To shape a realistic ten-year Campus Plan, Princeton had to balance the needs and desires of two interdependent communities. The University, a thriving community in itself, is home to a changeable population that interacts on many levels with the neighboring Princeton Borough and Princeton Township, a civic community of some 30,000 people including many longtime residents. These groups share a mutually beneficial relationship, and sustaining strong community relations became one of this plan’s guiding principles. To this end, the University encouraged public dialogue among the planning team, stakeholders, and local citizens. Their feedback helped to shape the plan’s approach to major issues—transportation, traffic, pedestrian safety, housing, and development along the campus edges—and also confirmed widespread support for environmental sustainability initiatives.
Dialogue with Our Neighbors and the University Community

Joined by a common history dating to the pre-revolutionary colonial period, as well as numerous contemporary economic and social interrelationships, Princeton University and the Princeton community are indelibly linked. Although the University owns property in two counties, its main campus areas are located in Princeton Borough and Princeton Township, collectively home to just over 30,000 residents. Defined by its appealing and historic downtown, Princeton is one of the most compact and walkable town centers in New Jersey. According to a recent study, a remarkable 36 percent of residents walk to work compared to 3 percent statewide. The availability of retail, services, and even a railroad link to the Northeast Corridor within walking distance of residential neighborhoods makes Princeton a unique community.

Princeton University is one of the top five employers in the region, with over 5,000 full-time equivalent workers. The University is located in two counties, Mercer and Middlesex, and in Mercer County alone it is estimated that in fiscal year 2005 the University’s direct and indirect economic activity created $1.38 billion in spending, as well as 16,483 non-University jobs, and 429 construction jobs. In the same year, students spent $40 million in the local economy, and 70,000 visitors to the University and the Princeton Visitor’s Center spent an additional $39.3 million. The University is the largest taxpayer in both Princeton Borough and Princeton Township, and it makes an annual (and increasing) voluntary contribution to Princeton Borough that in 2007 was more than $1 million. In recent years it has also made significant financial contributions to the school system, the public library, the hospital, the arts center, the first aid and rescue squad, and other organizations, and it has provided support for open space and affordable housing.

The University also subsidizes the local movie theater and the historical society, and recently took the initiative to make sure Princeton would continue to have an excellent independent bookstore right on Nassau Street. The campus provides green space, which is highly valued by residents of Princeton as a recreational asset and for its social and environmental benefits, as well as intellectual, cultural, athletic, and other activities and resources that are available to the public. These include the Princeton University Art Museum, the Cotsen Children’s Library, the Chapel, a Community Auditing Program, and concerts and other programs in Richardson Auditorium. In the fall of 2007, students at the University founded a farmers market on campus that was open to all.

As with any relationship between a large university and its community, the University can also be a source of concern, often centering on issues related to campus growth. Over time, as both the campus and the community see increased development, and as growth in the surrounding region puts increased pressure on already taxed road systems and infrastructure, such concerns are naturally heightened. Many of these concerns are shared by members of the University community, which consists of students, faculty, staff, and to some extent alumni and others who feel strong personal attachments to the campus. Members of both the on-campus community and the off-campus community are stakeholders in the process of planning for the campus of the future, and from the beginning opportunities were developed to provide information to them and seek their views.

One of the five guiding principles articulated by President Tilghman at the outset of the planning effort was that “sustain strong community relations,” signals the University’s recognition that it does not—and does not wish to—keep the campus for insiders, and outsiders should remain outside. This view was roundly rejected by the Princeton community of the late 1960s and, with the more dramatic moments of that era, the graduating class of 1970 opened the gate and engraved in it the words “Together for Community.” It has remained open since then.

The opening of the gate marked the beginning of initiatives that continue today to connect the University with the community in multiple ways. Some of these are architectural, such as the more open lawns on Nassau Street in front of McLean House and the Andlinger Center for the Humanities. Some are programmatic, ranging from community auditions to Community Campus. From athletic venues to cultural events, from the children’s library to the Art Museum. Some mobilize the volunteer energies of hundreds of students each year, others involve University investments in helping to meet a broad range of community needs. And some simply involve the simple act of outreach: inviting members of the community to an open house on campus planning, or opening up our resources to the community.

For the Princeton University campus—as for many other campuses and the country as a whole—the late 1960s were a time of enormous intellectual, social, and political ferment. It was a transformational era for the country as opposition to the war in Vietnam intensified and battles for human and civil rights took on renewed urgency. It was also a transformational era for Princeton, with women admitted as undergraduates for the first time in 1969, students of color admitted for the first time in significant numbers; and governance changes that, among other things, added students to the annual budgeting process and young alumni to the Board of Trustees.

One of the most disturbing symbols of what many saw as Princeton’s retreat beyond its borders was the closed FitzRandolph Gate. The gate separated the campus from the community, and like the University’s inward looking courtyards and its unmarked buildings and paths, it seemed to send a clear message that the campus was for insiders, and outsiders should remain outside. This view was roundly rejected by the community of the late 1960s and, on one of the more dramatic moments of that era, the graduating class of 1970 opened the gate and engraved in it the words “Together for Community.” It has remained open since then.
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### CAMPUS PLAN PRESENTATIONS TO THE PUBLIC AND THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Life Committee; University Student Government; and Graduate Student Government</td>
<td>Undergraduate Class Officers</td>
<td>Princeton Regional Planning Board—joint meeting with Borough Council and Township Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Regional Planning Board</td>
<td>Princeton Borough Council and Princeton Township Committee</td>
<td>Academic and Administrative Managers Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Street/University Place Open House</td>
<td>Council of the Princeton-University Community</td>
<td>Council of the Princeton-University Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>Plans in Progress—Open Forum for Campus and Community</td>
<td>Alumni Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Life Committee</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Life Committee</td>
<td>Princeton Regional Planning Board—Master Plan Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Administrative Managers Group</td>
<td>Academic and Administrative Managers Group</td>
<td>PRINCETON PLANNING BOARD—joint meeting with Borough Council and Township Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT WE HEARD

As a result of the “Plans in Progress” open house and other opportunities for public input, the planning team was able to collect feedback from diverse groups of people both within and outside the University. While input was wide-ranging in its subject matter, a number of recurring themes became clear.

#### Dinky station

Many people had questions or expressed concerns about the proposal to relocate the Dinky railroad station approximately 460 feet to the south in conjunction with the development of the planned Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts. The critical importance of the Dinky to the life of the community (and to the University) was underscored by a wide range of people. At the same time, many expressed support for the creation of additional services at the station that are not currently available, including an open and accessible waiting room, additional retail offerings, more convenient parking, better accommodations for bikes, and links to the University shuttle system and a community jitney service. Many also supported the idea of an arts-related development adjacent to McCarter and Berlind theaters. The idea of introducing retail establishments such as restaurants and cafes to support the arts development and Dinky riders was generally popular, although tempered by a concern that they complement, not compete with, Nassau Street businesses.

#### Pedestrian safety

Pedestrian safety was a common concern for both the University population and neighbors, particularly where large numbers of students frequently cross major arterial roadways such as Washington Road and Alexander Street. Many students, faculty, and employees also noted that some campus pathways lacked adequate lighting, drainage, and accessibility for the disabled, creating unsafe or unwelcoming conditions.

#### Parking

Parking was a frequent issue both for employees of the University and its neighbors. While many in the community expressed support for the proposed new parking facility east of the stadium, some neighbors expressed concern about the appearance of the facility and sought assurance that the traffic patterns into and out of the facility would minimize impacts on neighboring streets.

### Campus growth

University staff noted the impacts of campus growth in several ways. Some identified the need to adjust to different parking locations, and others expressed concern that their offices may be relocated off-campus to create additional space for academic development, although they welcomed some of the amenities that could be provided at off-campus locations. Additionally, members of the staff responsible for maintenance, services, security, and other areas expressed concern that resources will be stretched by the increase in the number of campus buildings.

#### Sustainability

Broad support was expressed by all groups for the proposed initiatives in environmental sustainability, campus landscape, and restoration of natural ecological areas. Others expressed an interest in additional sustainability initiatives, in particular for the enhancement of facilities for bicycling.

#### Campus architecture

Strong opinions on the style of campus architecture were common, particularly from students but also from others. The recent construction of Whitman College in a collegiate gothic style spurred numerous calls for a return to gothic architecture for new campus buildings. Other voices, however, called for Princeton to continue to be a place where some of the world’s leading architects can make major contributions to defining a campus that is both anchored in a distinctive history and ever evolving to meet new needs and new challenges in a changing world.

---

> The townsonk of Princeton won a competition to bring a fledgling college campus to their community in 1756, and both campus and community have drawn upon each other for sustenance ever since. The planning process invigorated an already lively dialogue between these two diverse, dynamic, and ever-evolving organisms.

> —ROBERT K. DURKEE, VICE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
THE ISSUES: AREAS OF PARTICULAR COMMUNITY INTEREST IN THE PLANNING PROCESS
New Jersey requires all municipalities to update their master plans periodically. By coincidence, the Princeton Regional Planning Board (which oversees long-range planning for both Princeton Borough and Princeton Township) had a review schedule completed for 2007, which allowed for considerable overlap with the campus planning process. During the two-year campus planning process, representatives of the planning board and the University met on several occasions, both informally and in public session, to discuss areas of common interest.

Since the community plan had previously anticipated that the University would expand in West Windsor, these discussions focused on the implications of the University’s decision to grow instead as a more compact, pedestrian-oriented campus on the Princeton side of Lake Carnegie. In general, the goals of the master plan and the campus plan were well aligned and local officials expressed support for the University’s guiding principles. 

CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY EDGES
While the community takes an interest in all growth on campus, in part because any growth has an impact on traffic, parking, the environment, and public services, it takes particular interest in growth near the edges of the campus, especially near the University’s growth over the next ten years will be along its southern edge where it owns all of the land between the campus and the lake. The community has an interest in the University’s sustained commitment to Faculty Road (which it owns and maintains) as a distributor of traffic that can enter and leave the campus without traffic from the residential neighborhoods. There are plans for housing and support uses such as additional capacity for the Office of Athletics and auxiliary fields; but those are all uses compatible with the residential character of this neighborhood.

A proposed new parking facility is intended to meet current and future parking needs in a way that minimizes the likelihood that growth in this area will have an impact on traffic or parking on neighboring streets.

The West Edge This edge of campus is well defined along University Place and College Road but is in a period of transition along Alexander Street south of University Place. This area historically has been defined by the transportation and service uses that followed the canal and later the railroad line into campus and town, and it continues to be a major gateway into the Princeton community from Route 1 both car and train (and in the future potentially by bus rapid transit as well). The Alexander Street corridor south of the Arts and Transit Neighborhood is one of the few areas of Princeton zoned for service uses, such as gas stations and light industrial uses. Many of these establishments have maintained a high level of activity in recent decades, and the University has obtained many of these properties for eventual development. This plan assumes that a gas station will continue to be located here, but leaves flexibility for future discussion of potential uses for the rest of the area. While no immediate development is proposed, the overall strategy is to promote mixed-use development that takes advantage of access to transit, while maintaining service uses that benefit the community.

THE ARTS AND TRANSIT NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE DINKY

Several proposed projects affect existing traffic patterns and roadway configurations. The plan leverages the opportunity of campus redevelopment to improve the roadway network, mitigate congestion points, and optimize the flow of traffic in the regional system. The University generates traffic in the form of daily commuters and visitors. The majority of vehicles that arrive on campus approach from Route 206 south, or from Route 1 via Alexander Street and Washington Road. While the plan redesigns and expands parking facilities across the campus to meet the needs of the next ten years, it maintains the current balance of traffic volumes on these approaches made by utilizing University-owned Faculty Road as a “collector-distributor,” shifting commuters from their road of approach to their assigned parking location. This strategy gets cars off the regional network as early as possible, and reduces impacts on neighborhood streets.

At the proposed Arts and Transit Neighborhood, one planning strategy is to relocate administrative office spaces out of the congested Alexander Street corridor, thus reducing the University’s contribution to peak hour commutes in the area. These commuters would be replaced with visitors to arts and cultural activities, making maximum use of less congested off-peak times as afternoons and evenings. A proposed roundabout at the intersection of Alexander Street and University Place, together with a relocation of the Wake House and a major pedestrian crossing, would greatly improve this seriously congested intersection, with local and regional benefits.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING
By state mandate, municipalities in New Jersey must ensure that development within their borders includes provisions for affordable housing. This means that as the University plans additional housing for its faculty, staff, and graduate students and adds new space to meet its academic and other needs, it also must help provide additional non-University affordable housing in the community. The University has a long history of supporting such housing as Princeton Borough and Princeton Township, with annual contributions to both municipalities for this purpose as well as the contribution of property near the Lawrence Apartments.

Recently, the University has agreed to purchase land in the community for affordable housing; to construct affordable units on a borough street adjacent to its Stanworth apartments; and to expand the number of units available in the township through Princeton Community Housing, an organization that the University helped establish 40 years ago. While the state formula for determining the number of affordable units associated with university construction remains under review, the University is continuing to realize obligations, while continuing to provide substantial housing for its faculty, staff, and graduate students, who therefore do not have to compete for lower-cost housing in the broader community.