current demands for mechanical and support spaces.

Option 4: FRAMEWORK OF THE SCIENCES

This option is an incremental approach to Park, based on an overall framework plan for the complex. With episodic renovations throughout, they together help clarify wayfinding, provide access to exterior views and light, create amenities and encourage interdisciplinary interactions. To allow this work, new building would need to provide swing space and replace reassigned areas. A new addition at the southeast corner signals changes within Park to the campus community and provides a new entry and collective space.

- Understand and plan for upgrades, as needed, of mechanical, electrical, plumbing, life safety, accessibility and technology infrastructures.
- Strengthen connections to the broader campus context and programs.
- Think environmentally about building use and reuse, and integrate interior spaces with surrounding landscapes.
D. BRINGING GSSWSR TO MAIN CAMPUS

Relocating GSSWSR to the campus core would involve at least three related issues: the need for new academic space near the core, requirements for additional parking, and reuse of the existing site.

1. Academic Space

Should GSSWSR faculty and staff be relocated as a unit, or should their new locations be interspersed with those of others with similar research interests? In either case, additional academic space would be needed near the campus core, either for GSSWSR or for other departments displaced by the move.

a. On the Merion-Morris Block

A new academic hub around Cartref, Helfarian and the perhaps Pagoda could be created, possibly including new or renovated space in the current Health Center building, if that function were to move. (If additional impervious surface allowances could be made available from the sale of GSSWSR to the Township, a substantial addition to Helfarian in the location of the existing trailer could provide accessibility to the building, and a larger critical mass of academic space on the site.)

Pro:
- These historic buildings would be renewed.
- New academic uses would be located near the current academic core, and directly across from Dalton.

Con:
- This would require moving administrative functions, possibly to West House. Other potential locations include Arnecliffe (displacing faculty housing), the current site of the GSSWSR, or another, off-site, location.
- Cartref, Helfarian and the Pagoda are not currently accessible to those with impaired mobility.
- The existing buildings alone might not meet the demand for new academic space.

b. Near Arnecliffe and Perry

A new, modestly scaled academic hub could be created near Arnecliffe, including the existing studio space and a new building along New Gulph Road.

Pro:
- New academic uses would be located near the current academic core, and directly across from Dalton.
- This option could help set the course for future development, particularly in tandem with Option D.1a above (a new hub in Cartref and Helfarian, above) and with sidewalk connections to the English-Russian site.

Con:
- Improved street crossings would be required.

c. Near Canaday

It could be possible to make a small addition to Canaday, possibly in a pavilion near the Taft Garden as suggested in MGA’s 2000 plan. Alternately, the topography around Canaday suggests that a modest addition, perhaps with a green roof, could be built in front of Canaday. This could be programmed in tandem with a renovated Thomas Hall and could possibly be combined, in the near or long-term, with a new building north of Canaday. (An alternative would be the eventual replacement or complete renovation of Canaday.)

Pro:
- New academic space would be added to the heart of campus.

Con:
- The per-square-foot cost of such a space could be high.
- Trade-offs could be required to meet current impervious surface requirements – except on site near Taft, which is already paved.

d. Near Park Science

Sites near Park Science could be reserved for near or long-term growth of the sciences.
2. Parking

The current GSSWSR site has 108 parking spaces. Structured parking locations could make use of the significant topography to obscure the necessary bulk of parking structures. It is possible that the need to build structured parking could be forestalled by managing demand – for example, by providing financial incentives to using transit and by discouraging students from neighboring institutions from parking in the College’s visitor parking spaces.

Options for additional parking include:

a. Near Erdman

It could be possible to replace the Erdman lot with two levels of structured parking, and to use the topography to advantage both for access to both levels and for hiding the bulk of the structure. This would put additional spaces where there is great demand for them.

Because the corner of New Gulph Road and Morris Avenue is a prominent gateway to the campus, and because Erdman is a significant building, the structure must be largely – if not completely – hidden from view from public streets. Further study would be needed to ascertain just how minimal its appearance would be.

Would close neighbors, already fatigued by the construction at the Baldwin School, object to building in this area?

b. The Corner of New Gulph Road and Roberts

This large site could accommodate a sizeable parking structure between Park Science and the Ward Building. Deciding on the number of levels to build would involve weighing the relative demand of effective land use and the desire of the College and its neighbors for an aesthetically pleasing aspect along public roads.

Some questions to consider: Is the parking lot in this location fully utilized now? Might the Sciences, in the long run, expand in this direction?

c. Brecon-Batten-Longmaid

Surface parking, or structured parking tucked into the hillside with tennis courts or a green roof above, could be located on the Brecon-Batten-Longmaid site. (See fig. 17.) The demand for parking in this area will depend, in part, on its future development. The need to improve the crossing – with better signage, walkways, and perhaps flashing lights within the crosswalk, with an “on-demand” button for pedestrian use – would intensify with increased use.
d. Reducing demand

As an alternate – or perhaps a supplement – to structured parking, the College could study methods of reducing the demand for parking:

- Many institutions charge a fee for parking on campus, and structure fees to make it more desirable to use public transportation, carpool, or bicycle to campus.
- Some colleges – Dartmouth, for example – “buy back” College parking decals, paying employees who agree to give up their parking passes and commute by means other than single occupancy vehicle.
- Other institutions buy transit passes for faculty, staff and (sometimes) students. Bryn Mawr’s campus is well-served by public transportation, at least to Center City and the Main Line. Comparing the cost of at least partially subsidizing transit use to the cost of building and operating a new parking structure could help determine whether to build new parking.
- Providing changing rooms and showers could help promote bicycle use, at least in fine weather.
- The College could better enforce its parking rules, to reduce on-campus parking by those not affiliated with teh College.

e. Other options

- In the long term, if the Gym were relocated to another site, the existing Gym location could serve as parking, hidden from view by the walls of the valley and by a turf field, tennis courts or green roof integrated into the hillside. (This could also facilitate pedestrian connections across the valley.) Vehicular access could be from the existing curb cut into the Facilities lot.
- It might be physically possible to locate a similar structure at the site of the existing lower field, with a turf field relocated atop the structure. This would not require removal of the Gym, but would require significantly widening the access way north of the Gym (probably necessitating construction of a retaining wall); it would also increase the amount of impervious surface on the main campus block well in excess of Township limits.
- The area around West House has been mentioned as a possible parking location. This is possible, although the site is not well-connected at present to most other parts of campus (although, with the addition of sidewalks, it could serve functions at Goodhart with reasonable proximity). Adding parking to the site, instead of more student-oriented uses, could miss an opportunity to further enliven Cambrian Row.
- The possibility of a partnering with the Township to build a joint use parking structure slightly off-campus, near the Bryn Mawr train station, has been discussed. This could be a great opportunity to provide additional parking while preserving College landscape and views.
- Cooperating with the neighboring Church – using some of the Church’s spaces during the week for faculty and staff parking and offering the use of Bryn Mawr spaces on Sundays in return – could help forestall the need for additional parking.

3. Reuse of Existing GSSWSR Site

The GSSWSR site could be useful to the College for functions that do not rely on direct adjacency to the core. Possibilities include:

- Administrative Offices. Although this site might feel too remote for some, locating administrative functions at GSSWSR would free up both office space and parking for other uses at the core. Offices here, though, would be far from food and amenities offered closer to the center of campus.
- Thorne School and Child Study Institute. Could these uses be located away from the campus core? Vehicular access to the GSSWSR would be less congested than at West House, and the children would have access to plenty of outdoor play areas. The northwestern corner of campus would then be available for other uses.
- Recreation. The field and the existing gym in the GSSWSR are currently used for athletic practices and rugby games. This use could continue, and perhaps be augmented with others, such as tennis courts. (Because the site is steeply sloped and bisected by a stream, it could not accommodate an outdoor track.)
- Parking. Allowing students who seldom use their cars to park at this site could decant some parking demand from the area around the campus core.

E. STUDENT HOUSING

1. Type

In our discussions with SGA, the Residence Council and others, students said they wanted privacy – single rooms or two-room doubles – but also communal spaces, including places to cook with friends. The configuration of rooms above Pembroke Arch was mentioned as a possible model. There was little support expressed for significant amount of apartment-style housing.

2. Location

a. In Existing Houses

The existing, dilapidated houses along Roberts Road could be renovated for use as student housing. How successful has this model of housing been elsewhere on campus?

- These buildings would be renewed, bringing 24-hour life to the area around Cambrian Row and the route to Brecon.
- Student housing in these buildings would add to the “critical mass” of housing around Brecon.
- Houses would add another option for residential life on campus.
- The scale and character of buildings along Roberts Road would be preserved.

b. On the Brecon-Batten-Longmaid Block

A new dormitory (or two) could be built on the Brecon block – east or west of the existing building.

- Student housing in this location would add to the “critical mass” of housing around Brecon and near Cambrian Row.
- Building closer to the road could help make the Brecon site feel less remote.
• With more students on site, a breakfast café in this location might be more feasible, eliminating the trek to Erdman for Brecon residents.

Con:
• Unless other uses were also added to the site, the resulting single-use block could seem very “un-Bryn Mawr.”
• Depending on configuration, this could abrogate the possibility of other future uses, possibly including athletic uses, for the site.
• Improving the poor crossing at Roberts Road would become even more critical.
• Depending on the configuration of buildings it may be necessary to relocate or incorporate an existing electrical substation.

- Near Cambrian Row

A new dormitory, oriented toward Cambrian Row and the fields, could be developed on the site of the existing tennis courts.

Pro:
• Student housing in this location would add to the “critical mass” of housing around Brecon and near Cambrian Row.
• With more students on site, a breakfast café in this location might be more feasible, eliminating the trek to Erdman for Brecon residents.
• Sensitive development of the area could help make better connections between Cambrian Row and West House, Rhoads, Goodhart and Bettws-Y-Coed.

Con:
• At least some of the tennis courts would be displaced. (One possible idea for relocation might be the Brecon-Batten-Longmaid block.)

- Between Arnecliffe and Perry

A new dormitory could be built along the serpentine drive between Arnecliffe and Perry. Development in this location could include an improved crosswalk, possibly with an all-way stop, across New Gulph Road. Ideally, new sidewalks would connect the site to English House/Russian Center site.

Pro:
• Student housing in this location would add to the “critical mass” of housing on the site.
• New student housing would be near existing dining facilities, and close to the center of campus.

Con:
• Unless other uses were also added to the site (for example, in a new academic building along New Gulph Road), the resulting single-use block could seem very “un-Bryn Mawr.”
VI. CONCLUSIONS
VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this report, we've described overall options for growth and outlined potential ways, within that framework, of meeting some identified near term needs. We believe there is great potential for creating a more cohesive, connected campus, and that by meeting some of its near term needs in strategic ways Bryn Mawr could move closer to that goal. For example:

• Intensifying uses around the intersection of Merion Avenue and New Gulph Road – by adding to the Arnecliffe-Perry-Healy site, considering new uses for Cartref and Helfarian, and improving the street crossings – could make more explicit, functional connections based on existing campus patterns and axes.

• Integrating the area around West House into the campus by relocating or repositioning the tennis courts, creating new paths, and sensitive adding new buildings could help link Brecon, Batten and Cambrian Row to Rhoads, Goodhart and the campus core.

• Adding strategically to the science building could help make connections within the building, and between Park Science and the academic core.

• Repairing, updating, and making accessible Thomas and Taylor would help preserve Bryn Mawr’s most historic and cherished buildings for future generations.

These strategies continue Bryn Mawr’s pattern of preserving important views; relating buildings to existing streets at the perimeter; and creating more Romantic combinations of building and landscape within the undulating topography and “outside the walls”—fuori le mura. Strategically acquiring properties in locations with the potential to further connections could help extend these patterns well into the future.