Joseph Hudnut, prominent 20th-century architectural critic, stated in 1947 that a university is "a growing organism whose form lies partly in the past, partly in the future." Princeton’s past established a unique “sense of place” that endures through beloved traditions and the beauty of its historic campus. Princeton’s continued success as a vital institution hinges on preserving this unique character while modifying the campus as necessary to meet the demands of new student populations and academic disciplines. Although this Campus Plan covers a ten-year period, the basic planning frameworks and principles it offers are flexible enough to apply well past 2016, ensuring the best use of existing properties before expansion south of Lake Carnegie or elsewhere becomes necessary.
Beyond 2016

The first goal of the Campus Plan is to prepare the University for the next decade of anticipated growth. The projects and policies described in previous chapters are based on known initiatives for academic, residential, campus life, and administrative expansion, and quantifiable needs for parking, traffic, utilities, and other services to support these initiatives. The plan provides a framework for the realization of these objectives.

But what can, or should, be said about the future of Princeton’s campus beyond ten years? Is it useful to speculate about long-term growth, since specific needs for the future cannot be accurately predicted? Many current initiatives, such as the Neuroscience Institute and the Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, were not predicted or allocated space in the previous master plan in 1995. Some earlier long-range plans have been left unrealized or incomplete, as changing needs caused their obsolescence. A study of Princeton’s campus planning history reveals a hidden wealth of unbuilt visions and ideas, a phantom cartography based on the philosophies and perceived needs of each era. Much of the richness of the campus design, as well as some of its weaknesses, derive from the unfinished layers imagined by planners and architects from the colonial period to the end of the 20th century. How then should this plan foresee future stages of campus evolution?

While specific needs cannot be known, it is safe to assume that the University, and thus its campus, will continue to grow as it has for 250 years. Academic programs, deriving from ever-expanding fields of human knowledge, will continue to multiply and expand. As diminishing available land causes the campus to approach its capacity, each new project must be carefully and strategically located to preserve options for the future. Maintaining the ability to grow within the campus for as long as possible is an important goal. It reduces expansion pressures in areas immediately surrounding the campus, and avoids premature consideration of off-site development, such as the University’s West Windsor lands. Concentrating growth within the walkable campus will also reinforce Princeton’s unique intimacy and collaborative academic culture.

Surrounding regional growth, continuing at a rapid pace, impacts the campus as well. Over time the University must continue to recognize the regional impact of its decisions on traffic congestion and the environment.

For these reasons, the Campus Plan has studied the potential for long-range development with these objectives:

- Quantify the remaining available land for development on the main campus (generally the area between Nassau Street and Lake Carnegie).
- Identify a range of sites for the location of future buildings, to create predictability for the University and its neighbors.
- Ensure that the actions of the next ten years do not preclude opportunities for coherent campus growth in the future.
- Create a general framework for the long-range build-out of the campus, while maintaining sufficient flexibility to allow for new and changing needs.
- Develop principles for the sustainable long-range growth of the campus through the management of traffic, environmental, and other impacts.

The long-range planning effort has affected current thinking. The plan seeks to avoid the common error of the expedient build-out of the campus, while maintaining sufficient flexibility to allow for new and changing needs.

CAMPUS CAPACITY

The map above illustrates the long-term developmental capacity of the main campus and immediate surroundings, showing remaining sites that could be redeveloped before consideration of off-campus development, in West Windsor or elsewhere, would be required. It is important to note that the areas shown in color are not buildings, but general development areas identified for academic and campus life uses.

For example, the proposed daycare facility in the Arts and Transit Neighborhood anticipates mixed-use redevelopment of the Alexander Street corridor, and plans for the Natural Sciences Neighborhood and the new parking facility anticipate academic development along Ivy Lane and Western Way.

The next few pages describe options for the long-range arrangement of land uses and infrastructure. Future growth can be leveraged to create improved open spaces, pedestrian linkages, infrastructure, and environmental sustainability. The ideas shown here are meant to serve as a general guide and inspiration for the future stewards of the campus and its continued transformation.

—ROBERT GUTMAN
LECTURER IN ARCHITECTURE

Future growth of the campus is divided into two basic categories: academic and campus life uses, which must be close to each other and within a ten-minute walk of the Frist Campus Center; and support uses, including administrative offices, graduate housing, campus utilities, parking, daycare, and others. The map defines proposed limits for the expansion of the first category of uses, to maintain a walkable main campus in support of the University’s primary mission.

The areas outside these limits include potential sites for support uses which are compatible with their surroundings. For example, the proposed daycare facility in the Breadman area can fit within the context of a residential neighborhood, and housing, retail, and administrative office space on Alexander Street can support a mixed-use vision for the corridor. The Campus Plan also recommends that some support uses be relocated out of the central campus area to create new spaces for academic and campus life uses on limited available land.
Looking to the Future: Beyond 2016

East Neighborhoods

The eastern area of the Princeton campus provides the greatest potential for future growth of academic and campus life uses. This area has been identified due to its close walking proximity to other main campus areas, access to parking, and the flexibility available for future development sites. A large consolidated area for potential growth can be developed gradually over time as land becomes available, ultimately resulting in the creation of a coherent, rather than haphazard, campus neighborhood.

A significant benefit of academic development on Ivy Lane and Western Way is the ability to create a physical and intellectual “bridge” between the applied sciences neighborhood to the north and the natural sciences neighborhood to the south. Academic collaboration between those areas is currently inhibited by a gap created by parking lots and a pedestrian flow to this area of campus, reducing its isolation, and relocating athletics fields in preparation for future development along Western Way.

By creating additional pathways between Prospect Avenue and Ivy Lane/Western Way, and linking new open spaces to the Sciences Green, the entire eastern area of the campus can become better connected and establish a stronger campus character.

A second pedestrian bridge at the Frist Campus Center would strongly link the Core Campus to the neighborhoods east of Washington Road, including future development along Ivy lane and Western Way.
West Neighborhoods

Unlike the east neighborhoods, potential long-term development on the western edge of campus is less contiguous with the main campus, separated by existing infrastructure such as the rail line and the co-generation plant. However, the advantages of development in this area are its proximity to mass transit, including the Dinky and potential bus rapid transit, as well as to the new Arts and Transit Neighborhood, and the concentration of graduate student housing, which presents an opportunity to support a mixed-use neighborhood. The Campus Plan has identified three precincts for long-term growth in the western areas of campus including a northern zone within walking distance of the Core Campus, an area south of the Central Plant and west of the tracks, and the Alexander Street corridor.

The presence of the Graduate College and Forbes College and the close proximity of Princeton’s residential core make the area immediately north of Forbes College an appropriate site for a future residential college or graduate student housing. Residential development on this site would be in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

The MacMillan building site is another key opportunity for academic and campus life growth. Since the power plant and other utilities are located just to the south, this site forms the southwestern limit of the walkable main campus. Given its proximity to undergraduate residential areas, the Arts and Transit Neighborhood, the Ellipse, and the Dinky station, the campus plan recommends that the MacMillan building site be redeveloped in the long term for academic, residential, or campus life facilities such as Health Services.

The Arts and Transit Neighborhood may be expanded in the future, near the planned Dinky commuter parking lot, and on the University-owned properties along the southern portion of Alexander Street present an opportunity to develop a mixed-use and higher density corridor with administrative, commercial, and residential uses. In order to optimize the development of these sites, a new zoning framework is recommended to increase the allowable floor area ratios and reduce required parking ratios. With public transit options and reasonable walking proximity to campus, parking requirements could be lower than an average suburban development. The location of this corridor along a potential bus rapid transit line could also make it convenient to Route 1, Nassau Street, and the Dinky.

The Alexander Street corridor has three zones: Zone 1 between the Arts and Transit Neighborhood and Faculty Road, academic or administrative uses are recommended; Zone 2 between Faculty Road and the Helm Building could provide a transition between administrative and residential uses; Zone 3 south of the Helm Building is recommended for residential uses, due to its adjacency to existing graduate student housing and a potential future bus rapid transit station stop. Some community-oriented service uses, such as the existing gas station, should be maintained in the corridor, and retail uses can be added to support existing and new housing. A recent study has shown that a significant demand for retail exists, partly due to the concentration of graduate students in the area. Overall, the corridor presents an opportunity to improve a significant gateway to both the University and the Princeton community.

Planning principles:

• Consider the area north of Forbes College as the possible location of a new undergraduate residential college or additional graduate student housing, while creating new pedestrian linkages from this area to the main campus.

• Take advantage of the MacMillan building site’s proximity to the Core Campus for academic or other core uses.

• Utilize the concentration of infrastructure in the south-western services neighborhood of campus to expand needed capacity for utilities and support facilities.

• Develop the Alexander Street corridor as a mixed-use area, potentially including retail to support nearby graduate student housing.

• Through re-development, strengthen the Alexander Street corridor as a gateway to the University and to the township and borough of Princeton.
The ten-year Campus Plan does not provide for additional growth in the undergraduate student population beyond the planned addition of 500 students accommodated by the new Whitman College and reconstructed Butler College. In the future, however, it is likely that additional undergraduate residential colleges may be needed. Looking at the long-term growth possibilities in the previous pages, only a few sites are available for the large footprint required to construct an undergraduate college. For size comparison, refer to the footprint of Whitman College in the map at left.

A logical location would be near the dense cluster of existing undergraduate residential neighborhoods on the western side of campus. Two potential sites, north of Forbes College and the MacMillan building, are possible, though the latter is constrained and may result in an unacceptably dense layout. This would follow the original “zoning” of the campus, conceived by Ralph Adams Cram in the beginning of the 20th century, which located all residential to the southwest and all academic to the northeast.

Another possible site is in the Ivy Lane and Western Way Neighborhood. With a mix of residential and academic uses, this neighborhood could develop a vibrant character in keeping with the historic core, with actively used open spaces and a diverse daily population of faculty, staff, and students. A new college could also be planned to ensure its compatibility with nearby community residential areas. This strategy would contribute to the goal of uniting the campus across the two sides of Washington Road.

**PARKING OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

Many of the future developments are likely to be on existing parking lots. The resulting loss of parking spaces and a growing campus population will require a comprehensive strategy that identifies convenient, sustainable, and cost-effective parking solutions. Similar to the current ten-year plan, future strategies must maintain expedient connections between commuter arrival points, their parking locations, and their ultimate destinations on campus. The scarcity of parking sites and near the core campus will also underscore the need to expand transportation demand management programs to reduce the number of vehicles on campus.

On the main campus, there are two potential future parking sites. One option would be to create underground parking just north of the new parking facility on Western Way, which would be, in effect, the basement level of future buildings along Western Way. This location has the advantage of proximity to academic neighborhoods and reduced reliance on shuttle service.

Another option would be to create a new parking facility on the west side of campus on Lot 23. As part of a campus services neighborhood, this new parking facility could be developed in conjunction with a new building to house the facilities and maintenance offices currently in the MacMillan building. A portion of the new parking facility would be dedicated to plant vehicles that need to maintain direct access to all main campus buildings.

Because of physical, environmental, and traffic constraints, these on-campus parking facilities are not likely to be large enough to satisfy the entire parking demand of future campus growth. Inevitably, an off-campus parking facility will become necessary in the future. The most logical location for such a facility would be in West Windsor off Alexander Road. This location has convenient access from Route 1 and a potential connection to New Jersey Transit service along the existing Dinky right-off-way. A shuttle would connect this parking area to main campus via Alexander Street or via Faculty Road to Washington Road.

**THE OPPORTUNITY OF TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT**

The Dinky is a remarkable and unique asset to the University. Rarely does a major university enjoy direct and convenient access to mass transit service, much less with a connection to the Northeast Corridor, linking the campus to major cities as well as Newark Liberty International Airport. Although this service established at the turn of the 20th century has been supplanted by cars as the primary mode of transportation to and from campus, it continues to serve as a vital link for a wide range of users, and can be embraced as a powerful means of reducing Princeton’s dependence on automobiles, with corresponding environmental benefits.

In consideration of the benefits of reducing automobile traffic through increased transit ridership, New Jersey Transit is in the process of developing a bus rapid transit (BRT) system for the central New Jersey region. BRT consists of express buses running in dedicated lanes, with boarding platforms and ticketing facilities similar to a train. The advantage of these systems is the ability to avoid traffic and maintain fixed timetables, creating a reliable option for commuters. One component of the proposed concept is a line running parallel to the Dinky, supplementing the Dinky train service with more frequent rapid bus connections between Princeton and Princeton Junction. This additional level of service would provide greater convenience for riders, and could include a proposed extension of the bus routes north into the Princeton community.

One of the most interesting opportunities created by the BRT, however, is the potential to provide additional stops along its route, which is not possible with the current train service. Two possible station locations would be catalysts for long-term growth. A station at Alexander Street and Lawrence Drive would connect graduate students living in Lawrence Apartments and Hibben and Magie apartments to the center of campus, as well as employees in the Holmes Building and Future mixed-use spaces along Alexander Street. A second potential station in West Windsor would create an entirely new location for growth, convenient to 701 Carnegie Center where an off-campus administrative neighborhood is proposed as part of the ten-year plan. A West Windsor station could also connect new parking, athletic facilities, and housing to the core campus, and could be the starting point for potential future campus development on the West Windsor lands. By using transit as leverage, the walkable campus can be extended beyond its current borders.
It is the nature of a university to grow and change as the fields of human knowledge grow and change. The pace of institutional development will vary as a result of many external factors, from global events to the local economy, but it is the commitment to advance learning, scholarship and research that drives university expansion.

Although growth and change at a university may be inevitable, they are not always predictable. In the early 1960s Architect Douglas Orr produced a Master Plan for Princeton that imagined its full “build-out”. Although the intervening forty years have been a time of unequalled growth and change, most of Orr’s predictions have not been realized. On the other hand, the 1996 plan by Machado Silvetti was more modest in its objectives and most have already been accomplished. In this Campus Plan, Beyer Blinder Belle and University planners have again pursued a ten-year horizon to identify projects and objectives that are of the highest priority to the institution and clearly attainable... with an appropriate stretching of energies and resources.

What may happen after ten years cannot be drawn or imagined clearly. Just as a vision of our campus today would have confounded President Aaron Burr when he and his family moved to Prince-Town in 1756, we would surely be startled and amazed by a glimpse of Princeton University 250 years from now. For that reason, the long-term objective of this Campus Plan has been an exploration of growth strategies for no more than several decades rather than a visionary speculation of very long-term growth.

If this plan does not propose specific solutions for an unpredictable future, it does suggest a framework that will allow our successors to make future decisions wisely, when they know a lot more about future needs than we can possibly know today.

As much as it has changed over 250 years, or even 25 years, our evolving campus has been able to maintain a strong continuity with its rich architectural legacy. As architects ponder and plan the physical spaces for academic disciplines that were unknown a few decades ago, President Tilghman and her advisors will guide the course of the University in Nassau Hall (c.1756), humanists will advance African-American scholarship in Stanhope Hall (c.1803), scientists will conduct ecological research in Guyot Hall (c.1912), and students will learn to live with each other in dorms constructed between 1877 and the present day. It is our privilege to preserve and celebrate these diverse layers of architectural history as new ones are added. Indeed, the Princeton campus evolved as a living record, not only of growth and change in higher education but of the architecture of America. This Campus Plan is dedicated to a thoughtful continuation of that record.

Jon Hlafter
University Architect
Princeton University