

10. IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

The Campus Master Plan is intended as a framework, or guide, for decision making. In order to accomplish this, some of the Plan's characteristics are quite precise, while others are flexible and subject to interpretation. For example, recommendations regarding the size and pattern of open spaces are very precise, but the design character of many spaces is not prescribed. Likewise, the general alignment of future buildings has clear intent, but functional uses are not indicated, nor are precise building dimensions given. In other words, the Plan needs continual interpretation, and management. This requires a *process* for plan management and decision making.

One key to successful implementation of the Campus Master Plan is the ability to initiate and provide *District Plans* and *Building Siting Studies* as required. Another key is the ability to interpret, monitor, and provide design judgement for the development of the Plan. This chapter addresses the process for implementation and management of the Plan.

THREE LEVELS OF PLANNING AND PLANS

The Campus Plan

This plan establishes the overall intent of the College. It defines the primary spatial anatomy—the hierarchical pattern of public spaces—of the campus as well as its relationship to its surroundings. It also suggests the quality and intent of buildings and public spaces. It does not, however, provide the necessary detailed guidance for specific designs, although it may come very close to providing this.

District Plans

The District Plan differs from the Campus Plan in scope and specificity; it is at once a smaller area—a neighborhood—and has greater specificity regarding buildings, landscape, walks, etc. As a neighborhood plan, it bridges the gap between the Campus Plan and the siting and design of individual buildings, and is, in practice, the most effective tool for managing campus development.

An example at Middlebury is the need for such a plan for the Main Quad and service area, in order to determine the parameters and scope for Old Chapel Walk and Centeno.

Site Plans

The building siting plan is often combined with the programming/feasibility study to determine the conceptual, economic, and environmental feasibility of a given building program. This plan tests, confirms, and conveys more specific requirements unique to the building project.

Together these three types of plans and guidelines are the tools or instruments of campus development. They are an indispensable part of the process. They may be performed either in-house, or by outside consultants. They require a different way of thinking about the campus and about project budgets, however.

PROCESS

Four distinct implementation activities are required: *initiation, design, management, and evaluation.*

Project Initiation and Design

The interpretation and development of the Master Plan demands the ability to proactively initiate and carry out the planning studies described above. Initiation must come from within; design or carrying out may be either in-house or by outside consultants.

Management

Project management must be an in-house activity, and is something that Middlebury College does very well. The experience of managing the Campus Master Plan should be extended to District Plans and Building Siting Studies.

Design Review

This important activity is required for advice and counsel regarding project initiation, monitoring plan development, and reviewing both planning and architectural designs for conformance with the intent of the Campus Master Plan.

It is therefore recommended that a Master Plan Committee be established to monitor and manage the implementation of the Plan. This committee should meet regularly to encourage consistent and appropriate development of the Plan.

Master Plan Committee

The Master Plan Committee should be advisory to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer, but should be

appointed by the President of the College, and be vested with the authority to review projects on the College's behalf. This review has two primary goals:

- 1. To monitor and ensure that all design projects comply with the intent of the Master Plan; to interpret the Plan and Guidelines; to recommend exceptions when appropriate; and to recommend modification or development of the Campus Master Plan as required (consideration should be given to a review and, if necessary, an update of the Plan every ten years)*
- 2. To evaluate projects to ensure that they meet the highest qualitative and sustainable standards*

It is recommended that membership consist of two architecture faculty, two outside professionals (who should recuse themselves from consideration of their own projects), and two at-large faculty/staff (one of which should possess sustainability expertise). The Associate Vice President for Facilities should chair the Committee. Other members of the College community might attend meetings as resources, but as non-voting members.

The Master Plan Committee should meet as required, but no less than monthly, and should develop a process for the appropriate times to review projects. Earlier is better.

PHASING

The issue of phasing is very complex, with no absolute answer regarding sequence and timing. There are many recommendations in the Plan; some are discretionary (such as some landscape improvements), but others are more imperative (accessibility improvements); some have a relatively low cost, and might be accomplished in association with routine maintenance, while others (such as accessibility) have a high cost; and finally, some projects can be rationally planned and funded, while others are subject to unpredictable funding opportunities that may or may not conform to a phasing plan. It is therefore important to remember that this is a very long-term plan with many "opportunities," and few mandatory schedule milestones. It is recommended that the College develop a financial scenario planning model to track project sequence and costs.