The District Design Guidelines establish the character of each district, and the development rules for the campus for buildings and the landscape.
Building Design Guidelines are intended to promote high-quality architecture and contextual design throughout the campus that enhances the image and identity of the University of Vermont. The guidelines describe the distinguishing characteristics of each architectural district and then provide specific guidelines for how new buildings and additions should be designed to fit in with that character. They are intended to establish essential design relationships with the campus and surrounding buildings but also leave flexibility for the architect’s expression. Accompanying the guidelines are some illustrative examples from other institutions and in some cases, the University of Vermont, that show a range of possible architectural expressions that would be appropriate for that particular district. These guidelines are to be given to the selected architect as part of the building and site program, and to be used by the Campus Master Planning Committee in its design review function.

The Building Design Guidelines separate building types into four different categories by District: Transitional Buildings, Foreground Buildings, Background Buildings, and Additions and Renovations. Transitional Buildings are new buildings that are located in the historic districts of the campus and therefore need to establish a relationship with the signature buildings of the University. Foreground Buildings, because of their use or location, will become some of the most prominent buildings in their district. Conversely, Background Buildings on the other hand are more quiet and respectful but should also help form the edges of campus outdoor spaces. Additions and Renovations need to be designed in a manner that does not compromise existing buildings, while enlivening the campus by making those existing buildings more open and inviting.

The Landscape Design Guidelines are intended to ensure that additions and improvements to the landscape at the University of Vermont maintain and respect the historic character of the campus and relate to its existing geometries and forms. The guidelines describe the distinguishing characteristics of each architectural district and then provide specific guidelines for initiatives that would enhance the district. The guidelines are intended to maintain connectivity continuity throughout the campus landscape, but also leave a certain flexibility for the designer’s expression. These guidelines are to be given to the selected designer as part of the landscape and site program, and to be used by the Campus Master Planning Committee in its site and design review function.

The Overarching Design Goals and Strategies include:

- Campus Master Plan Compliance – all projects will comply with the principles, premises and design guidelines identified in this Campus Master Plan.
- Inclusive and Accessible – all projects, including new building, major renovation/addition, and open space network projects must consider the best options to promote interaction and integration among a diverse community and comply with all local, state, and federal standards;
- Sustainable Design – all new building and major renovation projects will be developed for LEED certification, and when possible and financially feasible, will purchase Vermont goods and services in the design and construction of these buildings (see University Policy - Environmental Design and Vermont Purchasing in new and Renovated Buildings at www.uvm.edu/%7Euvmppg/ppg/facil/greenbuilding.html for more details);
- Architectural Characteristics – all projects will be reviewed in light of the recommended district guidelines for new foreground, transitional, and background buildings, and additions and renovations;
- Historic Context – all projects must comply with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation to ensure that a property’s most significant features will be preserved, while allowing adaptations for contemporary uses;
- Light Filled Public Spaces – it is recommended that all new buildings, additions, and renovations have glass enclosed public gathering spaces that bring daylight inside and allows users to look onto the campus;
- Circulation within & between Buildings – it is recommended that circulation within new buildings provide interior connections with other buildings or campus destination;
- Building and Landscape – new buildings and major additions will promote a strong relationship with the landscape spaces around them; and
- Building and Landscape Materials – priorities will be for recycled and/or sustainable materials products or materials as well as materials indigenous to Vermont.
The University has several recognizable “architectural districts” each with its own distinct styles of architecture, open space, physical layout and location, focal points, special views, and other characteristics. These special local qualities should be respected and celebrated with any new development. To ensure that future development on campus builds upon such existing character and special qualities, the Campus Master Plan defines nine distinct “architectural districts” within the Main Campus. The recognition of each district’s unique characteristics has specific implications for new development.

The Main Campus architectural districts include:

- **University Green District**: the historic heart of the campus with both academic and administrative functions.
- **Main Street North District**: a hub of student life on campus.
- **Trinity District**: the campus of the former Trinity College, which is now a mixed academic and residential district adjacent to the academic core campuses.
- **Gateway District**: the primary gateway to the campus with scientific and research facilities.
- **University Heights District**: a residential district that offers an amazing panorama of the Green Mountains.
- **Redstone District**: an historically and architecturally rich residential district.
- **Athletic District**: the center of recreational and organized sports and fitness on campus.
- **Centennial Sports District**: the historic sports fields and Stadium north of Centennial Woods.
- **Centennial District**: a densely wooded district with an important Natural Area with some peripheral faculty and staff housing.

In addition, architecture and landscape design guidelines are being developed for the following districts outside of Main Campus:

- **South Campus**: multiple properties devoted primarily agricultural, environmental and bio-research activities to the south of the Main Campus. Refer to Chapter 5.3 South Campus for associated design guidelines.
- **Fort Ethan Allen**: portions of an historic former military post that support family and student housing with some peripheral administration uses. Refer to Chapter 6.3 Fort Ethan Allen for associated design guidelines.
- **Colchester Research Campus**: a conveniently located satellite research district supporting research. Refer to Chapter 7.3 Colchester Research Campus for associated design guidelines.
UNIVERSITY GREEN DISTRICT

Architectural Characteristics

The historic buildings along University Place are the signature buildings of UVM. Built between 1880 and 1925, each one is a different style, from the Victorian Gothic Old Mill, and the Romanesque Billings Center, to the Colonial Revival Ira Allen Chapel. However, each one has a monumental facade that helps to frame the open space of the University Historic Green. Each building also has a main entrance facing the University Green, a prominent roof typically with slate shingles, and exterior walls of red brick or brownstone that are deeply sculpted with three-dimensional relief. All of the buildings on University Place are on the National Register of Historic Buildings, as are many of the others in this district (please refer to Chapter 4.1 Main Campus: Existing Conditions – Historic Resources, for a map of buildings on the National Register of Historic Places).

On the west side of the University Historic Green, the texture of the University buildings is smaller and more residential with the exception of the Waterman Building. The neo-classical Waterman Building is the largest building on the west side of the University Green, although it lacks the height, dominant character and distinctive skyline features of the ensemble of buildings on University Place. Other distinguished buildings in this district include the Wheeler, Peirce-Spaulding, and Nicholson Houses that are typical of the historic houses in the district. These houses are typically set back from the street on large landscaped lots. They are generally constructed of red brick walls, have hipped roofs, and their entrances are usually marked with white columnar porches.
Transitional Buildings

Any new buildings in this District should be thought of as transitional buildings. Transitional buildings act to bridge the differences between different eras of building design. They respect and reinforce the qualities of the existing buildings and therefore enhance the perception of the whole district. They harmonize with the architectural characteristics of the District in terms of height, mass, setback, rhythm, scale and proportions. The examples on the right show a range of buildings that could be considered transitional – each responds to its context in a different way, but they all reinforce the qualities of their neighbors and improve the campus around them.

The two available sites in the District are along South Prospect Street, to the north of Waterman, and to the south of the Peirce-Spaulding House (109 South Prospect Street). The placement of new buildings on these sites should preserve views of Lake Champlain from the University Historic Green and the historic buildings along University Place. The height of new buildings should respect the cornice height of the adjacent buildings, and the setbacks from the street should align with the adjacent buildings. The main entrances should be prominent and face the University Historic Green. The exterior walls should be of red brick or stone (although contrasting materials may be considered), and like their 19th century neighbors, the facades should be deeply sculpted and three-dimensional. The roofs should be pitched. Large windows or areas of glass that allow views of the lake, or across the University Historic Green, should be encouraged.
UNIVERSITY GREEN DISTRICT

Background Buildings

Background buildings in this District should be quiet and respectful relative to the historic buildings around them. Any sites in this District other than those directly facing the University Historic Green shall be considered locations for background buildings. These buildings should help form an edge to outdoor spaces or quadrangles. Exterior walls should be of red brick with stone trim although lesser amounts of metal, precast, or wood may be used. Roofs are to be less prominent than the historic buildings. Entrances should face the interior spaces, rather than the University Historic Green, and windows need to be in punched openings, although larger areas of glass at entrances, lounges, and other public spaces are encouraged.

Additions and Renovations

Additions to any of the historic buildings in this District need to follow the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. They should be designed to minimize any loss of historic materials so that the character-defining features are not obscured or trivialized. Additions should be located on an inconspicuous side of a historic building, limited in size and scale, and designed in a manner that differentiates between what is historic and what is new. Additions should also be compatible in terms of massing, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color, and they may be contemporary or reference the materials of the historic building.

The location and design of any addition needs to be carefully considered on a case-by-case basis. The planning of the addition needs to consider the impact to open space and campus circulation; what the program is, whether it is public space, offices, classrooms, etc.; how large it needs to be; and what the limitations are such as existing structure, entrances, windows, and corridors, and impact to open space and campus circulation.

Renovations to historic buildings should respect any historically significant interior spaces. However, renovations of interiors generally need to be compatible with new programmatic uses and technologies.
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UNIVERSITY GREEN DISTRICT

Landscape Design Guidelines

Landscape improvements in the University Green District are to respect and augment the historic character and form of the 18th-century New England Green, frame the historic architecture of University Row, and enhance the role of the University Historic Green as a threshold between the campus and the city.

The structure of the University Green District is derived from the campus geometries and major campus viewsheds (described in Chapter 4.2 Main Campus: Proposed Frameworks for Campus Planning). Future proposed plantings and landscape improvements should be both derived from, and supportive of, the campus geometries and viewsheds.

Landscape Initiatives

There are four major gateways to the campus in the University Green District: one at each corner of the University Historic Green. While these gateway elements are an important identity-defining tool for the University, the design must be mindful of their historic context, and not detract from the form or character of the University Historic Green.

The University and the City of Burlington are currently in discussion regarding potential transfer of ownership of University Place from the City to the University. If this transfer occurs, the University will conduct a collaborative community process and comply with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.

As the frame for the most iconic architecture of the campus, University Place requires a comprehensive approach to plantings and landscape constructs. Its roadway and pedestrian circulation spaces should be re-surfaced with historically-appropriate materials. The establishment of a limited vehicular-access plaza on University Place, with improved site architecture and a distinctive palette of materials will establish it as one of the pre-eminent public spaces on campus. A formal planting initiative will complement the period architecture of the University Place’s historic buildings and restore the historic canopy of elms lost in the 1960s.

Additional copes of trees on the corners of University Place at Colchester Avenue and Main Street will frame the historic architecture of the Ira Allen Chapel and Morrill Hall, and anchor the formal avenue planned for University Place. Additionally, informal plantings on the north side of Colchester Avenue will further enhance the sense of connectivity across this major traffic artery and complement the historic architecture of Dewey Hall.

The street tree plantings along Colchester Avenue, Main Street, South Prospect and Pearl Streets are the supporting context for the University Historic Green. Existing street tree plantings need to be formalized and augmented. Improved plantings along the major urban access routes to the University will have a strong effect on the public image of the University. In addition, new formal plantings of trees along University Place and the two east-west pedestrian walkways that bound the proposed Waterman North Quadrangle, will create a strong unified context for new and existing architecture, and a green frame for new pedestrian circulation routes.
UNIVERSITY GREEN DISTRICT

CHAPTER 4.3 – MAIN CAMPUS: DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES
Architectural Characteristics

This District has a great variety of architecture that represents almost every architectural period on the University of Vermont’s campus. The oldest building, Torrey Hall, was built in 1863 and was followed by the Victorian Gothic Converse Hall in 1895, and later by the neo-classical Fleming Museum in 1931. However, most of the District’s buildings were built in the 1950s and 1960s in the utilitarian International Style. These buildings such as the Chittenden-Buckham-Wills (C-B-W) residence halls, the Votey Hall, the Bailey/Howe Library, and the Cook Physical Science Building are characterized by red brick walls with windows that are often small compared to the amount of solid wall area. Although Converse Hall and the Fleming Museum have pitched roofs, the majority of buildings built in the mid-century have flat roofs.
Foreground Buildings

New foreground buildings in this District will be located on sites in places of focus such as at the head of a quadrangle, or in the case of the new Dudley H. Davis Center, at an important central point along Main Street. The entrances of foreground buildings should be prominent and face the quadrangles or be centered on an important axis. Although red brick is the predominant exterior material in this District, the use of stone, metal and wood is encouraged to expand and enrich the University’s palette. Roofs may be pitched or flat. Large windows and areas of glass are important for foreground buildings so that they look open and inviting.

As an example of a foreground building, the Dudley H. Davis Center will bring the language of the 19th century buildings on University Place into the south side of this District along Main Street. Large areas of glass will be combined with the brick walls and large roofs to give the building a more contemporary expression than the historic structures. The examples provided show other potential foreground buildings with different kinds of expressions and exterior materials but each one with large amounts of glass to open the building up to the environment.
Background Buildings

Background buildings are quieter than foreground buildings and should form the edges of outdoor spaces or quadrangles. Most of the existing buildings in this District would be considered background buildings. If new residence halls are built in the C-B-W quadrangle, these would be generally thought of as background buildings (although some in particularly prominent locations could be foreground buildings). Exterior materials should be compatible with adjacent buildings, although the use of stone, metal, pre-cast and wood is encouraged. Windows need to be in punched openings, but larger areas of glass at entrances, classrooms, lounges, dining areas, etc. should be provided. Roofs may be pitched or flat. The examples provided show several expressions of campus residential buildings.

Additions and Renovations

As was noted before, additions to existing buildings need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. An addition to an older building such as the Fleming Museum needs to be carefully considered so as not to damage the integrity of the existing structure, and should follow the guidelines for the University Green District. Additions to any of the buildings built in the 1950s and 1960s on the other hand should be designed with large areas of glass to make the existing buildings feel more open and inviting. It is important that any addition differentiate new from the original structure.

Renovations of interiors should be compatible with new programmatic uses and technologies.
Landscape Design Guidelines

The network of green connective spaces strongly influences the character of landscape improvements in the Main Street North District. These improvements visually re-enforce the flow of pedestrian traffic and the character and richness of new open spaces. The landscape of the Main Street North District also showcases existing memorable architecture and much loved public spaces, while bringing a more articulated sense of scale and intimacy to a part of campus that has thus far been defined by poorly-scaled buildings and public spaces from the 1960s and 1970s. While landscape improvements should respect the character of historic buildings and existing open spaces where they occur, it should also generate new forms and typologies to give this District a better sense of place.

The campus geometries in play here are largely derived from the campus grid, and the major north/south pedestrian corridors that connect the campus. In addition, the landscape of the Main Street North District has some topographic variation that needs to be addressed in terms of physical accessibility. There are major grade changes between the current C-B-W-Quad and Converse Hall, the Aiken Center and Bailey/Howe Library Quadrangle, and in the open space between Lafayette Hall and the Cook Science Building.

Landscape Initiatives

There are multiple gateways within this District, including two on the north side of the Main Street North District on Colchester Avenue at the FAHC access road and at the intersection of Mansfield Avenue; and on the south side of the District, on Main Street at the intersection with University Heights Drive. The Colchester Avenue and Main Street Gateways form the two primary entrances to the Green Mountain Walkway. All gateways act as points-of-entry to the vehicular access and connective green spaces of campus and must orient the visitor.

Formal avenues of trees reinforce the geometries of pedestrian circulation along Green Mountain Walkway, through the new Dudley H. Davis Center “oval,” and along the subsidiary pedestrian corridors that cross the District. In addition, large open spaces are articulated by informal copses of trees that bring a sense of composition to the landscape, and create intimate places for gathering and relaxing. Access ramps are considered an integral element of the design of the landscape and its connective green spaces and are designed to create strong gathering spaces and a pleasant pedestrian experience. By utilizing universal design concepts, access ramps will blend into the campus fabric.

The University previously supported the original concept of a “land bridge” over Main Street within the Main Street Improvement Project that was federally funded. The University would support the reintroduction of this concept as it is an innovative solution to provide a safer and more efficient pedestrian connection between the Main Street North and University Heights Districts while significantly improving the aesthetics of the area.

The architectural initiatives in this District further support its green connectivity by opening up buildings with lantern-like glass-enclosed public spaces, and interior pedestrian walkways that offer shelter from the weather.

Improved street tree planting along Colchester Avenue will further enhance the visual character of the Main Street North District and create a positive first impression of the campus from its primary vehicular approach routes.
TRINITY DISTRICT

Architectural Characteristics

The Trinity District has a diverse collection of architecture that includes academic buildings and small residence halls. The buildings have a range of materials: Mann Hall built in 1939, has red brick and limestone trim in a late Art Deco Style; McAuley and Mercy Halls were built in 1956 and 1962, and have metal and glass in an International Style; Delahanty Hall and the five residence halls (Hunt, Ready, Sichel, Richardson, and McCann), built between 1966 and 1973, have brown brick with slate panels. The roofs are typically flat although the Farrell Building, built in 1985, has a prominent sloping metal roof.

New Buildings

New buildings in the Trinity District should respect the architectural characteristics of the District in terms of height, mass, scale and proportions. Exterior walls should be of brick or stone in a color which is sympathetic to the District. For example, the use of slate panels that reference the adjacent buildings would be encouraged. Windows should also fit in with the scale and rhythm of fenestration in adjacent buildings. Roofs may be sloped or flat.

Additions and Renovations

Additions to buildings should follow the same guidelines as the other Districts. Additions to older buildings should follow the guidelines for the University Green District while additions to any of the buildings built between the 1950s and the 1980s should be designed with large areas of glass to make the existing buildings feel more open and inviting.

Renovations to the interiors should be compatible with new programmatic uses and technologies.
Landscape Design Guidelines

The Trinity District’s intimate sense of scale, its mixed use program, and its situation at the edge of a heavily wooded ravine are reflected in a landscape that is more intimate in scale than that of the rest of the campus.

The existing fabric of the Trinity District is structured by a grid derived from its neighborhood context that is distinct from those of the rest of University. The existing character of the landscape has historically been set by a legally-zoned setback from the road. While this setback may change, future buildings on the Trinity District should maintain some distance from the road to preserve the green character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Landscape Initiatives

The network of walkways in the Trinity District juxtaposes a formal structure derived from the Trinity Grid and the layout of its existing building, and a more sinuous series of braided walkways that cuts through the grid on the diagonal and connects the north edge of Trinity to the rest of the campus. Tree plantings in the Trinity District consist of linear allees blending into alternate side plantings on the braided paths. While the Trinity Walkways are narrower than the Green the curvilinear form and similar palette of plant and paving materials will give these paths a unified and coherent appearance.

An outdoor amphitheater located west of McAuley Hall will take advantage of existing grading conditions to serve as an outdoor gathering and performance space that will be a focus for the open space in the Trinity District.
GATEWAY DISTRICT

Architectural Characteristics

The character of this District is currently evolving to include a renewed medical and natural sciences research focus. New development in this District should be sensitive to its impacts, including traffic, circulation, open space, views to the mountains, and impact to the residential neighbors.

The existing buildings in this District were built between 1957 and 2000. Almost all of them, except for the largely glass-walled 1960s International-Style Giv- en Medical Building, are built of red brick in the utilitarian International Style with flat roofs. The landscape character of the District is defined by its stunning panoramas of the Green Mountains to the south.

Although not constructed but in the planning phases, a new Plant Sciences Building is underway to co-locate the plant sciences academic and research departments. An exciting new addition is in the early phases of planning for the “greening” of the Aiken Center and a new addition to the Marsh Life Sciences Building is under construction in anticipation of co-locating the Nutrition and Food Sciences academic and research department. These new facilities and additions will change the character of the Gateway District into a more vibrant and heavily utilized campus district in the near future.
Gateway District

Foreground Buildings

New foreground buildings in this District should herald the future of the University of Vermont. They should be expressive of the importance of scientific research to the University, but need to also fit in well with the landscape, particularly the new University Gateway and Arboretum planned along Main Street. The sites for foreground buildings are at the head of new quadrangles or at strategic locations seen prominently from Main Street. Although red brick is currently the predominant exterior material in this District, it is important that other materials such as stone, metal, wood and pre-cast be considered. Large areas of glass for public spaces that celebrate a sense of community should also be encouraged. Roofs may be pitched or flat, and should be carefully thought of as seen above the tops of the trees of the University Gateway Arboretum.
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Background Buildings

Background buildings are quieter than foreground buildings and should form the edges of outdoor spaces or quadrangles. Most of the existing buildings in this District would be considered background buildings. Exterior materials should be compatible with adjacent buildings, although the use of limited amounts of stone, metal, and wood is encouraged. Windows need to be in punched openings, but larger areas of glass at entrances, lounges, etc. should be provided.

Additions

Additions to any of the buildings built in the 1950s and 1960s should be designed with large areas of glass to make the existing buildings feel more open and inviting. The addition to Marsh Life Sciences, currently under construction, is an example of this. It is important that any addition differentiate between the new construction and the original.
**Gateway District**

### Landscape Design Guidelines

The Gateway District represents a more modern face of the campus. Until now it has largely served as the home of the College of Medicine, the College of Nursing and Health Sciences, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Rubenstein School of Environmental and Natural Resources and as a parking area for the University and Fletcher Allen Health Care. Future development will change the character of this District from what it is today. It will take on a greater built density, and will become a more integral component of the campus.

The geometries guiding future development in this district are defined by a downward extension of the existing campus grid, and wide setbacks from the road that will preserve the open, green character of the landscape. As the first part of the campus that most visitors will encounter, the Gateway District also serves as a visual point-of-entry to the University.

### Landscape Initiatives

Landscape improvements in the northern end of the District, are conceived as being urban in character. The existing and proposed quadrangles in the vicinity of the Given Medical Building are more structured and geometric than on much of the rest of campus. Further south and east, the landscape of the Gateway District becomes more naturalistic, and part of a larger University Gateway Arboretum, that will extend to the other side of Main Street in the University Heights District. Plantings should be arranged in naturalistic groups that frame new buildings from Main Street, but allow for clearings and glades for playing games, outdoor classes and informal gatherings. The building land banks should also inform landscape designs for this district.

The curvilinear form of the walkways reflects the informal structure of this part of the Gateway District. Here the arrangement of pedestrian walkways takes its cue from the great 19th century public gardens, with their gently meandering walkways, and constantly changing composition of landscape. The walkways are of a scale that reinforces the intimate pedestrian experience of the University Gateway Arboretum, and negotiates the grade change with a physically accessible slope of 5% or less. The sidewalk along Main Street is preserved for bicycle traffic at a steeper slope. A series of terraces are laid out at the southeastern end of the District, looking out to the distant view of Camel’s Hump and the Green Mountains.

Near to the corner of Carrigan Drive and East Avenue is the site for a Wind Turbine that is used as a public demonstration of the potential of wind power. This object in the landscape reflects the broader ethic of sustainability embraced by the University, and serves as a symbolic gateway element for the Environmental University.

There is a major gateway element to the University on Main Street. The design of this gateway element should be considered as an integral part of the pedestrian and University Gateway Arboretum experience. As Main Street is also the primary vehicular approach to the campus the gateway element must also engage motorists. Its design should be coordinated with the gateway on the opposite (south) side of Main Street within the University Heights District.

The formal structure of allees of trees along Main Street established in the University Historic Green and Main Street North Districts is carried on here, although at this point the formal plantings serve as a frame that merges in and out of the informal drifts of the University Gateway Arboretum. Similarly, Carrigan Drive and Beaumont Avenue to Fletcher Allen Health Center are planted with rows of trees to screen the surrounding parking.
Additions and Renovations
As with the residence hall complexes in Redstone District, additions to any of the buildings built in the 1960s and 1970s should be designed with glass enclosed public gathering spaces to make the existing buildings feel more open and inviting.
Renovations to the interiors should be compatible with new programmatic uses and technologies.

Architectural Characteristics
The University Heights District contains a number of residential complexes, including Marsh- Austin-Tupper Residential Complex built in 1960, Harris-Millis Residential Complex in 1967, and the Living and Learning Center Complex in 1972. All were built on the north-south grid of the campus with rectilinear plans. They are typical of the buildings built on the campus during that period, with brick walls, small windows, and flat roofs.
The new University Heights project, now under construction, is designed to set itself apart from those earlier complexes. It has four wings that are splayed at different angles to the grid, to follow the curve of University Heights Road. The buildings will have sloped roofs with dormers, and will be clad with concrete block and shiplap siding. The project is intended to feel more like a village than the earlier residence halls and to provide compatibility between a densely populated student environment and an adjacent residential neighborhood.

New Buildings
New buildings in the University Heights District should respect the architectural characteristics of the District in terms of height, mass, and scale. New buildings that are adjacent to the residence complexes built in the 1950s and 1960s should continue the architectural direction of the University Heights project with a village like feeling. Roofs may be pitched or flat. Exterior walls should be of a combination of materials such as brick, stone, wood, and metal.
CHAPTER 4.3 – MAIN CAMPUS: DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS DISTRICT

Landscape Design Guidelines

The University Heights District’s largely residential character and modernist style architecture is reflected in a less formal character in the landscape. The Redstone Walkway on the district’s western edge is a major connective green space, linking the residence halls of Redstone and University Heights to the academic heart of the campus. The extension of the University Gateway with a more limited arboretum design on the south side of Main Street is also a connective green space, forming a pedestrian link between the residential neighborhoods to the south and the campus while providing important informal recreation open space for students. As we move away from the historic core of the campus, the axial geometries and fine grain of historic buildings are replaced by a more fluid organizing structure that is derived from the park-like character of this part of the campus.

A formal structure of street trees along Main Street and University Heights forms a matrix that frames the informal planting in drifts along the Redstone Walkway and the south edge of the University Gateway Arboretum. The existing stands of mature trees in the jug handle, and the southern end of the University Gateway Arboretum are preserved and augmented by additional plantings of informal drifts. The Redstone Grove is preserved in its current state.

Landscape Initiatives

Along the Redstone Walkway, a field of sculpted wave landforms planted with drifts of trees creates a sinuous landscape that shelters the pedestrian pathway from the northwest winds and screens the walker from neighboring houses and gardens. The Redstone Walkway physically and visually merges the historic estate landscape with the contemporary landscape fabric of the University campus. The path of the Redstone Walkway takes a sinuous form, moving through the landforms like a dry stream bed. The walkways are broad enough to mix heavy cycle and pedestrian traffic together. The gently curving form of the pathway is reinforced by regular tree plantings lining alternating sides of the paths.

A land-bridge, connecting the Redstone Walkway and the Dudley H. Davis Center Oval, is proposed to bridge the gap in the campus fabric created by Main Street. The landbridge connection over Main Street has had a long history, first being proposed by the noted Landscape Architect Dan Kiley in the 1967 Campus Master Plan. Consistent with past land-bridge proposals, the landbridge would solve the significant pedestrian circulation issues between Main Street North and University Green Districts and the University Heights and Redstone Districts.

The existing sidewalk along Main Street is preserved as part of the regional bikeway, and continues to accommodate bicycle traffic. The pathways through the University Gateway Arboretum takes a sinuous form that negotiates the grade change with a physically accessible grade of 5% or less. Within the University Gateway Arboretum, clearings accommodate recreational sports and informal gatherings.

There are three gateways within the University Heights District; the first, on Main Street, mirrors the Main Street Gateway of the Gateway District. Like the Gateway District Gateway, this is a major gateway element to the University on Main Street, whose design should engage both pedestrians and passing motorists: the second and third, at either end of the land-bridge crossing Main Street north of University Heights, are pedestrian gateways, and points-of-access to the broader system of green connective spaces.
Redstone District

Architectural Characteristics

The historic buildings of the Redstone District, though smaller in scale than those along University Place, have an iconic relationship with their historic landscape context, the Redstone Historic Green and the landscape of the A. A. Buell Estate. The architectural character of the Redstone District is eclectic yet elegant and refined. The domestically-scaled Redstone Hall built in 1889 and the more institutionally scaled Southwick Hall by McKim, Mead & White set the tone for the diverse later additions that fill out this primarily residential district.

The District later saw the addition of several residence hall complexes built between 1956 and 1967. These later buildings are characterized by a restrained architecture, featuring brick walls with relatively small windows, and flat roofs.

New Buildings

New buildings in the Redstone District should respect the architectural characteristics of the District in terms of height, mass, and scale. A new building near the historic buildings would be considered a Transitional Building and should follow the guidelines for the University Green District.

New buildings that are adjacent to the residence halls built in the 1950s and 1960s should respect the architectural characteristics of the District in terms of height, mass, and scale. Roofs may be pitched or flat. Exterior walls should be of a combination of materials such as brick, stone, wood, and metal.

Additions and Renovations

Additions to any of the historic buildings in this District should follow the guidelines for the University Green District.

Additions to any of the buildings built in the 1950s and 1960s should be designed with glass enclosed public gathering spaces to make the existing buildings feel more open and inviting. The renovation of Christie-Patterson-Wright is a recent example of this approach on campus.

Renovations to the interiors should be compatible with new programmatic uses and technologies.
Landscape Design Guidelines

The Redstone District’s historic and refined architectural character, lush greenery, and residential character are reflected in the design of the landscape with an approach that is much more restrained than in other parts of the campus.

The Redstone District is structured by a grid that derives from the surrounding neighborhood. The organizational structure of the District is also dictated by the form of the Historic Redstone Green, which plays much the same organizing role in this District as the University Historic Green plays in the University Green District.

Landscape Initiatives

The design approach to the Redstone District is one that augments the character of the mature landscape and reinforces its existing structure.

Additional tree plantings at the periphery of the Redstone District draw the heavily-wooded edge of the Burlington Country Club up into the campus. It is a strategy of “borrowed scenery,” whereby background elements in the landscape are tied to foreground elements to create a sense of greater depth and expanse. The existing residential quadrangles and walkways are augmented by a program of linear tree plantings that reinforces their structure and geometry. The Redstone Pine Grove is preserved and augmented and becomes the terminus of the Redstone Walkway.
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ATHLETIC DISTRICT

Architectural Characteristics

The University’s Patrick-Forbush-Gutterson Athletic Complex (P-F-G) includes the Patrick Gymnasium and the Gutterson Fieldhouse, both of which were built in 1961. In 1991, Gutterson Fieldhouse was renovated and expanded to provide more seating for the University’s hockey team. Patrick Gymnasium is the home of men’s and women’s basketball as well as hosting concert events. The complex also includes the Gardner-Collins Cage, the recently constructed Gucciardi Fitness Center, and the new parking structure that is located along Spear Street. Patrick Gymnasium and the Gutterson Fieldhouse both have brick walls and long-span structure roofs. The Gardner-Collins Cage has a prominent aluminum arching roof, and the Gucciardi Fitness Center has metal and glass walls and is lifted above the ground on concrete columns.

New Buildings

Refer to the Athletics Facilities Master Plan 2005 by Gossen Bachman Architects for the current expansion plans of this complex.

Additions and Renovations

Additions should respect the existing buildings and be located so as not to intrude on outdoor athletic space.
ATHLETIC DISTRICT

Landscape Design Guidelines

The Athletic District is currently being reviewed as part of the Athletic Facilities Master Plan. Development in the Athletics District will increase the facilities for organized sports and spectator accommodation, while keeping the District’s current green character and expansive views to the Green Mountains.

Illustrative Plan from Gossens Bachman, Architects Athletics Master Plan, 2004
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CENTENNIAL SPORTS DISTRICT

Architectural Characteristics

The centerpiece of this District is Centennial Field, which since 1906, has been the home of the University’s baseball team, as well as a minor league professional team. The grandstand for the field was built in 1922 of concrete and steel. The Centennial Field National Register of Historic Places nomination states “Centennial Field’s grandstand is currently honored with the distinction of being the oldest grandstand structure in use by minor league baseball...Unlike many of its contemporaries, Centennial has remained virtually unaltered that gives it a distinction unique in itself. As it continues to play host to college and professional baseball, Centennial Field retains integrity of location, design, materials, and feeling, and remains a focal point in its community.” *

This District also includes a soccer field and bleachers.

New Buildings

New buildings in this District will likely be residential, and/or administrative, and may replace the existing soccer field and bleachers. This is also an important site to providing parking at the periphery of the campus. Any new buildings should respect the characteristics of the surrounding residential neighborhood in terms of height, mass, setback, rhythm, scale and proportions. At the same time the architecture should be clearly identified with the University of Vermont.

* Annotated excerpt from the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places that was researched and written by Michael McQuillen ’00, as part of his course work in the University of Vermont Historic Preservation Program in 1999.
CENTENNIAL SPORTS DISTRICT

Landscape Design Guidelines

The residential neighborhoods and the proximity of Centennial Woods that surround the Centennial Sports District create a unique sense of seclusion from traffic and the rest of the University.

Landscape Initiatives

New development within the Centennial Sports District should maintain the District’s unique wooded character with a rich program of planting. The District’s historical associations are maintained by preserving the historic Centennial Field and its viewing stands at its heart. New development will be oriented around a series of landscaped quadrangles and linked with a network of connective green spaces that preserve the intimate sense of scale of the Centennial Sports District.
Development within the Centennial District will be limited in scope to the areas designated as Undeveloped Open Space. The Centennial Woods Natural Area is protected from development in perpetuity.

**New Buildings**

New buildings in this District will likely be academic, administrative, and/or parking facilities. Any new buildings should respect the characteristics of the surrounding residential neighborhood in terms of height, mass, setback, rhythm, scale and proportions. These new buildings should have exterior materials, windows and roofs that are sympathetic to the wooded surroundings. At the same time the architecture should be clearly identified with the University of Vermont.
The Centennial District is home to the Centennial Woods Natural Area, a 66-acre preserve of woodland that the University has committed to preserving in perpetuity. Also included in the Centennial District are administrative facilities, significant amounts of undeveloped open space, the commuter and the Sheraton Parking Lots, and the University’s Rugby Fields.

The University is mindful of the sensitive ecological character of much of this District, and will undertake any future development here with care for its context and the concerns of the community.

Areas of the Centennial District that have already been developed (namely the commuter and the Sheraton Parking lots, and the Rugby Field) will take precedence for future development over existing undeveloped open space.

Any future development in this District will also include significant plantings of woodland to augment the existing natural character and ecological value of the site.

The potential development site on land bank area of the Rugby Field should stand back from Main Street and East Avenue with a significant set-back to minimize its impact on the Campus’s Gateway on Main Street. Informal plantings will minimize the visual impact of these structures.