Chapter 8:  
Conclusions and Recommendations

Through the grant provided to the University of Kansas by the Getty Foundation, the work associated with this Campus Heritage Plan has allowed the participants in the process to assess and document the historic buildings, sites and landscapes of the campus, to better understand the historic context for valued campus features, and to identify why these resources are important. The study has also provided insights into the process for meshing contemporary needs with historic context in order to make the best use of the historically significant resources of the KU campus.

Conclusions

The management and use of historic sites and facilities requires close attention to campus land use over time, both for the immediate area associated with a historic site and the associated environs. Campus buildings, sites and landscapes should not be evaluated as individually occurring and isolated but as related elements within a historic context in a contemporary time. For this reason, university campuses are unique in their building and site relationships and the various pressures for change as compared with other patterns of building and site development such as large scale commercial, residential or industrial districts.

On this campus, and more so than most campuses because of KU’s topography and the State-mandated reviews of historic resources, appropriate analysis of these resources is related to the views to and from these sites and the related visual impact on nearby historic structures and sites. These characteristics of campus “viewsheds” provide continuity over time and the ability to experience a more sophisticated layering of spatial qualities, high quality perspective views within the campus and to the horizon, and a higher quality pedestrian experience.

It is something of a misconception that preservation works best where the uses of buildings designed for specific activities do not change. A significant number of University programs require updated facility support on an ongoing basis for new programs and creative means to fulfill research, learning and teaching responsibilities. The ability to plan ahead for the anticipated facility and site needs of the institution is the key. With the use of appropriate planning tools, meeting the needs of contemporary programs does not preclude good preservation practice. For example, adaptive use of historic structures is a tool that should be considered within the campus environment. With appropriate
planning, it is entirely possible to maintain both a historically appropriate campus environment and leading edge programs of the University within the mix of facilities. When done well, this makes for a much more dynamic campus, with a clear connection to its history and a clear view to the future.

Today, the KU buildings on the National Register, and many that would be eligible for nomination, are virtually irreplaceable, both in terms of the lost detailing, craftsmanship and quality of materials of previous eras as well as the high costs of construction to replace these buildings today. Based upon their aesthetics and their contribution to the campus, the architecture, sites and exterior spaces held by these buildings are formative to the very identity of KU. Each of the current Register buildings has contributed to the campus composition and function over the course of significant periods of campus development and continue to contribute to the campus environment today. Moving forward, significant investment in stabilizing and restoring these historic structures is the key to ensuring their physical integrity 100 years or more from now. To support this goal, there is an incentive in the State of Kansas that allows the use of rehabilitation tax credits for the appropriate renovation of historic properties that are listed on State or National historic registers.

Recommendations for the preservation of campus buildings and the process for surveying additional historic structures have been mentioned earlier in this document. Undoubtedly, the buildings of the campus help to shape sites and provide context, functioning as an integral part of the campus landscape. In earlier eras of plantings, large scale landscape treatments of building façades and entries tied the campus together as a very rich environment and high quality pedestrian experience.

For the landscapes of the campus, the historic attributes have been defined by landscape architects and limited by nature. It has been clear in this assessment that although various design intents influenced by national and international movements have impacted the KU campus, the work of Hare & Hare and interpretations of their concepts for planting and site development have been the prevailing design influence over time. There is a larger context presented in this document that has traced the evolution of the planted environment of the campus from the prairie ridge top of the 1860’s to the bustling activity beneath the elm canopy of Jayhawk Boulevard in the late 1950’s. As compared with buildings, the planted landscape is more susceptible to the ravages of weather extremes, insect damage and construction equipment and the challenges of maintainence in the extremes of the eastern Kansas climate. While a building can be constructed within a year or two, landscapes can require one or two decades after planting to achieve a mature appearance to be enjoyed for years.

Since the 1980’s, the combination of various natural causes and events have affected the integrity of the campus plantings. The major overlapping landscape treatments that have been lost or are currently threatened include:

- The loss of the elms on Jayhawk Boulevard planted in the 1920’s and lost in the 1980’s due to disease.

- Conifers were planted primarily in the 1920’s through the 1970’s for landscape architectural delineation along paths and building foundations and to reinforce the architectural lines of buildings. They have been in decline since the 1990’s because of blight, weather and insect damage.
• The loss of the Malott era ornamentals as they achieve their anticipated lifespans.

These collective losses to the campus landscape have converged in a relatively short timeframe. The challenge for a campus so heavily invested in an image which relies on plant materials and consistent, high caliber design, is that declines can occur rapidly in a small portion of the time required to plant and re-establish the mature landscapes of the campus that have been created by the overlap of several eras of planting. KU has leveraged previous generations’ investments in plants and landscape, which are collectively now in decline and in need of significant reinvestment. Eight decades of focused planting that began in the early 1920’s, with a robust realization of a mature landscape between the 1940’s through the 1970’s, are now waning. Without an ongoing effort equivalent to this over the course of the coming years, re-establishing a high quality, mature landscape will be further postponed for decades in the remaking.

The Benefits of a Stewardship Vision

There are compelling reasons for KU to embrace a vision for a comprehensive and consistent approach to historic stewardship and preservation:

• Stewardship of the Campus Beauty and Tradition: The University of Kansas is widely known for the beauty of its campus, beloved by students, faculty, staff and alumni from Kansas and from around the world. As part of the public trust, it is the responsibility of each generation to pass on a campus known for its distinctive qualities and impressive beauty. Maintaining this beauty, respecting and continuing traditions and protecting the historic resources associated with KU also assist in promoting alumni loyalty and, in turn, public and financial support for institutional goals. When campus visits are seen as a key decision point for potential students and parents, the qualities of the campus, many of which qualify as historic attributes, provide a positive influence in recruiting efforts.

• Promoting Dialogue Within the KU Community to Establish a Value for Our History: A vision for stewardship and preservation planning provides a critical opportunity within the University community to continue the dialogue on how best to manage change and development opportunities on the campus in a manner that protects the historic resources of the campus while meeting the academic, research, program and facility goals of the University.

• Improved Planning and Financial Incentives: As a state, Kansas has developed a preservation law and policies that give KU rare opportunities to guide and financially benefit from the standards for stewardship and preservation outlined in this report. These policies include high rehabilitation tax credits, the application of “Environments” reviews to buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Register of Historic Kansas Places, and the designation of KU’s Campus Historic Preservation Board as the review body for purposes of the protective measures of the state historic preservation statute.

Progress toward these goals may be more fully realized with the consideration of a variety of projects and new policies and administrative approaches, as outlined in the following recommendations.
Implementation and Process Recommendations

Stewardship of the historic campus resources at KU should be seen as a strategy for responsible asset management rather than as an impediment to change. Realistically, it is not possible to anticipate every potential future development opportunity in any one timeframe. To answer the questions for the myriad of projects that will be contemplated for this campus in the coming years requires a process of additional investigation and evaluation. This set of recommendations provides a methodology and a better understanding of the historic campus context for use in the evaluation process for future development, including the facts and interpretations provided by those professionals who have worked on this project and which are summarized herein. These recommendations also optimize KU’s ability to recoup tax credits for future projects, ranging from the comprehensive rehabilitation of a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places to the repair of a storm-damaged roof.

The following recommendations will assist the University in implementing sound strategies for historic stewardship. Because this process recognizes the interdependent relationships between the implementation of specific projects and the processes and policies necessary to accomplish them, the recommendations within this Campus Heritage Plan have been presented to cover a comprehensive approach to campus preservation and stewardship, within the following categories:

1. Recommendations for actions on proposed projects
2. Recommendations for policy, process and planning

Recommendations for Actions on Proposed Projects

A. Develop a plan for renewal of the core campus and the signature Jayhawk Boulevard landscape for phased implementation (see details in Chapter 6).

Jayhawk Boulevard is the defining corridor of the historic core of the KU campus. The 2002 Campus Landscape Master Plan includes recommendations and preliminary concepts for the renovation of the Jayhawk Boulevard street and pedestrian corridor. While replanting of the street trees is a priority project to recreate the mid to late 20th century historic arched canopy over the Boulevard, the planting of these trees should occur only after the reconstruction of the necessary utilities, streets and sidewalks.

Concurrent with the plans for restoring the Boulevard, projects should be created and funded for the implementation of landscape renovation/restoration along the corridor for lawns and foundation plantings that would not be impacted by the reconstruction of Jayhawk Boulevard. Many of these sites are either currently deficient or will be substantially disturbed with upcoming tunnel construction projects. A strategy such as this, to coordinate individual site improvements with work to improve a main campus feature such as Jayhawk Boulevard, will extend the required investment over time and allow financial support from a variety of funding sources.

B. Prepare a building management and restoration plan for Spooner
Hall including an updated Historic Structure Report (HSR), investigation of stabilization methods and a plan for investment in the first phase of exterior work (see details in Chapter 7).

Spooner Hall, the oldest of the surviving main campus buildings, may currently be the most threatened. Maintaining the exterior of this deteriorating predominately sandstone facility poses a challenge for this project and will require technical preservation expertise. Due to the failing condition of the exterior stone, significant funding will be required for substantial stabilization of the building. For this reason, Spooner Hall has been placed at the top of the facility list of preservation and stewardship concerns.

To avoid further potential damage and expense, the stabilization and restoration of Spooner Hall should be completed as soon as funding can be secured for suitable restoration. Subsequent major restoration of other historic campus buildings should be completed on a cycle of at least one major restoration every five to 10 years. The general process for this type of project should become part of the skillsets for the building professionals on campus.

C. Pursue the restoration of Marvin Grove and other significant campus landscapes (see details in Chapter 6).

Marvin Grove is considered to be the most historically significant landscape on the campus due to its late 19th century association with Chancellor Marvin in planting the campus, the relative intactness of the space and vegetation, and its importance in the early years of KU. The Grove is also a rare expression of the settlement of the plains in being one of the earliest planted hardwood groves on a Midwestern campus. It is eligible for individual listing on the NRHP and at state and local levels. Although challenged by recent decline and tree damage, the beauty of this green space is unparalleled on campus. Subsequent efforts should be undertaken to pursue the nomination of Marvin Grove to the NRHP.

Other designed campus landscapes can be rehabilitated or restored following the treatment guidelines in this report. Several important projects are noted in this report, aspects of which are considered to be possible to achieve for a reasonable investment, such as the Mississippi Street Terrace, Prairie Acre, Memorial Drive and the Campanile, Potter Lake, the Class of 1943 Recreation Area, Jayhawk Boulevard, Lindley Commons, the Stauffer-Flint Lawn and areas surrounding the Hill. Landscapes are living environments that require a commitment for the cycle of planting, restoration and replanting in perpetuity. For a campus known in recent eras for the quality of overstory and ornamental trees, a long-term forestry management plan also needs to be put into place.

D. Begin a sustained effort at recapturing core campus hilltop views to the horizon (see details in Chapter 6).

The single most important formative element in the composition of the KU campus is the topography of the Mount Oread ridge and its slopes. As a result, the hilltop sites have provided magnificent views to the horizon since the earliest days of the campus. The campus today has lost many of these contributing viewsheds over time due to the addition of buildings and the increased growth of vegetation.
Some of these views can be recaptured with a planned program for the selective removal of overgrown vegetation and the use of alternative planting concepts to frame views or move landscape treatments to the ground plane.

Future planning for building expansions on and adjacent to the Hill must also account for these more timeless qualities of views to the horizon, which are difficult if not impossible, to recapture once interrupted by building additions or compromised views between buildings.

E. Pursue efforts for the Class of 1943 Recreation Area west of Potter Lake as a restoration project (see details in Chapter 6).

One of the least known culturally significant sites on the campus is the Class of 1943 Recreation Area, which includes a large concrete patio and adjacent built-in hillside bench used for war era dances and social gatherings. This area is eligible for listing on the NRHP as contributing to a larger district that encompasses the master plan of George Kessler. This area gains significance from associations with student life during WWII and the intact views to Potter Lake, the Campanile and Strong Hall.

F. Incorporate the use and modern interpretation of the historic plant palettes that were identified during the Campus Heritage Plan project for on-going maintenance and replanting of the campus landscapes.

To assist the professional campus staff of planners, designers and those involved in landscape maintenance, the historic plant palette matrix (Appendix F) generated in the course of this project is a tremendous reference for future design and maintenance applications. It will be important in the next generation of landscape revitalization efforts that the historic plant palette and design intent be appropriately interpreted. The process of generating specifications and selecting replacement plant materials will provide an opportunity for review of the historic documents and appropriate design interpretation for future use. Additionally, the recommendations of the 2002 Campus Landscape Master Plan provide lists of sustainable plant materials for various areas of the campus. Used in conjunction with the historic landscape resources, appropriate design solutions can be developed for future campus use to address the historic design intent as well as issues of sustainability.

G. Establish a suitable planted environment around Memorial Stadium and related football facilities.

Simultaneous to the Campus Heritage Plan process, the recent construction of the football practice fields and the facility expansion has prompted the need for enhancement of the remaining significant open space and landscape features associated with the history of this area. From a perspective of historic context, the activities associated with collegiate sports in the Memorial Stadium area are among the most traditionally significant campus elements, primarily for the relationships with student life and community involvement. In a basic preservation assessment regarding historic integrity, the original stadium construction is largely intact and is considered to be qualified individually for State or National listing or as a significant contributor to a larger campus district.

As identified with the 1904 Kessler plan, the association of the stadium area as the primary campus athletics site is still evident today. The later 1927 Hare & Hare planting plan for the stadium was one of the more developed schemes,
including sizeable overstory trees and ground level ornamentals which lined the exterior stadium façade.

Since the 1920’s the traditional graduation procession has linked the Hill where the Campanile now stands to the stadium by way of the parade of graduates into the stadium each spring. The hope is that the landscape in this area of campus can be rejuvenated so that the rolling hills of the site and the planted environment once again become the dominant feature, allowing the focus to return to the north facing hillside and the views into this site from the academic campus.

H. Complete a more thorough evaluation of the proposed concepts for environs boundaries of the current National Register facilities (see details in Chapter 7).

The insights gained from this Campus Heritage Plan process have provided a rationale for considering an approach for viewsheds and site attributes to be used as the basis for redefining the “environs” boundaries for the five NRHP properties from the current 500-foot statutory requirement. Because these buildings are experienced not as individual and isolated buildings, but as inter-related components of the campus environment, it is recommended that the revised environs boundaries be viewed in their totality as one composite environs boundary on the campus. The initial viewshed concepts for environs that are included within this document (Chapter 2 and Appendix G) would rely more heavily on campus sites and the ways in which they support existing NRHP buildings, i.e. Marvin Grove as a contributing feature to the environs of Dyche, Lippincott and Bailey halls. In certain cases, the viewed concept may reduce the boundary of environs reviews into non-state owned property (for example, in defining the extent of a viewshed environs to the east of Spooner Hall).

To accomplish this goal, it will be helpful for the CHPB and support staff to continue the work begun in this process to reach consensus on the contributing elements and environs definition for the NRHP properties identified in this document.

I. Pursue individual or district nomination(s) of additional properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

KU should consider nomination of a campus historic district or a series of individual nominations to the National Register to include both buildings and landscapes. The establishment of an NRHP district on the campus would assist in maintaining a more consistent institutional value for the historic resources of the campus as University leadership transitions over time. Designate a group (such as the proposed group identified in recommendation B in the Recommendations for Policy, Process and Planning found below) to evaluate the assessments provided by the Campus Heritage Plan and deliver a report to the Chancellor on what would be best for the long term interests of the University. Refer to Chapter 6 for additional information on eligible campus landscapes and Chapter 7 for eligible buildings.

Listing individual properties or creating a National Register district will qualify these properties for state rehabilitation tax credits, not only for the 15 individually eligible buildings within the historic core of the campus, but potentially an additional 11 buildings that would be eligible for listing as part of a district. Rather than reviewing individual buildings and landscapes, a district listing would facilitate a design review and guideline process that would incorporate stewardship and preservation
principles throughout the most significant historic resources of the campus. It would include contributing landscapes and site features that more realistically convey the comprehensive manner in which the campus is experienced.

In the course of establishing a district, additional work will need to be completed to more accurately assess the contributing versus non-contributing elements and more clearly define the boundaries of the district(s). Additionally, the process would begin the discussions for possible campus design guidelines to facilitate appropriate treatments for the historic resources of the campus.
Should the University choose not to nominate a district to the National Register of Historic Places, it may consider nominating some or all of the identified individually eligible buildings and eligible landscapes on an individual basis. Such listings would conserve the historic features that have the highest level of significance and integrity and qualify buildings for funding through the tax credit program. Prior to design, KU should consider advancing additional nominations to the NRHP for those properties that are candidates for substantial work related to deferred maintenance and program accommodation to take advantage of these tax credits.

The order in which individual buildings or landscapes might be listed may be determined in part by the schedule proposed for upcoming renovation projects. For example, KU may decide to list a building with a known upcoming construction project to qualify for the state tax credits. These savings would assist in providing funding for expanded scopes not necessarily related to preservation or for other preservation projects on campus.

It is also entirely possible that additional register nominations may come from the public at large. It is legally acceptable for individuals or organizations to submit nominations for public buildings and campus facilities.

**Properties Eligible for Individual Listing:** Based upon their level of significance, integrity and chronological distribution, the buildings and landscapes that should be given priority for further evaluation for individual listing and contributing to a district are identified below and presented in greater detail in chapters 6 and 7:

**Buildings:** Military Science, Lindley Hall, the Power Plant, Twente Hall (Watkins Hospital), 525 W. 14th Street (Robinson Barn), The Outlook (Watkins House), Battenfeld Hall, Memorial Stadium, Miller Scholarship Hall, new Fowler Shops (south Art & Design), Sellards Hall and Watkins Scholarship Hall. (See Chapter 7 for additional information.) Additionally, with the completion of recent renovation projects, Danforth Chapel and Crawford Community Center should be re-evaluated to determine whether they would be eligible for individual listing.

**Landscapes:** Marvin Grove and Prairie Acre. (See Chapter 6 for additional information)

**Properties Eligible for District Listing:** Based upon their level of significance, integrity and chronological distribution, the buildings and landscapes that should be evaluated for inclusion within a potential historic district listing include the buildings and landscapes listed above and the following:

**Buildings:** Carruth O’Leary Hall, Corbin Residence Hall, Facilities Operations Administration Building, Budig Hall (Hoch Auditorium), Marvin Hall, Marvin Studios (Broadcasting Hall, Mud Hut), Pearson and Douthart Residence halls, Snow Hall, Stauffer-Flint Hall (old Fowler Shops), University Relations (Wesley Foundation building) and Watson Library. (See Chapter 7 for additional information.)

**Landscapes:** Mississippi Street Terrace, Memorial Drive and the Campanile Hill, Potter Lake, Class of 1943 Recreation Area, Jayhawk Boulevard, Weaver Court at Spooner Hall, Lindley Commons and the Stauffer-Flint lawn. (See Chapter 6 for additional information.)
J. Survey historically significant campus buildings and landscapes to develop a plan for stabilization of these resources.

Preceding the detailed work of preservation, a less costly but critical stage is to begin the work of stabilization of various campus features to avoid further degradation. The work of this conservation plan does not provide a detailed technical analysis of the historic buildings on the campus of the University of Kansas. In order to prioritize stabilization, preservation and restoration projects for campus buildings, the University should complete Historic Structures Reports (HSRs) for its historic buildings.

HSRs are comprehensive plans that provide clear roadmaps for properties’ long-term preservation. HSRs include Master Plans, Feasibility Studies, and Conditions/Materials Assessments. They also include detailed chronologies of changes to the property over time, which professionals can use to recommend the best stabilization and treatment approach for building components and the overall structure.

KU should begin by preparing a series of HSRs for the five buildings currently listed individually. They should then prepare HSRs for buildings that are identified in this report as individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. HSRs should be completed before the University plans or carries out any major work on these buildings. In addition, the University should complete an inventory of campus artifacts (such as stone detailing, salvaged wood artifacts or ornamental railings from razed buildings, some of which have been incorporated into other buildings) to document what exists and where these artifacts are stored.

Simultaneous efforts should also address the historic landscapes of the campus. This is a long term process that must be systematically updated. KU’s most important and NRHP-eligible designed historic landscapes are in fragile condition. As listed above, the most significant landscapes are discussed in Chapter 6 along with those that directly contribute to a potential historic district nomination for the campus.

K. Facilities Operations should continue to work closely with the Office of Design and Construction Management (DCM) to adapt plant palettes, designs and policies for all units maintaining campus sites to follow.

To most effectively protect and maintain the historic fabric and maintenance quality of the open space of the campus landscape, it would be helpful to have all landscape maintenance and improvement projects (with the exception of athletic fields) maintained by one entity, with Facilities Operations as the recommended choice.

L. Complete an archeological study of West Campus.

Although the West Campus has not been included within the project boundary for this study, it is generally perceived that there are archeological resources on sites within its boundaries that may be of historic significance. It would be advisable to complete an archeological study of the West Campus to document the types, locations and significance of these resources prior to further development in the area. It is possible that such a study could be completed by KU faculty members or graduate students.
Recommendations for Policy, Process and Planning

It is in the University’s longest term interests to establish a more coherent policy related to preservation of campus historic resources. As the manager of a public trust for one of the most distinguished sites in Kansas, and one of the upper tier campus environments in the country, the quality of these institutional resources warrants greater attention. With the insights provided through the Campus Heritage Plan process, the subsequent steps to establish an institutional value for the historic resources of the campus will be determined by the leadership of the University.

With the historic information that has been collected and evaluated during the process of the Campus Heritage Plan, the University has a renewed opportunity to determine how the institution collectively weighs and values its future course in relation to preservation and reinvestment. The process of assessing the campus and identifying key and contributing features raises several questions:

“If we choose to develop new campus resources at a given location with various degrees of historic context, these projects may have potential impacts to our historic resources. How do we weigh and value these as a University?”

“What is the process to assess the impact on the composition and history of the place?”

“How are resources allocated to substantial preservation projects to deliver decades of stability for contributing elements?”

Collectively, these are important issues directly related to the physical quality of the place for campus leadership. They are ultimately questions of process, vision and investment.

The following recommendations will assist the University in stewarding the historic resources of the campus.

A. Establish planning and review processes for campus design and construction projects, including evaluation of the potential impact on ground level views. This will be especially critical for the most historically significant areas of the campus.

The review of all potential projects in the earliest stages of project development and conceptual design will improve the ability for overall coordination with campus issues related to historic resources and the CHPB process. Early planning evaluations of these projects will also assist in proactively addressing land use decisions, infrastructure needs, options for adaptive reuse and space management, impacts on parking and transportation planning, and changes to the campus landscape.

B. Identify a group to participate in a broadly representative advisory body to the administration to endorse and advance historic stewardship and preservation goals on campus.

A group should be identified to serve in a support role to discuss, evaluate and provide input to the administration for both campus-wide and site-specific campus historic stewardship issues on an on-going basis. Because the role of the Campus Historic Preservation Board has been intentionally designed as an independent body to fulfill a statutory review function, this expanded role may best be addressed by a group outside of the CHPB to facilitate the discussion and evaluation of potential
In order to accomplish the specific projects outlined in this document, it is recommended that the Chancellor, or a group such as the Campus Heritage Plan Steering Committee designated by the Chancellor, endorse the projects that have been designated as priorities in this Campus Heritage Plan. After priorities have been confirmed, the Chancellor may choose to request that KU Endowment conduct a feasibility study so that appropriate fundraising strategies can be crafted to identify donors and solicit gifts. Such fundraising efforts may include expendable as well as endowed funds.

Under the direction of the Chancellor and/or Provost, this advisory body could be responsible for maintaining and updating the Campus Heritage Plan, including an annual assessment of progress made toward goals and recommendations. Should an advisory group for campus stewardship and preservation efforts not be appointed, then continue the role of the Steering Committee for the Campus Heritage Plan to monitor and review progress.

C. Involve the Campus Historic Preservation Board early in the planning and review process on projects to facilitate timely interaction with project managers and outside design consultants.

As an agent of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), KU is uniquely granted the authority through the Campus Historic Preservation Board to review historic preservation projects in much the same manner that is allowed by a freestanding town or city. Given this authority, early participation by the CHPB allows potential issues to be addressed most successfully with minimal impact to the project budget and helps to establish appropriate design guidelines relative to preservation concerns. Plans that are provided to the CHPB early in the process (for projects impacting such elements as historic resources, land use, views and vistas, open space, traditional campus entries and landscape treatments) significantly reduce the risk of potential negative impacts to the historic resources and overall planning goals of the campus, particularly when working with multiple outside consultants not as familiar with the historic context of the campus or the goals for campus preservation.

D. Consider the addition of a historic preservation staff member or look to qualified consultant services to support the work identified within this document.

With the wealth of historic resources in the buildings, sites and landscapes of the KU campus, it would be appropriate to create the position of Campus Preservation Officer for further assessment of historic campus resources, the review of projects, the preparation of materials for CHPB review, professional guidance to DCM project managers and consultants, and to critique potential National Register nominations of campus properties. This position could report to the University Architect and serve as staff support for both the CHPB and the efforts of the recommended advisory group in item B above.

E. Pursue a new cycle of master planning at KU, which would incorporate the Campus Heritage Plan.

A consistent and regularly scheduled planning process, perhaps every three to five years, would assist in keeping historic preservation goals more closely aligned with issues and concerns for campus development projects and goals. Master
Plan updates should also incorporate the Landscape Master Plan, the 1997 Campus Plan and other relevant utility and planning documents for the campus.

Including space management for the University within the planning process would help to identify those facility needs that are associated with various programs best suited to remain in the historic core of the campus. This assessment of opportunities will also help to identify appropriate programs and services to move to outlying areas of Main Campus and to West Campus. The better match of building resources to programs will assist in addressing the issues of adaptive use of historic resources. In addition there are basic campus planning concerns related to preservation that are not always consistent with central campus density, parking and transportation solutions, and general congestion. This sort of interface will help to reduce the potential for central campus areas to become more urbanized and a loss of the historic campus context.

**Closing Remarks**

Many individual accounts through history recognize the substantial positive impact on the campus environment for many students, alumni and visitors. It is not happenstance or by luck that this University of Kansas campus provides an environment that ties generations of people to this place. As this report documents, our campus environment is the result of a provident approach: good planning decisions have resulted in a beautiful campus. More clearly evident now, given the insights of this Campus Heritage Plan, is that maintaining this quality requires diligence.

The Campus Heritage Plan process has provided a substantial inventory of the physical composition of the campus and how it supports the life of campus residents. Understanding the distinguishing characteristics of the campus, criteria by which these can be measured, the degree of integrity extant, and the historic and cultural relevance of sites has been the focus of this study. This report documents how sites have been maintained where events became traditions, and in some cases, where buildings and traditions have been lost or replaced. To a large degree we’ve come to know the extent to which the historic context remaining today provides for the daily activities that are part of the educational mission of the University. There is a certain timelessness associated with this particular place that links generations and is evident in the physical surroundings. In the realm of higher education, these are qualities that are highly valued and difficult to build, recreate or replace.

In the previous pages, a direction for long term investment has been put forward. This report, however, must be revisited over time, improved and updated around contemporary needs so that new and historic values can be applied to the most significant projects within the campus environment.

The interesting distinction regarding planning for preservation is that it requires a look at some of the longest term contextual concerns and it projects into the future the most valued characteristics and long term vision for the physical campus. Given the contribution of the Getty Foundation for this Campus Heritage Plan, the framework of the campus composition is now clear, the contributions of significant campus features noted, and the justification for their preservation evident.