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September 5, 2001

I am honored to present to the Wayne State University Board of Governors this final report of the university’s facilities planning process, “The 2020 Campus Master Plan for Wayne State University.”

When I came to Wayne State in fall 1997, one of my first official acts was to meet with the Board of Governors to discuss what I felt were 10 challenges whose call to action we needed to answer in the immediate future. Leading the list was what I had determined when I first visited this most beautiful of urban universities – the need for a “celebration of entry” to the campus. Although what happens in the classrooms, laboratories and auditoriums of Wayne State University has an effect on the lives of people far beyond the boundaries of our campus, our facilities seemed to focus inward rather than outward toward the many communities we serve.

It is appropriate, then, to note that we recently have broken ground for a Welcome Center, our celebration of entry, the latest in a series of building projects that includes an addition to our Law School, a state of the art Recreation and Fitness Center, and a new home for the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions. Our Welcome Center, augmented by a new campus bookstore and a large, modern parking structure, finally will give Wayne State a gateway onto Woodward Avenue, the city of Detroit’s primary surface street, and open our “front door” toward the museums and other institutions of the University Cultural Center.

As you can see from this Campus Master Plan, these projects, while imaginative and critical, are but the beginning of a process designed to make Wayne State University the model for urban universities in the 21st century.

Wayne State’s rise in less than 50 years from a modest city college to a research university of national reputation is all the more remarkable because it was achieved without a formal plan for development, expansion and placement of facilities. To be sure, the handiwork of great architects such as Suren Pilafian and Minoru Yamasaki may be seen and admired across campus, but never has the university formulated a comprehensive facilities plan and then systematically enacted it to a successful conclusion.

On my first visit to Wayne State in summer 1997, I found an extraordinary campus in the heart of a city in its renaissance, a campus not only still awaiting to be discovered, but one also with infinite potential to make itself known throughout the world. I found a university with a tradition of providing access to people of diverse backgrounds, a university committed to the dreams of equality and opportunity. I found a student body eager to learn, grow and contribute; a faculty committed to a high quality of teaching and research; and employees firmly committed to our academic enterprise. In short, I found a university that, under the guidance of my predecessors, has been preparing for true greatness.

Now it is up to us to take the next important steps that will assure the destiny this institution has earned and to richly deserves.

At Wayne State University we are proud of our past, passionate about our future and certain of our abilities. Many years of evolution and change have brought us continuing challenges, but none so great as our charge to fulfill this ambitious and intricate Campus Master Plan. We stand at a pivotal point in our history, for we are creating the university that will serve not only our contemporaries but also their children and grandchildren. This plan has been designed to provide intelligent guidelines for expansion and development as well as the flexibility to meet changing needs and circumstances throughout its implementation.

Our continued success rests on the standards of excellence we set in teaching, research, scholarship and community service – and on our commitment to provide the facilities, space and technology necessary to uphold these standards. The Campus Master Plan will help ensure that these resources are available and that they will continue to grow and develop, thereby allowing us to remain true to our mission.

After more than a century of preparation, we now have a clear and comprehensive blueprint for our future. It is a future built solidly on the achievements of what has gone before as well as on our present strength of purpose and a clear vision of what we wish to become. The university’s Board of Governors will consider and debate this report, further refining it; from there, we hope it will encourage the entire community to join us as we take Wayne State University into a brilliant new era of greatness.

Irvin D. Reid
President
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Illustration 1: Regional Campus Context
THE UNIVERSITY TODAY
Wayne State University is an integral part of Detroit as educator, employer and economic catalyst. The city’s 10th largest employer, Wayne State University is a major contributor to the economic well being of the region. Area businesses in general, and local health care providers in particular, depend on the university for knowledge, skills, and leadership. The university in turn depends on the city for resources and for opportunities to serve. Demographically, the university’s students are older than average and ethnically diverse. Many are employed, part-time or full, and are responsible for family dependents. The university is committed to educational excellence for all students, undergraduate to graduate, gifted to disadvantaged, local to international.

The university’s physical plant is concentrated in the heart of Detroit’s Midtown district, which bridges from Downtown to New Center. The university is in proximity to the city’s Cultural Center and within a few miles of the central business district and other major employment centers. The Midtown district includes six sub-areas, of which the university is a lead actor in one and supporting actor in three others. The Cultural Center is a valuable resource to the university and includes the Detroit Public Library, Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit Historical Museum, Clifford Wright African American Museum, and the Center for Creative Studies. The Detroit Medical Center is the teaching hospital for the university’s School of Medicine.

TOWARDS A NEW UNIVERSITY
From its inception Wayne State University has provided higher education to a diverse student population residing primarily in Detroit, Wayne County and Southeastern Michigan. Wayne State University is quintessential “commuter university,” a 20th century phenomenon that depends on an automobile and mass transit systems to transport its students, faculty and staff from remote locations. These distant realms represent “home,” while Wayne State University extends the precollege notion of “school.” As an underlying goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, tomorrow’s Wayne State University will develop the critical mass of housing and associated amenities necessary to build a more complete and vital urban community. In its second century, the university will more fully realize and express its social and educational goals in the physical form of its Midtown Detroit campus.

Pursuant to these goals, the Midtown Detroit campus will undergo significant transformation in the next generation. Yet social, political, economic, and physical constraints impose limits to real growth. Given the university’s corollary goal of expanding primarily on current land holdings, the Midtown Detroit Campus will reach its physical development potential early in this century. Working with projected budgetary resources, the 2000 Campus Master Plan defines the limits of physical growth and offers recommendations for optimizing the university’s potential for physical expansion.

Wayne State University will continue to grow through other means, both physical and virtual. Major growth potential continues to reside in the greater metropolitan region. The Wayne State University of the 21st century will serve one population that prefers to commute within the suburban and exurban rings, and another that prefers no commute at all. The former will be served through the expansion of satellite campuses, augmenting existing extension centers in Farmington Hills and in Clinton Township. The latter will be served by telecommuting alternatives, which will further expand the university’s outreach through virtual classrooms, online instruction, teleconferencing and other methods of instruction.

As this new wave of technology defines new frontiers for Wayne State University, the Midtown Detroit Campus will increasingly become the strategic hub for physical archives, research laboratories and other university uses highly dependent on physical access, personal interaction and economies of scale. And, of course, as a laboratory for urban engagement, the Midtown Detroit campus will aspire to be a model village within Wayne State University’s global educational enterprise. The Wayne State University of the 21st century will create learning opportunities by community, by distance and by commute.

Vision Statement
The Master Planning process will create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century. The future Wayne State University campus...

- creates connections between all the functions and activities of the university;
- serves as a home to a rich and diverse community of scholars and students;
- presents a compelling and competitive setting for research, teaching and residence;
- provides an environment convenient and compact in scale and form;
- celebrates continuity with the traditions of the university and the city that is its home.

Illustration 2: Local Campus Context
PURPOSES AND USES OF THE MASTER PLAN

Why plan? To envision and manage change. The purpose of the 2020 Campus Master Plan is to meet the highest mission, values and goals of Wayne State University through physical form and investment. Consistent with this overriding purpose, the Campus Master Plan charts a course of physical development that leverages capital assets and resources to highest and best uses.

The Master Plan is a flexible document, written to accommodate unforeseen conditions that will undoubtedly occur as the university progresses into the future. The Master Plan is intended to be viewed as a living document. The plan should be updated to reflect the current thinking of the university as it proceeds toward implementation. Guidelines for updating the Master Plan are listed in the Implementation Section.

As a guide to developing future buildings and open spaces, the 2020 Campus Master Plan specifies use characteristics, locates major new facilities, describes circulation and parking, delineates open space corridors, identifies locations; it provides guidelines for campus site design, architecture, and landscape architecture.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan “officially replaces” the current master plan – the “Long-Range Master Development Program for the Main Campus, 1967” – which is also the only comprehensive master plan completed to date, albeit largely ignored. Five studies before and two studies since have been issued to help the university make critical decisions about its future form and development. The last such plan was the “Comprehensive Re-Examination of Campus Master Plan – Phase One: Inventory and Analysis,” prepared in 1981. Phase Two, which was to provide an action plan for short-term and long-term strategies, was not prepared.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan is also intended to be a reference for related follow-up studies, several of which are recommended here. Studies to be completed by internal and external resources to the university include academic programs and plans by department and by college, a housing demand analysis, a residential life and programming study, a sports and recreation program and master plan; parking simulation; an alternative transit analysis; and additional building condition analyses.

Integrating realistic budget forecasts, institutional policies and educational goals, the 2020 Campus Master Plan will inform and guide the university’s physical development for the indefinite future. For the plan to succeed, several university constituent groups must now come forward to implement the next phases of development. University academic administrators must agree on specific priorities for university and campus development and pursue projects that address these priorities. University Facilities Planning and Management professionals must be equipped with the tools necessary to research and document existing conditions; review, interpret, and enforce the principles, objectives and guidelines outlined here; and monitor implementation.

Principles, objectives and guidelines outlined here: and monitor implementation.

METHODOLOGY

The master planning process has included two phases of development, summarized in the Strategic Vision Plan and the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The preliminary phase included data gathering and review of prior planning efforts. Physical conditions were documented and evaluated. Stakeholders, including civic leaders, neighbors, students, faculty and staff were interviewed and their commentaries and recommendations were recorded. A representative cross-section of issues raised through the interview process includes:

- Access and wayfinding are difficult.
- The campus is disconnected.
- Pedestrian malls are thoroughfares, not places to gather.
- Parking is not well distributed.
- Mass transit is not readily available.
- The university has no presence on Woodward Avenue.
- There are not enough retail, restaurant and entertainment establishments in the campus vicinity.
- The campus lacks a sense of place.
- Campus buildings focus inward.
- Pedestrian malls are thoroughfares, not places to gather.
- Parking is not well distributed.
- Mass transit is not readily available.
- The university has no presence on Woodward Avenue.
- There are not enough retail, restaurant and entertainment establishments in the campus vicinity.
- The campus lacks a sense of place.
- Campus buildings focus inward.

Following the data gathering and stakeholder interview process, the Strategic Vision Plan was completed. The plan includes strategies, goals and objectives, and guidelines for the Master Plan. (See Appendix: Strategic Vision Plan – Summary.) At this stage the Strategic Vision Plan launched the academic planning and programming process. Four building projects documented in the Strategic Vision Plan have been sited and are in various stages of development: the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building; Law School expansion; Recreation and Fitness Center, and Welcome Center.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan has departed from the Strategic Vision Plan in two areas of concern. First, the 2020 Campus Master Plan charts a course of physical development that leverages capital assets and resources to highest and best uses. Second, the Master Plan provides a conceptual framework for the development of the campus over the next 40 years. As a result of subsequent developments and corrections, the university is committed to building an urban university in a re-emerging city.
MODELS OF UNIVERSITY FORM AND THEORIES OF URBAN INTEGRATION

Given its extraordinary history and potential, Wayne State University is poised to enter a post-entrepreneurial era of focus and refinement. With the convergence of a strong economy, urban re birth, and institutional maturity, the present offers a unique opportunity for Wayne State University to clarify and refine its physical form in support of its educational ideals. What role do buildings and grounds play in the University’s educational agenda and institutional enterprise? What is the basis for a “campus master plan”, one that meets the University’s highest aspirations for a model urban educational environment? To chart the future course of Wayne State University development, we must look to the first books of university planning and design.

“Campus” is an American invention with a Latin root, meaning “a field.” Excepting its athletic fields, Wayne State University’s Midtown Detroit landholdings neither constitute nor cohere as “a field.” “Master Plan” is variously defined as “a controlling design,” a highly wishful if not oxymoronic notion in the university setting. One can therefore posit that a campus master plan is a hopeful enterprise – a reverie of form and space. Accordingly, and further to the president’s charge, it is useful to place Wayne State University in the context of four university planning traditions which represent quite distinct models for relating gown, town and nature. These include the Continental/Urban, the English/Monastic, the American/Campus, and the International/Commuter – in the order of historical development in Western civilization.

The Continental/Urban model evolved in Europe and is decidedly urban. In this oldest of generic forms, centers of academic excellence are thoroughly integrated in urban environments as individual buildings and small clusters. In today’s parlance, the physical form resembles a strategy of scattered sites and urban-infill – a classroom building here, a library there, and in between a butcher, a baker, etc. The university’s legibility and meaning are inextricably ingrained in its urban context. To this day the University of Copenhagen, one of Europe’s first major institutions of higher learning, remains dispersed throughout a broad, mixed-use area of the historic inner city. In America, the University of Pennsylvania in the 18th century and Johns Hopkins in the 19th century developed in this manner. Importantly for our purposes, the Continental/Campus model provides no housing.

The English/Monastic model evolved from Continental roots while adding an important new dimension: housing. The monastic cloister offered a formal precedent that was readily adaptable to the emerging university program. The quadrangle was a highly defensible form that protected “gown” from “town” – which occasionally acted out its suspicions. The monastic model, epitomized by Oxford and Cambridge, also protected students from themselves, enabling administrators to better control their 24-hour existence – specifically, to prevent them from wayward pursuits of urban vices. Thus, the intention and meaning of the English/Monastic model was opposite that of the Continental/Urban. While both were located in urban contexts, in form they were typically walled from wilderness threats, the monastic model was a self-contained, miniature town within a town. Architecturally, the English university was a highly legible form, in contrast to the Continental university, which was barely distinguishable from its urban fabric.

The development economics inherent in the European alternatives are distinct, as well. The Continental University is free to expand more flexibly in piecemeal fashion on available properties. While the English quadrangle may require larger plats, the quadrangle form provides a quite economical utilization of land – one that optimizes the floor area to site area ratio. Beginning in the late 19th century American universities applied variants of the English/Monastic model in nostalgic references to “higher architectural authorities” – Princeton, Harvard, etc. – but with few exceptions, these applications were fragmentary. The American planning experience was altogether different, as a new paradigm was invented for a new land.

The American/Campus model resembled English precedent only in its inclusion of resident education; however, colonial Congregationalists rebelled against the monastic model as denying Anglican conformity and rule. American educational values followed democratic ideals, and new physical forms were needed to express Puritan independence. In the colonial break with tradition, nature represented not a threatening wilderness but an ideal garden of enlightenment. Incorporating landscape as a meaningful expression of educational values, early American educators inventors developed inventive new approaches to urbanism. The ideal American university was, itself, an ideal city located in an Arcadian landscape removed from village and town. Many of the early colonial universities were developed either on the urban fringe or sufficiently removed to create the image of a community of buildings in a remote landscape. The American experience is characterized by free-standing structures dispersed more or less formally on spacious grounds. The expansive green in front of Princeton’s Nassau Hall was an early example, and the first known use of the term “campus.” Harvard’s development of a “cow yard” and Yale’s “old brick row” set back from the village green were innovative “urban compromises” of the Arcadian ideal. In the typical historic development, town followed gown; many originally rural universities are today surrounded by urban and suburban development that dilutes their founding intention and meaning.

Permutations of American/Campus planning extend through the 19th and 20th centuries to this day. Olmsted explored the naturalistic limits of the model with his “university in a park,” which influenced the planning of many American land grant universities – e.g., Michigan State. At the more urban end of the spectrum, proponents of the City Beautiful Movement applied Beaux Arts planning principles of good form – symmetry, balance, axial focus, directional space, etc.
to university contexts throughout the country – e.g., Washington to Vice to Minnesota. Characteristic of the City Beautiful rendition was the creation of a superblock plinth, almost inevitably and ironically once removed from its urban context. Later variations on the theme – e.g., Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s Illinois Institute of Technology – attend little or not at all to suturing the edges, but almost celebrate the boundaries of town and gown. These academic experiments in urban malling in turn influenced the now discredited if not dreaded Urban Renewal Movement. The rural application of the model has been, almost automatically, more successful in merging campus edge with nature as found – monumentally, in Jefferson’s University of Virginia. Indeed, the American/Campus tradition supports the notion that planning is about edges. The fourth planning tradition, the International/Commuter university, is a more recent phenomenon. Similar to the Continental/Urban, this model caters to nonresidents, but commuting from distances beyond walking range. The commuter model is primarily a product of 20th century transportation systems. (In a sense the University of Copenhagen may hold a double distinction as one of the first commuter universities, given the preponderance of bicycle ridership in the city; however, rows of bike racks and fields of parking are different in kind and degree, but this belabor the point.) Unlike other traditions, this model suggests no lofty philosophical linkages between physical form and educational ideal, between town and gown, or between man and nature. The commuter university has no single, character-defining organization or order, but borrows from many sources, including most particularly other university planning traditions and formal precedents. Less than appealing characteristics of the model are wide expanses of surface parking lots, often the rule in greenfield application, and large walls of parking structures, often the reluctant alternative in urban contexts. The superhuman scale typified by parking and transit infrastructure replaces the human scale generally provided by housing in the American/Campus and English/Monastic traditions. The Commuter model has assumed a variety of form and expression throughout the world, and in the American experience in particular. Identified as the driving force of the model, the Commuter university adopts urban land development principles commonly governing the private commercial sector. Appealing to a population relatively more preoccupied with the value of time, the Commuter model celebrates convenience, as measured in transit efficiency, parking through-out, and point to point proximity. In architectural terms, the model naturally gravitates to the megastructure form, extrahuman scale, and transportation center mixed-use. Precedents include the 19th century rail terminal, the intermodal hub and airport-sans-runway. Nature can play any num-ber of roles in the Commuter model as a consequence of context and available land; but natural setting is typically of secondary im-portance to the physical implications of real time accessibility. Al-though the model is “non-collegiate” – non-residential – many examples in the American experience have developed a collegiate spirit of modest housing, student unions, recreational facilities, athletic programs and perhaps even architec-tural allusions to distant traditions – e.g., Wayne State University. Parenthetically, to these four traditions of university planning must be added the special case of the Athletic Camp. Sports and recre-ation programs are primarily late 19th century American developments that add a beneficial dimension to the university experience. The park-like nature of the athletic campus or compound has an inevitability of shape, size and location that generally follows educa-tional values, convenience and land economics. Wayne State University and Integrative Campus Design Strategies In view of Wayne State University’s educational ideal of urban en-gagement, the nature and potential of its many cityscapes can be better understood and projected in relation to the great traditions of campus planning. But these models alone will not suffice; they may help describe Wayne State University’s parts, but offer little insight for developing a strategy of integration, precipitously or precintly, to whole and whole to city. For a more comprehensive theory to guide the development of Wayne State University – as a model urban university – we must turn to integrative theories of urban design, and pose the question: In what ways can the university better ac-commodate, cohere and engage as a compelling educational environ-ment? The Vitruvian definition of “well building” – “firmness, comodity and delight” – is a clarifying point of departure. The university’s physical plant must survive as a given – “firmness.” Wayne State University’s properties must be employed to highest and best uses – e.g., “sus-tainable.” The great traditions of university planning, however, are less than instructive or relevant to these points: their value inheres in “commodity” and “delight.” These Vitruvian ideals are the wellhead of urban design and architectural theory. Integrative planning theory today includes a handful of complementary concepts that extend from these great ideas: convenience, good form, integrative theory. Convenience embraces use, function, comfort, circulation and linkage. Theories of good form offer aesthetic criteria for the design of buildings and groupings of buildings in space. Imagery embraces possible theories of design en-vironments for legibility, orientation and wayfinding. The idea of meaning introduces higher-order criteria for evaluating the spirit of place, plenitude and design intention. Whereas conveni-ence, good form, imagery and meaning tend to be self-refer-ential and secondarily about context, vitality is primarily contextual and extrinsic. Adding “...is good” to each of these ideas is to summa-rize their integrative essence. In application, these integrative theories reveal both similarities and differences among the university planning traditions, considered above, and these comparisons are instructive to the Wayne State University challenge. The Continental/Urban model is dependent on urban infrastructure for convenience: it is not preoccupied with good form, or legibility of the institutional whole. It represents a practical approach to “firmness” – life cycle durability – and urban sustainability. While associated individual buildings and public realms may imply a sense of place, there is no overarching meaning in tended in the whole, no collective “there there.” The equally un-intended and perhaps most compelling consequence of the Continental model is its vitality, by definition, as a mixed-use urban village. As such the Urban model is profoundly applicable to the Wayne State University ambition. Urban integrative theories applied to the Monastic model further reveal English departure from Continental precedent. The consolid-ation of university uses in a self-contained cluster offers theoretically optimum convenience, comfort and linkage. The monastic form, while not high art, is highly imageable as a whole, and legible in extension. Its reference to the Church is intentional, meaningful and conducive to place-making; but, as a potentially vital environment, the model’s self-limitations are stale, controlling and continied in comparison to the model Urban village. The English/Monastic para-digm may more appropriately serve fragmentary purposes in the Wayne State University experience – i.e., an Honors College; but, as a comprehensive model, it represents the antiplayth of urban integra-tion and engagement. While nature plays no significant role in either of the European mod-els, landscape is integral to the early American/Campus model. Many subsequent variants of the American model – from Land Grant open field to City Beautiful set piece – offer a range of applicability to Wayne State University. At lower densities of campus development, convenience is compromised more or less as a function of distance, scale and climate. Good form relates to architecture and landscape architecture alike. Legibility of form is complemented by coherence of space – spaces between buildings, greens, courts and
streetscape corridors. Meaning is more or less intended and imbued in place — e.g., Cornell. Vitality in the American model is a function of scale and context.

The International/Commuter university is all about access, convenience, proximity, comfort, linkage, accommodation — an intermediated, space/time machine for higher education. Its imageability and identity are typically related to its infrastructure, from surface parking lots to parking structures; as a consequence, good form is functional. Meaning and sense of place, too, are integrally linked to the big idea of commodity — doubly intended. Nature is not intrinsic to the greater educational goals of the commuter university, but a landscaped environment enhances the whole while softening the preponderant infrastructure — much as landscape is employed as an “amenity” in the modern retail mall or office complex. Vitality of place is primarily about provisions for leisure and entertainment; the addition of a significant housing component can significantly enhance the equation. Higher proportions of residential life would transform the model to characteristics of an alternative tradition or a new university model.

THE DETROIT CAMPUS

Wayne State University’s Midtown Detroit campus comprises 9.4 million square feet of floor area in 94 buildings, including 2.1 million square feet of parking structures, situated on approximately 200 acres, including 40 acres of surface parking lots (for perspective, the University of Michigan’s acreage is 1.4 times greater.) In fall term 1999, 31,000 students enrolled in 15 schools and colleges. These academic units offer more than 355 degrees and certified programs, which are taught by approximately 2,700 faculty and supported by 5,000 personnel. Functionally and by definition, Wayne State University is a progeny of the International/Commuter branch of the university planning tree; formally, Wayne State University is an institution of higher education; the preponderant infrastructure — much as landscape is employed as an “amenity” in the modern retail mall or office complex — is otherwise bounded by Cass Avenue and Woodward Avenue on the east and by Warren Avenue and Forest Street on the south. Main Campus coheres as a planned and purposeful district. It exemplifies a skillful reuse of urban infrastructure to create a superblock in the American/Campus tradition, with references to both City Beautiful and Modernist principles of urban design. As a compositional whole, Main Campus is indebted to modernist planning ideas of the Illinois Institute of Technology campus, augmented by an almost painterly, Mondrianesque modeling of space and form, thus extending Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s more classical (Beaux Arts) precedent. The master plan, itself, is historically significant. (Suggests to recreate the urban grid in lock step with New Urbanist theory, would destroy this work of art.) While the north and west edges of Main Campus are abruptly defined by expressways, the east edge merges more or less successfully with the Cultural Center district. The south edge, south of Warren, blends rather successfully with the Orchestra Place/North Cass Village district, a re-emerging residential and mixed-use area of notable historic value.

Wayne State University’s Medical Campus precinct is located prima- rily at the northern fringe of the Detroit Medical Center (DMC) on Canfield between Brush and St. Antoine. The DMC is an amalgam-
while celebrating the differences. The future Wayne State University neither shouts nor withdraws, is not a gothic tower, nor a city within a city, nor a remote city within a landscape, but essentially is the city.

There is no perfect metaphor to describe the future Wayne State University, as it is as much about process and becoming as about form. Perhaps an organic analogy pertains. The sense of the whole is an infrastructure of more or less specialized organs in turn grafted onto a larger urban corpus. The circulation infrastructure serves the commuter, both from without and within; the commuter model offers lessons of accessibility and convenience. Each of the precincts – Main, Medical, Athletic, etc. – constitutes a center or centers of excellence, a vital mix of uses, and a physical balance of building and landscape – i.e., a campus. Lessons are to be learned from the American/Campus tradition. Each campus, or potential campus, is equally attentive to its core and its edges, its sense of campus and its sense of urban place and vitality. Within each campus precinct are complexes of structures, clusters of academic uses, and cloisters of internally focused self-sufficiency – e.g., a Residential Honors College, Medical Center, or bioengineering complex. Finally, the organic campus building block, the cellular unit of the organization, is the room – indoor and out, from the high-tech, geared-up smart classroom, to a meaningful place beneath a tree. The principal elements of the Master Plan are city, infrastructure, campus, cluster and room; the future Wayne State University is a model urban community of campuses equally accommodating part-time commuter, multidisciplinary collaborator and cloistered scholar. The application of integrative theory adds flesh to the organic model. The future Wayne State University must attend, first, to making good rooms – classrooms, bedrooms, gardens and playfields – that are both commodious and delightful. Clusters, cloisters and campus core will be judged by their good form, legibility, convenience and vitality. Campus edges represent the critical places of departure from precedents, as we place high value on pluralistic and integrative uses. Good form, legibility and meaning at the edges apply not to the city alone nor to the institution alone, but to a merging of the two in urban placemaking. The skeleton, muscles and tendons that connect the whole – the infrastructure – will be similarly judged as an indistinguishable blend of town and gown. Here, too, new orders of connective tissue exhibiting good form, legibility, meaning and vitality must be invented to suture organism and host.

THE 2020 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The 2020 Campus Master Plan provides a framework for addressing these ideals, ambitions and needs. The framework is based on principles, policies, goals and strategies for implementation. The plan is flexible and interpretable by others who will follow. It is responsive to the university’s mission of advancing excellence and diversity in teaching and research; it reaffirms the university’s place within a rich historical context while reaching out to the global intellectual enterprise. Up front and by way of introduction, the 2020 vision is incomplete. The reader will find that some parts are obscure and others are missing, but the whole represents an entablature for the future that is built on solid foundations.

The Wayne State University campus challenge encompasses academic use, buildings and grounds, quality of life, infrastructure and capital investment. In addressing these needs, the 2020 Campus Master Plan is a strategy driven by economic, functional and formal criteria. The Master Plan document that follows is therefore strategically organized around the following questions: Where do we want to go? – “The Campus Growth Model”; who are we now? – “Existing Conditions and Analysis”; what do we want to become, and how? – “The 2020 Campus Master Plan”, “Planning and Design Guidelines” and “Implementation”.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW
Illustration 4: Existing Midtown Campus Building Identification, 1998 Building Survey
CAMPUS GROWTH MODEL
Wayne State University’s future is based on its present and past. The 2020 Growth Model constitutes not a projection, but a vision of what the university can become in 2020. This vision is based on goals for university growth and change. The 2020 Growth Model is a multi-dimensional construct that includes vectors of population, buildings, infrastructure and budgets, all intertwined over time. The desired physical growth and change described by the model are enabled and constrained by economic, political and physical realities. The temporal dimension extends 20 years forward, a timeframe we believe is distant enough to justify a master plan and near enough to define a realistic vision. It is further noted that the 2020 Growth Model is based on a preliminary understanding of functional programming, which is in progress and which, when complete, will amend and confirm the vision.

Two primary goals extend from the Strategic Vision Plan and inform the 2020 Growth Model for the Midtown Detroit campus. First, a growth of students from 31,000 to 36,000 is desired to meet the university’s evolving academic mission; faculty and staff will expand at current rates to serve these additional students. A second goal is to increase the resident population fivefold, coincidently accommodating the additional students, faculty and staff, combined, on a campus more balanced as both a community and a commune. The population growth goal will commensurately impact the scale of the university’s physical plant, while the residential life goal will dramatically transform the essential nature, the ethos, of the Midtown Detroit campus.

POPULATION

Table 1 describes a transformation of the campus population from 1980 to 2000 and 2000 to 2020. While the overall student population appears to have remained relatively constant from 1980 to 2000, it expanded to a period high of 34,945 in 1992 before returning to 1980 levels in 2000. This short-term expansion may be linked to the status of the economy at the time, as some posit an inverse relationship between economic health and student enrollment. Despite the physical change to the housing program, two structures taken off-line and one added, the on-campus residential population has remained relatively constant since 1980.

The 2020 population goal of 45,315 students, faculty and staff represents a 16 percent increase from the total Midtown Detroit campus population estimated in 2000. While the proportion of graduate students has grown from 27 percent of the student body in 1980 to 41 percent in 2000, that growth was primarily realized from 1980 to 1990. Wayne State University’s graduate/undergraduate ratio is relatively high within the university’s peer group. The 2020 Growth Model assumes that graduate and undergraduate classifications will expand equally over the next 20 years and, as noted below, the growth goal for residential life is comparably distributed between graduate and undergraduates (see Table 6).

While the proportion of graduate students has grown from 27 percent of the student body in 1980 to 41 percent in 2000, that growth was primarily realized from 1980 to 1990. Wayne State University’s graduate/undergraduate ratio is relatively high within the university’s peer group. The 2020 Growth Model assumes that graduate and undergraduate classifications will expand equally over the next 20 years and, as noted below, the growth goal for residential life is comparably distributed between graduate and undergraduates (see Table 6).

Table 2 tabulates the location of permanent residences of the student population in 2000. The table also provides a breakdown of students who maintain in-state residency. More than 90 percent of the student body maintains Michigan residency and most of these students permanently reside in the tri-county area of Southeastern Michigan. The great majority of non-Michigan residents are internationals, most of whom are graduate level.

BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Table 3 represents an inventory of Wayne State University’s physical plant, with building areas assigned by primary university uses. The 2020 Growth Model describes a physical plant expansion that is both derived from the 2020 population goals (outlined above) and constrained by conservative economic projections (see below). The projected 59 percent overall increase in building inventory – from 9.4 to 16.4 million square feet – significantly exceeds the population growth of 16 percent and is attributable to several independent considerations:

- The 2020 Campus Master Plan goal of building a more residential campus, with a five-fold increase in housing on WSU land, accounts for about a third of the increase.
- The goal of maintaining current parking ratios without sacrificing meaningful open space will cause a shift toward predominantly structured parking; and this redistribution accounts for another quarter of the overall increase in building inventory.
- The goal of disproportionately expanding the research component of the combined academic/research use category will cause an increase in the floor-area-per-student ratio, because research requires more floor area per full time equivalent (FTE) student. This measure is expected to increase from 177 to 190 square feet per student over the next 20 years.
- The balance of projected physical plant growth is attributable not to straight-line projections of primary uses, but to specific conditions attendant to each major use category, as outlined below. Included also in Table 6 are commitments to capital renewal renovation programs over the next 20 years. In addition to new construction, a goal of the 2000 Campus Master Plan is to renovate two-thirds
Table 4 measures the impact of the physical plant growth model on important measures of campus development density, as well as the relationship of building growth and its open space inverse. (For the purposes of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the calculation of the Midtown Detroit campus land holdings includes buildings and grounds controlled through long-term lease.) With a relatively modest increase in real estate holdings – including acquisitions known but not completed at this writing – the ratio of building floor area to campus land area (FAR) will increase from 1.06 to 1.60 by 2020. It should be noted that these FAR calculations are based on the inclusion of structured parking development. The meaning of the projected FAR will be explored further in the Existing Conditions and Analysis section.

Also described in Table 4 is the significant decrease in surface parking lots in favor of structured parking, to accommodate building expansion and development. Through this commitment the 2020 Master Plan can sustain the ratio of meaningful open space to total land area, more than one-half of the Midtown Detroit campus.

ECONOMICS

Economic considerations drive the overall 2020 Growth Model, as fiscal reality informs interrelated dimensions of population, building inventory and program use. Included in the budget paradigm are allocations for new construction, renovation, infrastructure, soft costs and capital renewal expenditures. The economic model is predicated in part on a straight-line projection of recent funding history and, in part, on a desired end-point redistribution of future invest-ment. As reflected in the econometric model, a key university goal is to significantly decrease levels of renovation and capital renewal expenditures over the next 20 years. The recommendation to include allocations for operating expense within all new construction budgets will augment current practice and ensure capital renewal into the longer-term future. Additional state requirements relating to life-cycle planning should be further investigated by the university’s Facilities Planning and Management Department. The economic model both determines the scope of projected building inventories and serves to verify the legitimacy of the population growth goals. The reader should note that the economic model and all related budgets that follow are expressed in year 2000 dollars.

Table 5 describes an economic model that is based on an annual university funding goal of $65 million, yielding a total investment of $1.3 billion. This economic model is in turn linked to both the physical plant recommendations and to the financial realities the university is expected to operate within over the next 20 years. Included in the table are three perspectives on the allocation of investments. The 2020 Growth Model sets a goal that every dollar of new construction, and its supporting infrastructure, is matched by a comparable investment in renovation and capital renewal.

The 2020 Growth Model additionally assumes that “private” investments will supplement university-derived funding. Wayne State University will leverage land, buildings and infrastructure to attract private investment in housing, private development into open space, and other uses, as described below. This investment is estimated to amount to approximately $280 million over the next 20-year period. In addition, the 2020 Campus Master Plan recommends that Wayne State University Research and Technology Park will attract private and public funding to develop approximately 500,000-750,000 GSF for academic and commercial purposes. As the principal sponsor and partner with General Motors, Wayne State University Health Systems, Wayne State University will make available a portion of the real estate required for the park development. Based on the range of development, the physical plant investment associated with the Wayne State University Research and Technology Park and attributable to the leveraged investment of the principal stakehold-ers is estimated at $100-160 million. The 2020 Campus Master Plan documents this related development by others, which represents a combined investment that could amount to $440 million, as il-ustrated in Table 5.

Notably excluded from the economic model are the more remotely related real property investments that are nevertheless expected to positively impact the Midtown Detroit campus environment well into the 21st century. Wayne State University’s urban context is undergoing a revitalization that encompasses residential, commercial and retail development. The university clearly plays an important role as a primary catalyst for this rebirth. Indeed, the 2020 Campus Master Plan premise that the university’s growth will be realized primarily through consolidation on current land holdings reflects, in part, an optimistic view that Detroit’s regeneration will be competing with its own success; for example, available on-street parking is expected to diminish over the coming 20 years with the pressures of peripheral urban renewal. Both the 2020 Growth Model and the 2020 Campus Master Plan imply realistic assumptions about the university’s context, but do not attempt to forecast the future shape of the Midtown Detroit campus environs.
Academic, Research and Library

Wayne State University libraries today contain over 3 million volumes. The expansion provided in the 2020 Growth Model comports preliminary reports from the recently completed RBR Study, which addresses space needs for the next 10 years; the evaluation of the “academic” component has yet to be informed by more detailed academic programming and planning in progress. Based on economic as well as space allocation standards, the Growth Model can be expected to accommodate academic space demands to 2020.

The expansion of Wayne State University libraries today contains over 3 million volumes. The expansion provided in the 2020 Growth Model comports preliminary reports from the recently completed RBR Study, which addresses space needs for the next 10 years; the evaluation of the “academic” component has yet to be informed by more detailed academic programming and planning in progress. Based on economic as well as space allocation standards, the Growth Model can be expected to accommodate academic space demands to 2020.

The economic model also supports significant replacement and renovation programs. In addition to 856,000 GSF of new academic space, another 158,000 GSF will be replaced on current or new sites. Completing the academic and research commitment, another 2,320,000 GSF, or 2/3 of the existing physical plant, will be renovated with budgets comparable to 75 percent estimated replacement value. No existing library buildings are to be replaced.

For the next 20 years – as measured in floor area per full time equivalent student and faculty – the expansion provided in the 2020 Growth Model comports preliminary reports from the recently completed RBR Study, which addresses space needs for the next 10 years; the evaluation of the “academic” component has yet to be informed by more detailed academic programming and planning in progress. Based on economic as well as space allocation standards, the Growth Model can be expected to accommodate academic space demands to 2020.

The expansion of Wayne State University libraries today contains over 3 million volumes. The expansion provided in the 2020 Growth Model comports preliminary reports from the recently completed RBR Study, which addresses space needs for the next 10 years; the evaluation of the “academic” component has yet to be informed by more detailed academic programming and planning in progress. Based on economic as well as space allocation standards, the Growth Model can be expected to accommodate academic space demands to 2020.

The economic model also supports significant replacement and renovation programs. In addition to 856,000 GSF of new academic space, another 158,000 GSF will be replaced on current or new sites. Completing the academic and research commitment, another 2,320,000 GSF, or 2/3 of the existing physical plant, will be renovated with budgets comparable to 75 percent estimated replacement value. No existing library buildings are to be replaced.
will be reduced by a nonaffiliated population (yet to be determined) of dependents and other cohabitants. Historically, up to 200 nonaffiliated beds have supplemented the roughly 1,200 affiliated beds in 911 housing units. Affiliated resident occupation is typically between 75 and 85 percent of total university beds. The 2020 Campus Master Plan therefore reserves sufficient land to develop these 5,000 additional beds for students, faculty and staff, plus their dependents. The university must determine housing policies that will define the desired proportions of affiliated and nonaffiliated residents with respect to housing contexts and types.

Table 6 outlines the desired distribution of the 9,000 (theoretical total) university students, faculty and staff living on and near the campus in 2020, as preliminarily envisioned by the Housing Subcommittee to the Master Plan Steering Committee. The tabulation includes the number and location of beds by university classification, as well as anticipated support facilities that will be required. As described in the Master Plan section, undergraduate housing will be concentrated on and near the central campus, while graduate students will be housed primarily in peripheral campus precincts. The 2020 Campus Master Plan recommends that faculty and staff housing be developed in locations throughout the Detroit campus environs. User category, unit type and location will determine the size and nature of developed housing products. Several unit types are under consideration, including traditional dormitory housing, shared apartments and extended-stay suites. For planning purposes, the housing development program is based on 350 gross square feet per bed. This area allowance accounts for living quarters, food service, laundry, indoor activity areas, circulation and infrastructure space. Therefore, a total of 1,680,000 GSF of housing will be built to accommodate 4,800 additional beds on current campus landholdings.

The economic basis of the 2020 Growth Model assumes that Wayne State University will develop 20 percent of new housing product (1,000 beds) and will use its land to leverage the development of the balance by others – 3,800 beds. The reader should note that the disposition of land ownership under this strategy is not reflected in the 2020 Growth Model nor delineated in the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The economic model therefore assumes that the university will invest in 350,000 GSF and the private sector in 1.33 million GSF of housing. In addition, the economic model provides for the renovation of one-half of Wayne State University’s existing housing inventory, or about 452,000 GSF, by 2020. A 2020 Campus Master Plan goal is to allocate a capital renewal, renovation budget that equals approximately 75 percent of the estimated replacement value. The economic model uses a hard construction cost basis of $125/GSF, in 2000 dollars for housing.

Following the recommendations of the president’s task force on the future of intercollegiate athletics at Wayne State University, certain athletic programs will advance to higher levels of competition within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) format. A goal is to move men’s and women’s basketball and men’s hockey from Division II to Division I-AA. Men’s football may ascend from Division II to Division 1-AA. These goals bring the need for specialized facilities that will be required. As described in the Master Plan section, undergraduate housing will be concentrated on and near the central campus, while graduate students will be housed primarily in peripheral campus precincts. The 2020 Campus Master Plan recommends that faculty and staff housing be developed in locations throughout the Detroit campus environs. User category, unit type and location will determine the size and nature of developed housing products. Several unit types are under consideration, including traditional dormitory housing, shared apartments and extended-stay suites. For planning purposes, the housing development program is based on 350 gross square feet per bed. This area allowance accounts for living quarters, food service, laundry, indoor activity areas, circulation and infrastructure space. Therefore, a total of 1,680,000 GSF of housing will be built to accommodate 4,800 additional beds on current campus landholdings.

The economic basis of the 2020 Growth Model assumes that Wayne State University will develop 20 percent of new housing product (1,000 beds) and will use its land to leverage the development of the balance by others – 3,800 beds. The reader should note that the disposition of land ownership under this strategy is not reflected in the 2020 Growth Model nor delineated in the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The economic model therefore assumes that the university will invest in 350,000 GSF and the private sector in 1.33 million GSF of housing. In addition, the economic model provides for the renovation of one-half of Wayne State University’s existing housing inventory, or about 452,000 GSF, by 2020. A 2020 Campus Master Plan goal is to allocate a capital renewal, renovation budget that equals approximately 75 percent of the estimated replacement value. The economic model uses a hard construction cost basis of $125/GSF, in 2000 dollars for housing.

Following the recommendations of the president’s task force on the future of intercollegiate athletics at Wayne State University, certain athletic programs will advance to higher levels of competition within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) format. A goal is to move men’s and women’s basketball and men’s hockey from Division II to Division 1-A. Men’s football may ascend from Division II to Division 1-AA. These goals bring requirements to renovate and expand an aging and over utilized physical plant. Several related issues, such as campus housing for athletes, gender equity and specialized facilities will add to the space demands on buildings and grounds that are already deficient.

The 2020 Growth Model and 2020 Campus Master Plan assume the development of a new 5,000 to 7,500-seat multipurpose sports and
entertainment arena serving both the hockey and basketball pro-
grams. In addition, the economic model provides for an additional
70,000 GSF to accommodate new NCAA requirements.

Goals relating to housing and residential life will place additional
demands on fields and facilities. The recently completed Recreation
and Fitness Center, which is included in the tabulation of existing
sports and recreation inventory, will likely need to be supplemented
to serve 5,000 new residents on campus. This requirement has yet to
be quantified and is not provided in the current Master Plan, de-
scribed here.

The economic model supports a renovation program encompassing
132,000 GSF, with budgets comparable to 75 percent estimated
replacement value. No buildings are to be replaced. The eco-

2000 inventory of vacant and underutilized space amounts to
75,000 GSF, with budgets comparable to 75 percent estimated
replacement value. No buildings are to be replaced. The eco-

A preliminary program analysis of sports and recreational conditions
indicates that the university lacks sufficient land holdings to accom-
modate the combined needs of sports and recreation programs
implicit in the 2020 Master Plan. The shortfall is estimated to be on
the order of 15-25 acres. Recognizing that the projections set out in
the Master Plan are preliminary, more detailed analysis, program-
ing and master planning for future needs are recommended.

Support Services
The Support Services category encompasses space assigned to ad-
imistration, student services, central services, vacant inventory and
surge space. The average age of the building stock assigned as
support use is 63 years, and several of these buildings are in a state of
disrepair. About 50 percent, or 664,000 GSF of existing support ser-
vice space, will be renovated by 2020 and another 322,000 GSF will
need to be replaced. The 2000 Growth Model assumes that a modest
amount of new space, about 57,000 GSF, will be added to the portfolio
by 2020 to meet program goals. The new Welcome Center, currently in
design, draws upon both the new and replacement categories.

The economic model supports a renovation budget comparable to
75 percent estimated replacement value. For replacement and
renovation construction, the economic model uses a hard construc-
tion cost basis of $150/GSF (in 2000 dollars) for support services.

Four university buildings are currently vacant or underutilized. Impor-
tant to the university is the ability to provide functional academic
space to accommodate temporary dislocations brought on by new
construction and renovation. The university portfolio includes three
buildings that can be developed for such “surge” space needs, in-
cluding the Criminal Justice Building, Pontiac Building and Rackham
Building. The Facilities Planning and Management Department rec-
ommends that the university maintain at least 100,000 GSF of generi-
cally improved space to accommodate short-notice and short-term
surge space requirements.

The 2000 inventory of vacant and underutilized space amounts to
437,000 GSF, and the 2000 Campus Master Plan calls for the release of
179,000 GSF, yielding a net potential of 258,000 GSF for surge space
needs. With the goal of maintaining an average of 179,000 GSF for tem-
porary dislocations, the economic model provides budget to renovate
the entire remaining vacant space inventory over the twenty-year period. A renovation budget comparable to 75
percent estimated replacement value is provided, assuming a hard
construction cost basis of $150/GSF (in 2000 dollars) for surge space
improvements.

### Table 7: Parking Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Non-Ride Share</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>DTM</th>
<th>Rec’d Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000 Existing Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Students</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting Students</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39,000 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020 Continuation of Current Trends

| 2020 Utilization of TDM Program |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| House Students      | 6,000      | 5.0%           | 0.0%    | 0.0%| 5.0%                 | 1.192          |
| Commuting Students  | 30,000     | 5.0%           | 11.0%   | 2.0%| 18.0%                | 0.203          |
| Faculty/Staff       | 9,290      | 4.0%           | 3.6%    | 1.0%| 8.6%                 | 0.402          |
| **45,290 Total**    |            |                |         |     |                      | 16,980         |

Summary

| Existing Parking Supply |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 11,402 Off-Street Spaces |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 2,161 On-Street Spaces    |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 13,263 Total Spaces       |            |                |         |     |                      |                |

Parking Supply Forecast

| 16,230 Off-Street Spaces |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 750 On-Street Spaces     |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 16,680 Total Spaces      |            |                |         |     |                      |                |

| 14,250 Off-Street Spaces |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 750 On-Street Spaces     |            |                |         |     |                      |                |
| 14,700 Total Spaces      |            |                |         |     |                      |                |

1 Number of parking spaces allocated per person.

2 Actual number of vehicles parked during peak demand.

3 Parking for the School of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions is not included in the scope of the Master Plan, which includes the existing lots located at the Downtown Campus and the proposed parking location adjacent to the Red Cross Building at Mack Ave.
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As a footnote, the Growth Model assumes that a portion of future Model’s “Infrastructure” line, which is assumed to require dominant funding by others at the local, state and federal levels.

Table 7 illustrates current and projected parking supply and demand calculations based on 2020 Growth Model goals. Campus population and visitation are expected to increase at comparable rates. The affected area includes the university’s Midtown Detroit campus. The observed frequency of use by different user groups is reflected in parking supply ratios. The recommended parking supply is established by multiplying the parking supply ratio by each user group. Visitor parking is included within the Commuting Students user group. Most notable is the disproportionate increase in parking demand caused by the growth in the residential population; residents generate parking demand at a 1:1 ratio, while one parking space is assumed to meet the demand of about five commuters.

Currently, 11,102 off-street parking spaces are available on campus, excluding the 300 spaces at the Downtown Detroit Campus. A controversial conclusion of the parking study is that supply exceeds demand; the qualifier is that the location of this supply is perceived as not entirely convenient. Table 7 calculates a future parking supply requirement of 16,680 spaces based on current parking utilization. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program alternatives assume that additional modes of transportation, such as bicycling, walking, ride-sharing and increased transit ridership would reduce parking demand. Under the TDM assumption, the future parking supply requirement can be reduced to about 14,700 spaces, excluding the 300 spaces allocated to the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions.

The university’s existing off-street parking inventory of 11,102 spaces includes 6,658 structured and 4,744 surface lot spaces. Current off-street capacities are calculated at 2,161 spaces, which is expected to diminish to 750 spaces over the next 20 years because of increased development in the area. Assuming an on-street supply of 750 spaces, the university must provide about 13,950 spaces to meet 2020 demands. The net expansion in off-street parking inventory therefore will be 2,850 spaces.

In order to meet a variety of goals relating to overall campus consolidation, floor-area-ratio constraints, and desired open space preservation, the university’s surface parking lots will be reduced from 4,444 spaces today to an estimated 502 spaces in 2020. This reduction, therefore, must be offset through the construction of structured parking spaces. With the net growth demand for 2,856 new spaces, the university will need to build 6,798 new structured parking spaces.

The 2020 Growth Model assumes 325 GSF per structured parking space, yielding an expansion in parking deck inventory from approximately 2.1 to 4.3 million GSF. The economic model uses a hard construction cost basis of $10,000 per space or $31/GSF (in 2000 dollars) for structured parking. The model also supports a renovation program encompassing 50 percent of the existing parking structure inventory, or about 1.0 million GSF, with a budget comparable to 75 percent of estimated replacement value.

ADDITIONAL USES

The 2020 Growth Model envisions that Wayne State University will leverage sufficient campus land to encourage development by others, of approximately 120,000 GSF of retail and entertainment facilities over the next 20 years. Opportunities for students, faculty and staff to shop, dine and be entertained on or near campus are few and far between. The 2020 Campus Master Plan suggests that the university should otherwise support additional retail development in areas near the campus.

Unfortunately, the steady decline of the Midtown Detroit campus context over several decades has constrained retail development. Both the Long Range Plan of 1967 and the Comprehensive Development Plan of 1981 note the deterioration of surrounding areas and lack of amenities that are available to University students. Lack of adequate parking, crime, and a declining residential base – largely replaced by a growing commuter population – have been cited as reasons for the decline. Any addition of such space on campus anticipates the provision of convenient access through vehicular and pedestrian improvements, adequate parking, an expanding residential population on and near campus, and the resurgence of retail use throughout the general area. Transforming Wayne State University’s image to a mixed-use destination is a goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.

The 2020 Growth Model similarly envisions a university role in developing 50,000 GSF of childcare facilities through leveraging real property assets. The model also supports a renovation program encompassing 50 percent of the existing parking structure inventory, or about 1.0 million GSF, with a budget comparable to 75 percent of estimated replacement value. The model also supports a renovation program encompassing 50 percent of the existing parking structure inventory, or about 1.0 million GSF, with a budget comparable to 75 percent of estimated replacement value.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The 2020 Growth Model envisions that Wayne State University will leverage sufficient campus land to encourage development by others, of approximately 120,000 GSF of retail and entertainment facilities over the next 20 years. Opportunities for students, faculty and staff to shop, dine and be entertained on or near campus are few and far between. The 2020 Campus Master Plan suggests that the university should otherwise support additional retail development in areas near the campus. Unfortunately, the steady decline of the Midtown Detroit campus context over several decades has constrained retail development. Both the Long Range Plan of 1967 and the Comprehensive Development Plan of 1981 note the deterioration of surrounding areas and lack of amenities that are available to University students. Lack of adequate parking, crime, and a declining residential base – largely replaced by a growing commuter population – have been cited as reasons for the decline. Any addition of such space on campus anticipates the provision of convenient access through vehicular and pedestrian improvements, adequate parking, an expanding residential population on and near campus, and the resurgence of retail use throughout the general area. Transforming Wayne State University’s image to a mixed-use destination is a goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.

The 2020 Growth Model similarly envisions a university role in developing 50,000 GSF of childcare facilities through leveraging real property assets. The model also supports a renovation program encompassing 50 percent of the existing parking structure inventory, or about 1.0 million GSF, with a budget comparable to 75 percent of estimated replacement value. The model also supports a renovation program encompassing 50 percent of the existing parking structure inventory, or about 1.0 million GSF, with a budget comparable to 75 percent of estimated replacement value.

OPEN SPACE AND LINKAGE

The open space inventory, which excludes both the aggregate campus, and the resurgence of retail use throughout the general area. Transforming Wayne State University’s image to a mixed-use destination is a goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.

Any addition of such space on campus anticipates the provision of convenient access through vehicular and pedestrian improvements, adequate parking, an expanding residential population on and near campus, and the resurgence of retail use throughout the general area. Transforming Wayne State University’s image to a mixed-use destination is a goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.
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EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

CAMPUS HISTORY

Wayne State University’s origins trace to the Detroit Medical College, which was founded in 1868 and was the direct predecessor of the present School of Medicine. In 1923 the Medical College merged with several independent colleges and assumed the collective rubric of “Colleges of the City of Detroit.” Among these unifying colleges was the Detroit Junior College, which offered a two-year program in the Detroit Central High School Building at Cass and Warren. The Detroit Board of Education operated the original “College,” which offered a four-year degree in general education. In 1934, the Colleges of the City of Detroit became Wayne University and assumed complete control of the former high school building. Wayne University became a state institution in 1956, and to this day, the building at Cass and Warren – “Old Main” – has served as the heart, soul and frequent icon of a vibrant Wayne State University.

Citizens Committee on Campus Expansion: 1936

As early as 1936 Wayne University enrollment was increasing at a remarkable rate, raising issues about physical plant and campus expansion. A “Citizens Committee” was formed to study the physical needs of the university and whether the university should relocate. The committee concluded that resources and amenities in the immediate area, including the recently developed Cultural Center, could not be replaced. Moreover, the challenges facing the city coincided with the university’s mission. The committee recommended that the university acquire a three-block area immediately north of Old Main. The onset of World War II temporarily interrupted the university’s ambitions to expand, but did set in motion appointment of a campus architect and planning at larger scales.

Detroit Board of Education Planning: 1942-45

In 1942 the Detroit Board of Education held a design competition to select an architect for a new Student Center Building. Participants were asked to address not only the Student Center Building, but its future campus context, including proposed building locations and architectural character. An important by-product of this competition was the jury’s conclusion that the three-block site previously recommended for acquisition by the Citizens Committee would not be sufficient for the expanding university. As a consequence, the Board of Education appointed a three-person Board of Architects to investigate current trends in campus planning and design, and to prepare a master plan – Illustration 5. Neither master plan nor Student Center Building were ever completed, but the proposed planning and architectural design guidelines of the master plan were released and variously influenced campus development for the next 25 years.
Important throughout these deliberations and actions, the Detroit City Plan Commission and Detroit Common Council supported the Board of Education’s ambition for Wayne University. Fortuitously coincident with these events was the finalization of plans for both the Ford and Lodge expressways, whose rights of way to the north and west came to be viewed as potential “natural boundaries” for Wayne University expansion. Further to City Plan Commission recommendations, the Detroit Common Council placed a moratorium on the development of alternative uses in the area, thus effectively reserving 85 acres for the university campus of the future.

Pilafian Plan: 1946-48
Assisting Wayne University in meeting the educational needs of returning World War II veterans, the Michigan Legislature enabled the development of two new university buildings. A general classroom building – State Hall – and science building – Science Hall – were funded for construction on land recently acquired, and coincidentally part of the area first proposed for acquisition by the Citizens Committee. The architect chosen to design the classroom building, Suren Pilafian, persuaded the provost to authorize preparation of a campus master plan in the context of Pilafian’s planning for the nearby Detroit Cultural Center. The Pilafian master plan, the university’s first, fundamentally conceived the Main Campus “superblock.” – Illustration 6

The plan recommended the elimination of vehicular traffic from a multi-block area, including a section of Second Avenue and its tributaries, which were to be converted to pedestrian malls. As a means to limit the disruption to the north-south traffic flow, Second Avenue through traffic was to be routed under the campus. Consistent with contemporary planning orthodoxy, the plan divided the superblock into four quadrants, each organized by similar academic uses, surrounding a central library. The pedestrian malls were conceived as highly active circulation ways, while inner courtyards were to be more passively secluded. Consistent with contemporary planning orthodoxy, the plan divided the superblock into four quadrants, each organized by similar academic uses, surrounding a central library. The pedestrian malls were conceived as highly active circulation ways, while inner courtyards were to be more passively secluded. Pilafian planned campus expansion along the north and west perimeters; however, neither specific growth projections nor phasing strategies were included in the master plan. Nevertheless, the plan profoundly impacted the shape of the modern campus through the 1950s, as Pilafian himself went on to design at least a half-dozen additional buildings on the campus over the next decade.

Yamasaki Site and Density Study: 1954-58
By the early 1950s, increasing enrollment required additional planning. Minoru Yamasaki prepared a study that proposed a higher density of campus development than envisioned by Pilafian or the earlier Board of Architects. Yamasaki suggested that a maximum density of 2.5 FAR was academically feasible and could be achieved without sacrificing the aesthetic quality of the central campus superblock. – Illustration 7

(A 2.5 floor area ratio means that the aggregate sum of campus building floor areas equals 2.5 times the related land area.) Yamasaki’s study, tantamount to a master site plan, also refined the concept of the superblock and the nature of the pedestrian malls. Several now-existing buildings were gener-
ally sited in this study, including the Community Arts complex, Cohn Building, Education Building and McGregor. Several courtyards and other open space configurations were also planned, most notably the courtyard and water feature between the Community Arts Building and the McGregor Center. Unfortunately, later misinterpretations of the plan also led to the loss of meaningful open space, including the courtyard of the Science and State Hall quadrangle.

**University City Urban Renewal Project: 1960-64**

The evolution of city college to state university brought increasing population and demands for additional facilities. During the same period the university’s context began a gradual decline in population and investment, leading to conditions of urban blight. This phenomenon was consistent with the downtown and midtown Detroit experience, as within a short generation the university’s location transformed from asset to liability. With good intentions and mixed results, the Federal Housing Act of 1959 broadened eligibility requirements for Urban Renewal funding. What was originally intended to address substandard housing was broadened to assist institutions of higher learning in acquiring and clearing land for future development. The legislation was a tremendous catalyst to both Detroit and Wayne State University development. The university and city immediately collaborated to revitalize a 304-acre parcel immediately west and south of the main campus known as “University City.” Approved in 1960 by both the federal government and the city of Detroit, the plan for University City called for the clearance of the north portion of the Woodbridge neighborhood to make way for university expansion, residential and commercial development, public schools and infrastructure improvements. The implementation of the plan was to occur in five phases – Illustration 8.

A significant number of area residents strongly opposed the plan, and with the formation of the University City Citizens District Council, they effectively stopped the plan from proceeding beyond the second phase. Ironically prophetic to the 2020 Campus Master Plan was the Urban Renewal program’s goal to add 5,000 university residential beds. Although the town/gown stalemate halted progress toward a more residential, mixed-use campus nearly a half-century ago, the initiative did lead to the creation of the present-day Athletic Campus.

**Long Range Master Development Program – WSU, with Sasaki, Dawson, Demay: 1962-67**

“The Long Range Master Development Program for the Main Campus of Wayne State University” was the first and, outside of the current master plan, the only comprehensive plan completed by the university. Based largely on the framework established by the University City Urban Renewal Project, the plan interpreted existing conditions and past planning efforts and was based on an academic plan provided by the university. The proposed plan...
offered flexibility of implementation and emphasized design aesthetics. The plan proposed a maximum overall campus density of 2.0 FAR, which would yield a development 20 percent less dense than that recommended by the Yamasaki Study. Particularly interesting were suggestions to add open spaces enhancements to both Gullen and Ferry Malls, to build four parking structure “anchors,” and to construct skywalks across Warren Avenue and Anthony Wayne Drive.

During this time, but not addressed in the Sasaki plan, planning was underway for relocating the Medical School to the newly formed Detroit Medical Campus (DMC) – Illustration 9. The impetus for the relocation was the announced construction of the Detroit Receiving Hospital, a replacement facility for the aging Detroit General Hospital located in the Greektown area of downtown Detroit, at the DMC. During the mid-1950s, the Wayne State University School of Medicine was well established in Greektown, adjacent to Detroit General Hospital; the closure and demolition of the hospital combined with the addition of the expressway has eliminated any semblance of a ‘campus’ in the area of the I-375 and Monroe Street interchange.

With the opening of the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions Building in 2001, the university’s relocation, begun in 1960, will be complete.

Long Range Development Plan – Beckett, Jackson, Raeder, Inc.: 1973

The Beckett, Jackson, Raeder study consisted of presentation boards, which evaluated physical development options for use as a guide to additional land acquisition. One attribute of the study was a proposal to close traffic on Cass Avenue from Warren Avenue to Palmer Street. There was no written report to accompany the plan, but it was officially approved by the University Board of Governors. Unfortunately, all records of the plan have been lost.


Intended as a two-phase comprehensive master plan, only the first phase, Inventory and Analysis, was completed. The university has not attempted to complete a physical master plan until now.
CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT DENSITY

Density of built-form is an important measure influencing functional use, institutional image, and the experience of the campus. It can determine whether students and faculty want to spend time on campus, where and in what manner. It can affect the quality of the learning experience. As a part of the master plan analysis phase, we evaluated benchmark campus environments for perspective and possible emulation.

Introduced above, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is a useful quantitative measure of density. FAR measures the total building area divided by the total land area of a given context. A ratio of 1.0 represents a building that has a total floor area equal to the total lot area, however it may be defined. A ratio of 10.0 means the building area is ten times greater than the total site area. FAR, however, is not a measure of open space, as a ratio of 1.0 could represent a one story building with no open space or a 10 story building with 90 percent of the site open. Therefore, in addition to FAR, open space must also be measured by percentage of land coverage. The additional notion of apparent density introduces broader, more qualitative and meaningful issues of perception psychology and aesthetics.

Real estate economics play an important role in determining optimum development density as well. Densities above 0.4, for example, bring premium costs in the commercial world – structured parking is required to support higher densities. University campus density is similarly constrained; as discussed in the 2020 Growth Model, Section 2 above, the 2020 Campus Master Plan expansion goals bring a nearly complete conversion to structured parking. Following these and other economic factors, large urban campuses are typically developed at higher densities than campuses in smaller towns, suburbs and rural locations. Simply put, lower densities require more land than higher; this fact becomes increasingly important with higher land prices. Land in the Midtown Detroit context could be five to 10 times as costly as a greenfield site.

There are no scientific formulae for determining optimum campus development density; nevertheless, adhering to an overall density constraint can be a useful and beneficial discipline. Historically, the campus first considered an optimum development density in the Board of Education Plan of 1942, which imposed a limit of three stories on all future development. The Yamasaki Plan of 1958, offered in the context of rapidly expanding growth, suggested that a FAR up to 2.5 was both aesthetically and functionally feasible for the campus. The Long Range Plan of 1967 reconsidered Yamasaki’s study and recommended a lower campus FAR of 2.0. The campus now enjoys an overall FAR of 1.06, with 54 percent of the total campus land area occurring as open space. The Main Campus FAR, within the original “superblock”, is above 1.50 – Illustration 17. As noted in Section 2, the goals inherent in the 2020 Growth Model are within a campus-wide FAR of 1.75, which we recommend as feasible and desirable as a goal and constraint to development of the Detroit campus. The 2020 Campus Master Plan additionally preserves open space at a level not less than 50 percent of campus land.

As background for these density and land coverage recommendations, we investigated built-form development conditions at other urban universities. Harvard, Columbia, Penn, MIT and Minnesota were examined – Illustration 18 thru 22. The area of study was limited to the central core of each campus, with the highest concentrations of activity and development. Tables 8 and 9 tabulate the results, which suggest that Wayne State University’s development density is comparatively low. These results suggest that the FAR implicit in the 2020 Growth Model is realistic and feasible.
### Existing Conditions and Analysis

#### Site Area, Floor Area, and Footprint Area for Each Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Site Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Floor Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Footprint Area (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>1,468,166</td>
<td>3,089,861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University (1997)</td>
<td>2,409,000</td>
<td>2,456,865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>1,489,168</td>
<td>3,019,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>3,069,861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>3,019,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Footprint Area vs. Floor Area Ratio

- Harvard University: 1.43
- Wayne State University (1997): 1.21
- Columbia University: 1.76
- University of Pennsylvania: 1.63
- MIT: 1.43
- University of Minnesota: 1.33

#### Percentage of Site Area

- Harvard University: 0.45
- Wayne State University (1997): 1.21
- Columbia University: 1.76
- University of Pennsylvania: 1.63
- MIT: 1.43
- University of Minnesota: 1.33

Source: Albert Kahn Associates, Inc.

Illustration 20: Columbia University Density Study

Illustration 21: University of Minnesota Density Study

Illustration 22: Harvard University Density Study

Aerial view of Wayne State University

Table 8: Campus Site Areas

Table 9: Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Open Space %
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

Wayne State University’s Midtown Detroit campus comprises approximately 203 acres on six campus precincts. About 86 percent of the land holdings are contiguous – separated only by public rights-of-way, which vary from human scale streets to nonhuman-scale expressway canyons. The Main Campus occupies 28 percent of the whole. The other five precincts include the Research and Technology Village, Athletic Campus, East Campus, South University Village and the Medical Campus; with the exception of the South University Village, all precincts appear disconnected from the Main Campus core. Four additional sites are more remote – including the Bonstelle Theatre, Mortuary Science, Parking Lot M2, and the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions. Illustrations 23 & 24 identify university holdings and surrounding land uses.

The Main Campus occupies 91 acres and includes the 56-acre superblock parcel, which is bounded by Cass Avenue, Warren Avenue, Anthony Wayne Drive and Palmer Street, and is central to all campus activity. Vehicular access is restricted on Main Campus to service and limited visitor parking. The largest concentrations of university structures – 34 – are located within the superblock development. The remaining property to the north and west is primarily occupied by structured and surface parking that buffers the campus from the two expressways, plus a concentrated academic enclave at the corner of Warren Avenue and Anthony Wayne Drive. The Main Campus includes landscaped pedestrian malls, developed from partial closures of the historic grid; many stakeholders interviewed as a part of the Master Plan data-gathering phase referred to the superblock as a “green oasis in the city.” The Main Campus identity extends south, more or less, to Hancock Street and Forest Street, where it transitions into the predominantly residential North Cass area. The campus benefits from the proximity of the Cultural Center to the east and the vibrant mixed-use activity of the North Cass Corridor to the south.

The north campus precinct, Research and Technology Village, comprises about 12 acres north of the Ford Expressway, I-94. These holdings include several surface parking lots and eight pre-1950 buildings, several of which are historically significant to the early development of the automotive industry in this area. Currently the area’s buildings and streetscapes are in varying states of disrepair. There is little open space or greenery in the area. The expanse of the submerged expressway effectively cuts this area off from the main campus. Optimistically, three major redevelopment initiatives are in the planning stages, including the Wayne State University Technology and Research Park, the New Amsterdam mixed-use residential development, and the Intermodal Transportation Center to the north of university holdings in the area. These initiatives, involving private and public sector commitments, portend a vital urban environment by 2005.

The Athletic Campus is located in the southwest quadrant of the Ford and Lodge expressways. The Lodge, M-10, effectively separates Main Campus from the Athletic Campus, which encompasses 46 acres devoted entirely to athletic activities. As previously noted, the
university acquired this land through Urban Renewal for mixed-use purposes; we understand that certain encumbrances to expansion remain to this day. Directly west of Trumbull Avenue is the Woodbridge neighborhood, which is made up of detached, early 20th-century vintage housing. The area maintains a strong neighborhood association with many of the houses occupied by university students, faculty and staff. The condition of the housing stock is good, although some derelict and vacant properties exist, especially at the northern fringe closest to the expressway. South of Warren Avenue are more recently developed, low-rise condominiums, mid-rise senior housing, and a small-scale, recently completed grocery and retail center. The southeast corner of Warren Avenue and Trumbull Avenue contains one of the oldest churches and parish houses in the area. Expansion of athletic and recreational programs on the Athletic Campus is therefore constrained by both physical and political conditions.

East Campus includes 11 acres of university land east of Cass Avenue and north of the Detroit Institute of Arts. The boundary of this precinct is far more loosely defined than the Main and Athletic campus precincts. While the three buildings of the Merrill Palmer Institute – Freer, Knapp, and Skillman buildings – are the most recognizable components of the campus, seven other buildings between Cass and Woodward avenues are also included. The Center for Creative Studies and the museums of the Cultural Center to the south offer stability in the area, while the derelict and vacant properties to the north and east represent challenges for all. The supplementary land use is residential, which supports a modest population. The area’s Ferry Historic District includes several notable late 19th century mansions.

Wayne State University’s Medical Campus, which includes eight buildings on 20 acres, is readily identifiable within the context of the Detroit Medical Center (DMC) complex. The majority of university buildings are located along Canfield between John R and St. Antoine. The Mott Center is somewhat isolated to the north and represents a second potential “bridge” site to Warren and the Main Campus. The new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building is clearly a gateway to the DMC at John R and Mack Avenue. Unfortunately, the Medical Campus is isolated from the rest of the campus. The vacant and blighted block between Woodward and John R contributes to a perception of remoteness which exceeds the actual distance.
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

CIRCULATION

Weaknesses and Constraints

- Wayfinding to campus from area expressways and arterial routes is confusing;
- Routes between campus precincts are not direct or well marked;
- Mass transit options are limited;
- Alternative modes of intra-campus transit are not available;
- The service dock at Elkan Building is both unsightly and prevents future expansion;
- Building access to Scott Hall from Canfield is obstructed by the depressed service dock;
- Service dock at Science Hall is unsightly and hazardous to pedestrian traffic along Warren;
- Service routes to the Art Building conflict with the pedestrian traffic on Ferry Mall;
- Adamany Undergraduate Library service is unsightly and impedes future expansion;
- Several buildings lack dedicated service areas: Education Building, Prentis Hall/DeRoy Auditorium, State Hall, Chemistry Building, Science Library, Life Sciences Building, Manoogian Hall, General Lectures Building, Manufacturing Engineering Building;
- Access into the recently completed Manufacturing Engineering building is poorly defined.

Strengths and Opportunities

- A light rail transit line is proposed for Woodward Avenue;
- A shuttle service between campuses will reduce the number of supplemental vehicular trips on and around campus and make perimeter parking facilities more convenient;
- The implementation of a campus wide wayfinding system is physically feasible;
- A proposed intermodal station is planned at the existing Amtrak station site;
- Most unsightly service areas are relatively easy to screen;
- Proposed expressway service drives could be utilized for parking structure access;
- The width of Anthony Wayne Drive could be reduced to provide a more human scale circulation corridor;
- The planned Interstate 94 redevelopment could improve the Main Campus to North Campus linkage;
- The existing pedestrian bridge from Main Campus to Athletic Campus could be replaced;
- The city and state could assist to improve street spaces linkages between all campus precincts.
ACCESS AND CIRCULATION ANALYSIS

Vehicular Access and Circulation

Primary vehicular access to Wayne State University is via area expressways. The Edsel Ford expressway (I-94) provides access from communities in the northeastern and western reaches of the metropolitan region. The Jeffries expressway (I-96) and the John C. Lodge expressway (M-10) provide access from the northwest suburbs. The Walter P. Chrysler expressway (I-75 north of downtown) and the Fisher expressway (I-75 south of downtown) provide access to both northern and southern communities. Both the Lodge and Chrysler expressways connect the university to Canadian constituents. The Ford and Lodge expressways intersect, define and delimit the modern campus. There are five points of interchange from the Lodge, Ford and Chrysler expressways to arterials serving the six campus precincts—namely John R, Mack Avenue, Trumbull Avenue, Warren Avenue and Woodward Avenue. Woodward Avenue, Detroit’s “main street,” is the major north-south trunk through the midsection of the city, while Mack and Warren avenues provide east-west trunk capacities. Several local streets, such as Anthony Wayne Drive, Canfield Street, Cass Avenue, Forest Street, Hancock Street, John R and St. Antoine Street provide vehicular access in and around the campus—Illustration 25.

Vehicular circulation in the midtown area was transformed in the latter half of the 20th century. Until the 1960s Second and Third avenues carried the bulk of northbound and southbound traffic, respectively. With the closure of Second and creation of the superblock, Third Avenue between Forest and Palmer was converted to a two-way, part-time road and renamed Anthony Wayne Drive. In the redesign process, traffic engineers overcompensated for the interruption to Second Avenue by doubling the capacity of Third. Ironically, the completion of the Lodge and Ford expressways significantly reduced traffic demands on arterials in and around campus. The over-design of Anthony Wayne Drive was noted as early as 1963 with the publication of the Long Range Plan. The 1960s also brought east-west arterial improvements, which mitigated long-standing connectivity problems traceable to the domination of north-south oriented “ribbon farms” established in the 18th century. Both Warren and Mack Avenues were widened into boulevards in the 1960s to facilitate east-west circulation between the newly completed expressways; these improvements greatly benefited university access and traffic flow. Meanwhile, other local streets were changed to one-way routes to further facilitate traffic flow in the midtown area. These changes, however, did create a few oddities that remain to this day, such as the one-way boulevard section of Second Avenue north of the campus, and the two-block split of Warren Avenue west of the Athletic Campus.

Public Transit Access and Circulation

In the early history of Wayne University, streetcars met the desires of most commuter constituents. Streetcars were first horse-drawn, then electrically powered, and eventually phased out in favor of the “more economical” bus. Before the university became a state institution, however, the automobile had become the transportation mode of choice; the university has had problems providing adequate parking ever since. (This perceived shortcoming, which will be explored below, follows the rule rather than the exception of modern campus planning, if not life in general.) Mass transit planning, not to be confused with implementation, has continued over much of the 20th century, with numerous ideas proposed to improve public transportation in Detroit. The past quarter-century has focused on mass transit in the Woodward corridor, linking downtown with suburban ring communities. The downtown People Mover System is the first and only link in the chain ever realized. Its cost-benefit equation has been critiqued since. In the not too distant past, rail access from Pontiac to downtown Detroit included a stop at Baltimore and Woodward, while the Amtrak station serving New Center and Detroit. Today, plans continue to call for light rail or no-rail “rapid” transit service to be implemented on Woodward Avenue. The Amtrak station at Baltimore and Woodward is planned to be developed as a new intermodal station that will provide access to both regional and interstate destinations, high-speed rail, as well as local bus service. The facility will be served by a parking structure, within walking distance of Wayne State University’s north campus precinct, and may also house a conference center. The university will greatly benefit from these developments.

Public transit serving the midtown Detroit campus in today’s reality is limited to a handful of bus routes. The Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation (SMART) and Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) each provide limited bus service in the vicinity. Providing service from the northern suburbs to downtown Detroit, SMART buses transverse the midtown campus on Woodward, Cass and Warren Avenues. The SMART system is geared to the suburban working professional, providing service on a limited number of routes primarily during the morning and evening rush hours. SMART patrons commuting from other suburban locations must first travel to downtown Detroit, then transfer to northbound SMART bus routes. DDOT buses provide local service throughout the day and evening on eight different routes passing through the midtown Detroit campus area. Unfortunately, DDOT service is limited to the city of Detroit proper. Also limiting is the fact that SMART and DDOT bus systems do not interface, precluding dual-system bus access to the campus. The campus population using public transportation today is estimated as extremely minimal, as the vast majority of student, faculty and staff are dependent on private automobiles and parking structures.

We believe the future connectivity of the five Wayne State University campus precincts depends on the development of a small-scale, dedicated transit system. There was once a shuttle bus service, the “TT-Mini,” that connected the Medical Campus, the Central Campus, the New Center Area and Henry Ford Hospital. No public shuttle expressway (M-10)
service operates in the area today. The university’s analysis concluded that dedicated shuttle service requires subsidies; however, we recommend an investigation of the broader context, including costs of land acquisition and parking structure development.

**Pedestrian Access and Circulation**

Pedestrian access to the campus from nearby residential areas has suffered over the years, in part as a result of improvements to the vehicular circulation infrastructure. The widths and volumes along Woodward and Warren avenues, most notably, act as barriers to pedestrians; added provisions for safe crossings have achieved limited effectiveness. The placement of chains in the medians of Anthony Wayne Drive and Warren Avenue were constructed to prevent unsafe jaywalking, but communicate an undesirable image of closure and restriction. See Illustration 24 for a summary of existing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts. Cass Avenue exemplifies several qualities of a successful collegiate environment, including a narrower right of way, two-way traffic, two lanes of on-street parking, appropriately scaled sidewalks, street trees and prolific jaywalking.

Within the Main Campus context, building access changed radically with the creation of the superblock, which essentially turned orientation and access outside-in. Wayne State University’s experience is consistent with that of most other urban universities redeveloped as superblocks. Prior to the internal street closures, the early Main Campus buildings were accessed in the more traditional urban manner, with pedestrian entries placed at the street and service entries located at the rear. Old Main, Kresge Library, Cohn Building and the Engineering Building are examples of buildings designed in this manner. Consistent with the essence of creating a “campus environment,” subsequent buildings were designed to orient to the pedestrian malls now internal to the Main Campus, thus relegating service to the street or discrete penetrations of the superblock. In any case, the superblock concept effectively deadens the surrounding streets by moving the pedestrian activity to the campus interior while leaving the servicing activity at the exterior. As many urban campuses have experienced, the ability to provide a campus environment that features a “public front” on both the interior and exterior can prove prohibitively costly. New additions to the campus, however, can be designed in a manner that addresses both the internal campus and the street.

Most university buildings of the last 35 years have effectively merged internal circulation with the exterior system of pedestrian malls. In more recent design, security and building efficiency considerations have limited the number of access points. Illustration 27 shows both pedestrian and service access to major buildings on campus. Several campus buildings built after 1950 feature a protected entrance area within a building arcade or under a canopy. The Meyer and Anna Prentis building, Law School complex, and Student Center...
buildings offer protected areas as extensions of pedestrian walks. Overall, the pedestrian experience on the Main Campus is successful. Less successfully resolved are service access and routing within the Main Campus context. This condition, too, is not uncommon in superblock conversions. Several campus buildings that now front a pedestrian mall were built when streets and alleys were still in place on Main Campus. Service inefficiencies and conflicts with pedestrian movement are the occasional unfortunate byproduct of the superblock conversion. Maintenance and ground crews, and delivery trucks must use the pedestrian malls for service access and circulation due to the current site configuration of several campus buildings such as State Hall, Education Building, Cohn building, and the Art Center complex including McGregor Hall. The proposed 2020 Campus Master Plan alleviates some of the more egregious hazards, while accepting limited conflict as contributing a messy vitality to the campus environment.

As to the campus buildings more effectively serviced from perimeter streets, the planning of service access varies. Several key buildings are plagued by prominent service docks, which convey a less than attractive impression of the campus. Such buildings include Science Hall, Engineering Building, Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building, Faculty/Administration Building, Elmman Building and Scott Hall. The 2020 Campus Master Plan’s design guidelines accordingly focus attention on this condition, as Wayne State University’s model urban campus of the future should convey a positive “public front” while efficiently conducting the necessary day to day operations without undue notice.

Pedestrian conflicts along Anthony Wayne Drive

Illustration 27: Existing Building Access and Service Routes, 1998 Survey
PRIMARY USES

Included in the 2020 Campus Master Plan analysis and formulation are university and non-university uses. Primary university uses are categorized broadly as academic, research and library; housing; sports and recreation; support services; and parking. University-related uses, which include retail, childcare, and the proposed Wayne State University Research and Technology Park, are additional uses.

The pattern of university uses in the Main Campus precinct continues to follow the broad tenets established in the Platian Plan of 1948. Several functions continue to maintain a location as originally envisioned, such as the central location of campus libraries, the siting of professional schools toward the northeast quadrant, and the location of engineering programs toward the southwest. Moreover, the campus continues to be organized largely through the co-location of similar uses; resulting synergies continue to evolve and reinvent academic relationships. Through considerable discussion of the subject, the Steering Committee concluded that this approach should extend indefinitely into the future, certainly as foreseeable as the year 2020. Illustration 28 identifies existing Midtown Detroit campus building uses (based on majority use).

LEGEND:
- H: WSU HOUSING
- CR: ACADEMIC (CLASSROOM AND RESEARCH)
- L: LIBRARY
- F: ATHLETIC AND RECREATION
- A: SUPPORT SERVICES
- P: PARKING STRUCTURE
- U: UNDERUTILIZED
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY VILLAGE:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• Majority of buildings are unoccupied, in various states of disrepair, and portray a poor image of the university;
• Music North building is an auxiliary site too remote from music program core;
• Several buildings provide a function or contain materials and equipment not easily relocated.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Majority of existing buildings represent redevelopment potential for expansion;
• American Beauty Electric Iron, Criminal Justice, Pontiac, and 6050 Cass buildings are historically significant structures.

ATHLETIC CAMPUS:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• The land area and physical plant are insufficient for current and future NCAA divisional aspirations;
• Provisions for non varsity programs, such as intramural sports, are not addressed;
• The physical plant does not promote a positive, inviting image of the university.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Both the stadium and the Matthaei building are positioned for expansion.

MAIN CAMPUS:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• The pedestrian mall system precludes proper building service, especially for those located on the mall’s interior;
• The location of the designated service area of the David Adamany Undergraduate Library is not conducive to future campus development on the site. In addition, the land area utilized to service a building of this type is excessive;
• Access to the Chittsworth Apartments garage utilizes valuable open space and poses a hazard to pedestrian traffic on Williams Mall;
• Program segregation within several schools and colleges occurs because of past expedited expansion programs and room scheduling criteria;
• The programmed uses of the buildings adjacent to Ludington Plaza share few commonalities. In addition, the space is not fully enclosed by buildings on the side of the John C. Lodge expressway, making the space excessively noisy;
• The average age of campus buildings is 49 years;
• Several buildings are deficient in size, environmental systems, maintenance and technology for their current use;
• The Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building is an inadequate facility and in an inappropriate location on campus for the intended function;
• General Lectures Building is an inefficient use of campus land;
• Several surface parking lots occupy valuable campus expansion space;
• The planned I-94 expressway expansion may limit potential peripheral development opportunities, specifically in the area of surface parking lot B.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Science Hall, Chemistry Building and the Science Library could be physically linked to improve circulation, communication and delivery of services;
• Housing nucleus on Main Campus offers opportunity for expansion;
• Science and engineering corridor is forming along Warren Avenue;
• The removal of the Bioengineering and Engineering Technology buildings, both aging structures in a poor state of repair, would bring into view the recently completed Manufacturers Engineering Building and allow the potential to strengthen desired linkages between the science and engineering programs through expansion on the available site;
• A reduction in the width of Anthony Wayne Drive would provide additional space that could be used for campus expansion;
• The Linsell House is an historic structure;
• The university maintains significant exposure along Warren Avenue.

EAST CAMPUS:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• Beyond the proposed Welcome Center, Woodward Avenue frontage is not exploited;
• Several buildings provide a function or contain materials and equipment not easily relocated;
• Several buildings are poorly constructed and/or in various states of disrepair and convey a poor image;
• Merrill Palmer Institute programs exceed capacities of Freer House, Knapp and Skillman buildings, and land for expansion is limited;
• 5439 Woodward (Building C) is landlocked behind buildings A and B.

Strengths and Opportunities
• The university maintains significant Woodward Avenue frontage from I-94 to Kirby Street;
• The Freer House, part of the Merrill Palmer Institute, is an important historic structure;
• The Beecher House is an historic structure.

SOUTH UNIVERSITY VILLAGE:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• University Tower apartment building is visually unappealing, out of context and an inefficient use of land;
• Several buildings are poorly adapted to current use, in disrepair and portray a poor image;
• The performing arts physical plant is insufficient to meet the needs of the program.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Bonstelle Theatre, Hilberry Theatre, Mackarelle House, the Simon Building and the Thompson Home are historically significant structures in varying states of repair;
• Simons Building and the University Tower apartment building offer the university additional Woodward Avenue frontage;
• Vacated Mortuary Science Building site is an attractive location for housing.

MEDICAL CAMPUS:

Weaknesses and Constraints
• Existing physical plant is not strongly interrelated;
• Adequate parking is limited at various locations;
• Scott Hall commands an overbearing presence due to its size and appearance.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Most of the physical plant has additional but limited capacity for expansion.
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

Illustration 29: Existing Academic Use, 1998 Survey

LEGEND:
- C: Community-related clinical study programs
- V: Various college/school sponsored programs
- M: Medicine
- SE: School of Engineering
- EE: School of Business and Administration
- P: Professional programs
- F: Fine, performing arts, and communication arts
- H: Humanities
- S: Social/science programs

Old Main

Illustration 29: Existing Academic Use, 1998 Survey
ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH
Wayne State University is a national research university with a mission of urban teaching, research and service. The university is made up of 15 schools and colleges offering bachelor’s, graduate and post graduate degrees. Each of these colleges and schools is part of seven academic components, which are listed in Table 10, refer to Illustration 29 for their location. In general, each of the schools and colleges maintains a “home base,” most of which were established years ago. The academic model adopted by the university promotes concentrations of compatible and potentially cooperative academic utilization. Many individual school and college programs have matured and expanded at a pace that has exceeded the physical plant. As a result, many programs utilize facilities spread all over campus, neither by design nor in relation to the “home base.” Table 10 also lists all of the locations that are used for academic functions per each academic component.

Community Related – Clinical Study Programs
Most community outreach activity that occurs on the Midtown Detroit campus is located primarily in the Medical Campus and East Campus precincts. What began as a joint effort with the University of Michigan, the Merrill Palmer Institute, is now located in three facilities on the East Campus: The Freer House, the Knapp Building and the Skillman Building. Space is limited within the current facilities, while the demand for community service programs is growing. As a result, the excess demand is housed in various locations throughout the campus and surrounding community. In addition, the nature of these programs is such that their duration and/or mission change from year to year, adding to the difficulty of facility scheduling.

Fine, Performing and Communication Arts
In the late 1980s several programs within Liberal Arts were combined to form Fine, Performing and Communication Arts. Based out of the Community Arts complex since the buildings opening, the College is comprised of several units – Art and Art History, Communication, Dance, Music and Theatre. The units are spread over three campuses, plus an isolated location on Woodward Avenue south of Mack Avenue (Bonstelle Theatre). Art and Art History are located in the Art building and maintain a foundry located in the University Custodial Grounds Building. Communications and general lecture space are primarily located in Manoogian Hall; The Maggie Alleere Department of Dance is located in Old Main. Theatre is located in the Bonstelle and Hilberry Theatres; design studios are located in the Art building and Old Main; and music studios are located in Old Main and the Schauer building. In addition, St. Andrews Hall is frequently utilized for various college functions. The distance and complexity of the current utilization pattern negatively impacts the College’s ability to foster a strong sense of identity and operate efficiently.

Humanities
The Humanities component is made up of departments in the College of Liberal Arts, whose programs are located in 10 different buildings. Most of these programs are housed in Manoogian Hall and 51 West Warren. Though instructional units are also in State Hall and the Adammery Library. Humanities instruction is offered through the College of Lifelong Learning as the administrative unit handling most course offerings at satellite locations in the metropolitan area.

Social Sciences
Programs in the Social Sciences are located in the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Science, the College of Urban, Labor and Metropolitan Affairs (CULMA), and the School of Social Work. Social Science departments within the Liberal Arts are found primarily in the Faculty/ Administration Building (F/AB); Manoogian Hall and Old Main, the location for the Anthropology Museum. The psychology program in the College of Science occupies 71 West Warren and several other locations. CULMA’s programs are centered in F/AB, State Hall and the Reuther Library. The School of Social Work occupies the Thompson Home, which not only accommodates administrative functions but also has become an icon for the school.

Health Sciences
The Medical School, College of Nursing and the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions make up this component. The College of Nursing is based in the Cohn Building on the Main Campus. The Medical School is based in Scott Hall on the Medical Campus. The College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions is based in the old Shapiro Hall located on the Downtown Detroit Campus, and is to be relocated to the DMC in 2002. The disparate locations are awkward considering the similarities inherent in each program and the desire to participate with the Detroit Medical Center. The Medical Center is the entity common to each program.

Professional Schools
The professional schools have maintained independent locations over the years. The Law School has recently completed an addition to its facilities. The nature of the Law School’s curriculum lends itself to an independent facility. The School of Business and College of Education maintain their own facilities; however, growing demands for space from other academic units are requiring these schools to share their lecture halls.

Science and Engineering Research
The technical requirements of the colleges of Science and Engineering reduce the availability of facilities that can be shared with other groups. Most facilities are program specific and therefore generally autonomous; however, outside demand for shared lecture space use has also occurred in these academic units. An alliance between the Science, Engineering and Medicine components has been developing over recent years, prompting thinking about a concentration of “life sciences” in a mutually convenient location.
### ACADEMIC USE - EXISTING

#### Academic Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Related - Clinical Study Programs</th>
<th>Fine, Performing and Communication Arts</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
<th>Science and Engineering Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Colleges and Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various locations</th>
<th>Fine, Performing and Communication Arts</th>
<th>Academic Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 West Warren</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Community Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Hancock</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Building</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Foundry</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonstelle Theatre</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Arts</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Administration Building</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilberry Theatre</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linzel House</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoogian Hall</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Annex</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Building North Old Main Schauer Hall</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Existing Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various locations</th>
<th>Fine, Performing and Communication Arts</th>
<th>Academic Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 West Warren</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Community Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Hancock</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Building</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Foundry</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonstelle Theatre</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Arts</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Administration Building</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilberry Theatre</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linzel House</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoogian Hall</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Annex</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Building North Old Main Schauer Hall</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Fine, Performing Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 10: Existing Academic Building Utilization

Source: WSU Office of the Registrar, 1999
The Wayne State University Libraries support the education and research missions of the university by providing comprehensive support for its instructional and research programs and by sharing its resources with business, industry, the community and other libraries. The University Libraries’ holdings total over 3 million volumes and approximately 25,000 serials. The WSU Libraries currently ranks 47th among the top 110 research libraries in the United States, according to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) composite rating. There are seven libraries located throughout the main and medical campuses. The recently completed Adamany Undergraduate Library meets undergraduate student needs while graduate level utilization occurs in both the G. Flint Purdy Library and the Kresge Library. The Arthur Neef Law School Library, Science and Engineering Library, Vera Shiftman Medical Library and Walter P. Reuther Library of Labor and Urban Affairs each caters to a specific academic program. Portions of the G. Flint Purdy Library, the Kresge Library, and the Science and Engineering Library are also used for various academic functions.

The average age of the library facilities is 31 years. The older facilities, such as the Purdy Library, Kresge Library, Science and Engineering Library, and Vera Shiftman Medical Library, are not in good physical repair. An addition was put onto the Walter P. Reuther Library of Labor and Urban Affairs in 1990 and the Arthur Neef Law School Library is currently under renovation in conjunction with the Law School expansion. The Strategic Plan to the Year 2000 / Wayne State University Library System was released by the university in 1994. The completion of the Adamany Undergraduate Library in 1997 brought the university library system up to current academic standards relative to comparable universities. An outstanding exception is the Vera Shiftman Medical Library, which has been identified as inadequate to meet the needs of the Medical School.
### Table 11: Existing and Potential Housing on and Near Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Existing Beds</th>
<th>Potential Beds</th>
<th>Existing Beds</th>
<th>Potential Beds</th>
<th>Total Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus/ Woodbridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus/ Art Center Neighborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Beds</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,399</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The capacity for existing on-campus beds has been reduced to account for non-university affiliated residents and market conditions. Actual capacity is between 1,344 and 2,538 beds.
- The capacity for existing and potential off-campus beds was determined by assuming that half of all available units in the Art Center and Woodbridge neighborhoods and all available units in the South University Village area are occupied by students, faculty and staff. The capacity for potential off-campus beds was also influenced by the amount of available land in the area.
- Source: Albert Kahn Associates - Field Survey
- Table 11: Existing and Potential Housing on and Near Campus

Illustration 30: Existing Housing Use on and Near Campus, 1998 Survey
HOUSING ANALYSIS

The university introduced a residential component to the campus in the mid-1950s with the purchase of Chatsworth Tower Apartments. Six on-campus apartment buildings constitute Wayne State University’s housing inventory today. Of these, three were designed specifically for university markets and uses, and the other three were acquired and converted. On the Main Campus, three apartment buildings are located near the campus core. Two of these structures, the Chatsworth Tower and Chatsworth Annex apartment buildings, are remnants of the Merrick Street residential block, the predecessor of Williams Mall. On the south campus, the other three university apartment buildings are more distributed from each other and integrated into largely residential environments.

Students are the dominant residents in university housing, with faculty and staff occupying about 5 percent of the total units. Four of the buildings are high-rise structures—nine to 15 floors—while two are low-rise structures of three floors. The nine-story Chatsworth Towers and its three-story annex comprise 117 units. Immediately west of the Chatsworth complex is the 15-story Helen DeRoy Apartment Building, which contains 256 units. The three-story Sherbrooke Apartment Building is a 25-unit facility located one block south of the Central Campus. The 10-story Forest Apartments building is one block east and contains 211 units. The 11-story University Town apartment building is located about midway between the Main and Medical Campuses and has a capacity of 300 units. University Tower is the only apartment building offering in-home childcare service. The current on-campus housing capacity is 911 units, containing a total of 1,344 bedrooms—see Table 12.

The 1967 Long Range Development Program set a goal to house 5,000 students on campus. This was to be achieved by an extensive urban renewal program that was to convert vacant land near the Atlantic Campus to university housing. Some non-university housing was eventually developed in the area. The university initiated a residential program with the construction of the Helen Newberry Joy Women’s Residence Hall, completed in 1964. Shortly thereafter, an existing structure was purchased and converted in the name of Katherine Fashionville. Combined, the two dormitories contained 181 rooms. Subsequently, the university either sold or demolished buildings that it could not adequately maintain. The Santa Fe Apartments and Katherine Fowlie Hall were demolished, while the Helen Newberry Joy building was converted to a student services building. Throughout the university’s history, on-campus housing has never played a significant role in the composition and life of the campus.

Students desiring to live near campus have found a limited supply of housing options in the Art Center, Medical Center, Woodward and Cass Corridor, New Center and Woodbridge neighborhoods. The majority of existing housing in the area that is affordable to students includes older housing stock that has been subdivided into rental units. Apartment-style housing is found in the Cass Corridor and in the East Campus area, while detached housing predominates in all other areas around campus. Newer housing in the area is either priced at “working professional” rates or restricted to low-income families, which precludes most students. Preliminary analysis indicates that the area within a 15-minute walking radius of campus offers a capacity of about 3,000 units. See Illustration 30 and corresponding Table 11.

Opportunities exist throughout the university campus holdings to increase on-campus housing capacity. By assuming existing vacant land and converting surface parking lots, it is estimated that an additional 5,000 students, faculty and staff can be housed on-campus. In the Wayne State University context, at least two factors suggest that new housing be located in residential pockets distributed through the five campus precincts: will facilitate the creation of community, and a critical mass will provide economies of scale with respect to essential support functions, notably food service and maintenance.

Space available on the Main Campus is best suited for undergraduate housing because of the proximity of undergraduate programs, lecture halls and library facilities. Surrounding campus precincts offer space available on the Main Campus is best suited for undergraduate housing because of the proximity of undergraduate programs, lecture halls and library facilities. Surrounding campus precincts offer

Comparative Study

Within the specialized context of university housing, several trends were noted as applicable to the Wayne State University experience. Table 13 presents a benchmark comparison of what 10 peer universities are currently implementing in housing development programs. Several trends were noted in the comparison study of conditions at this time:

- In general, campus housing designs are moving away from traditional dormitory arrangements in favor of residential environments that provide students with a greater sense of freedom and independence—apartments and shared apartment types.
- There is no relationship between the size of the campus (as measured by enrollment) and the amount of housing provided to the students.
- There is no standard amount of housing provided; the amount on each campus varies widely.
- Housing is a “hot commodity.” All campuses investigated have just opened or plan to add new student housing.
- None of the campuses studied is building housing specifically for families with children.
- Many of the newly proposed projects contained more than 300 beds.

The following are among more specific trends in student housing design:

- Single student suites are accommodating 2.4 to 2.8 students per unit.
- Married student apartments support an average of 1.1 students per housing unit.
- Freshman units generally include single and double suites with supervision (such as a resident advisor housed on each floor).
- Upper-classmen units are single and double bedroom apartments with less supervision.
- Residential college units include single and double rooms with the majority single.
- Athletics integrated within other student housing.
- Graduate students require studio, one- and two-bedroom apartment units, typically built and operated by the private sector.
- Faculty should not be intermixed with student housing, as their needs are different.
- Visiting faculty and guest (extended stay) units should be combined with a conference center.
- "International House" developments are often donor-sponsored and vary significantly in program.

Trends in housing unit size include the following:

- 350 – 400 GSF per bed is appropriate for apartment-style housing.
- Studio apartments: 350 GSF per unit.
- One bedroom apartments: 475 to 525 GSF per unit.
- Two bedroom apartments: 700 to 800 GSF per unit.
- 350 – 375 GSF per unit is appropriate for dormitory-style housing.

The demand for food service in the university residential context has not diminished, but changed in recent years. Students prefer less rigid programs in their food service program. They tend to “graze” and enjoy additional freedom in meal planning. Traditional food service programs may be appropriate to certain populations, notably freshmen.
Those that do participate in the program should be served in facilities close to their place of residence. Many students prefer to prepare their own meals in their apartment or at least have a place to prepare them. The omission of a food service program does not relieve the university from providing food. Such a provision can be met by outside sources such as vending areas, delis, or local restaurants. Activities that enhance livable campus communities—lounges, laundries, study areas, etc.—should be distributed through all housing facilities rather than concentrated in a single location. A residential life program should be defined for Wayne State University based on additional survey and research.

The goal of housing 6,000 students on campus by the year 2020 is both compelling and highly determinative to the shape of the future campus. An analysis of today’s conditions in the context of national norms is thought-provoking. The demand for student housing programs is growing. In the fall of 1999 at Wayne State University, 9,015 full-time students were enrolled in undergraduate programs, 2,907 full-time students enrolled in graduate programs, and 2,214 enrolled in graduate professional programs for a total of 14,136 full-time students. In the context of national norms, approximately 60 percent of the university’s full time students would be housed on campus, as compared to approximately 20 percent in 1999. Also worth considering is that in the national context, freshmen students typically make up half of the total undergraduate, on-campus, housed population; for every 25 to 44 beds, there will be sophomores, 30 will be juniors and 15 will be seniors. These comparisons to national norms suggest that the Wayne State University goal is aggressive; on the other hand, the university’s location, stature, demographics and graduate/undergraduate balance are relatively unique. In light of these comparisons, we recommend further analysis of the unique context and potential for residential life at Wayne State University.


**ON-CAMPUS HOUSING**

**Weaknesses and Constraints**

- The campus offers few housing type options – primarily apartments.
- Limited land is available for recreational activities, potentially limiting the amount of new housing that can be built.
- The limited housing options on and near the campus encourage students, faculty and staff to commute.

**Strengths and Opportunities**

- Land is available on the Main Campus to support a significant housing expansion near existing housing inventory, while land is available on the adjacent campuses for addition housing units.
- Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building could be reconverted to dormitory use, or replaced with a new housing facility.
- Potential exists to augment the Student Center Building with a residential life program offering additional food service options to on-campus residents.
- St. Andrews Hall could be utilized as anchor to a new Residential/Honors College.
- Land is available at the Research and Technology Village for a sizeable housing development.
- The University Tower site is significantly underutilized and offers potential for residential expansion.
- The East and Medical Campuses contain sizeable surface parking lots that offer the potential of additional on-campus housing development.
- Anthony Wayne Drive can be narrowed to facilitate residential corridor development.

---

**Table 13: Housing Benchmark Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Enrollment Fall 1999</th>
<th>% of Total Enrollment Housed</th>
<th>Total Student Resident Hall Occupancy</th>
<th>Total Student Apartment Occupancy</th>
<th>New Projects Underway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama, Birmingham</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>New project in planning stages. Privately built. Open in fall 2001. 300 beds, apartment style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plan to add new housing. No details are available at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Chicago</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>New apartments will open in fall 2000. 3, 4 and 8-R student apartments. Privately built. 492 beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana-Purdue University, IPUI Indianapolis</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>New project in planning stages. Privately built. 393 beds. Open in fall 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>In 1999, university purchased two existing private apts. totaling 420 units to convert to student occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New project in planning stages. Privately built. 393 beds. Open in fall 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University, Ohio</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>New project in planning stages. Privately built. 393 beds. Open in fall 2001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ira Fink and Associates

---
Illustration 31: Existing Athletic and Fitness Use, 1998 Survey

Existing tennis courts and football stadium

LEGEND:

ATHLETIC / RECREATION
SPORTS AND RECREATION

Sports and recreation uses encompass competitive athletics, physical education, intramural sports, and unorganized recreation, requiring buildings and grounds generally specialized in nature. No additional facilities or fields have been added to the athletic program since the publication of the 1967 Long Range Plan, which found existing conditions to be insufficient for university needs. Wayne State University’s facilities currently dedicated to athletic and physical education uses occupy 189,310 GSF = Illustration 31. All assigned structures are over 30 years old and underscored for current programs. The new 75,000 GSF Fitness and Recreation Center will house indoor recreational activities for the general campus population, including commuting students and residents. The facility, however, is sized for the existing campus population and will need to be supplemented to meet the needs of an expanding campus. The university’s potential petition for higher NCAA divisional status for existing athletic programs will broadly impact the campus. The additional recreational requirements of potentially 5,000 more campus residents will place further demands on existing resources already taxed beyond designated capacities. Immediate additional studies into this area are recommended.

The following report by Sports Management Group documents preliminary findings with respect to athletic fields and dedicated recreational space conditions at Wayne State University.

**Sports Field Analysis**

During the master planning of the Wayne State University campus in Detroit, it was observed that an assessment of need and accommodation for outdoor fields and play space would be of significant benefit. The availability of outdoor recreation space had been recognized as important to the university, particularly in light of the objectives of the administration with regard to growth in residential enrollment and quality of campus life to be offered. The urban character of the campus, and the limited availability of additional land for development, required careful analysis of current and projected program needs, existing inventory of fields/spaces available, and a flexible and creative approach to providing adequate facilities to accommodate current and anticipated needs. In addition, the encroachment of adjacent infrastructure (expressways), the allocation of available real estate to accommodate housing, academics, and new sports arena, and the significant need for parking presented limited opportunities for expansion or addition of fields.

In interviews with representatives of the Department of Athletics and the Department of Physical Education and Intramurals, a number of issues were revealed regarding facility use patterns, growth of programs and projected changes in the current situations. Following is an outline of field inventory, use and condition, current program conditions and projected needs, goals, and objectives.

**Football Stadium**

Originally seating 6,000 spectators, the stadium now seats approximately 4,000 on the home side and 500-750 on temporary bleachers on the visitor’s side. Addition of a new press box and other modifications resulted in a reduction in the original capacity. The Detroit Public Schools previously utilized Wayne State University’s football stadium for championship games; however, there are now high school facilities that are more desirable. An expansion of the stadium to accommodate approximately 10,000 spectators should be considered for Division I-AA play. Larger crowds for specific games would require use of another facility, presumed currently to be the Detroit Lions’ new stadium. Competition at Division I-A would require games to be played in a stadium accommodating 30,000 spectators. The field is reasonably well drained, but is described as “crusty” and may necessitate refurbishment. It is currently used two to three days per week during football season and is fairly well protected from overuse. There is also a dirt track around the field that should be reconstructed for recreational as well as athletics use.

**Football Practice Field**

The practice field is poorly drained and well worn from over-use, requiring football practice to take place on the intramural fields if they are available. Renovation and reconstruction are recommended.

**Softball Fields**

Two softball fields with temporary bleacher seating lack press boxes and permanent seating. These facilities are shared between athletics and intramural sports. One field is adequate, but, with the work planned for the adjacent Ford expressway, it will need to be modified due to loss of necessary area.

**Baseball Field**

The baseball field is adequate, but, with the work planned for the adjacent Ford expressway, it will need to be modified due to loss of necessary area.

**Baseball Field**

Illustration 31

***Athletic Program***

University Sports Programs with Exterior Field Requirements:

- **Baseball**
- **Cross-country**
- **Football**
- **Golf**
- **Soccer**
- **Softball**
- **Tennis**
- **Track** (to be reinstated)

**Issues:**

- Residential quality of life and expansion are dependent on improving recreational space opportunities
- Increase outdoor play opportunities for faculty and staff
- Outdoor play opportunities are provided but are under-utilized

**NCAA Division Classification**

- The move to Division I has a greater impact on indoor facilities than on exterior fields
- Move will require higher commitment to maintenance of existing facilities and fields

**Real Estate**

- I-94 expansion further diminishes Athletic Campus and will necessitate replacement land acquisition
- NCAA program goals will require additional land area to economically realize physical plant requirements

**Field Utilization Efficiency**

- Maximize use of available facilities without duplication between athletics and recreation
- Consider developing roofs of new structures with artificial surfaces
- Extend play time with site lighting at all venues
- Maintain playtractive facilities

**Gender Equity**

- Add women’s soccer
Physical education would have similar access as they now do. An infield for practice and instruction should be considered for use by athletics and physical education. The existing intramural fields require, as a minimum, fences to contain little maintenance. Intramural Fields Two reduced-size football/soccer fields are available primarily for intramural use. They have little safety buffer as they are located very near the adjacent sidewalk and street. Their condition is unconfirmed, although they apparently receive little maintenance. Department of Athletics Currently, Athletics accommodates approximately 300-350 athletes per year. The outdoor activities include football, baseball, softball, tennis, golf, soccer and cross-country. In addition, there is a strong desire to reestablish track, as Wayne State University had a great tradition from the 1920s to the 1950s. Further, gender equity requirements are currently not being adequately met and the addition of women’s soccer is being strongly considered due to the significant participation anticipated. (Female participation rates as well as opportunities for participation are key components in assessing gender equity.) Importantly, Wayne State University currently participates in intercollegiate athletics at the NCAA Division II level and desires to compete at Division I-AA level, with aspirations to move to Division I eventually. A Blue Ribbon Task Force (report dated June 1, 1998) studied such a progression and the time frame identified for the first move was three to five years (2001-2003). While the current inventory of fields and outdoor facilities is adequate in number if dedicated to athletics use only, they require improved quality and may require expansion. The football field and stadium should be improved and moderately expanded and an additional soccer field is recommended when women’s soccer is instituted. Department of Physical Education Physical Education programs at Wayne State University include approximately 70-80 sections of activity classes serving 500 students each semester, in addition to the academic major classes. While the department classes have priority access to facilities from 7:30 a.m. to 3 p.m., there is no access after 3 p.m. because of the shared use of facilities with athletics and intramurals. Outdoor activities include tennis, golf, soccer, softball, football and track. Ideally, adequate facilities would include two multi-use fields, a softball field, 12 tennis courts and golf driving and putting areas. The existing field facilities may be adequate if they were dedicated for department use or shared only minimally. Tennis court availability is generally acceptable because of typical use of only eight to 12 of the 16 courts by the department at one time. There are no golf instruction spaces on campus, requiring use of off-campus facilities. Evening class offerings are limited and could be quite popular due to the large number of professional and graduate students who cannot participate during the day. In general, promotion of instructional and recreational programs would require more space for dedicated use, particularly in the afternoon and evening. The desired expansion of program offerings is not possible due to inadequate facilities for accommodating physical education as well as athletics and intramurals. Intramurals Intramural outdoor sports programs at Wayne State University include softball, tennis, soccer and grass volleyball. Scheduled play begins after 4 p.m., or 5:30 p.m. on fields used by athletics. Other activities include National Youth Sports programs, 12-30-5:30 p.m. in the summer. Community use of facilities is accommodated as space is available. Interestingly, participants in outdoor intramurals must be sought out. The small number of residential students limits the available participants, as most commuters leave campus after classes and are unlikely to return. There is no intramural football program currently due to lack of interest. Surprisingly, when queried about whether and for what reasons people could not be accommodated in the outdoor intramural programs, the only reason given was lack of adequate participants to form enough teams. The issue then is not the lack of facilities to accommodate programs; rather, there is inadequate demand. The recently initiated intramural soccer program required numerous advertisements and notices with very few responses. Many of the participants were recruited. The lack of easy access to a large pool of students makes it difficult to “get the word out” and generate enthusiasm for the programs. There simply are not enough residential students to support intramural programs. When considering programs that are successful, the needs are consistent with the other stakeholders. A dedicated softball field with fences at 250-275 feet would be ideal. Intramurals, which occur at the same time as athletics, would utilize this field while athletics would occupy the shorter field. Physical education would have similar access as they now do. An infilled for practice and instruction should be considered for use by athletics and physical education. The existing intramural fields require, as a minimum, fences to contain kicked balls. Ideally, the fields would be standardized and expanded to provide adequate safety zones as well. A well-designed track is also desired for all stakeholders. The student body at Wayne State University includes a large percentage of international students whose interests suggest the need for such facilities as a cricket pitch. As the institution addresses the diversity of its enrollment and the residential choices available to them, further consideration should be given to the types of activities to be offered and the facilities required to accommodate them.
Recommendations

Generally, it must be recognized that the available fields for athletic, intramural and physical education activities are not adequate nor are they consistent with the size of the institution. However, its urban location and the percentage of students who commute, as well as of those who are professional and graduate students, requires careful assessment of needs. Although this study requires significantly more input and analysis than the current scope allows, some conclusions can be drawn and recommendations made.

First, the reconfiguration of the current athletics/sports field site is strongly recommended and in fact will be required at the time of the I-94 expansion. Ideally, the football stadium could be relocated to better utilize the available land area, and to accomplish the renovation and expansion required if athletics is to compete effectively in Division 1. Included in the stadium should be a track with an appropriate competition surface for use by intramurals, physical education, drop-in recreation and fitness users and, eventually, NCAA track practice and competition. Careful planning, design and location will be critical to preserve the available area for the baseball and two recommended softball fields, one with a fence at 200-225 feet and one with 250-275-foot fence. If possible, practice infields for baseball and softball should be considered as well.

Two football/soccer fields should be provided for athletic use. One should be dedicated for football use and the other for soccer. Other uses of these fields (in the off-season, for example) should be carefully controlled and monitored to maintain them in safe condition.

It may be necessary to relocate 12-16 tennis courts to provide additional surface area for natural turf fields. While it is not ideal to locate tennis courts on the roofs of buildings, the unavailability of open land requires consideration of compromises. The tremendous need for parking on campus has been well documented and provides a good opportunity to maximize use of available land. Construction of one or more parking decks could include tennis courts and/or an artificial turf field on the roof(s). Appropriate fencing and precautions to prevent frequent loss of balls would be required, but two needs could be met on the same area of land. Locating a lighted artificial play field surface on the roof of a garage would allow extended play into the evening as well. (Note: There are new artificial field surfaces available which are surprisingly similar to grass in their appearance and playability.) Two intramural/physical education, soccer/football fields should be provided in addition to those required for athletics.

Recommendations for the number of fields to incorporate consider only conceptually the available space for their development. While it is clear that area will be lost to expressway improvements, there is little information available about the location and land required for the new sports arena and associated parking. This will, of course, strongly impact land availability and athletic campus configuration. Location of such a facility close to the heart of the campus may not be advisable, particularly given the parking requirements and its sheer size. Further, the spectators to be accommodated may best be confined to a campus edge. Careful study of the arena’s effect on the campus, and, more specifically, available area for field development, must be undertaken prior to determining the optimal site. The consideration and integration of each of these opportunities (and constraints) is required to develop a reliable master planning direction in this area of campus.

Finally, the causal effect of having few residential students on the size and success of the intramural/recreational programs is counter to the initial objective of the administration, which suggests that the quality of life improvement would increase the number of residential students. Certainly a successful move to Division 1 competition would increase the visibility of Wayne State University and may have a greater impact on this issue than the size and availability of intramural programs. It is important, however, to anticipate the needs and potential, and to allocate land or develop such alternatives as are proposed here.

One additional note: While the scope of this study does not include indoor facilities, the interviews with stakeholders revealed a very intense dissatisfaction with current facilities and their availability. Even the addition of the new Recreation and Fitness Center is not anticipated to significantly relieve the pressure on the gymnasium, weight training, locker rooms, athletic training and office facilities. These facilities accommodate a significant percentage of the programs for each of the stakeholders. Further, a move to Division 1 in athletics will require much greater expansion to these support facilities than to the outdoor ones. When the new sports arena is planned and programmed, the move to Division 1 must be accounted for and knowledgeable assistance in developing the facility requirements will be critical to the success of the program (i.e., recruiting).
Illustration 32: Existing Support Services Use, 1998 Survey
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SUPPORT SERVICES

The support services component encompasses administration, student services, childcare, general services and such on-campus amenities as retail and entertainment functions. Vacant buildings are included in this category for analysis only, but are identified separately in the Growth Model on the basis of their recommended conversion to surge space development. Support service facilities are distributed throughout the Midtown Detroit campus, and many are located in groupings of similar specialty. For example, the Research and Technology Village includes a two-block area containing predominantly service buildings. Other groupings include areas along Ferry and Reuther malls on the Main Campus, the area between Woodward and Cass avenues on the East Campus, and the area south of Warren Avenue between Woodward and Cass avenues on the South Campus. The Faculty/Administration Building, Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building, and the Student Center form an administrative/student hub on Main Campus.

The average age of support services buildings is 63 years. Some structures, such as the 100 Antoinette, 5959 Woodward, C.I.T. Building, Computing Services Center, Federal Mogul Building, Westinghouse Building, University Custodial Grounds Building and University Services Building, are unsightly and generally in poor repair. Most are on property that exhibits little if any possible expansion opportunities. On a positive note, the Criminal Justice Building is a solid, durable structure that can be reused for a variety of worthy purposes. 6050 Cass, Beecher House, Charles Freer House, David Mackenzie House, Frederick Linsell House, Leonard Simons Building, McGregor Memorial Conference Center, Thompson Home, and the William Rands House are all significant structures, many of which are included on local, state and/or national registers of historic designation – Illustration 32.

Administrative services include such functions as academic oversight, development, finance, legal, operations and general office use as well as conference facilities. Computing and Information Technology, parking services, public safety, television studios are also included in this category. These functions are housed in facilities throughout the campus. The university previously held an administrative presence at the corner of Warren and Cass in Mackenzie Hall, which was demolished in the early 1990s. Occupants and programs were relocated in the Academic/Administration Building and the Faculty/Administration Building.

Student service functions include admissions, financial aid, transcripts, records, etc. These functions are currently housed in Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building, a converted women's dormitory. The Student Center Building provides office space for student organizations and houses several dining and recreational functions. Other student affiliations are located throughout the campus, such as the Upward Bound program at 5225 Woodward.

A General support service catchall category includes campus operations, campus services, storage, surge and vacant space. Campus operations, including buildings and grounds maintenance, are located in the University Custodial Grounds Building and the University Services Building – both on the East Campus. Campus services also include miscellaneous functions such as the WDET radio transmitter. Storage and surge space facilities include 100 Antoinette, 5959 Woodward, Criminal Justice Building, Federal Mogul Building, Rackham Educational Building and the Westinghouse Building. Also in this category are the vacant buildings, which include the American Beauty Electric Iron Building. The building is not habitable in its current condition, but is historically significant and occupies a prominent location along Woodward Avenue within the Research and Technology Village.

Childcare is currently provided at three locations on campus – the DeRoy apartment building, Merrill Palmer Institute and the University Tower apartment building. The capacity and nature of these programs do not meet the needs of the university population.

The Student Center Building contains two floors of restaurant, retail, and recreational use. Additional on-campus retail use includes the campus bookstore, located at the southern end of the Adamany Undergraduate Library.
Illustration 33: Existing Parking Use, 1998 Survey
Students, faculty and staff that commute to campus have five available parking options. They can park in university parking structures, university surface lots, private parking structures, private surface lots, or they can park on the street. Five university parking structures are available; four are located on Main Campus and a fifth is located on the Medical Campus. Those users without assigned parking find university parking structures convenient to many campus users.

Many campus buildings are close to surface parking lots, but most of these spaces are inaccessible to the general constituent. The five campuses peripheral to Main Campus all provide plentiful surface parking. Many privately operated surface and structured parking facilities in the area are restricted or cost-prohibitive for most users — a perception that varies with context. Plentiful on-street parking is available in the university campus area. Metered parking is available along major thoroughfares such as Cass, Warren and Woodward avenues, although this parking includes drawbacks of limited supply and imposed time limits. Non-metered parking is available in the South and Athletic Campus precincts, and less so in the North and East Campus contexts.

Parking consultant HNTB concluded the following in its “Existing Conditions Parking Report,” May 2000:

A cursory review of the existing mode split between automobile, transit and pedestrian/bicycle use at the university suggests that the automobile is the predominant mode of choice for campus commuters. Based on the current student population on campus and the number of students that reside on-campus, approximately 28,500 students commute to campus. The physical inventory of where these users park included conducting a survey of both on- and off-street parking facilities both on and off campus. This survey was conducted during the week of October 4, 1999. From this survey it was estimated that the peak period of demand was between 9:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. During this peak period 68 percent of all parking spaces were occupied, leaving a total of approximately 3,000 off-street spaces unoccupied. This resulted in the conclusion that the number of spaces supplied was adequate, but not distributed as efficiently as possible. For example, occupancy rates north of the I-94 Ford Freeway (33 percent) and west of the M-10 Lodge Freeway (56 percent) were considerably lower than overall occupancy rate of 68 percent. This data led to the conclusion that there is increased competition for spaces in “prime” locations.

The strategy to locate parking structures on the north and west perimeter of the Main Campus both facilitated circulation efficiency and created an effective buffer to the expressways and interchange. Large areas of land dedicated to parking are also located in sizeable surface lots in each of the Athletic Campus, Medical Campus, Research and Technology Village, and South University Village. A drawback to the efficient placement of parking structures along the perimeter of the Main Campus is that the southern and eastern reaches of the campus are less than ideally served. Travel distance from many parking locations to final destinations, especially during inclement weather, can be excessive by any standard. This situation is not easily resolved because of the lack of available or affordable land in the vicinity of Woodward and Warren avenues. Current parking conditions present a number of challenges, from sublime to tactical, that require resolution. Users of some campus parking facilities have experienced access problems attributable to changes in the parking payment system. The university recently converted from a “pay as you leave” to a “pay as you enter” fee collection system. As a result, traffic accessing “prime” parking structures during peak periods will back up along the streets. The university has found that commuters are more likely to wait than to seek out an alternative surface lots. Unfamiliarity with lot locations, added walking distances, and safety issues are cited as some of the reasons for tolerating a queuing process. As noted above, there is no expedient shuttle system to move individuals from remote surface parking lots to the campus precincts. Unfortunately, current conditions impede traffic flow, aggravate commuters and create confusion for visitors, who often must compete with students for the same parking spaces.
Illustration 34: Existing Land Restrictions, 1998 Survey

Gullen Mall looking toward Fisher Building
INFRASTRUCTURE – LAND RESTRICTIONS AND UTILITIES

Campus-related infrastructure encompasses the expressways, streets, walkways and utilities that enable the campus to function. Much of the existing infrastructure, as public domain, also constrains campus redevelopment and growth. The Perkins-Rogers 1981 Comprehensive Development Plan – Phase One: Inventory and Analysis is the last complete inventory of campus infrastructure. While much of the report remains valid, thorough field surveys are warranted prior to any development activity to verify actual conditions.

At least three categories of infrastructure both enable and constrain development: public rights-of-way, easements and utilities. The network of utilities that serve the Main Campus, built below the street grid of the 19th century, effectively define and delimit the open space/development pattern above. For example, a 15-foot-six-inch sewer line passes through the plaza between Manoogian Hall and General Lectures Building, parallel with Fourth Avenue. The athletic campus is built on land that contained no less than five city streets and harbors several utility lines. Utility improvements and additions, such as replacement lines, fiber optics, etc., have typically been built within existing utility easements. Illustration 34 indicates the general utility infrastructure in and around the campus.

Electricity is provided to the campus by both the City of Detroit Public Lighting Department (PLD) and Detroit Edison. Detroit Edison also provides steam to the campus. Natural gas is provided by Michigan Consolidated Gas (MichCon). Water and sewerage service is provided by the City of Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (DWSD).

The age of the utility infrastructure is a legitimate cause for concern. In general, no significant improvements, aside from general maintenance and repair, have occurred within the utilities that serve the university since the 1981 survey was completed. The telecommunication infrastructure is an exception, as the university has completed a campus-wide fiber optics system installation. Recent power outages have raised questions about the reliability of both Detroit Edison and the PLD to deliver a continuous supply of power to the campus. Upgrading the university power supply infrastructure will most likely require the construction of a new substation on campus. A site in the vicinity of Parking Structure 5 on the Main Campus is a most likely candidate for this development. Wayne State University will need to continue to evaluate the ability of current utility providers to maintain reliable service to the campus, while keeping abreast of potential changes the industry may incur due to deregulation, mergers and the like. The university must position itself for additional physical campus growth by insuring that a suitable and reliable infrastructure is maintained in order to move toward the goals exhibited in the 2020 Campus Master Plan.
Table 14: Open Space Percentage

Source: WSU Facilities Planning and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Precinct</th>
<th>Total Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Park, Lot Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Tech. Village</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>53.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>203.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>110.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) 1.06
Open Space Percentage 0.54

Source: WSU Facilities Planning and Management

Table 14: Open Space Percentage

Illustration 35: Existing Open Space, 1998 Survey
OPEN SPACE

The character and quality of open space design encourages interaction and the sharing of ideas, thus contributing to a holistic learning environment. Campus open spaces and public streets form the basis of Wayne State University’s intra-campus and inter-campus linkages. Wayne State University’s open space pattern is based on its underlying street grid, which provides for efficient connections between destinations. Over the past 40 years additional land has been transferred and transformed from street grid to university open space inventory. Breaking the existing or pre-existing pattern is a costly enterprise that few projects can justify; the... arena is an exception that proves the rule. Clearly, the university’s open space core and evolving network represents a timeless and defining resource whose preservation will necessarily endure.

Based on a comprehensive landscape master plan for the Main Campus, the university followed standards for the appropriate selection and placement of plant materials, paving, seating, lighting, etc. As a result, the Main Campus environment has been valued by campus users and perceived by the greater community as a “green oasis in the city.” Located throughout Main Campus are spaces that promote conversation and assembly, encourage formal and... foster active use and passive solitude. Such open space qualities did not happen by chance, but were made possible through several years of planning and design that refined the vision for the main campus superblock.

As noted above, the genesis of the superblock was the Pilafian Plan of 1948. The first streets to be vacated were Putnam and Merrick. The Pilafian Plan called for a formal east entry to the campus between the then-new Purdy and Kresge libraries and State Hall. The proposed open space was an extension of the then newly formed west courtyard of the public library. The first campus quadrangle was formed in the late 1950s by State Hall and its new addition to the south, Science Hall, and the new Life Sciences Building to the west. Over the next 20 years the university struggled to maintain a balance between an ever-growing demand for new facilities on the one hand, and the desire to realize and maintain the superblock’s open space vision on the other.

Through the 1970s the university was able to vacate most of the streets that make up the Main Campus core, and convert them to primarily pedestrian and low-intensity service uses. The last of the finger malls, the west portion of Williams Mall and the east portion of Ludington Mall, were completed with the opening of the Admastery Undergraduate Library in 1997. Gullen Mall, the backbone of the system, replaced a section of Second Avenue as the main spine of the pedestrian mall system about 20 years ago. Second Avenue, which links Cass Park to the south and New Center to the north, provides a dramatic view corridor terminating at the Fisher Building as a prominent visual landmark. From the outset of the Gullen closure the university has taken great care to maintain this vital view corridor that facilitates orientation and wayfinding in the Midtown area. We strongly recommend continuation of this policy.

As defined and calculated here, open space equals total land area, less coverage of both buildings and surface parking lots. Currently 54 percent of university land area is open space—see Table 14. Illustration 35 provides an inventory of existing categories of open space. The majority of the open space inventory is categorized as “connective space,” which primarily serves to accommodate pedestrian circulation. “Primary open space” alludes to generally well-defined, formal open spaces that encourage congregation and larger scale public assembly. “Secondary open space” includes relatively less formal, often quieter spaces intended for smaller gatherings as well as individual study and repose. Several examples of each type are present on the Main Campus. “Athletic and recreational space” encompasses informal recreational uses, intramural sports, physical education and intercollegiate athletics. At present, recreational space is available only on the Athletic Campus. It is noted that when the land for the Athletic Campus expansion was originally acquired, the portion south of the Matthaei Physical Education Building was reserved for intramural and recreational use. Half of this land has been eliminated by the construction of Parking Lot 3, and the other half has been overtaken by athletic program usage.

We conclude that the Main Campus lacks a central gathering space appropriate for a university of Wayne State University’s size and national stature. The current central space and fountain are of a scale and character that would typically be found in a community college setting. Several independent sub-spaces, which include the lawn adjacent to the Linsell House, the water feature and courtyard surrounding DeRoy Auditorium, the seating area and fountain at the
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

OPEN SPACE

Weaknesses and Constraints

- Very little “active campus green” space;
- Negligible space for recreational activities;
- Insufficient space for programmed athletic activities;
- Entries to pedestrian malls are undeveloped and weak;
- Lack of quality open space in the East, Medical, Research and Technology Village and South University Village campus precincts;
- Main Campus pedestrian malls interrupted along Cass Avenue, Anthony Wayne and Warren;
- Proposed “sports plaza” open space on Athletic Campus exacerbates land constraints.

Strengths and Opportunities

- Stronger physical connections to the Cultural Center could be achieved through open space extensions;
- The addition of gateways and “windows” into Main Campus will help announce and celebrate arrival onto campus;
- The current open space of walkways, lawns and athletic fields makes up more than 50 percent of all campus land that can be maintained by the development of surface parking lots;
- The aging Gullen Plaza is still central to most student activities. Space exists to redefine this existing open gathering space on Main Campus.

Gullen Mall

The university’s open space inventory is both the outdoor classroom and a large measure the very image of the university. Wayne State University’s considerable investment must be preserved and enhanced; accordingly, the infrastructure investment provided in the economic/growth model, described above, includes an appropriate allocation for ongoing open space improvements over the next 20 years.

Theaging Gullen Plaza is still central to most student activities. Space exists to redefine this existing open gathering space on Main Campus.

Campus pedestrian malls, central gathering spaces, site furnishings on the Main Campus and sports fields on the Athletic Campus.

Several efforts over the past 20 years to improve the Main Campus pedestrian malls and adjoining landscapes have been developed independently of each other and, in some cases, at odds with the original intent of the mall system as a whole. As a result, the open space network is beginning to take on a “patchwork” appearance. Installed plant materials are mismatched or inappropriately placed, walkway surfaces and curbs are paved in several ad hoc combinations of brick, smooth and exposed aggregate concrete. Installed site furniture, bollards, and information kiosks are generally dated, and increasingly inconsistent in style. Our observation is that the cohesive environmental quality that has defined the Main Campus precinct, and indeed Wayne State University, is in jeopardy.

Pedestrian malls on and near campus
LINKAGE

The university is a place where knowledge and ideas are exchanged. The accommodation of its population is critical to the university’s success as an educational environment. In the viable campus, students, faculty and staff readily find their way, comfortably circulate from place to place, and serendipitously meet for brief exchange. Linkage is a critical factor in fostering intellectual, social and recreational relationships. Through its urban location, the university has been able to leverage its resources to include prominent institutions in the area. Inherent in the university’s mission is the ability to connect its resources with the community at large. An intrinsic goal of the 2020 Campus Master Plan is to identify those aspects of the campus that support a positive experience through campus connection and suggest corrective action for those aspects that fall short of the goal.

Evaluating the effectiveness of linkages begins with observations of campus user attitudes and behaviors. Through both formal and informal interviews, a number of generalizations emerge with respect to “getting around campus” – Illustration 36. The most common concern is the perceived inconvenience of parking facilities and their remoteness from desired campus destinations. Wayfinding, from initially locating parking facilities to reaching campus building destinations, is viewed as difficult and challenging. Visitors and new arrivals express frustration; university recruitment and image building suffer. Most users appreciate the pedestrian malls, but find access to locations outside the superblock to be troublesome. Bridges to the Research and Technology Village and the Athletic Campus are viewed as uninviting and undesirable. The preferred access to the Medical Campus is by car, which is a costly repercussion of the pedestrian’s perception that the route is unsafe and remote. Those users living on or near campus find housing to be convenient to most campus destinations, again excepting the Medical Campus. Interestingly, the adjacency of the Cultural Center, while important to many, is not highly engaged in the daily activities of the Wayne State University campus. Images and perceptions of the Wayne State University campus vary with its constituent campus precincts. Perceived safety, activity and popularity all contribute to images, fostering perception and in turn leading to use behaviors. Gullen Mall, Adamany Undergraduate Library and State Hall, to name a few, are popular places in part because they provide essential services and in part because they are perceived as being active, “happening” places. The Research and Technology Village environs, on the other hand, do not appear to be active because they are not because of the low intensity of use. Research facilities, such as Elliman and Life Sciences, are less densely occupied and less active. University support service buildings also receive lower levels of utilization. About 2.5 percent of the campus population utilize on-campus housing, which correspondingly contributes a modest amount of activity within the Main Campus.

Early university campus planners proposed that buildings with higher utilization be located toward the physical activity center of campus. With some exceptions, the university has been successful in maintaining that principle through the years. Observations of campus activity suggest that Gullen Mall between Reuther and Ludington malls remains the center of highest use. Exhibiting secondary levels of activity as a popular gathering place for students, faculty and staff is the general area defined by the Faculty/Administration, Helen Newberry Joy, Education, and Student Center buildings. Contributing factors include not only the size and functional assignment of these buildings, but also the scale and orientation of the spaces they define, plus the amenities offered within those spaces.

Most frequented paths of travel vary for commuters and residents. On this predominantly commuter campus, most users must twice-daily traverse the Anthony Wayne/Palmer ring road, which represents a forgettable if not regrettable experience. Reuther and Williams malls carry the majority of people coming from Parking structures 2 and 5 into the Main Campus, while the Law School and the alley west of the Cohn Building – notably more than Cass Avenue itself – accommodate most users from Parking Structure 1. The corridors in and around State Hall provide access for the majority of people coming from Lot K and other parking facilities east of Main Campus. Woodbridge residents choosing to walk use a path through the Athletic Campus. Residents of the South University Village area use the network of area streets. The east-west Main Campus area may find east-west access to and from Main Campus a bit disjointed, and traversing the width of Woodward on a single crosswalk light is always a challenge for even the able-bodied.

Image and Perception

Images and perceptions of the Wayne State University campus vary with its constituent campus precincts. Perceived safety, activity and popularity all contribute to images, fostering perception and in turn leading to use behaviors. Gullen Mall, Adamany Undergraduate Library and State Hall, to name a few, are popular places in part because they provide essential services and in part because they are perceived as being active, “happening” places. The Research and Technology Village environs, on the other hand, do not appear to be active because they are not because of the low intensity of building use and high intensity of vacant land and parking lots. The “East Campus” cannot be evaluated as a whole, as it is more about potential as campus in the making, than a reality. The South University Village area is identifiable as a mixed-used whole that is gener-
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

LINKAGES

Weaknesses and Constraints
• Expressways are major barriers that divide the campus;
• Lack of assigned activity in Research and Technology Village precinct – no “there” yet;
• Little space is available for intramural and informal recreational uses;
• East Campus and Medical Campus are isolated from a greater whole formed by the Main campus, Athletic Campus, Research and Technology Village and South University Village precincts;
• Lack of support uses in the immediate area that stimulate a vibrant, 24-hour campus experience;
• Noticeable blight in some surroundings creates impressions of decline and crime;
• Perception and reality of the Cass Corridor;
• Activity on the Medical Campus is primarily close to the Medical Center;
• Several existing buildings require maintenance;
• The General Lectures Building and Manoogian Hall are somewhat peripheral to Main Campus center of gravity.

Strengths and Opportunities
• Development potential of existing buildings and grounds;
• Accessibility afforded by expressways and major urban arterials through the campus;
• Urban revitalization in the area;
• Potential to extend pedestrian-oriented mall concept to surrounding city streets;
• Housing opportunities on the Main Campus;
• Quality of Main Campus outdoor spaces as exemplary internal linkages.

Pedestrian connection to the Athletic Campus

Illustration 36: Existing Exterior and Interior Pedestrian Routes, 1998 Survey
ally perceived as an attractive environment by the users who frequent the area. The attribute of discontinuity is not without merit, as the area’s merging of town and gown may be indeed worth preserving in the future. In contrast, the Medical Campus is easily recognized as big, institutional and somewhat inhospitable. To what extent the perceived remoteness of the Athletic Campus is attributable to its physical separation and constraints, or to a lack of interest on the part of a largely commuting population, cannot be readily measured.

Interest and Motivation
The motivations of the campus population to frequent some areas more than others are often attributable to interest, which relates to stimulation. Classrooms, research labs and offices are most often frequented out of necessity, while restaurants, shops and theatres are frequented out of desire. The Student Center Building, Gullen Mall, and the water features around McGregor Conference Center are places on Main Campus that are frequented due to interest. The campus libraries, the bookstore and sporting events all have the potential to attract students, faculty and staff. The museums of the Cultural Center, the shops along Warren and Woodward, the restaurants and entertainment establishments near the East Campus and South University Village all contribute to university life, but fall short of developing a critical mass and creating a stimulating environment. In a word, the campus environment tends to be a bore. Noticeably absent are strong linkages between the campus and the too few nodes of interest needed to sustain the whole. The residential growth goals of the 2020 Campus Master Plan are in large measure promulgated to positively stimulate a total campus experience as a vital place to learn, live, work and play.
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

BUILDING CHARACTER ANALYSIS

Weaknesses and Constraints
- Blighted areas surrounding Research and Technology Village and East Campus;
- The overgrown foliage in Main Campus Mall open space system;
- Scale of Anthony Wayne Drive and wall of parking decks;
- Main Campus building perimeter approaching build-out, with few inviting spatial linkages to surroundings.

Strengths and Opportunities
- Build upon quality architectural precedents;
- Redevelop surface parking lots;
- Exploit view terminus opportunities to reduce scale of campus;
- Develop architectural gateways to campus precincts;
- Preserve architectural heritage;
- Landmarks should be coordinated into new wayfinding system.

Wayne State University is situated in an area rich in history, including an exceptional heritage of architecture and urban design. The churches and mansions of the Midtown area reflect an ascending era of wealth extending from the mid-19th century through the 1920s and from old-money lumber barons to nouveau riche industrialists. The Cultural Center core, including the Detroit Public Library and Detroit Institute of Arts, is as fine an example of the City Beautiful Movement as can be found anywhere in the country. The university has preserved several historically significant buildings including Old Main, the Hilberry and Bonstelle theatres, St. Andrews Hall, the Criminal Justice Building and several historically significant houses. Wayne State University has also served as a patron of the building arts, most notably in commissioning Minoru Yamasaki to design several important campus buildings including the McGregor Memorial Conference Center, DeVos Auditorium and the Meyer and Anna Prentis Building, which are cited by many as among his master works.

The university’s context boasts at least 60 architectural pieces and neighborhood places of significant merit, and at least two dozen of these are officially certified in local, state and/or national historic registries. Beyond these many jewels, accessible and important to the architectural cognoscenti, are countless buildings and spaces that create impressions of the built environment that vary from place to place. Few would argue that the “marshmallow building” of the university Services Building is a bit quirky, and the one-way boulevard of Second Avenue a tad preposterous, but both have their temporary roles in the order of things urban. Blight, however, is not quaint by any measure in civilized context, and does indeed play a contrary role in the state of the Wayne campus 2000.

Illustration 39 identifies the significant architecture of the general Wayne State University campus and its environs, as well as important distant landmarks, such as the Fisher Building seen from Gullen Mall. Additionally, notable campus vistas and views, both attractive and otherwise, are represented in Illustration 40.

Illustration 39: Existing Building Character Analysis, 1998 Survey

Illustration 40: Existing Campus Views, 1998 Survey

University’s Main Campus was designed as an artful assemblage of buildings that create a rich hierarchy of exterior space. In perspective, the Main Campus is indebted to and surpasses in some respects the achievement of Mies van der Rohe’s plan for the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Advancing toward its Vision 2020 and beyond, the university must assign extra care to the development of its physical plant and the Main Campus in particular. Four principles are recommended as a framework for future development. First, Wayne State University’s physical plant, including both its high architectural heritage and lesser building stock, must be appropriately maintained and preserved. A deteriorating McGregor Center conveys an impression that marketing brochures cannot readily erase. Second, vacant and blighted structures should be restored or replaced. Third, new architecture, especially in the Main Campus context, must be artfully situated and formed so as to enhance places between buildings and reinforce the open space hierarchy and balance as a whole. Fourth, all new architecture should be of a caliber comparable to the university’s finest and most enduring. While Wayne State University cannot single-handedly eradicate blighted conditions controlled by others, the university’s example can serve as a powerful catalyst to urban revitalization.
Criticism and conflict over expansion and land acquisition are perhaps endemic to the modern urban university experience. The subject was noted in the 1967 Long Range Plan and related issues were raised in stakeholder interviews held in 1998. Competing interests promote or allow an image of the university as bent on community conquest more than community outreach. Mindful of the perception, however appropriately placed, the university’s Strategic Vision Plan of 1998 adopted a principle of “a consolidated campus,” including the goal of expansion primarily on current land holdings.

The university holds approximately 78 acres that can be developed for additional campus facilities. Development of at least half of this real estate would carry a premium price tag because of uneconomical size and/or shape characteristics. While about 35 acres of vacant land is undeveloped, 38 acres are currently developed as surface parking lots, and another six acres are occupied by buildings that need to be replaced. The university holds approximately 78 acres that can be developed for additional campus facilities.

**Table 15: Land Available for Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Precinct</th>
<th>Total Land Area</th>
<th>Parking Lots</th>
<th>Vacant Land</th>
<th>Other Land1</th>
<th>Available Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Tech. Village</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>95.26</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>22.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>203.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Buildings Proposed for Demolition by 2020

Source: WSU Facilities Planning and Management

DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Criticism and conflict over expansion and land acquisition are perhaps endemic to the modern urban university experience. The subject was noted in the 1967 Long Range Plan and related issues were raised in stakeholder interviews held in 1998. Competing interests promote or allow an image of the university as bent on community conquest more than community outreach. Mindful of the perception, however appropriately placed, the university’s Strategic Vision Plan of 1998 adopted a principle of “a consolidated campus,” including the goal of expansion primarily on current land holdings.

The university holds approximately 78 acres that can be developed for additional campus facilities – Table 15. Development of at least half of this real estate would carry a premium price tag because of uneconomical size and/or shape characteristics. While about 35 acres of vacant land is undeveloped, 38 acres are currently developed as surface parking lots, and another six acres are occupied by buildings that need to be replaced – Illustration 41.
PRINCIPLES
• A Campus in the city
• A Place of learning
• An extended campus
• A consolidated campus
• A residential campus
• Learning by community, by distance and by commute

LEGEND:
PROPOSED WSU BUILDINGS
A. RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY VILLAGE
   GRADUATE HOUSING, CHILDCARE, AND PARKING STRUCTURE
B. NORTH WOODWARD ACADEMIC PROGRAM EXPANSION
C. ANTHONY WAYNE DRIVE FARMING STRUCTURE
   AND UNDERGRADUATE HOUSING
D. LAW SCHOOL EXPANSION
E. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT
F. EAST CAMPUS GRADUATE HOUSING, CHILDCARE
G. RESIDENTIAL / HONORS COLLEGE
H. HELEN HENDERSON JOY UNDERGRADUATE
   HOUSING AND RECREATION CENTER
I. RECREATION AND FITNESS CENTER
J. CAMPUS COMMERCE CENTER
K. ARENA, COMBINED HOUSING AND PARKING STRUCTURE
L. HUMANITIES / SOCIAL SCIENCES BUILDING
M. PREKRMIS MALL, UNDERGRADUATE HOUSING
N. SCIENCE PROGRAM EXPANSION
O. WELLCOME CENTER BOOKSTORE AND PARKING STRUCTURE
P. ENGINEERING PROGRAM EXPANSION
Q. PERFORMING ARTS PROGRAM EXPANSION
R. WARREN UNDERGRADUATE HOUSING, PARKING STRUCTURE
S. C.S. MOTT CENTER VERTICAL EXPANSION
T. SOUTH CAMPUS GRADUATE HOUSING
U. SCHOOL OF NURSING, PROGRAM EXPANSION, CHILDCARE,
   ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND PARKING STRUCTURE
V. FORGE APARTMENTS EXPANSION - GRADUATE HOUSING
W. MEDICAL CENTER PROGRAM EXPANSION, GRADUATE
   HOUSING, CHILDCARE AND PARKING STRUCTURE
X. PHARMACY AND ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS BUILDING

EXISTING WSU BUILDINGS

OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT
1. RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY VILLAGE COMMONS
2. ANTHONY WAYNE GROVE
3. LEEDS DRIVE STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS
4. EAST-PREST GREENWAY ENHANCEMENT
5. LOYALHEMM DR PARKING LOT
6. ENGEMANN SQUARE
7. SAINT MARY'S COMMONS
8. WILLIAMS MALL
9. GLENNA PLAZA
10. EAST-PREST GREENWAY
11. WEBER AVENUE STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT
12. UNIVERSITY TOWER COMMONS
13. CAMFIELD PLAZA
14. ATHLETIC PLAZA

WSU RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PARK

Illustration 42: 2020 Master Plan
2020 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The 2020 Campus Master Plan is based on six guiding principles established in the Strategic Vision Plan, completed in September 1998 with the inauguration of President Reid. In sum, these principles envision a university and a city interdependently linked as resources to each other. The campus will be an intellectual community in which student, faculty and staff will learn, live, work and play. The university will foster an environment that will be accessible, walkable, welcoming and encourage activity to occur spontaneously. The campus will engender pride and inspire all associated to excel. The campus will be physically planned in a manner that promotes university outreach to the city, its neighboring institutions and resources. The campus will focus physical plant expansion on current land holdings. The campus will become a lively, safe, mixed-use urban village, with residential environments supported by retail and entertainment amenities meeting the diverse needs of university constituents and stakeholders. Future growth will be balanced both by the continuing requirements of commuting students, faculty and staff, and by the evolution of learning by distance in the virtual classroom.

The 2020 Growth Model, presented in the previous section, charts the course for the Midtown Detroit campus expansion within a realistic accounting of the university’s means and resources. New development, renovation and renewal of campus infrastructure, if necessary to realizing the 2020 Campus Master Plan vision, will be implemented in the context of recent fiscal experience. 5.2 million square feet of new development is planned for the campus, including about 3.7 million square feet of development funded from university-related resources. The balance of development will be realized through public/private ventures, in which the university will primarily leverage current land holdings to attract private sector development. Based on both the condition of the university’s existing physical plant and the need to remain technologically competitive, Wayne State University will invest in capital renewal amounts comparable to investments in new construction and infrastructure – about a half-billion dollars to each over the next 20 years.

A 2020 Campus Master Plan goal is to realize this potential growth primarily on the university’s present Midtown Detroit campus land holdings, including real estate in various stages of acquisition. Of these approximately 208 acres, 79 acres are potentially available for infill development; however, this potential area is significantly constrained by physical plant in place. Wayne State University’s land holdings constitute a significant asset that continues to appreciate in the context of Detroit’s center city revitalization. Early action projects documented in the Strategic Vision Plan include the new Recreation and Fitness Center, Law School Expansion, and a replacement facility for the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions. A new Welcome Center is in final planning stages. In strategic partnership with General Motors and Henry Ford Health Systems, Wayne State University is leading an effort to develop a Research and Technology Park in an area integral to the northern campus precinct – Research and Technology Village.

In addition to various university initiatives, several significant projects are either planned or under construction in the Midtown Detroit campus environs and are contributing to the area’s resurgence. The 2020 Campus Master Plan accounts for both the benefits and challenges these related initiatives present. The Center for Creative Studies is implementing a major building expansion program that will further stabilize the East Campus area and potentially compete with university expansion requirements. The Detroit Institute of Arts is planning for expansion and the Detroit Science Center is finalizing an expansion to its facility that will further enhance this neighboring resource. The WSU Research and Technology Park will catalyze the redevelopment envisioned for the Research and Technology Village. A significant amount of privately developed housing is planned for both the northern and southern campus vicinities. Private housing redevelopment continues in the Woodbridge neighborhood to the west of the Athletic Campus. The planned expansion of the Ford Freeway (I-94) will improve access to the Research and Technology Village, Main and Athletic Campus precincts, but will involve takings of precious real estate. In synergistic fashion, university development will further embolden development by others in the area. These hallmarks of urban resurgence are evident across the six campus precincts, which, when ultimately linked through continuous viability, will, as a goal, appear as one.

Proposed university uses will be distributed across and consolidated within the Midtown Detroit campus precincts to encourage an atmosphere of diversity and synergy, spontaneity and rigor, identity and breadth. Proposed academic program expansion will help amalgamate academic units. The development of residential life will promote additional campus activity aimed at creating a vital, 24-hour university village. Athletic program expansion will position Wayne State University for ascendency to higher NCAA classifications. Proposed renewal of the supporting physical plant will help improve services to students as well as streamline administrative operations.

The university campus today features positive planning and design qualities that will be reinforced by the 2020 Campus Master Plan and facilitated through Planning and Design Guidelines, which follow below. Key open spaces will be preserved and enhanced. New building/built-form envelopes have been defined for optimum economy of means, multipurpose flexibility, and relationships of compatible form and meaningful open space. The overall campus form will be compact, low-rise, and human in scale, consistent with the best of Wayne State University precedents. The 2020 built campus form, while increasing density by more than 50 percent, will decidedly not restore the environment that preceded the university’s occupation. Such a precedent, marked by buildings that are built out to the sidewalk, is at odds with the very nature of the urban place originally envisioned and is not appropriate for this campus now or in the foreseeable future regardless of current planning trends.
CIRCULATION PLAN

Located at the corner of two expressways, Wayne State University is not wanting in vehicular access. The design of area ingress and egress ramps, however, represents a less than ideal compromise between circulation patterns designed in different centuries for different modalities. These shortcomings are expected to improve by 2020 with the redesign of the Ford expressway (I-94) and its interchange with the Lodge expressway (M-10). Ancillary service drive improvements would facilitate traffic flow to and from parking decks that ring the Main Campus, thereby further reducing traffic volumes on Anthony Wayne Drive. The proposed reduction in the width of Anthony Wayne Drive, which was over-designed at its inception, will improve pedestrian access and safety. Moreover, a fat-free Anthony Wayne Drive would create opportunities for adding weight to the university’s open space inventory. With the insertion of major housing development, a reinvented Anthony Wayne Drive corridor will transform the western edge of Main Campus and the image of the university as a whole.

As the residential population on and near campus grows over the next generation, the university and city will need to collaborate to improve pedestrian circulation across the Midtown Detroit campus. Obstacles to pedestrian traffic flow, such as bollards and chains, should be removed. The number of traffic lanes provided along most arterials is greater than capacities required for peak conditions; accordingly, campus perimeter streets should be reduced to the narrowest extents feasible. A suggested maximum condition for general application is a five-lane road profile including two lanes of directional traffic, a center turning lane, and one lane on each side for on-street parking.

The university should encourage transit improvements proposed in the Midtown area. The planned intermodal station at Woodward between Amsterdam and Baltimore will provide high-speed, regional rail access, and connections to area bus routes and possibly a higher speed mass transit service on Woodward, linking downtown and the northern suburbs. An important transit hub at the intersection of Woodward Avenue and Warren Avenue is anticipated as a result of this infrastructure improvement, reinforcing that location’s importance as Midtown’s “100 percent corner.” As a result of these transit upgrades, university students, faculty, staff and visitors will be better served and parking pressures commensurately – that is, hopefully – reduced. Passenger drop-off zones for car-pooling commuters are recommended as a part of infrastructure improvements at each of the six campuses.

Connectivity between the six campus precincts varies from barely adequate to extremely challenging for pedestrians. Additional on-street parking would assist users with relatively short-term commitments in multiple campus locations. Presently, for example, commuting medical students generally drive between the Medical and Main campuses, thus doubly burdening parking resources. The university should specifically seek additional on-street parking along Anthony Wayne Drive and Palmer Street. In addition, the university should develop – subsidize, if necessary – a shuttle bus service to interconnect the Midtown Detroit campus whole, thereby decreasing parking demand and increasing user options. Pedestrian traffic between all campuses except the Medical Campus is foreseen to continue as the predominant mode of travel. Proposed open space linkages, discussed below, are envisioned to encourage additional pedestrian traffic.

Existing service traffic patterns are variously efficient, and some refinements are recommended over the next 20 years. Vehicular traffic will continue to be very restricted on Main Campus, and its impact on all campuses should be minimized to the greatest extents possible. Service to buildings will continue to be provided from the perimeter of the Main Campus superblock in manners least invasive. Major existing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts, which most often result from inadequate building service access design, should be mitigated at the source wherever possible – including internal building circulation improvements. For example, suggested additions to the Chemistry Building, Science Hall and Science Library will create an opportunity for a common service point, eliminating existing service to these buildings from pedestrian malls – Illustration 43.

Connectivity between the six campus precincts varies from barely adequate to extremely challenging for pedestrians. Additional on-street parking would assist users with relatively short-term commitments in multiple campus locations. Presently, for example, commuting medical students generally drive between the Medical and Main campuses, thus doubly burdening parking resources. The university should specifically seek additional on-street parking along Anthony Wayne Drive and Palmer Street. In addition, the university should develop – subsidize, if necessary – a shuttle bus service to interconnect the Midtown Detroit campus whole, thereby decreasing parking demand and increasing user options. Pedestrian traffic between all campuses except the Medical Campus is foreseen to continue as the predominant mode of travel. Proposed open space linkages, discussed below, are envisioned to encourage additional pedestrian traffic.

Existing service traffic patterns are variously efficient, and some refinements are recommended over the next 20 years. Vehicular traffic will continue to be very restricted on Main Campus, and its impact on all campuses should be minimized to the greatest extents possible. Service to buildings will continue to be provided from the perimeter of the Main Campus superblock in manners least invasive. Major existing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts, which most often result from inadequate building service access design, should be mitigated at the source wherever possible – including internal building circulation improvements. For example, suggested additions to the Chemistry Building, Science Hall and Science Library will create an opportunity for a common service point, eliminating existing service to these buildings from pedestrian malls – Illustration 43.

Connectivity between the six campus precincts varies from barely adequate to extremely challenging for pedestrians. Additional on-street parking would assist users with relatively short-term commitments in multiple campus locations. Presently, for example, commuting medical students generally drive between the Medical and Main campuses, thus doubly burdening parking resources. The university should specifically seek additional on-street parking along Anthony Wayne Drive and Palmer Street. In addition, the university should develop – subsidize, if necessary – a shuttle bus service to interconnect the Midtown Detroit campus whole, thereby decreasing parking demand and increasing user options. Pedestrian traffic between all campuses except the Medical Campus is foreseen to continue as the predominant mode of travel. Proposed open space linkages, discussed below, are envisioned to encourage additional pedestrian traffic.

Existing service traffic patterns are variously efficient, and some refinements are recommended over the next 20 years. Vehicular traffic will continue to be very restricted on Main Campus, and its impact on all campuses should be minimized to the greatest extents possible. Service to buildings will continue to be provided from the perimeter of the Main Campus superblock in manners least invasive. Major existing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts, which most often result from inadequate building service access design, should be mitigated at the source wherever possible – including internal building circulation improvements. For example, suggested additions to the Chemistry Building, Science Hall and Science Library will create an opportunity for a common service point, eliminating existing service to these buildings from pedestrian malls – Illustration 43.
Illustration 44: 2020 Building Use Plan
PRIMARY BUILDING USES
The 2020 Campus Master Plan of university uses builds on current utilization patterns. Academic expansion facilities are located in a manner that supports academic centralization. Similar uses are co-located to promote departmental identity, improve accessibility and adjacency, and streamline operation of services. Proposed housing development will be located primarily within already established residential contexts to foster community. Athletic expansion is limited to the Athletic Campus; recreational spaces, yet to be programmed, unfortunately remain largely undistributed. Support services are both distributed and consolidated for access and functional efficiency – Illustration 44.

CONSOLIDATE BUILDING USES
Policy: Wayne State University will redistribute uses to optimize educational and economic benefits
Goals: Improve adjacency, access, program efficiency and inter-disciplinary synergy
Strategies:
- Reinforce science/engineering corridor
- Lead development of WSU Research and Technology Park
- Concentrate medical uses
- Improve clinical study programs accessibility
- Maintain general lecture hall/classroom distribution
- Develop business/executive lifelong learning facility
- Distribute housing on each of the six campus precincts
- Promote mixed-use integration

BALANCE NEW DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL OF EXISTING PHYSICAL PLANT
Policy: Capital renewal planning will assume parity status with new construction.
Goal: Conserve existing physical plant.
Strategies:
- Allocate half of annual investment to capital renewal and half to new construction
- Renovate existing physical plant at 75 percent replacement value
- Sustain necessary infrastructure and support facilities

CONSOLIDATE DEVELOPMENT
Policy: Wayne State University will expand predominantly on university land holdings
Goal: Acquisitions will be limited to strategic parcels
Strategies:
- Develop primarily through strategic infill
- Partner with private sector developers through leveraged real-estate
- Secure compensating land losses incurred by I-94 expansion
- Collaborate with local reinvestment initiatives – public and private

EXTEND CAMPUS
Policy: WSU uses will be integrated into the urban context.
Goal: Create identity, connection, convenience.
Strategies:
- Utilize Woodward Avenue holdings to promote community outreach and campus identity
- Develop Science/Engineering corridor on Warren Avenue
- Reinforce linkages to Medical Campus and the DMC
- Develop transverse, pedestrian-oriented corridors linking the various campus precincts, the Cultural Center and the DMC
- Extend housing development distribution to each of the six campus precincts
- Extend, from Gullen Mall, compatible streetscape improvements on Second Avenue at both the southern and northern directions
- Strengthen the physical connections between the Main Campus and surrounding campus precincts
- Reinforce the North Cass Area as mixed use village – Research and Technology Village
- Construct new parking in locations close to each campus precinct for improved convenience

CONSOLIDATE BUILDING USES
Policy: Wayne State University will redistribute uses to optimize educational and economic benefits
Goals: Improve adjacency, access, program efficiency and inter-disciplinary synergy
Strategies:
- Reinforce science/engineering corridor
- Lead development of WSU Research and Technology Park
- Concentrate medical uses
- Improve clinical study programs accessibility
- Maintain general lecture hall/classroom distribution
- Develop business/executive lifelong learning facility
- Distribute housing on each of the six campus precincts
- Promote mixed-use integration
Several new facilities will house programmed academic and research expansion. In addition to the recently completed Law School expansion and the nearly completed College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building, space for each of the seven academic components is planned. A “science and engineering corridor” is proposed along Warren Avenue between the Lodge expressway (M-10) and Woodward Avenue, with extension potential to Brush Street. The Research Building Renovation (RBR) Study proposes that related engineering programs expand at the sites of the Engineering building and Manufacturing Engineering building. A focal point for the creation of an academic quad at the Manufacturing Engineering building. The science program would expand with a building to be located adjacent to the Physics building. Additional growth is planned with the replacement and enlargement of the Life Science facility. An atrium enclosure is planned to physically connect the Life Sciences building, Science Hall, the Chemistry building and the existing Science Library to form a contiguous facility – Illustration 45. The medical program would expand through additions to Louis M. Ellman Clinical Research Building, Gordon Scott Hall and the C. S. Mott Center, which take into account additional recommendations made in the RBR Study. The Rackham Building could serve a variety of purposes yet to be determined, but ideally bridging the needs of the Main and Medical campuses.

In addition to the new construction, several departmental moves are suggested to increase each academic unit’s identity, encourage a more efficient utilization of space, and improve access among common facilities for students, faculty and staff. A preliminary reorganization model locating academic units based on general classification is summarized in Table 16.

As a general approach, large capacity lecture halls will remain collocated for convenience, and to free up additional space to meet specific needs of the 15 schools and colleges. Four buildings, located throughout the Midtown Detroit campus, have been designated as general lecture halls to be shared by several academic units. An additional five buildings have been identified as general academic facilities for assignment to a specific academic component at a later date. State Hall would be renovated for a third generation of usage while a new structure to house LifeLong Learning programs will be added to the north to create a quadrangle closure at the DeRoy Auditorium.

The Fine, Performing and Communication Arts program would remain in its current facilities. The undergraduate theater program is proposed to move from Hilberry to either a renovated Rackham Building or a new theater facility adjacent to Old Main, at the corner of Second and Warren. Departmental offices located at the Linsell House would relocate to the Thompson Home. The stage shop would remain at 95 West Hancock. The proposed demolition of the University Custodial Grounds building will require the relocation of the foundry, operated through the Art and Art History department, to a location to be determined after resolution of replacement specificities.

The Humanities and Social Sciences component has been determined after resolution of replacement specifics. As envisioned in the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the Science and Engineering colleges will form their own “engineering and sciences corridor” on Warren Avenue, with additional specialized commitments to the proposed Wayne State University Research and Technology Park.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan takes into account the results of the Research Building Renovation Study. Natural Sciences will be relocated to the Warren corridor. General lecture-type facilities would be vacated, while three deficient buildings – Engineering Technology Building, Bioengineering Laboratory Building and Chemistry Building – are to be demolished. Four new facilities along Warren Avenue and two renovated buildings within the WSU Research and Technology Park will accommodate future space demands. The Engineering program will be expanded by an addition to the Engineering building and a new complex built around the existing plaza of the Manufacturing Engineering Building. A new facility adjacent to the Foundry building and the integration of Chemistry, Science Hall, Science Library and a replacement of the Life Sciences into a single complex will accommodate the Science program expansion. A new complex between the Chemistry Building and Science Hall would connect the complex. The elimination of the Psychology Building and 51 West

Advanced Imaging Research building, will be connected to the north wall of the Louis M. Ellman Clinical Research Building.

Professional Schools

Professional Schools have traditionally held autonomous positions within the campus. As demand for academic space has increased, they have seen other colleges and schools encroach upon their domain, as was the experience of the College of Education. Some programs have had limitations placed on their growth, such as the Business school. The 2020 Campus Master Plan envisions that the professional schools will continue to operate in their own facilities and maintain flexibility for program expansions. The school will retain the use of Prentis Building and Randa House. In the longer term, Business would expand into a State Hall facility, enabling the divorce of its Executive Lifelong Learning program in facilities comparable to the University of Michigan and Michigan State University business programs. The School of Education will be enhanced by the removal of the ground floor of Neilson Hall and the elimination of programs from the Education building. The Law School expansion will provide up-to-date facilities. The Graduate School has been primarily administrative in nature, requiring a modest amount of academic space; future program requirements would be added to the new Academic Expansion Building.

Science and Engineering Research

The Science and Engineering Research component will elevate its profile by its participation in a state-wide Life Sciences Corridor – partnering with the University of Michigan, Michigan State University and the Van Andel Institute for Medical Research. As envisioned in the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the Science and Engineering colleges will form their own “engineering and sciences corridor” on Warren Avenue, with additional specialized commitments to the proposed Wayne State University Research and Technology Park.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan takes into account the results of the Research Building Renovation Study. Natural Sciences will be relocated to the Warren corridor. General lecture-type facilities would be vacated, while three deficient buildings – Engineering Technology Building, Bioengineering Laboratory Building and Chemistry Building – are to be demolished. Four new facilities along Warren Avenue and two renovated buildings within the WSU Research and Technology Park will accommodate future space demands. The Engineering program will be expanded by an addition to the Engineering building and a new complex built around the existing plaza of the Manufacturing Engineering Building. A new facility adjacent to the Foundry building and the integration of Chemistry, Science Hall, Science Library and a replacement of the Life Sciences into a single complex will accommodate the Science program expansion. A new complex between the Chemistry Building and Science Hall would connect the complex. The elimination of the Psychology Building and 51 West

Community-Related Clinical Study Programs

Community-Related Clinical Study Programs have traditionally been located at the Merrill Palmer Institute; however, programmed services have been located wherever space could be found. The nature of these programs is such that their number and location changes from year to year. As a result, available space is often remodeled and consolidated to suit the sponsoring organization. As a remedy, the 2020 Campus Master Plan proposes that these programs be consolidated to serve both university and community needs. The Freer, Knapp, and Skillman facilities of the Merrill Palmer Institute will continue to serve current constituents. A three-story vertical expansion planned for the C. S. Mott Center is proposed to accommodate remaining programs and clinical growth. Mott Center was chosen because of its central proximity to both Main and Medical campuses, ease of access from Warren Avenue, and the plentiful supply of convenient parking at the Veterans Administration Hospital across the street.

The proposed demolition of the University Custodial Grounds building will require the relocation of the foundry, operated through the Art and Art History department, to a location to be determined after resolution of replacement specificities.

Humanities and Social Sciences

The Humanities and Social Sciences component is traditionally lecture hall-oriented. The 2020 Campus Master Plan proposes to relocate and consolidate related departments in a new Humanities and Social Sciences building to be located on the site of the General Lectures building. The new facility will include Liberal Arts (currently based in Maroon House); Social Work (currently located in the Thompson Home); and CULMA (currently located in F/AB and State Hall). The proposed building will provide classrooms, seminar rooms, computer laboratories, limited research space and offices.

Medicine

Programs relating to the Medical School mission are proposed to be co-terminous with the sponsoring organization. As a remedy, the Advanced Imaging Research building, will be connected to the north wall of the Louis M. Ellman Clinical Research Building.

Professional Schools

Professional Schools have traditionally held autonomous positions within the campus. As demand for academic space has increased, they have seen other colleges and schools encroach upon their domain, as was the experience of the College of Education. Some programs have had limitations placed on their growth, such as the Business school. The 2020 Campus Master Plan envisions that the professional schools will continue to operate in their own facilities and maintain flexibility for program expansions. The school will retain the use of Prentis Building and Randa House. In the longer term, Business would expand into a State Hall facility, enabling the divorce of its Executive Lifelong Learning program in facilities comparable to the University of Michigan and Michigan State University business programs. The School of Education will be enhanced by the removal of the ground floor of Neilson Hall and the elimination of programs from the Education building. The Law School expansion will provide up-to-date facilities. The Graduate School has been primarily administrative in nature, requiring a modest amount of academic space; future program requirements would be added to the new Academic Expansion Building.

Science and Engineering Research

The Science and Engineering Research component will elevate its profile by its participation in a state-wide Life Sciences Corridor – partnering with the University of Michigan, Michigan State University and the Van Andel Institute for Medical Research. As envisioned in the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the Science and Engineering colleges will form their own “engineering and sciences corridor” on Warren Avenue, with additional specialized commitments to the proposed Wayne State University Research and Technology Park.

The 2020 Campus Master Plan takes into account the results of the Research Building Renovation Study. Natural Sciences will be relocated to the Warren corridor. General lecture-type facilities would be vacated, while three deficient buildings – Engineering Technology Building, Bioengineering Laboratory Building and Chemistry Building – are to be demolished. Four new facilities along Warren Avenue and two renovated buildings within the WSU Research and Technology Park will accommodate future space demands. The Engineering program will be expanded by an addition to the Engineering building and a new complex built around the existing plaza of the Manufacturing Engineering Building. A new facility adjacent to the Foundry building and the integration of Chemistry, Science Hall, Science Library and a replacement of the Life Sciences into a single complex will accommodate the Science program expansion. A new complex between the Chemistry Building and Science Hall would connect the complex. The elimination of the Psychology Building and 51 West
The Research Building Renovation (RBR) Program is a study recently completed that identifies research programs that are in need of renovation and additional space. Listed below are the buildings included in the program.

**Legend:**

- **Existing Buildings:**
  - 195 NONENGINEERING BUILDING
  - 197 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE BUILDING
  - 198 CHEMISTRY BUILDING
  - 199 LOUIS W. ELBOWAY CLINICAL RESEARCH BUILDING
  - 200 ENGINEERING BUILDING
  - 201 ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY BUILDING
  - 202 PROGRAM TO BE RELAOCATED
  - 203 PHULMJAN KAMP BUILDING
  - 204 LEWIS HUBEL PLANT SCIENCE BUILDING
  - 205 LIFE SCIENCES BUILDING
  - 206 CASE WESTERN RESEARCH BUILDING
  - 207 C.S. MOTT CENTER
  - 208 NATURAL SCIENCES BUILDING
  - 209 PHYSICS BUILDING
  - 210 SCIENCE MALL
  - 211 GORCZY-M. SCOTT BUILDING
  - 212 LEWIS/HENRY R. HOLLIN BUILDING
  - 213 SKILLMAN BUILDING

- **Proposed Buildings:**
  - 1 MT. C.S. MOTT CENTER VERTICAL EXPANSION
  - 214 ENGILBREIT BUILDING EXPANSION
  - 215 ENGINEERING PROGRAM EXPANSION
  - 216 RESEARCH INTEGRATED LABORATORY
  - 217 SCIENCE COMPLEX ATRIUM
  - 218 SCIENCE PROGRAM EXPANSION
  - 219 GORCZY-M. SCOTT MALL BUILDINGS EXPANSION

- **Additional Research Space**
  - [Existing and Planned Buildings]

Illustration 46: 2020 Research Building Use Plan
Principal Findings:

- There is no relationship between campus size, measured by enrollment, and the amount of housing provided to students.
- All benchmarked campuses have recently opened student housing.
- The amount and proportion of housing provided varies widely – 2% to 23%.
- Demand and the overall economy are impacting campus housing growth.
- Apartment-style housing is the unit type most preferred by comparable universities today.
- Variants of the apartment type unit are responsive to:
  - Students' need for independence
  - Adequate supply of dormitory style housing exists (50-100%)
  - Ease of construction
- Private developers are more willing to build apartment-style housing.
- No benchmarked campuses are building housing for families, following path of least resistance.
- Many newly proposed housing projects are greater than 300 units.
- Many campuses may have an occupancy problem as students move from existing campus housing.
- Two campuses are expediting the development schedule of new housing – about 16 months.

Table 16: Future Academic Building Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Occupancy</th>
<th>Community-Related – Clinical Study Programs</th>
<th>Fine, Performing and Communication Arts</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
<th>Science and Engineering Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer House</td>
<td>90 Hancock Art Building</td>
<td>8 University</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Social Sciences Building *</td>
<td>Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mott Center Expansion</td>
<td>61 Bonstelle Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law and Information Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skillman Building</td>
<td>Community Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilberry Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban, Labor and Metropolitan Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music Annex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allied Health Professions</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schaefer Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Information Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Lecture Use</td>
<td>Academic Expansion Building *</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Science Building *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Expansion Building *</td>
<td>Education Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Education Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Expansion *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law School Library</td>
<td>Education Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Hall Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prentis Hall</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiftman Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rand House</td>
<td>Education Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Health Ctr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Expansion Bldg.</td>
<td>Expansion Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Proposed buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Expansion Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* General Academic Use facilities are to be assigned at a later date and include Academic Expansion Facility, General Academic Facilities (Main and South campuses), Rackham Building, and Saint Andrews Hall.

**Academic Components**

- Community-Related – Clinical Study Programs
- Fine, Performing and Communication Arts
- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Medicine
- Professional Schools
- Science and Engineering Research

**Housing Analysis**

- Benchmark Universities:
  - University of Alabama, Birmingham
  - University of Cincinnati
  - University of Illinois, Chicago
  - University of Indiana-Purdue, Indianapolis
  - University of Louisville
  - University of Missouri, Kansas City
  - University of Pittsburgh
  - University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
  - Virginia Commonwealth University
  - Wright State University

**Principal Findings:**

- There is no relationship between campus size, measured by enrollment, and the amount of housing provided to students.
- All benchmarked campuses have recently opened student housing.
- The amount and proportion of housing provided varies widely – 2% to 23%.
- Demand and the overall economy are impacting campus housing growth.
- Apartment-style housing is the unit type most preferred by comparable universities today.
- Variants of the apartment type unit are responsive to:
  - Students’ need for independence
  - Adequate supply of dormitory style housing exists (50-100%)
  - Ease of construction
- Private developers are more willing to build apartment-style housing.
- No benchmarked campuses are building housing for families, following path of least resistance.
- Many newly proposed housing projects are greater than 300 units.
- Many campuses may have an occupancy problem as students move from existing campus housing.
- Two campuses are expediting the development schedule of new housing – about 16 months.

**Libraries**

The construction of Adymany Undergraduate Library resolved a number of deficiencies in the university’s library program, including a lack of sufficient media storage, inadequate space for students, faculty and staff, and dated technology. The 2020 Campus Master Plan addresses for the most significant Library challenge remaining, that is, the renovation of the Purdy, Kresge and Science Libraries, and enlargement and renovation of the Shiftman Medical Library. The 2020 library program presupposes that undergraduate needs will be met in Adymany Library, graduate activities will remain in Purdy and Kresge libraries, Labor and Urban Affairs will remain in the Reuther Library, Science and Engineering programs will be served by the Science Library, and an expanded Shiftman Medical Library will meet Nursing and Medicine program needs.
### 2020 Housing Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Tenant Composition</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 Chatsworth Tower Apts</td>
<td>122,172</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 Chatsworth Annex</td>
<td>44,242</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Hulin &amp; DeBary Apts</td>
<td>208,444</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 Forest Apartments</td>
<td>145,174</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Max Jacobs House</td>
<td>8,458</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Sherbrooke Apts</td>
<td>21,745</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 University Tower Apts</td>
<td>354,382</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>903,197</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Affiliated Residents</strong></td>
<td>-144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Housing Total</strong></td>
<td>903,197</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>East Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10 Proposed Housing</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Housing Total</strong></td>
<td>1,085,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Housing Total</strong></td>
<td>903,197</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 Housing Total</strong></td>
<td>2,083,197</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenant Composition Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant Composition</th>
<th>Existing Total</th>
<th>Proposed Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate/Honors</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and Faculty</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The existing number of beds is based on an allocation of one bed per bedroom. Additional bed capacity is possible. The capacity for existing number of beds has been reduced to account for nonaffiliated university residents and market conditions.

Source: Existing capacity – WSU Department of Housing, Fall Term, 2000; Proposed capacity – Albert Kahn Associates, Inc.

Table 17: 2020 Housing Capacity
ON-CAMPUS HOUSING

The five-fold expansion of university housing (from 1,000 to 6,000 beds) will significantly transform the Wayne State University campus. Additional housing units are proposed for all campuses except Athletic. All housing will be adjacent to recreational open space, parking facilities and food service. Six new campus greens have been created, while two existing spaces have been reconfigured to offer residents recreational opportunities. Most proposed housing units will be constructed as new facilities with the exception of 600 Cass Avenue, located in the Research and Technology Village, which would adaptively reuse an historic facility currently occupied by Business Operations and Parking Services operations – Illustration 47.

A sense of déjà vu accompanies the 2020 Campus Master Plan housing proposal. A goal of increasing the number of students, faculty and staff residing on campus, and creating a more balanced, residential community, was proposed in the context of the Urban Renewal Plan of 1964 and the subsequent 1967 Long Range Plan. Significant residential expansion is planned for all of the six campuses. Not previously contemplated is a northern campus precinct transformed from a university utility closet to a residential quad supporting a multitenant Research and Technology Park. The 2020 development proposed at the University Tower will address inefficient land use and bring a more appropriate scale and character to the physical surroundings of the area. The housing proposed at the Medical Campus will bring life to an area encircled by the harsh edges of parking decks and lots and leftover spaces.

Wayne State University’s vacant Research and Technology Village holdings will be developed primarily for housing relating to the proposed Research and Technology Park. 677 new beds would be placed around a two-acre quad and serve graduate students, faculty and staff. The South University Village proposal contains 1,637 new graduate and undergraduate beds that will be integrated into the vicinity of the University Tower apartment building. The planned expansion immediately adjacent to the tower would be in the form of additional quads defining up to four acres of common and recreation space. The existing Sherbrook and Forest apartments will cater to a mix of new graduate and undergraduate beds located in the vicinity of the Prentis/DeRoy complex. Another 1,317 new undergraduate beds are proposed for the central Main Campus area near the Student Center and existing housing core. The Chatsworth Tower and Annex apartments will house graduate students primarily. The Medical Campus will accommodate 441 new graduate and undergraduate beds located in the vicinity of the Prentis/DeRoy complex.

Housing development will be demand-driven and address a range of user groups. Housing development will be demand-driven and address a range of user groups. The success of the Wayne State University housing initiative depends on private sector interest in developing appropriate housing both on and near campus. The 5,000-bed, on-campus expansion goal is predicated on private sector participation in an 80/20 investment formula, with Wayne State University primarily investing the land. The 1,300-bed, near-campus growth goal is based on similar private developer interest in serving the special needs of a university population. Based on our evaluation of surrounding neighborhoods within walking distance of the university, and current trends in the local housing market, current national practice exhibits a tendency toward apartment-style housing, preferred by students desiring additional independence and by developers seeking to minimize risk. Several residential units are proposed as a veneer to adjacent existing and proposed parking structures. These single-loaded corridor units will mask the unsightly appearance and scale of the parking structures, take advantage of an otherwise undevelopable space, and afford the residents a convenient proximity to vehicle storage.

The five-fold expansion of university housing (from 1,000 to 6,000 beds) will significantly transform the Wayne State University campus. Additional housing units are proposed for all campuses except Athletic. All housing will be adjacent to recreational open space, parking facilities and food service. Six new campus greens have been created, while two existing spaces have been reconfigured to offer residents recreational opportunities. Most proposed housing units will be constructed as new facilities with the exception of 600 Cass Avenue, located in the Research and Technology Village, which would adaptively reuse an historic facility currently occupied by Business Operations and Parking Services operations – Illustration 47.

A sense of déjà vu accompanies the 2020 Campus Master Plan housing proposal. A goal of increasing the number of students, faculty and staff residing on campus, and creating a more balanced, residential community, was proposed in the context of the Urban Renewal Plan of 1964 and the subsequent 1967 Long Range Plan. Significant residential expansion is planned for all of the six campuses. Not previously contemplated is a northern campus precinct transformed from a university utility closet to a residential quad supporting a multitenant Research and Technology Park. The 2020 development proposed at the University Tower will address inefficient land use and bring a more appropriate scale and character to the physical surroundings of the area. The housing proposed at the Medical Campus will bring life to an area encircled by the harsh edges of parking decks and lots and leftover spaces.

Wayne State University’s vacant Research and Technology Village holdings will be developed primarily for housing relating to the proposed Research and Technology Park. 677 new beds would be placed around a two-acre quad and serve graduate students, faculty and staff. The South University Village proposal contains 1,637 new graduate and undergraduate beds that will be integrated into the vicinity of the University Tower apartment building. The planned expansion immediately adjacent to the tower would be in the form of additional quads defining up to four acres of common and recreation space. The existing Sherbrook and Forest apartments will cater to a mix of residents, while the University Tower apartments will continue to house graduate students primarily. The Medical Campus will accommodate 441 new graduate beds defining approximately 4.5 acres of common open space. Proposed for East Campus are 182 new graduate beds that will be integrated into the historic Ferry Street neighborhood. 146 beds for both graduates and undergraduates are planned for the Athletic Campus. The Main Campus is proposed as the site for a new Residential/Honors College containing 400 new beds. Another 1,317 new undergraduate beds are proposed for the central Main Campus area near the Student Center and existing housing core. The Chatsworth Tower and Annex apartments will house graduate students, while the Helen DeRoy apartments will focus on international students. – see Table 17. Additional consideration will be given to the possible replacement of the Forest Apartment building. Also, an extended stay facility serving visiting faculty, visitors and participants in Belong learning programs is suggested as a potential use of the two upper floors of the General Academic Program building located at Gulen Plaza to complete the quad at the Prentis/DeRoy complex.

Proposed housing would be designed at heights and densities lower than previously developed. It is essential that new housing development sustain meaningful open space and be provided supporting amenities to ensure high standards of liveability. No housing unit would be more than four stories, and housing aggregations are proposed to create traditional hierarchies of community and privacy. Housing unit types would range from dormitory-style for entering undergraduate students to apartment-style for graduate and married students. The university will incorporate different housing unit arrangements depending on student demographics, campus location, past successes and current trends in the local housing market. Current national practice exhibits a tendency toward apartment-style housing, preferred by students desiring additional independence and by developers seeking to minimize risk. Several residential units are proposed as a veneer to adjacent existing and proposed parking structures. These single-loaded corridor units will mask the unsightly appearance and scale of the parking structures, take advantage of an otherwise undevelopable space, and afford the residents a convenient proximity to vehicle storage.

The five-fold expansion of university housing (from 1,000 to 6,000 beds) will significantly transform the Wayne State University campus. Additional housing units are proposed for all campuses except Athletic. All housing will be adjacent to recreational open space, parking facilities and food service. Six new campus greens have been created, while two existing spaces have been reconfigured to offer residents recreational opportunities. Most proposed housing units will be constructed as new facilities with the exception of 600 Cass Avenue, located in the Research and Technology Village, which would adaptively reuse an historic facility currently occupied by Business Operations and Parking Services operations – Illustration 47.

A sense of déjà vu accompanies the 2020 Campus Master Plan housing proposal. A goal of increasing the number of students, faculty and staff residing on campus, and creating a more balanced, residential community, was proposed in the context of the Urban Renewal Plan of 1964 and the subsequent 1967 Long Range Plan. Significant residential expansion is planned for all of the six campuses. Not previously contemplated is a northern campus precinct transformed from a university utility closet to a residential quad supporting a multitenant Research and Technology Park. The 2020 development proposed at the University Tower will address inefficient land use and bring a more appropriate scale and character to the physical surroundings of the area. The housing proposed at the Medical Campus will bring life to an area encircled by the harsh edges of parking decks and lots and leftover spaces.

Wayne State University’s vacant Research and Technology Village holdings will be developed primarily for housing relating to the proposed Research and Technology Park. 677 new beds would be placed around a two-acre quad and serve graduate students, faculty and staff. The South University Village proposal contains 1,637 new graduate and undergraduate beds located in the vicinity of the University Tower apartment building. The planned expansion immediately adjacent to the tower would be in the form of additional quads defining up to four acres of common and recreation space. The existing Sherbrook and Forest apartments will cater to a mix of residents, while the University Tower apartments will continue to house graduate students primarily. The Medical Campus will accommodate 441 new graduate beds defining approximately 4.5 acres of common open space. Proposed for East Campus are 182 new graduate beds that will be integrated into the historic Ferry Street neighborhood. 146 beds for both graduates and undergraduates are planned for the Athletic Campus. The Main Campus is proposed as the site for a new Residential/Honors College containing 400 new beds. Another 1,317 new undergraduate beds are proposed for the central Main Campus area near the Student Center and existing housing core. The Chatsworth Tower and Annex apartments will house graduate students, while the Helen DeRoy apartments will focus on international students. – see Table 17. Additional consideration will be given to the possible replacement of the Forest Apartment building. Also, an extended stay facility serving visiting faculty, visitors and participants in Belong learning programs is suggested as a potential use of the two upper floors of the General Academic Program building located at Gulen Plaza to complete the quad at the Prentis/DeRoy complex.

Proposed housing would be designed at heights and densities lower than previously developed. It is essential that new housing development sustain meaningful open space and be provided supporting amenities to ensure high standards of liveability. No housing unit would be more than four stories, and housing aggregations are proposed to create traditional hierarchies of community and privacy. Housing unit types would range from dormitory-style for entering undergraduate students to apartment-style for graduate and married students. The university will incorporate different housing unit arrangements depending on student demographics, campus location, past successes and current trends in the local housing market. Current national practice exhibits a tendency toward apartment-style housing, preferred by students desiring additional independence and by developers seeking to minimize risk. Several residential units are proposed as a veneer to adjacent existing and proposed parking structures. These single-loaded corridor units will mask the unsightly appearance and scale of the parking structures, take advantage of an otherwise undevelopable space, and afford the residents a convenient proximity to vehicle storage.

The success of the Wayne State University housing initiative depends on private sector interest in developing appropriate housing both on and near campus. The 5,000-bed, on-campus expansion goal is predicated on private sector participation in an 80/20 investment formula, with Wayne State University primarily investing the land. The 1,300-bed, near-campus growth goal is based on similar private developer interest in serving the special needs of a university population. Based on our evaluation of surrounding neighborhoods within walking distance of the university, and current trends in the local housing market, we believe that a total near-campus population of about 3,000 – double the current estimated population – is achievable by 2020 (refer to Table 11).
Illustration 48: 2020 Athletic and Fitness Use Plan

EXPAND SPORTS

Policy: Wayne State University will elevate participation in selected NCAA programs.

Goal: Augment Athletic Campus to support new intercollegiate athletic programs.
Meet NCAA gender equity requirements for facilities and fields.
Achieve economies of scale and economies of means.

Strategies:
- Acquire necessary land for program expansion.
- Develop new multipurpose arena.
- Replace athletic fields lost to I-94 taking.
- Exercise efficient utilization of existing infrastructure.
SPORTS AND RECREATION

The 2020 Campus Master Plan documents a preliminary understanding of the university’s long-term sports and recreation needs. Elevation in NCAA competition, combined with the recreational demands of an expanding residential population will strain university facilities and fields beyond current capacities. Under consideration are moves from NCAA Division II to Division I in men’s hockey, men’s basketball, and women’s basketball programs. In addition, the university may move from NCAA Division II to Division I-AA in football. All other programs are expected to remain at Division II level. The change in division status will require the university to undergo substantial changes that will impact both the programs and the physical infrastructure necessary to support them. Gender equity must also be addressed.

Included in the 2020 Campus Master Plan is a new 5,000 to 7,500-seat multipurpose arena and a modest addition to Matthaei Complex in anticipation of growing athletic space demands required by athletic, intramural and recreational programs. A new Recreation and Fitness Center, recently completed on Main Campus, is expected to meet current demands, although a second facility will undoubtedly be required in the future – Illustration 48.
Illustration 50: 2020 Support Services Use Plan
SUPPORT SERVICES

Support Services is a category that includes student services, administration, buildings and grounds, storage, vacant inventory and surplus space. The 2020 Campus Master Plan proposes new administrative and student service presence on Woodward Avenue that will dramatically increase the university’s exposure and identity. Remaining service locations will be renovated over the next 20 years. Childcare facilities, also under the umbrella of support services, are to be located at or near new housing developments at each of the campuses with the exception of the Athletic Campus. A modest amount of dedicated retail space is proposed to be located near housing and parking structures throughout the Midtown Detroit campus, as private sector initiatives are expected to meet market demands – Illustration 50. The university continues to maintain an interest in partnering with others to develop a conference center on a site yet to be determined.

Administration

Administration, which includes academic, finance, operations, public safety, Computing and Information Technology, the university press and the television studio, is currently housed in various locations throughout the Research and Technology Village, South University Village, East Campus and Main Campus precincts. Most administrative offices are currently located in the Faculty/Administration Building and Academic/Administration Building. The 20-year future growth of the campus, as well as the proposed demolition of several existing administration buildings, will require additional space to meet the demands of the university. Identified as a strategic gateway to the university by the Steering Committee, Parking Lots 1 and MH, located at the intersection of Woodward Avenue and Palmer, will provide the necessary real estate for two new administrative buildings. The new buildings will house additional offices and the relocated computer center, and would ideally be interconnected for future flexibility and functional efficiency. The added space will enable the university to maintain a dominant presence along the west frontage of Woodward from I-94 to the Detroit Historical Museum at Kirby.

Student Services

Student services are currently housed in two structures: Helen Newberry Joy building, a converted women’s dormitory that now provides admissions, transcript and financial aid services, and the Student Center Building, providing food service, recreational opportunities and offices for student affiliations. Other student affiliations are located throughout the campus, such as the Upward Bound program at 5225 Woodward. These programs will remain unaffected by the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The Student Center Building will continue to function as a union; a link to the Master Plan’s proposed Residential Life building will be implemented to provide resident students additional dining options. The Helen Newberry Joy building will be demolished and its functions moved to the planned Welcome Center, which will be located on the northwest corner of Woodward and Warren Avenue. This new signature building, located at the most prominent corner in the area, will cater primarily to student enrollment and financial needs. A new bookstore is planned for the adjacent corner of Cass and Warren avenues. The university’s Academic Success Center will be located in the space vacated by the existing bookstore within the Adanamy Undergraduate Library.

General Services

General Service functions include buildings and grounds maintenance, materials storage and miscellaneous uses such as the WDET radio transmitter. The majority of the buildings that house these functions are located in the Research and Technology Village and East Campus precincts. All functions housed in facilities within the Research and Technology Village would be relocated to the proposed support services complex at the northwest corner of Woodward and Palmer. The majority of the existing facilities would be demolished to make way for other use developments, notably housing. An exception is the 6050 Cass Avenue building, which would be adaptively reused as a graduate housing facility. The Custodial Grounds building is proposed to be demolished and reconfigured within the support services complex at Palmer. Remaining service-oriented buildings will be renovated. A relocation of the occupants of the University Services Building to a yet-to-be-determined site is anticipated. Possibilities for the re-use of this site include additional academic, housing and/or retail opportunities.

Childcare

One new childcare center is proposed for each campus precinct with the exception the Athletic Campus. These new facilities would be located as part of proposed housing developments. Each will provide convenient vehicular access, temporary parking and adjacent exterior play space. Each center is planned to contain 7,000-10,000 square feet of interior space and a minimum .25 acres exterior play space. A facility of this size should accommodate up to 140 children at any given time, providing care for a total of 1,200 children per day. Current estimates based on student, faculty and staff attendance patterns predict that as many as 3,500 parents could take advantage of the new centers before exceeding their capacity. Further study on the topic is recommended.

Retail

New retail space will be necessary to meet the needs of an expanding residential population. Without basic support amenities such as grocery stores, restaurants, specialty shops, clothing stores and cleaners, residents will need to travel elsewhere to meet their needs, and thereby place the program at risk. The additional retail space included in the 2020 Campus Master Plan will supplement existing and planned private sector investment. Proposed retail is located in areas where demand is anticipated to be high and where it will be convenient to high volumes of pedestrian circulation, intense residential development and sufficient vehicular access.
Illustration 51: 2020 Parking Use Plan
PARKING

Goals to expand the university’s residential base and overall population, coupled with a preference to consolidate new development on current holdings, will cause more intense utilization of campus land. Surface parking lots will be redeveloped for “higher and better uses”; those lots retained and newly developed will follow more strategic considerations than previously. Moreover, these combined goals will result in the construction of seven new parking decks, accommodating nearly 6,800 new structured spaces – Illustration S1.

By 2020 all campus destinations will be within a five to 10-minute walk from a parking structure. In areas where demand for parking is high, new structures will be constructed in a manner that allows for expansion as land area becomes available. While additional on-street parking is recommended along each side of Anthony Wayne Drive, this increased supply will be more of an exception to the overall forecasted reduction in the on-street parking capacity, anticipated due to increased development expected in the area.

The redevelopment of expressways and service drives will help improve traffic flow to the campus and the perimeter parking structures. The efficiency of circulation to and from existing and proposed parking structures will improve; additional measures internal to the decks and payment systems would also improve campus parking conditions. The university’s parking consultant advises methods to improve operational efficiency:

First and foremost, provide adequate signage to visitor parking. Second, provide visitor-parking spaces in locations proximal to the Main Campus; finally, facilitate easy ingress and egress. To increase the operating efficiency of all parking facilities on campus, the following items have been recommended:

- Installation of electronic message signing in conjunction with implementation of reversible ingress/egress lanes at PS1, PS2 and PS5;
- Implementation of an Advanced Parking Information System to inform arriving commuters of available parking, how long the wait might be at major parking facilities, and provide directions to remote lots;
- Evaluation of the possibility of modifying class times to reduce parking demand.

Another strategy aimed at mitigating the congested operating characteristics experienced at many of the prime parking facilities explores the current fee strategy … (which) … does not provide a mechanism for the university to “control” where most users of the system park. By changing different user groups variables of graduated parking fees, the potential exists for some level of control to be placed on each user group. The following conceptual fee strategies are examples of some of the more popular methods:

- Implementation of a university-operated shuttle system in conjunction with incentives for use of remote parking facilities where parking would be significantly reduced;
- Restriction of the amount of parking that certain user-groups can purchase;
- Charging users desiring “prime” parking increased parking fees, while charging less to those users who are willing to park farther from their destination;
- Reduction of the residential parking supply near housing units. The ability to park adjacent to one’s residence could still be offered but at a significantly increased cost. (Parking Policy: Park and Ride, District of Columbia, 2000, HNTB Michigan, Inc.)

Several planned transportation developments in the area validate the assumptions and expectations of the consultant’s “Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program.” Refer to Table 7 in the Campus Growth Model section. Most significant plans include the new Intermodal Station in North Campus, a light rail transit line on Woodward Avenue, and a potential joint venture between the Southeastern-Michigan Authority on Regional Transportation (SMART) and the Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT). Planned greenway and streetscape improvements will encourage additional pedestrian and bicycle use.

Nevertheless, the Wayne State “parking issue” will ultimately require behavior modification, and for many, pain: “Transportation Demand Management programs are most successful when the cost of parking acts as a disincentive to drive-alone commuters and incentives are simultaneously provided to encourage alternative modes or methods of commuting”. (ibid.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Precinct</th>
<th>Total Land Area (Acre)</th>
<th>Building footprint (Acre)</th>
<th>Park &amp; Lot footprint (Acre)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Tech. Village</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>208.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>111.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio</th>
<th>Open Space Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Tech. Village</strong></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Albert Kahn Associates, Inc.*

Table 18: 2020 Land Area Allocation

Illustration 52: 2020 Open Space Plan
OPEN SPACE AND LINKAGE

Wayne State University’s open space environment, especially that of its Main Campus, is universally valued by students, faculty and staff. Less obvious is the importance of open space linkage in determining the success of the Midtown Detroit campus environment as a whole. The university currently maintains 110 acres of open space, not all of which, however, can be termed “meaningful.” A significant existing inventory of underutilized or vacant open space amounts to about 35 acres. The 2020 Campus Master Plan proposes a constant level of meaningful open space by locating new buildings on surface parking lots and replacing displaced parking in multilevel decks – Illustration 18.

“Meaningful open space” can be defined in terms of a hierarchy of places and linkages. Places for congregating and sharing ideas are critical to creating a stimulating intellectual environment. Conversely, more private places of solitude for quiet reflection are equally important. Places for designated activities, especially recreational play, need to be provided on campus. Open spaces must also facilitate connections from place to place. The design development of path and place sets the spatial rhythm and tone of the campus.

For many, the readily visible and highly identifiable campus space constitutes the very image of the university itself – from Michigan’s “Diag” to Harvard’s “Yard.” As a key recommendation of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the Main Campus patchwork of open space at Gullen and Williams Malls would be redeveloped as a galvanizing public realm more consistent with the scale, complexity and ambitions of the university. The new Central Green would be a signature space that would bring unity to the diversity of its architectural surroundings and transition linkages to the greater Midtown Detroit campus whole.

In the larger context, the 2020 Campus Master Plan calls for a strengthening of existing open spaces and development of several important new places for public gathering and use – including at least one focal space in each of the six campus precincts. An expanding residential population will require more than just “green spaces,” but also places to meet, socialize and play. Secondary spaces offering more private places to study and relax give character to the campus and support the unique attributes of each academic and residential environment. The Open Space Plan, Illustration 52, illustrates how places and linkages of connective spaces interlock to create an open space pattern of place and connections within the Midtown Detroit campus.

This urban university is able to offer its students, faculty and staff a broader exchange of knowledge through its integration with the city. The Midtown Detroit context is rich in history, culture and resources, and the 2020 Campus Master Plan suggests ways in which the university can position itself over the next 20 years to improve interconnectedness between campus and community resources. Strongly defined linkages serve a variety of purposes, from wayfinding and spatial mapping to circulation and socialization. Linkages are a matter of accessibility, imageability and mobility – Illustration 54.

Serving a significant commuter population, expressway corridors, connecting suburban and ex-urban points beyond, offer major open space opportunities for improvement, enhancing university access, image and identity. Expressway embankments could be revitalized as linear greenways including trees, shrubs, bulbs and ornamental grasses. The development of such “highway gardens” would provide unique and attractive gateways to the university and its Midtown neighbors.

The expansion and integration of Wayne State University’s open space infrastructure offers a means to connect the six distinct campuses. We propose developing six primary linkages to knit these disparate precincts into a campus whole. In general, primary should be given to the pedestrian, as landscape and streetscape improvements will vary to fit the use profile and design character of their respective contexts. To ensure their success as university environments, linkages must indeed connect important public spaces and offer a variety of episodic spatial events to promote interaction and sustain an intellectual environment. Each of the six primary linkages would contain a hierarchy of multiple spaces conducive to a range of activity and connective to the defining open space of each precinct – Illustration 53.

Woodbridge/Cultural Center Greenway Linkage

An east-west greenway might be strengthened and developed from the Athletic Campus and Woodbridge neighborhood at the west, through the Main Campus core, to the heart of the Cultural Center and the Wright Museum of African American History as an eastern terminus. This link would further connect to Brush Street and points south to the Medical Campus and Brush Mall. Several key modifications are necessary to implement the proposal. The pedestrian bridge over the Lodge expressway connecting the Athletic Campus to the Main Campus should be replaced with a bridge of significant stature and width to convey the presence of the greenway.

Placement of new buildings and modifications to existing structures on Main Campus are critical to the greenway’s definition and continuity. The path between State Hall, Science Hall and the Chemistry Building would become a meaningful and open spatial link to the Cultural Center. The area south of the public library on Packard, currently used as a surface parking lot, would be included in a greenway link and transition from the Main Campus core to the Cultural Center. Streetscape improvements on Packard would reinforce Main Campus linkage to the Rackham Building. Similar streetscape improvements to Brush would enhance connection from the Cultural Center to the Medical Campus and DMC’s Brush Mall, which in turn accesses the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building at Mack and John R. Putnam, currently used as a surface parking lot, would be included in a greenway link and transition from the Main Campus core to the Cultural Center. Streetscape improvements on Packard would reinforce Main Campus linkage to the Rackham Building. Similar streetscape improvements to Brush would enhance connection from the Cultural Center to the Medical Campus and DMC’s Brush Mall, which in turn accesses the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building at Mack and John R.
Illustration 53: 2020 Greenway Linkages Plan
Wayne Streetscape Linkage
The Warren Avenue corridor extends from the Athletic Campus at the west to the Brush corridor described above. As a dogleg, the Warren Avenue/Brush Street connection represents one of two primary, multimodal and mixed-use linkages from Main Campus to Medical Campus. The west Warren Avenue leg is proposed as a “science and engineering corridor” that concentrates departments of these colleges as well as pre-med and synergistic combinations thereof. A Parisian boulevard greenway is an applicable model for a streetscape improvement of the Warren Avenue corridor from the Lodge to Chrysler expressways. As described above, the planning appeal and design potential of the Brush leg is its linkage to the Medical Center’s organizing Bush Mall.

Cass/Canfield Streetscape Linkage
The Cass Avenue/Canfield Street dogleg is the second important link from Main Campus to Medical Campus precinct. Extending the analogy, Cass offers potential as a dynamic, mixed-use “dogtown” common to the American university experience. Terminating at the New Center core, the northern reach of Cass serves as the connecting hub for an emerging urban village, including the new Intermodal Station, the proposed New Amsterdam residential development, the Wayne State University Research and Technology Park, and the university’s own development of graduate housing in the block bounded by Cass Avenue, Burroughs Street, Woodward Avenue and Antoinette Street. The Palmer Street to Forest Street leg is a successfully scaled streetscape boasting a number of historic buildings, many of which belong to Wayne State University. The University Tower site represents the linchpin in the connection to the Medical Campus. A new residential quad expansion of University Tower would reinforce the linkage and potentially provide an alternative route to the Medical Campus. The open space sequence would be active and interesting on a 24-hour basis. Less clear at present is the Canfield Street leg from Woodward Avenue to John R, which is largely vacant and a prime development opportunity.

Gullen/York-Burroughs Streetscape Linkage
The Strategic Vision of “an extended campus” is perhaps most directly realized through extensions of Gullen Mall north and south on Second Avenue. The redevelopment of Second Avenue north of Main Campus as a two-way boulevard, combined with access from two one-way service drives at the Ford Expressway, offers a strategic opportunity to create a major gateway to the university. Extending to the north, Second Avenue provides a dramatic view to the Fisher Building and the heart of New Center area. The Second Avenue to York Street connection will access the proposed university residential development and primary open space for the Research and Technology Village, entered from Cass Avenue. Correspondingly, the Second Avenue to Burroughs Street connection will access the focal public space of the Wayne State University Research and Technology Park, which is suggested at the southwest corner of Burroughs Street and Cass Avenue.

Gullen/Canfield Streetscape Linkage
Extending Gullen Mall southward connects Main Campus to the heart of the proposed South University Village, which overlaps the historic neighborhoods of the area. Streetscape improvements in this corridor would enhance linkage to an urban population that includes non-university residents interested in the resources Wayne State University offers the greater community.

Third/Palmer Streetscape Linkage
One block to the west at Third Avenue is an important north-south traffic connector to the Main Campus. The 2020 Campus Master Plan proposes that this original ring road be transformed from single purpose infrastructure to multi-use core for both the commuter and residential populations. The proposed narrowing of Anthony Wayne Drive to serve realistic traffic volumes will enable the concentrated development of undergraduate housing in the Main Campus core and a Residential/Honors College at the St. Andrews Hall vicinity. The Palmer Street leg is the primary continuous link to the emerging East Campus its redefined core. Palmer Street further penetrates the heart of a stable and developing residential neighborhood in the area bounded by Hendrie Street at the north and Ferry Street at the south.

In sum, activity and linkage are reciprocally related phenomena. An expanded resident population will extend the duration of activity and improve the community’s perception of the campus as a vital and safe environment. Additional usage will increase residential and commercial demand. These uses will facilitate a more livable environment. By providing attractive destinations and ensuring safety en route, the university and greater community will knit the campus together through human activity; the design and construction of innovative passageways alone will not be enough. Proper maintenance of existing buildings and grounds is critical to building and preserving the perception and reality of a revitalized campus.
CAMPUS DESIGN

Development Density
Policy: The Midtown Detroit campus will be developed to optimum density.
Goal: Protect delicate balance of built form and open space.
Strategies: Overall campus density will not exceed 1.75 floor area ratio; Open space will not fall below 30 percent of total campus land. Building development envelopes will be defined through design covenants.

Open Space
Policy: Campus open space will assume equal status to building development.
Goals: Revitalize campus open space. Interconnect campus precincts and city.
Strategies: Historic campus plan will be preserved with judicious exceptions. Mall landscape architecture to be revitalized. Develop new Central Campus Green. Create use hierarchy of active and passive campus open spaces. Interconnect university campuses. Connect university to its urban context through streetscape improvements.

Architecture
Policy: Architecture will support campus as a model learning environment.
Goal: Campus development will preserve, enhance and create architecture of merit.

GOVERNANCE

Stakeholder Participation
Policy: The 2020 Campus Master Plan will be implemented through broad participation of the WSU community.
Goal: Develop university consensus.
Strategies: Master Plan governance will be created to implement stewardship responsibility. Promote planning input at all levels of the university community. WSU will determine academic growth priorities through development procedures. The Master Plan will be reviewed and updated regularly.

Administration Commitment
Policy: Wayne State University will provide necessary support to Master Plan oversight and implementation.
Goal: Empower Facilities Planning and Management with necessary tools to administer and enforce the Master Plan.
Strategies: Develop comprehensive space inventory database. Develop systematic space allocation and assignment protocols. Develop procedures for new project review and approval.
DESIGN GUIDELINES
PURPOSE

The purpose of the following planning and design guidelines is to establish general formal and functional parameters in support of the university’s 2020 Campus Master Plan. These guidelines will provide a framework for judging and approving future planning, architectural, urban design and landscape architectural proposals for the Midtown Detroit campus. As such they are intended to facilitate development of a useful, meaningful and delightful educational environment.

Of the many positive integrating parameters of campus planning and design – including good form, imageability, vitality of use, convenience and meaning – these guidelines are primarily concerned with issues of form, space, legibility and convenience. University and non-university uses are addressed individually and collectively in Master Plan sections, above. Higher order complexity issues relating to meaning – e.g., place-making, etc. – are specifically viewed as the purview of those who follow in planning and design implementation.

Accordingly, these guidelines are not intended to stifle creativity but to offer interpretative latitude. Their purpose is to ensure a campus that is both unified and diverse, legible, comfortable, vital and meaningful. The purpose of these guidelines is to enable and encourage design excellence.

IMPLEMENTATION

The university’s Division of Finance and Administration, Department of Facilities Planning and Management (FPM) will ensure adherence to the principles and goals of the 2020 Campus Master Plan and implementation of these planning and design guidelines. FPM will employ these guidelines in its evaluation of all new construction and renovation projects impacting the physical form of campus development.

Professional planning and design consultants shall be responsible for adhering to and promoting the principles and goals outlined in the 2020 Campus Master Plan and these guidelines for physical development. As a project is developing, consultants are to evaluate specific programs in the contexts of campus precinct, infrastructure and campus whole.

GOALS

The shape of Wayne State University’s future in physical use and form is based on an array of interrelated development goals, that make up the foundation for the planning and design guidelines:

Campus Use
- Reinforce the total campus experience as a livable community.
- Create diverse opportunities for constituents to live, learn, work and play.
- Improve linkages between campus precincts through university functions and in supporting collateral development by others.
- Augment patterns of formal and informal activity within each precinct and in the context of the whole.
- Provide space for informal outdoor instruction.
- Accommodate spontaneous interaction – from intellectual exchange to recreational play.
- Achieve a balanced distribution of support uses – for example, childcare centers.
- Consolidate compatible academic uses and create centers of synergistic excellence in support of teaching and research goals.
- Facilitate outreach to the diverse land use pattern of the Midtown Detroit context.
- Sustain and integrate university uses and activities into existing districts.
- Serve as a catalyst and change agent for improving the safety and economic viability of neighborhoods surrounding the university.

Campus Design
- Preserve and extend the campus open space hierarchy inherent in the Main Campus, master planning precedent as exhibited by Suren Pilafian in the 1940-50s and Minoru Yamasaki in the 1950-60s.
- Design new open spaces and buildings for legibility, vitality and meaning.
- Conceive open space and built form in reciprocal terms – that is, avoid creating open space as architectural residual.
- Preserve and renew the best of the existing landscape environments, and integrate new hardscape and softscape with new building development.
- Encourage the use of native planting in campus green spaces, plaza environments and building courtyards.
- Integrate new architecture with old in terms of form, pattern, fenestration, material, color and scale – that is, without reviving, replicating or mimicking architecture of these or other places.
- Continue the unique human-scale attributes of the historic campus architecture and open space – notably the character-defining Yamasaki and Sasaki legacies.
- Seize renovation opportunities to improve previous design shortcomings and further unify the campus image as appropriate.
- Enable future development flexibility and choice in architectural and open space design.
- Reduce impact of planned and existing parking structures on the campus character.

Circulation and Parking
- Facilitate comfortable, safe and convenient circulation within and between each campus precinct.
- Ensure that pedestrian movement takes precedence over vehicular and service traffic.
- Develop campus gateways and entrances consistent with theme established by the university.
- Provide legible, barrier-free accessibility to campus parking and buildings.
- Create convenient visitor access to campus facilities.
- Extend wayfinding system in future infrastructure and building development.
• Promote shuttle system to reduce duplicative parking space development. Create opportunities and plan for integration of future intra-campus transit alternatives.
• Provide curbside passenger drop-off zones as appropriate.
• Promote on-street parking wherever feasible to encourage accessibility, convenience and vitality.
• Explore parking development opportunities in areas currently under-served.
• Encourage parking lot design that is screened by built-form and located at lot interiors wherever possible; screen otherwise exposed surface lots with significant architectural walls and fences consistent with theme established by the university.

Infrastructure
• Integrate new systems and extensions into the framework of the campus infrastructure.
• Anticipate future systems and technologies in providing for appropriate rights-of-way.

Implementation
• Establish priorities for development in line with university needs and available funding.
• Plan construction implementation with minimal disruption of university life.

PLANNING GUIDELINES
Built Form and Open Space
Development Density and Coverage
The next generation of campus development will generally consolidate new development on existing land holdings in an approach characterized as “strategic infill.” The development density goal for the campus as a whole is 1.75 floor area ratio, the ratio of the gross building area to total site area for a given context. Development proposals greater or less than this datum will be considered by the university on a case by case basis. The campuswide target for meaningful open space is 50 percent of total land area; again, higher and lower coverage conditions will be entertained in the context of the whole.

Building Height
In the “strategic infill” context, a relatively uniform height of three to four stories is desired. This datum balances functional, social, formal, spatial and economic considerations. Occasional extensions above this reference – e.g., tower elements – are encouraged to provide legibility and meaning to the campus whole.

Building Placement and Orientation
The image of each campus precinct and the university as a whole significantly depends on building placement and orientation to open spaces and streets. The appended illustrations describe basic built-form parameters for each development zone identified in the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The depicted volumes and planes are to be interpreted as generalized representations of both setbacks and build-to conditions desired as a means of maintaining campus design massing, balance, scale and continuity. Additional qualifying guidelines include:
• Buildings should be oriented to promote legibility and prominence suitable to their use, import, existing site conditions and compatibility with the overall 2020 Campus Master Plan, i.e., “foreground” vs. “background” buildings.
• Buildings and complexes should be designed to provide safe and convenient access for both pedestrians and vehicles.
• Appropriate attention should be given to relationships between buildings and setbacks to integrate and enhance open spaces, streetscapes and intersections.
• Building placement should properly address unique site conditions.
• Buildings should be oriented so as to obscure service, loading, temporary storage and other unsightly activities from view.
• All ancillary structures, such as trash enclosures and storage facilities, should be located and screened to reduce visual impact.

Open Space
Pedestrian malls, plazas, greens and courtyards shall be designed as part of the overall open space network described in the Master Plan section of this document.

In the design of these open spaces, the following criteria should be considered:
• Orient open spaces to take optimum advantage of sunlight conditions.
• Provide physical and visual access to new walkways and integrate with existing sidewalk conditions.

• Design adequate areas for seating, planting, etc., but not so large as to appear barren and unwelcoming.
• Provide seating of comfortable heights and depths with appropriate arrangement.
• Use nonglare, nonslip and durable pavement materials.
• Use plant material to enclose space and reinforce human scale. Locate trees and plantings to provide protection from wind and glare while allowing for sunny areas.
• Provide accessible areas for persons with disabilities, especially resolving changes in elevation.
• Use pedestrian and accent lighting, fountains, trash receptacles and other pedestrian conveniences consistent with university standards.
• Preserve the Second Avenue/Gullen Mall open space view corridor.
Access and Circulation

Vehicular Campus Access
Access drives should be designed to serve potentially multiple ac-
cess requirements—serving multiple points of entry and service. The purpose of minimizing access drives is to concentrate turning move-
ments, decrease traffic congestion and improve traffic safety. Drive-
ways to surface parking lots should be designed to accommodate efficient vehicle stocking during peak periods, based on a site-spe-
cific traffic analysis. Vehicles should be able to enter and exit from
the campus without posing any substantial danger to themselves, pedestrians or other vehicles travelling on abutting streets.

Gateways
Campus gateways should announce with celebration entry onto the
-campus. Campus entries should be legible, interesting, contribute to
campus identity and enhance a sense of place. By signaling arrival
into the campus, gateways should serve as points of orientation and
visual landmarks for campus visitors. Clearly marked gateways
should be developed at the following locations into the campus:
• Anthony Wayne Drive and Warren Avenue
• Woodward Avenue and Palmer Street
• Woodward Avenue and Warren Avenue
• Cass Avenue and Canfield Street
• Canfield Street and Brush Street

Gateways should incorporate bold landscape forms, large groupings
and varying colors and textures of plant materials. Signage pylons
adopted by the university should be strategically located within
gateway areas. Dramatic lighting should be used to accentuate
gateways.

Circulation
New buildings, complexes and infrastructure initiatives should follow
circulation goals and principles to the extent pedestrian and vehicu-
lar movement is impacted. New circulation patterns are to be inte-
grated with existing ones. Legibility and safety are key to extending
pedestrian and vehicular routes.

Give priority to pedestrians on sidewalks and at street intersections.
Curb radii should be as tight as possible and crosswalks should be
enhanced with special paving and/or markings. Traffic-calming
measures are to be introduced wherever feasible. Anthony Wayne
Drive is to be narrowed to a pedestrian-scaled environment. All side-
walks and walkways should be barrier-free. Within street rights-of-
way, walks shall be of sufficient width to create a pedestrian-friendly
atmosphere.

The pedestrian circulation system shall provide direct paved connec-
tions between buildings and parking. Pedestrian amenities and
building entrances will be used to reinforce pedestrian paths. Trees
and landscaping will be provided along pedestrian walks, providing
definition and enclosure.

Accommodate existing and anticipate additional bus stops for
present and future transit systems. Shelters should offer protection
from the sun and rain; seating will be designed as part of the pedes-
trian and open space environment.

Originating from view in a manner architecturally compatible with the building.

Campus gateways should announce with celebration entry onto the
campus. Campus entries should be legible, interesting, contribute to
campus identity and enhance a sense of place. By signaling arrival
into the campus, gateways should serve as points of orientation and
visual landmarks for campus visitors. Clearly marked gateways
should be developed at the following locations into the campus:
• Anthony Wayne Drive and Warren Avenue
• Woodward Avenue and Palmer Street
• Woodward Avenue and Warren Avenue
• Cass Avenue and Canfield Street
• Canfield Street and Brush Street

Gateways should incorporate bold landscape forms, large groupings
and varying colors and textures of plant materials. Signage pylons
adopted by the university should be strategically located within
gateway areas. Dramatic lighting should be used to accentuate
gateways.

Circulation
New buildings, complexes and infrastructure initiatives should follow
circulation goals and principles to the extent pedestrian and vehicu-
lar movement is impacted. New circulation patterns are to be inte-
grated with existing ones. Legibility and safety are key to extending
pedestrian and vehicular routes.

Give priority to pedestrians on sidewalks and at street intersections.
Curb radii should be as tight as possible and crosswalks should be
enhanced with special paving and/or markings. Traffic-calming
measures are to be introduced wherever feasible. Anthony Wayne
Drive is to be narrowed to a pedestrian-scaled environment. All side-
walks and walkways should be barrier-free. Within street rights-of-
way, walks shall be of sufficient width to create a pedestrian-friendly
atmosphere.

The pedestrian circulation system shall provide direct paved connec-
tions between buildings and parking. Pedestrian amenities and
building entrances will be used to reinforce pedestrian paths. Trees
and landscaping will be provided along pedestrian walks, providing
definition and enclosure.

Accommodate existing and anticipate additional bus stops for
present and future transit systems. Shelters should offer protection
from the sun and rain; seating will be designed as part of the pedes-
trian and open space environment.

Where possible orient buildings to face both the principal street ad-
dress and pedestrian mall entry as applicable. Provide fenestration
on street elevations to engage the architecture and public realm.

Parking
Parking Structures
New parking structures outside the Main Campus superblock are to
be integrated into building massing and, to the extent feasible, lo-
cated at the interior of the block situation – behind housing units, for
example. Where a parking structure fronts onto a street, the struc-
ture should complement neighboring buildings. Where possible, the
first floor area of the parking structure should have retail, entertain-
ment, and campus service uses fronting the street. Vehicular access
should be strategically located so as to avoid pedestrian conflicts and
limit traffic congestion.

Parking Lots
Parking lots should be concealed from street-level view by hedges
and/or decorative walls and/or obscuring fencing. Parking lots
should be broken into relatively small units divided by landscape
islands. Parking area landscaping should be used to define and
separate parking and access from pedestrian use areas within the
parking lots.

Infrastructure
All electric power lines, telephone and gas distribution lines should be
placed underground in accordance with the specifications and
policies of utility providers. Utilities should be located and con-
structed so that extensions can be made conveniently and without
undue burden or expense or unnecessary duplication of service. All
utilities should be constructed so as to minimize interference with
pedestrian traffic and facilitate maintenance without undue dam-
age to improvements or facilities within the development.

Loading docks and trash storage areas should be screened from
view by walls and/or the building itself. Service elements, such as
loading doors, should be integrated within building facades. Service
areas and access drives should be located in a manner that does
not conflict with automobile or pedestrian movements.

Lighting
Open Space Lighting
A safe, effective and attractive nocturnal campus environment is
critical to the university’s success. Artificial lighting of pedestrian
walkways, malls, plazas and courtyards will be provided at appropri-
ate illumination levels. Entryways and primary paths of travel should
be highlighted. Fixtures, both general-purpose and character-defin-
ing, should be consistent with university design standards. Special
lighting of open space areas should be used whenever possible to
enhance the aesthetic character of the development area.

Landscape accent lighting should be encouraged in significant ar-
areas such as the Central Green, Gullen Mall and building entrances.
All accent lighting should be directed away from vehicular traffic.
The university’s Brightways program should be considered as lighting
schemes are being developed for public open spaces.
Site lighting should be designed to contribute to the safe and efficient use of each development and to the campus precinct as a whole. Campus lighting should be carefully integrated with positive features of existing urban context.

Parking Lot and Structure Lighting
Parking lot and parking structure lighting should include parking areas, access drives and internal vehicular circulation areas. The light source should not be visible from adjacent properties or the street. The parking area should be uniformly lit with an illumination level target of three-foot candles on average, one-foot candle minimum.

Service Area Lighting
Service area lighting should be contained within the service yard boundaries, enclosure walls or truckwell. The light source should not be visible from the street. Site lighting should not cast glare onto adjacent streets and/or property.

Building Lighting
Building illumination and architectural lighting should be indirect in character – no light sources should be visible. Architectural lighting should articulate and accent the particular building architectural components.

LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES
As an integral component of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, landscape elements will visually enhance and emphasize the character of the Wayne State University campus. Landscape establishes a framework for consistency between different areas and land uses. The intent of the following landscape design guidelines is to enhance and unify the visual character of the overall campus, to emphasize usable open space areas, to direct pedestrian flow between and around buildings, and to screen unpleasant sights and sounds.

General Standards
Creativity in landscape design is encouraged within the framework of the existing patterns, forms and species of value. Historic landscapes are to be preserved and extended; overgrown and declining landscape material is to be replaced.

All unpaved portions of the site should be planted with grass, ground cover, shrubbery or other suitable live plant materials.

Landscaped areas adjoining paved parking or driveways should be protected from encroachment of vehicles by concrete curbs.

Plant materials should be nursery grown, free of pests and diseases, hardy in Wayne County, in conformance with the standards of the American Association of Nurseriesmen, and have passed inspections required under state regulations.

All landscaping should be served by an in-ground sprinkling system.

Plastic and other non-living plant material is not considered acceptable to meet these landscape standards.

Specific Standards

Rights-of-Way
A single row of deciduous trees evenly spaced at no more than 40 feet apart should be planted in rights-of-way.

Frontage
Frontage landscaping is located in the transitional area between street rights-of-way or pedestrian malls and building facades. Such landscaping shall include grass, shrubs, trees, and/or ground cover, and interrupted only to provide for pedestrian or vehicular access.

Parking Lots
All parking lots should be landscaped and maintained in such a manner as to achieve the following:

- Divide expanses of pavement
- Define identifiable parking areas to assist wayfinding
- Differentiate vehicular and pedestrian circulation
- Improve overall aesthetics

When parking lots are located adjacent to public rights-of-way and/or open spaces, screening should be required to reduce the negative visual impact of the parking lots.

Site Landscaping
In addition to any landscaped frontages and parking lots, 12 percent of the site development area should be improved as landscaped open space. Site landscaping should consist of the following landscape standards:

- Both evergreen and deciduous trees.
- Deciduous ornamental trees and shrubs shall be introduced within the site landscaping to add variety and visual interest on the site.

- Shrubs and ground cover shall be planted so that the ground will be covered within two years, or planted with grass.
- Groupings of deciduous ornamental trees and shrubs shall be placed near the building to identify entries.

Plant Material

The following specifications should apply to all plant material:

- Deciduous canopy trees should be a minimum of 3 to 3-1/2-inch caliper measured 6 inches above grade, with the first branch a minimum of 7 feet above grade when planted.
- Evergreen trees should be a minimum of 8 feet height when planted, except that Juniper and Yew species should be a minimum of 3 feet in height when planted.
- Shrubs should be a minimum of 30-36 inches in height when planted. Low-growing shrubs should have a minimum spread of 15 inches when planted.
- Hedges should be planted and maintained so as to form a continuous, unbroken screen, within two years after planting.
- Vines should have a minimum of three runners, 6-8 inches long when installed, and a minimum of 30 inches in length after one growing season.
• Grass areas should be planted using species normally grown as permanent lawns in Wayne County. Grass sod and seed should be clean and free of weeds, noxious pests and diseases. Straw or mulch should be used to protect newly seeded areas.
• Mulch used around trees, shrubs and vines should be a minimum of 3 inches deep, and installed in a manner as to present a finished appearance.
• Use of the following plant materials or their clones (or cultivars) is prohibited because of susceptibility to storm damage, disease and other undesirable characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Material</th>
<th>Clones/Cultivars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boxelder</td>
<td>Tree of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa</td>
<td>Russian Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage Orange</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>Female Gingko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

New Construction

Entry
Building entrances should be clearly marked and designed to be inviting. As applicable and feasible, new buildings should provide entry from both the public realm and internal campus circulation routes.

Facade
Building facades should be articulated to achieve design coherence and order and compatible with the best of the historic campus context, as applicable. Massing, facade articulation, fenestration and visual cues should communicate a human-based scale. In the context of building additions, building designs should complement the facade treatment of adjacent buildings in terms of dimensions, scale, proportions, material and color.

Building Base and Skyline
Special architectural attention should be given to the base and skyline of buildings to establish positive relationships between buildings and ground, horizon and sky.

Preservation and Renovation
Preservation of local, state and national historic building and/or sites should adhere to Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, its structure and its environment should not be destroyed.

Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity.

Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired or restored. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

The surface cleaning of structures should be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials are prohibited.

Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties should not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
Providing larger-scale definition of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the following three-dimensional illustrations describe individual zones identified for potential development and redevelopment.

Two sets of illustrations are provided for reference and cross-reference. The first set offers a useful reference to describe the location of primary university and related uses, as defined here – including academic, research and library, housing, sports and recreation, support services and parking. The contexts for these illustrations are campus sections, many of which include more than one development zone. The patchwork of sections and zones is indicated in the Location Key.

The second set, organized by campus precinct, depicts built-form parameters consistent with planning and design guidelines cited above. Critical dimensions are provided and capacities noted for each development zone from individual building to complex. Additional guidelines relating to access, circulation, through-building easements, landscape and other development opportunities and constraints are identified as appropriate.
BUILDING USE

Academic

Academic Building Location Key

- **Site Area I:**
  - N5. Academic program expansion
  - 49. Law School addition – recently completed

- **Site Area V:**
  - C9. Optional academic space

- **Site Area VI:**
  - C13. Life Science Building replacement
  - C14. Science Complex
  - C15. Reserved
  - C21. Performing Arts program expansion

- **Site Area VII:**
  - C11. Humanities/Social Science Building
  - C12. Engineering Building expansion

- **Site Area VIII:**
  - C13. Life Science Building

- **Site Area IX:**
  - S9. General academic use

- **Site Area XI:**
  - M1. C. S. Mott vertical building expansion
  - M2. Louis M. Ellison Building expansion
  - M5. Shiffman Medical Library expansion
  - M6. Gordon H. Scott Hall

- **Site Area XII:**
  - S9. General academic use

Academic Building Use: Site Area I

- C13. Life Science Building replacement
- Research use on all levels

Academic Building Use: Site Area V

- C9. Engineering program replacement and expansion
- C20. Science program expansion

Academic Building Use: Site Area VI

- C13. Life Science Building
- C14. Science Complex
- C15. Reserved
- C21. Performing Arts program expansion

Academic Building Use: Site Area VII

- N5. Academic program expansion
- Research use on all four levels

Main Campus Precinct Academic Building Use

- C9. Optional academic use
- Classroom use suggested on levels 1 - 2
- Housing use suggested on levels 3 - 4
- Physical connection to both State Hall and the G. Flint Pundy Graduate Library

Main Campus Precinct Academic Building Use

- C13. Life Science Building replacement
- Research use on all levels

Main Campus Precinct Academic Building Use

- C14. Science Complex
- New construction connects the Chemistry, Life Science, Science Library and Science buildings

Main Campus Precinct Academic Building Use

- C15. Reserved
- C21. Performing Arts program expansion
- Theatre use on all levels

Academic Building Use: Site Area VII (continued):

- C19. Engineering program replacement and expansion

Research and Technology Village Precinct

Academic Building Use

- N5. Academic program expansion
- Research use on all four levels

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section
Academic Building Use: Site Area VII

- General academic facility
- General classroom use on all levels (potential housing use on upper levels)
- Direct connection to Housing S5 and Parking Structure S4

Academic Building Use: Site Area IX

- C. S. Mott vertical building expansion
- Clinic and laboratory use on all three levels

Academic Building Use: Site Area XI

- Humanities/Social Sciences Building
  - Classroom/research use on all four levels
- Engineering Building expansion
  - Classroom/research use on all four levels
  - Addition to the Engineering Building (90)
- Maintain existing grade level service facilities
- Engineering program replacement and expansion
  - Research use on all four levels
  - Addition to the Manufacturing Engineering Bldg. (166)

Academic Building Use: Site Area XII

- Louis M. Elliman Building expansion
  - Research use on all levels
  - Shared service facilities with Elliman Building (629)
- Shiffman Medical Library building expansion
  - Library use on each of the two levels
- Gordon H. Scott Hall building expansion
  - Research use on all levels
BUILDING USE

Housing

Housing Building Use: Site Area I

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section

Research and Technology Village Precinct Housing Use

N1. Graduate housing - 76 beds
   Housing use on levels 2-4 (childcare occupation on level 1)
   Conversion and expansion of 6050 Cass Ave. Bldg.
N2. Graduate housing - 337 beds
   Housing use on all levels
N3. Graduate housing - 264 beds
   Housing use on all four levels (partial retail/entertainment occupation on level 1)

Housing Building Use: Site Area II

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section

East Campus Precinct Housing Use

E3. Graduate housing - 182 beds
   Housing use on all three levels (partial childcare occupation on level 1)

Housing Building Use: Site Area III

Partial Site Plan

Partial Site Section

Main Campus Precinct Housing Use

C2. Undergraduate housing - 470 beds
   Housing use on all four levels
   Shared passageways connecting to Parking Structures P5-6 (45) and C1

Site Area I:
N1. Graduate - 76 beds
N2. Graduate - 337 beds
N3. Graduate - 264 beds

Site Area II:
E3. Graduate - 182 beds

Site Area III:
C2. Undergrad. - 470 beds

Site Area IV:
C4. Undergrad. - 400 beds
C5. Undergrad. - 247 beds
C6. Undergrad. - 535 beds

Site Area V:
C9. Optional housing space

Site Area VI:
S2. Undergrad. - 416 beds

Site Area VIII:
A4. Combined - 146 beds

Site Area IX:
S2. Undergrad. - 61 beds
S3. Undergrad. - 194 beds
S4. Undergrad. - 159 beds
S5. Undergrad. - 308 beds
S6. Graduate - 106 beds

Site Area X:
S7. Graduate - 308 beds
S8. Graduate - 106 beds

Site Area XII:
M3. Graduate - 441 beds
Main Campus Precinct Housing Use

C4. Undergraduate housing - 400 beds
Housing use on all four levels

C5. Undergraduate housing - 247 beds
Housing use on all four levels

C6. Residential Life Program - cafeteria and offices
Connection to the Student Center Building (34)

C7. Undergraduate housing - 65 beds
Housing use on levels 2 - 4

C8. Undergraduate housing - 535 beds
Housing use on all four levels (partial retail/entertainment occupation on level 1)
Connection to Adomany Undergraduate Library (96)

Main Campus Precinct Housing Use

C9. Optional visiting faculty and staff housing
Housing use suggested on levels 3 - 4
(Academic use suggested on levels 1 - 2)

Athletic Campus Precinct Housing Use

A4. Combined undergraduate and graduate housing - 146 beds
Housing use on levels 2 - 4 (retail/entertainment occupation on level 1)
Shared passageways connecting to Parking Structure A3

South University Village Precinct Housing Use

S1. Undergraduate housing - 41 beds
Housing use on levels 2 - 4 (零售/entertainment occupation on level 1)
Shared passageways connecting to Parking Structure S1
South University Village Precinct Housing Use

S3. Undergraduate housing - 194 beds
Housing use on all four levels (addition to Forest Apts.) (186)

S4. Undergraduate housing - 159 beds
Housing use on all four levels (addition to Forest Apts.)

S6. Combined undergrad. and graduate housing - 735 beds
Housing use on all four levels (partial academic, childcare and retail/entertainment use on level 1)
Shared service facilities with University Tower apts. (507)

S7. Graduate housing - 308 beds
Housing use on all four levels

S8. Graduate housing - 106 beds
Housing use on all four levels

S9. Potential housing use on upper levels (academic use on lower levels) - potential location for Honors College

Medical Campus Precinct Housing Use

M3. Graduate housing - 441 beds
Housing use on all four levels (partial childcare occupation on level 1)
Athletic Buildings Location Key

Site Area V:
- 25. Recreation and Fitness Center – recently completed

Site Area VIII:
- A1. Matthaei physical education building expansion
- A2. Basketball and hockey arena

Athletic Building Use: Site Area VIII

Athletic Building Use: Site Area VIII

Support Building Location Key

Site Area I:
- N1. Childcare center
- N3. Retail/entertainment

Site Area II:
- E1. Administration support
- E2. Administration support
- E3. Childcare center

Site Area III:
- C3. Retail/entertainment

Site Area IV:
- C8. Retail/entertainment
- C10. Childcare center

Site Area VI:
- C17. Bookstore
- C18. Welcome Center
E1. Administration support
Administration use on levels 1-4, grounds and maintenance use on level 1
Physical connection to Academic Administration Building (62)

E2. Administration support
Administration use on all four levels

E3. Childcare center
Childcare use on a portion of level 1 (housing occupation on levels 1-3)

C3. Retail/entertainment
Conversion of a portion of level 1 of Parking Structure 1 anticipated

N1. Childcare center
Childcare on level 1 (housing use on levels 2-4)
Conversion and expansion of 6050 Cass Ave.

N3. Retail/entertainment
Retail/entertainment use on part of level 1 (housing use on all four levels)

C8. Retail/entertainment
Retail/entertainment use on a portion of level 1 (housing occupation on levels 1-4)

C10. Childcare center
Entire facility dedicated to childcare use
Support Building Use: Site Area VI

Main Campus and South University Village Precinct Support Building Use

C17. Bookstore
Retail use on all three levels
Connection to Parking Structure C16 anticipated

C18. Welcome Center
Support use on all four levels
Connection to Parking Structure C16 anticipated

S2. Retail/entertainment
Retail/entertainment use on a portion of level 1
(housing occupation on levels 2 - 4)
Connection to Parking Structure S1

Support Building Use: Site Area VIII

Athletic Campus Precinct Support Building Use

A4. Retail/entertainment
Retail/entertainment use on level 1 (housing use on levels 2 - 4)
Shared access to Parking Structure A3
Convenience parking anticipated between downtown and Warren Avenue

Support Building Use: Site Area IX

South University Village Precinct Support Building Use

S6. Retail/entertainment
Retail/entertainment use on a portion of level 1 (housing use on levels 1 - 4)

S9. Childcare center
Childcare use on a portion of level 1 (academic use on levels 1 and 2, housing use on levels 3 and 4)
Shared service facilities with University Tower apartments (S01)

Support Building Use: Site Area XII

Medical Campus Precinct Support Building Use

M3. Childcare center
Childcare use on a portion of level 1 (housing use on levels 1 - 4)
Parking Structure Location Key

Site Area I:
N4. Parking structure - 750 spaces
Site Area III:
C1. Parking structure - 1,600 spaces
Site Area VI:
C16. Parking structure - 700 spaces
S1. Parking structure - 380 spaces
Site Area VIII:
A3. Parking structure - 1,906 spaces
Site Area IX:
S4. Parking structure - 680 spaces
Site Area XII:
N4. Parking structure - 782 spaces

Partial Site Plan

Parking Structure Location Key

Site Area I:
N4. Parking structure - 750 spaces
Site Area III:
C1. Parking structure - 1,600 spaces

Partial Site Section

Research and Technology Village Precinct Parking Use

N4. Parking structure - 750 spaces
Five-level structure

Main Campus Precinct Parking Use

C1. Parking structure - 1,600 spaces
Four-level structure
Connected to Parking Structure PS-5 (45)
Pedestrian access shared with housing development C2

Partial Site Section

Main Campus and South University Village Precinct Parking Use

C16. Parking structure - 700 spaces
Six-level structure
Direct connection with Welcome Center and Bookstore anticipated
S1. Parking structure - 380 spaces
Five-level structure
Future expansion anticipated
Pedestrian access shared with housing/retail/entertainment development S2

Partial Site Plan
South University Village Precinct Parking Use
S5. Parking structure - 680 spaces
Four-level structure
Direct connection to adjacent housing, academic and support uses
Future expansion anticipated

Athletic Campus Precinct Parking Use
A3. Parking structure - 1,906 spaces
Four-level structure
Direct connection with basketball and hockey arena
Pedestrian access shared with housing development A4

Medical Campus Precinct Parking Use
M4. Parking structure - 782 spaces
Eight-level structure
Expansion of Parking Structure PS-4 (613)
Design Guidelines
Wayne State University Campus Master Plan

Building Location Key

Development Site 1:
N1. Graduate housing, childcare center
N2. Graduate housing

Development Site 2:
N3. Graduate housing, retail/entertainment
N5. Academic program expansion

Development Site 4:
N4. Parking structure

Development Site 5:
E3. Graduate housing, childcare center

Development Site 6:
E1. Administration support

Development Site 7:
E2. Administration support

Building Form: Development Site 1
Building N1: Graduate Housing, Childcare Center
Building N2: Graduate Housing
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- WSU Parking Services building (6300 Cass Avenue) should be retained and incorporated into the design of bldg. N1 - preserve east, north and west bldg. facades. Align west facade of N2 with 6050 Cass Avenue.
- Provide access, along the axis of York Street, to the interior open space defined by bldgs. N1, N2 and N3.
- Locate deciduous canopy street trees within the Cass Ave. R-O-W. Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees between the building and N4.
- Complement the architectural style of the historic automotive manufacturing buildings in the area.
- Provide short-term vehicular drop-off zone adjacent to childcare center.

Building Form: Development Site 2
Building N3: Graduate Housing, Retail/Entertainment
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Primary building entrances on Woodward Ave. Provide access, along the axis of Harper Street, to the interior open space defined by buildings N1, N2 & N3.
- Locate building at the R-O-W line of Burroughs and setback 25 feet from Woodward Ave. R-O-W (to maintain a landscaped buffer zone).
- Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous tree plant material along building frontage.
- Complement the architectural style of the historic automotive manufacturing buildings in the area.
- Interior open space to support recreational activity; provide direct access onto Woodward Avenue, Cass Avenue and the parking structure.

Building Form: Development Site 3
Building N5: Future Academic Development
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Primary building entrance should be located along Woodward Avenue; secondary building entrance should be located along Harper.
- Locate building at the R-O-W line of Woodward Ave. and Harper; overall building setback discouraged.
- Locate deciduous canopy street trees within the Woodward and Harper R-O-W. Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material along building frontage.
- Service access and parking to be located at the rear or north side of the building and screened from view with decorative wall and/or landscaping.
- Complement the architectural style of the historic automotive manufacturing buildings in the area.
Building N4: Parking Structure
- New construction height limited to five levels or 60 feet.
- Architectural style should complement the residential complex; treat as a gateway to the North Campus.
- Locate structure at the R-O-W lines of westbound I-94 Service Drive, Woodward and Cass Avenue.
- Provide pedestrian access at building corners and midpoint along the north facade. Provide vehicular access at I-94 Service Drive and north access drive.
- Locate deciduous canopy street trees within the Cass, Woodward and I-94 R-O-W. Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material to screen the structure and articulate access points.

Building E3: Graduate Housing, Childcare Center
- New construction height limited to three levels or 45 feet.
- New construction to acknowledge the existing setback of adjacent development.
- Primary building entrances should be on Palmer with service access from the alley.
- Architectural character should complement the style of the East Campus and Ferry Street Historic District.
- The character of the landscape should complement the landscape development of this historic area.
- Provide frontage open space to support both the recreational and leisure activities for the building occupants.
- Provide short-term vehicle parking/drop-off zone adjacent to childcare center.

Building Form: Development Site 4
Building Form: Development Site 5
Building Form: Development Site 6
Building Form: Development Site 7

Building E1: Administration & Grounds Support
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building should be of significant quality and character to enhance this primary gateway to the university.
- Align building face with Woodward and Palmer Avenue R-O-W lines. Primary entrance should be located along Woodward Avenue, secondary entrance along Palmer. Service area to be screened by the building.
- Landscaping should complement E1 and E2, including landscaped planters and piazzas to create a formal entrance to the buildings and the university.
- Provide enclosed connection (skywalk over service access) to the Academic Administration Building (62).

Building E2: Administration Support
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building should be of significant quality and character to enhance this primary gateway to the university.
- Align building face with Woodward and Palmer Avenue R-O-W lines. Primary entrance should be located along Woodward Avenue, secondary entrance along Palmer.
- Landscaping should complement buildings E1 and E2, including landscaped planters and piazzas to create a formal entrance to the buildings and support the campus gateway.
- Service access and limited parking to be located at the rear of the building and screened from view with decorative walls and/or landscaping.
Building C3: Retail/Entertainment
- New construction height limited to two levels or 30 feet.
- Treat all planned development at the intersection of Palmer and Second as a gateway to the university.
- Align the building face with the R-O-W lines of Second and Palmer. Provide primary building entrance along Palmer, secondary entrance along Second.
- Adjacent open space area should support various activities related to building and area use.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C1: Parking Structure
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Treat building as a gateway to the university. Avoid monolithic building profile and use of materials. Conceal planned utility substation within Parking Structure C1.
- Align building with the R-O-W lines of Anthony Wayne Drive, Second Avenue and I-94 service drive.
- Provide vehicular access from service drive, pedestrian access along Anthony Wayne Drive for both buildings.
- Locate evergreen tree screen along the service drive.
- Provide open space along each side of AWD to support leisure and recreational use by C2 residents.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C5: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction height of C5 limited to four levels or 60 feet, C6 limited to the intermediate roof of the Student Center Building (34).
- The architectural character should attempt to balance the high-density built surroundings with the pedestrian-oriented activities of the "street.
- Primary entrances should face the pedestrian mall.
- The building should be placed to maintain the setback of the adjacent planned and existing development.
- Provide frontage open space to act as an extension of the pedestrian mall and serve the recreational and leisure activity needs of the building occupants.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
Building C10: Childcare Center
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building should be placed to define and maximize adjacent open space while shielding the sights and sounds of the John Lodge Expressway (M-10).
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C9: General Academic Facility
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should be compatible with style and character of Adamany Library. Primary entrance should be along the pedestrian mall and Anthony Wayne Drive. Service area to be shared with the Adamany Library (96).
- The structure should be set back to conform to adjacent patterns of development along the pedestrian mall and Anthony Wayne Drive. Frontage setback and profile should allow for traffic flow along the pedestrian mall and landscaped open space.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
- Access to the courtyard to be controlled.

Building Form: Development Site 13

Building Form: Development Site 14

Building C8: Undergraduate Housing, Retail/Entertainment
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should be compatible with style and character of Adamany Library. Primary entrance should be along the pedestrian mall and Anthony Wayne Drive. Service area to be shared with the Adamany Library (96).
- The structure should be set back to conform to adjacent patterns of development along the pedestrian mall and Anthony Wayne Drive. Frontage setback and profile should allow for traffic flow along the pedestrian mall and landscaped open space.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants and general Williams Mall traffic.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C7: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Buildings should help "define" and support a pedestrian-oriented Anthony Wayne Drive streetscape and conceal Parking Structure 2 (56).
- Building should be placed to maintain setback of adjacent (planned) development. Primary entrance should be located along AWD.
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants and general Williams Mall traffic.
- Provide parking along AWD.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C6: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement both Pilafian and Yamasaki buildings (16, 26-27) as well as the planned Gullen Plaza.
- Direct access should be provided to connect Gullen Plaza, the DeRoy Auditorium open space and Cass Avenue.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
- Building and site development are key components of the planned east/west pedestrian greenway network.

Building C5: General Academic Facility
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building is a primary terminus of Williams Mall. Architectural character should complement both Pilafian and Yamasaki buildings (16, 26-27) as well as the planned Gullen Plaza.
- Direct access should be provided to connect Gullen Plaza, the DeRoy Auditorium open space and Cass Avenue.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
- Building and site development are key components of the planned east/west pedestrian greenway network.

Building C4: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Buildings should help "define" and support a pedestrian-oriented Anthony Wayne Drive streetscape and conceal Parking Structure 2 (56).
- Building should be placed along Anthony Wayne Drive. Service area to be shared with the Adamany Library (96).
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants and general Williams Mall traffic.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C3: Childcare Center
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building should be placed along Anthony Wayne Drive. Service area to be shared with the Adamany Library (96).
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants and general Williams Mall traffic.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C2: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Buildings should help "define" and support a pedestrian-oriented Anthony Wayne Drive streetscape and conceal Parking Structure 2 (56).
- Building should be placed to maintain setback of adjacent (planned) development. Primary entrance should be located along AWD.
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants and general Williams Mall traffic.
- Provide open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building C1: Childcare Center
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building should be placed to define and maximize adjacent open space while shielding the sights and sounds of the John Lodge Expressway (M-10).
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities of the building occupants.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building Form: Development Site 12

Building Form: Development Site 11
Building Form: Development Site 15

Building C14: Parking Structure
Building C17: Retail/entertainment - Bookstore
Building C18: Welcome Center
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet. C16 limited to six levels.
- Building should be of significant quality and character to enhance this primary gateway into the university.
- Align building face with the Warren, Woodward and Cass R-O-W lines. Primary entrances should be Woodward, Warren and/or Cass Avenue.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscape planters and open lawn panels. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant materials along building frontage.
- Link Welcome Center to the east/west greenway.

Building Form: Development Site 16

Building C13: Life Science Replacement
Building C14: Science Complex Atrium
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet, natural light collectors at C14 permitted up to 75 feet.
- Buildings should be placed to maintain setback of adjacent development. C13 should help identify the entry onto Gullen Mall. C14 profile should promote pedestrian traffic flow along the east/west greenway and Cass Avenue sidewalk.
- Primary entrance of C13 should be along Warren Avenue and Gullen Mall, C14 along the east/west greenway. Utilize existing service area at Science Hall (5) and screen from view with plant materials/walls while maintaining access from Warren Avenue.
- Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material along building frontage.

Building Form: Development Site 17

Building C21: Performing Arts Program Expansion
- New construction height limited to 60 feet and in no case should exceed the eave of Old Main.
- Building architecture should complement and extend the historical character of Old Main while screening the recent addition from Warren Ave. views.
- Building should be placed to maintain the setback of Old Main and the Science Library. Service area should be screened from view from Warren Avenue.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters. Provide a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material along building frontage.
- Marquee and signage, if utilized, should not overwhelm the historical prominence of Old Main and should be limited to a height of 60 feet.
**Building C20: Science Program Expansion**
- New construction limited to the height of the Physics Building (3).
- Building architecture should complement and extend the character of existing Physics building.
- The architecture should support and act as a gateway into the campus - in conjunction with C19.
- Building should maintain the setback of adjacent development.
- Exterior entrance, if applicable, should be located along Warren Avenue.
- Existing service area and access should be maintained and screened from view.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

**Building C11: Humanities/Social Sciences Building**
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Treat outward perimeter of the building as part of a western gateway into campus.
- Complement and minimizing any impact to St. Andrews Hall (156).
- Building should be placed to maintain setback of adjacent development.
- Frontage setback to allow for landscaped open space and pedestrian walkways.
- Provide building service access from Anthony Wayne Drive. Service area to be enclosed within the building.
- Maintain quality and character of existing open space – Ludington Plaza.

**Building C12: Engineering Building Expansion**
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet and in no case should exceed penthouse height of bldg. 90.
- New construction should complement and unify existing building and its past additions. Building should be placed to maintain the setback of adjacent development.
- Exterior entrance, if applicable, should be located along Warren Avenue.
- Existing service area and access should be maintained.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

**Building C19: Engineering Program Replacement and Expansion**
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Exterior entrance, if applicable, should be located along Warren Avenue.
- Existing service area and access should be maintained.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

**Building C20: Science Program Expansion**
- New construction limited to the height of the Physics Building (3).
- Building architecture should complement and extend the character of existing Physics building.
- The architecture should support and act as a gateway into the campus - in conjunction with C19.
- Building should maintain the setback of adjacent development.
- Exterior entrance, if applicable, should be located along Warren Avenue.
- Existing service area and access should be maintained.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.
DESIGN GUIDELINES

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

BUILDING FORM
Athletic Campus District
South University Village District

Building Location Key
Development Site 22:
A1. Matthaei Education Expansion
A2. Hockey and basketball arena
A3. Parking structure, housing (combined), retail/entertainment

Development Site 23:
A1. Matthaei Education Expansion
A2. Hockey and basketball arena
A3. Parking structure, housing (combined), retail/entertainment

Development Site 24:
A1. Matthaei Education Expansion
A2. Hockey and basketball arena
A3. Parking structure, housing (combined), retail/entertainment

Building A1: Matthaei Education Expansion
- New construction limited to the existing building height. All new development on the Athletic campus should be limited to the southern edge of the existing east-west pedestrian mall.
- Architectural character should complement new arena and existing facility. Building should support pedestrian access into the Athletic Campus from the gateway formed by the arena and parking structure.
- Building facades should align with bldg. 80 and the western limits of A3. Locate primary entrance along the east-west pedestrian mall. Service area should be accessed from the southern access drive and screened from view from Warren and athletic fields.

Building A2: Basketball and Hockey Arena
- New construction of A2 to be limited to 110 feet; new construction of A3 limited to 4 levels or 60 feet.
- Buildings A2 and A3/A4 form a pedestrian gateway into the Athletic Campus and define an open space plaza. Pedestrian bridge connecting A2 and A3 will act as the portal of entry. Maintain a 20-foot height clearance.
- Locate primary entrances at the plaza. Additional entrances should face Warren Avenue. Provide screened service area with access from Trumbull.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters and open lawn panels suitable for large gatherings. Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material along building frontage.

Building A3: Parking Structure, Housing, Retail/Entertainment
- New construction of S1 limited to five levels or 60 feet; S2 limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture and signage should complement character of new Welcome Center complex.
- Primary entrances should be along Warren Avenue.
- Locate vehicular access to S1 off existing alleys; NOT Warren. Locate pedestrian access facing Warren Avenue.
- Provide a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant material at building frontage that is conducive to pedestrian activity.
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

DEVELOPMENT SITE 25

Building S5: Parking Structure
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should attempt to balance the density of the University Tower apt. bldg. (507) with the pedestrian activities of the planned development.
- Provide access, along the axis of Garfield Street, to the interior quadrangle. S8 frontage setback and building profile should reflect the significance of the Cass-Canfield linkage.

Buildings S6/9: Housing, Academic, Childcare, Retail
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should attempt to balance the density of the University Tower apt. bldg. (507) with the pedestrian activities of the planned development.
- New construction to maintain the existing setback of adjacent development. Provide access, along the axis of Garfield Street, to the interior quadrangle. S8 frontage setback and building profile should reflect the significance of the Cass-Canfield linkage.

Buildings S7 and S8: Graduate Housing
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Buildings should complement character of Cass Ave.
- The architecture of buildings S8 and S9 should support and act as a gateway into the campus.
- The building should be located at the R-O-W lines of Cass and Canfield. Primary entrances should be along Cass. Service areas to be screened from Cass and accessed from the existing alley.
- Provide open space to support recreational and leisure activities.
- Landscaping should include open space panels; a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant materials along the building frontage.

DEVELOPMENT SITE 26

Buildings S3 and S4: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement the character of the Forest Apts. building (186) and the surrounding historical structures. An option is to replace 186.
- Locate building at the R-O-W lines of Cass, Forest and Second Ave. Primary entrance should face Forest Ave.
- Provide open space along Forest and Second to support recreational and leisure activities.
- Landscaping should include open lawn panels; deciduous and evergreen plant material to be located along building frontage.

Buildings 15a/Y: Housing, Academic, Childcare, Retail
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement the character of the Forest Apts. building (186) and the surrounding historical structures. An option is to replace 186.
- Locate building at the R-O-W lines of Cass, Forest and Second Ave. Primary entrance should face Forest Ave.
- Provide open space along Forest and Second to support recreational and leisure activities.
- Landscaping should include open lawn panels; deciduous and evergreen plant material to be located along building frontage.

DEVELOPMENT SITE 27

Building S10: Graduate Housing
- New construction limited to three levels or 45 feet.
- Building should complement character of Alexandrine.
- The primary entrances should be along Alexandrine.
- Frontage setbacks should be developed as landscaped open space and walkways.

Buildings S7 and S8: Graduate Housing
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement character of Cass Ave.
- Provide access, along the axis of Cass Ave., to the interior quadrangle. S8 frontage setback and building profile should reflect the significance of the Cass-Corfield linkage.

Buildings S3 and S4: Undergraduate Housing
- New construction limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement the character of the Forest Apts. building (186) and the surrounding historical structures. An option is to replace 186.
- Locate building at the R-O-W lines of Cass, Forest and Second Ave. Primary entrance should face Forest Ave.
- Provide open space along Forest and Second to support recreational and leisure activities.
- Landscaping should include open lawn panels; deciduous and evergreen plant material to be located along building frontage.
Building M1: C.S. Mott Center Vertical Expansion
- New construction height limited to three levels or 45 feet.
- New construction should be an extension of the form and character of the existing structure.
- Frontage setbacks should be developed as landscaped open space and walkways.
- Streetscapes and sidewalks should provide linkages to the greenways and central open space areas of the Main and Medical campuses.

Building M2: Louis Elliman Building Expansion
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should complement and extend the character of the Louis M. Elliman clinical research building (629) and support the Medical Campus gateway intersection of Brush and Canfield.
- New construction will, in part, define the open space plaza. Building should maintain the setback of adjacent development (planned and existing). The primary entrances should face the new plaza. Combined service area for both M2 and 629 to be accessed from Brush and screened from Canfield.
- Landscaping should include open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant materials along the building frontage.

Building M3: Graduate Housing, Childcare Center
- New construction height limited to four levels or 60 feet.
- Building architecture should extend and unify the character of adjacent development while addressing the human scale of the intended use of both building and surrounding open space.
- Structure will define the open space and form the primary view terminus from Canfield. Access through the building should be provided to connect the north and south areas of open space. The building should help screen the parking structure. The primary entrances should face the proposed plaza.
- Open space should support recreational activities and group functions. Maximize exposure to Canfield.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters, open lawn panels and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant materials along the building frontage.
Building M5: Shiffman Medical Library Expansion
- New construction limited to existing building height.
- Building architecture should support the Medical Campus gateway intersection of Brush and Canfield. New construction will terminate the pedestrian corridor running along the southern edge of 612 and will contribute to the definition of the existing open space.
- Building should be placed to maintain the setback of the adjacent development. Provide access into the structure from both 612 and the service access drive from Canfield.
- Landscaping should include an outdoor plaza with landscaped planters, open lawn panels, and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen plant materials.

Building M6: Gordon Scott Hall Building Expansion
- New construction limited to the height of the intermediate roof of existing building 612.
- Building architecture should complement and extend the character of the existing structure while supporting the Medical Campus gateway interaction.
- Building should be placed to maintain the setback of the adjacent development. Primary access into structure through existing building 608. Service access from the Canfield access drive; screen from Canfield.
- Landscaping should include open lawn panels, deciduous and evergreen plant materials along the building frontage.
IMPLEMENTATION
Illustration 55: Implementation Plan
GENERAL PLANNING AND DESIGN REVIEW

Recommended is the creation of a Design Review Committee (DRC) to ensure the continued life of the 2020 Campus Master Plan. The ongoing review and legislation of Master Plan policies, objectives and proposals will provide professional interpretation and manage-ment continuity from one administration to the next. A duly authorized administrator – Director of Design Services, Director of Facilities or newly designated University Architect – would oversee the Design Review Committee on behalf of Facilities Planning and Manage-ment.

The primary responsibility of the Design Review Committee is enforce-ment of the 2020 Campus Master Plan. All open space, building, infrastructure and major graphic projects are to go through the DRC at set points during the design process and under the direction of the administrator.

The composition of the DRC will vary as needed to reflect the pri-mary design discipline involved in a specific project. The committee reviewing major open space projects will include a majority of land-scape architects and urban designers. The committee reviewing building projects will include a majority of architects and urban de-signers.

Grounds Services Design Review

The DRC administrator will also be responsible for ensuring that im-provements proposed by Grounds Services are reviewed and ap-proved by the committee. To that end, a joint planning process from Ground Services and the DRC administrator should be established, thus assuring that grounds improvements are in compliance with the Campus Master Plan.

Review Process

The DRC administrator should present schematic design concepts for review by the DRC. The purposes of reviews are:

- To assess conformance of the proposal with the intent of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.
- To assess appropriateness of the proposed placement orienta-tions of buildings to open space (both existing and proposed by the 2020 Campus Master Plan).

DEVELOPMENT PHASING STRATEGY

Implementation phasing of the 2020 Campus Master Plan takes into account several related considerations, including funding availabil-ity, urgent university needs and overarching goals and priorities. Pre-vious sections presented a completed snapshot of the 2020 physical campus in terms of use and form. The 2020 Growth Model, summa-rized above and appended below, presents the development as straight-line projections over 20 years. This section proposes an imple-mentation strategy that includes three time frames: short-term, within five years; medium-term, six to 10 years; and long-term, 11 to 20+ years – Illustration 55. It is recommended that this section be up-dated in five-year increments, or more frequently if necessary, to ensure the currency of priorities accompanying the 2020 Campus Master Plan.

Short Term Initiatives – Within five years

1. Evaluate and respond to the I-94 freeway expansion/improve-ment project.
   • The north edges of the Athletic and Main Campuses will re-quire careful consideration of expansion impacts to the base-ball field, Parking Structure 1 and the Computing Services Center.
   • Additionally, treatment of these edges will require evaluation of setbacks, parking structure access; campus entry treat-ments and compensation for university property taken for expressway rights-of-way.
2. Complete academic programming and planning.
3. Conduct a recreation and athletic planning study to evaluate existing conditions and program NCAA requirements and resi-dential life standards at the university.
4. Complete residential life programming and planning, including student housing market analysis.
5. Complete design and construction of Midtown Detroit campus signage system.
6. Continue implementation of university brightways lighting pro-gram. Conduct a lighting study to evaluate light levels and develop a coordinated lighting scheme.
7. Conduct a campus outdoor furniture study to provide detailed guidelines for the unification of outdoor elements that comple-ment signage and lighting design recommendations.
8. Complete associated site improvements at the recently com-pleted Law School expansion, including associated vehicular drop-off zone at north end of Gullen Mall, at Palmer and Sec-ond Avenue.
9. Design and construct a 535-bed undergraduate student dormitory and interior court on the open site adjacent to the Adamany Undergraduate Library. Redevelop Williams Mall from Gullen Plaza to Parking Structure 5.

10. Demolish Helen Newberry Joy Student Services Building; design and construct new 247-bed undergraduate housing complex with 45,000 square-foot Residential Life Center.

11. Complete design and construct new 70,000 square-foot Welcome Center, 30,000 square-foot bookstore, and 700-space parking structure in the Woodward, Warren, Cass, Palmer block.

12. Complete construction of associated site improvements at the recently completed Recreation and Fitness Center.

13. Demolish the General Lectures Building. Design and construct a new 150,000 square-foot Social Sciences and Humanities Building and associated sitework.

14. Confirm site selection, develop program, design and construct new 5,000- to 7,500-seat sports arena, plus 1,906-space parking structure, a 146-bed combined student housing unit, and 40,000 square-foot retail/entertainment complex.

15. Demolish Life Sciences Building. Design and construct an 80,000 square-foot replacement facility. Connect the existing science programs (Chemistry Building, Science Hall, Science and Engineering Library) and the new Life Science Building replacement with a 18,000 square-foot Science Complex Atrium.

16. Design and construct a 53,000 square-foot vertical expansion on top of C.S. Mott Center, with associated sitework.

17. Design and construct a 100,000 square-foot research facility, the Advanced Imaging Research Building, connected to the northern edge of the Louis M. Elman Clinical Research Building.

18. Design and implement pedestrian crosswalks and landscape/streetscape enhancement projects to improve safety and aesthetic issues along Main Campus perimeter.

19. Design and construct new Gullen Plaza, focal open space for the Midtown Detroit Campus.

20. Design and begin construction of pedestrian mall improvements on Main Campus.

21. Design and renovate approximately 235,000 square feet of university building inventory each year.

22. Determine appropriate program to be housed in the Horace H. Rackham Building.

23. Renovate portions of the Criminal Justice Building as academic swing space for use during the renovations of other university buildings.


25. Work with the city of Detroit to begin the process to redesign Anthony Wayne Drive; shift right-of-way to the east to include three lanes of roadway with one lane on-street parking. The remaining right-of-way will be reserved for landscaped open space.

26. Partner with local residential developers to develop various types of residential housing for students, faculty and staff.

27. Partner with local developers and/ or merchants to identify sites for retail and support service uses.

Midterm Initiatives – Six to 10 Years

1. Complete upgrade of campus-wide lighting system.

2. Complete pedestrian mall and open space improvements on Main Campus.

3. Continue renovation of approximately 235,000 square feet of university buildings each year.


5. Design and construct a 470-bed undergraduate housing complex abutting and shielding from view a new 1,600-square space expansion of Parking Structure 5 on Anthony Wayne Drive.

6. Confirm demolition of Engineering Technology Building and Bioengineering Building to accommodate future academic facilities. Determine site location, design and begin construction of Engineering buildings totaling 230,000 square feet, located adjacent to the Manufacturing Engineering Building on the south side of Warren Avenue.

7. Design and construct new 60,000 square-foot Performing Arts Center adjacent to Old Main at Warren and Cass.

8. Demolish the surface Parking Lot C in front of Parking Structure 2. Design and construct a Residential/Honors College on the west side of Anthony Wayne Drive to accommodate 400 undergraduates. Renovate St. Andrew’s Hall as support facility.
and develop an open space commons area between the two facilities.

9. Work with Michigan Department of Transportation to design and construct a greenway/land bridge over the Lodge expressway (M-10), and initiate landscaped bridges at Second, Cass and Woodward over the Ford expressway, I-94.

10. Develop childcare facilities in the context of housing expansion areas.

11. Design and begin construction of athletic and recreation facilities and fields. Confirm site selection and program for a 70,000 square-foot Athletic Program Expansion facility.

12. Design and begin construction of three Medical Campus expansion facilities, including a 66,667 square-foot expansion of the Shiffman Medical Library, a 45,000 square-foot expansion of the Gordon H. Scott Building and a 782-space expansion to Parking Structure 4.

Long Term Initiatives – 11 to 20 Years

1. Complete construction of the Medical Campus with a 441-bed graduate student housing facility and open space development on the north side of Canfield.

2. Complete construction of athletic and recreation facilities and fields.

3. Continue to partner with developers on expanding retail uses in and around the university.

4. Continue to partner with residential developers to expand housing types in and around the university.

5. Demolish buildings and prepare sites in the South University Village area including the Federal Mogul Library Annex to accommodate future residential development opportunities.

6. Confirm site location, design and construction of 1,576 beds for undergraduate and graduate housing, a 45,541 square-foot academic space, and a 680-space parking structure in the South University Village area.

7. Design and construct a new 100,000 square-foot Science Program expansion facility adjacent to the Physics Building on Lot R.


9. Demolish several buildings in the North University Village area including 100 Antoinette, 5959 Woodward, the Computing Services Center building and the Westinghouse building to accommodate future residential development opportunities.

10. Confirm site location, design and construct 677 beds for graduate housing and a 750-space parking structure on the North University Village Campus. Renovate 6050 Cass Avenue structure as part of the housing complex.

11. Confirm program, design and construct a north wing addition to State Hall which might include an extended-stay facility, academic space and/or conferencing space.

12. Demolish parking lots at Palmer and Woodward Avenue to accommodate university support services buildings. Design and construct two support services buildings totaling 308,390 square feet.

13. Design and construct a 182-bed graduate housing complex on the East Campus on Lot MP adjacent to the Merrill Palmer Institute.
### BUILDING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Total Bldg Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Average Bldg Age</th>
<th>% w/o H, P, U</th>
<th>Total Bldg Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Average Bldg Age</th>
<th>% w/o H, P, U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Administration - Support</td>
<td>1,328,176</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>1,554,766</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Classroom</td>
<td>1,535,032</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>1,896,550</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Athletic - Physical Fitness</td>
<td>284,310</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>584,310</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Housing</td>
<td>903,197</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2,583,197</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Library</td>
<td>858,195</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>924,862</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Parking Structure</td>
<td>2,099,011</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>4,308,361</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Research</td>
<td>1,956,778</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>2,451,105</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U) Underutilized/Vacant Space</td>
<td>437,273</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>258,154</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                      | 9,381,972             | 49               | 14,561,305    | 41                     | 5,179,333        |

### LAND AREA ALLOCATION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology Village</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                         | 203.4                   | 53.1                      | 39.8              | 110.6             | 206.4                   | 89.7                      | 7.7               | 111.0             | 4.9    |

### PARKING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>LotSpaces</th>
<th>% of Total Spaces</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>% of Total Spaces</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>56.99</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>7,719</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology Park Lots</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village Parking Lots</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off-Street Spaces</td>
<td>11,102</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>13,456</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available On-Street Parking</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAMPUS DENSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>2020 Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Campus Open Space</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Floor Area Ratio is defined as the total amount of building floor space divided by the total amount of University owned property. FAR figures are based on the total University owned property within the scope of the 2020 Campus Master Plan, the Midtown Detroit campus. Leased land is included only if it is leased in totality.
- Campus Open Space is defined as space not dedicated for building or vehicular use. Campus Open Space figures are based on University owned land. Leased property is included only if it is leased in totality.

Total Available Parking figures do not include the 300 spaces allocated to the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building. Those spaces will be located outside the scope of the 2020 Campus Master Plan.
### 2020 NEW BUILDING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Combined (146 Beds)</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (470 Beds)</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Honors College (400 Beds)</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (247 Beds)</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Resident Life Off-Campus/Office</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Housing Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (530 Beds)</td>
<td>182,500</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (182 Beds)</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (441 Beds)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (76 Beds)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (337 Beds)</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (264 Beds)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (61 Beds)</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (194 Beds)</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (159 Beds)</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Combined (738 Beds)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (305 Beds)</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (106 Beds)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (74 Beds)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

- 341 gsf per bed

### Library

- 66,667 Library GSF

### Academic (Classroom & Research)

- 443,541 Classroom GSF

### Parking Structures

- 2,209,350 Parking Structure GSF

### Athletic - Physical Fitness

- 320,000 Athletic - Physical Fitness GSF

### Administration - Support

- 548,390 Administration - Support GSF

### Underutilized - Vacant Buildings with Available Space

- 258,154 Available GSF

### 2020 NEW BUILDING PROGRAM continued…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Combined (146 Beds)</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (470 Beds)</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Honors College (400 Beds)</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (247 Beds)</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Resident Life Off-Campus/Office</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Housing Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (530 Beds)</td>
<td>182,500</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (182 Beds)</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (441 Beds)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (76 Beds)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (337 Beds)</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (264 Beds)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (61 Beds)</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (194 Beds)</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Undergraduate (159 Beds)</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Combined (738 Beds)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (305 Beds)</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (106 Beds)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Athens Housing - Graduate (74 Beds)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Underutilized - Vacant Buildings with Available Space

- 258,154 Available GSF

* Included as part of the Research Building Renovation (RBR) new building program, (386,500 sf of new construction)
### 2020 NEW BUILDING PROGRAM continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg. No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>6050 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>31,013</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Business Op. &amp; Parking Services moved to E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,013 Administration GSF to be Relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>100 Antoinette</td>
<td>31,011</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village</td>
<td>Computer Services moved to E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>5959 Woodward</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Misc. functions moved to 194 and E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>6050 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>31,013</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Computer Services Center moved to E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Computing Services Center</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Student Services moved to C18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Federal/Mogul Library Annex</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Misc. functions moved to 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Helen N. Joy Student Services Bldg</td>
<td>64,509</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Academic administration offices moved to E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Psychology Building</td>
<td>37,990</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Misc. functions moved to E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>University Custodial Grounds Building</td>
<td>35,568</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Academic administration offices moved to E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Westinghouse Building</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Misc. functions moved to E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321,800 Administration GSF to be Relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Engineering Technology Building</td>
<td>24,204</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Academic program moved to C19, C20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>General Lectures</td>
<td>30,159</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Academic programs moved to 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94,363 Classroom GSF to be Relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Bioengineering Building</td>
<td>46,973</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Academic program moved to C19, C20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Life Science Building</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Academic program to expand into C13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103,879 Research GSF to be Relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>479,836 Total Relocated Program GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buildings to be Demolished (Existing Programs to be Relocated)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Bldgs. to be Demolished or Released</th>
<th>Funded Growth</th>
<th>Non-funded Growth</th>
<th>Growth Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Administration - Support</td>
<td>321,800</td>
<td>378,390</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>226,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>82,023</td>
<td>443,541</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>361,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Athletic, Physical Fitness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,209,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,209,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 NEW BUILDING PROGRAM SUMMARY

- **Code**: Building Use
- **A**: Administration - Support
- **C**: Classroom
- **F**: Athletic, Physical Fitness
- **H**: Housing
- **L**: Library
- **P**: Parking Structure
- **R**: Research
- **U**: Underutilized/Vacant/Swing Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldgs. to be Demolished or Released</th>
<th>Funded Growth</th>
<th>Non-funded Growth</th>
<th>Growth Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>479,836 Total Relocated Program GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Childcare Centers (50,000 gsf) and Retail Space (120,000 gsf) to be provided by others – not included as Funded Growth.
2. Total of 1,400,000 gsf housing difference to be provided by others – not included as Funded Growth.
3. 179,119 gsf of Vacant / Underutilized buildings to be released to the WSU Research and Technology Park.
4. Funded Growth figures include replacement space for all utilized buildings slated for demolition except Mortuary Science.
5. Recreation and Fitness Center, Law School expansion and the College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions were Early Action Projects as defined in the Strategic Vision Plan. They are currently under construction or recently completed and are, therefore, considered existing buildings.

---

**Buildings to be Demolished (No Program Replacement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg. No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Mortuary Science Building</td>
<td>27,568</td>
<td>South U Village</td>
<td>Vacant bldg., Academic program exists in E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,660 Classroom Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507,496 Total Demolished GSF (13 Buildings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- American Beauty Electric Iron building to be developed in totality as part of the WSU Research and Technology Park.
- Criminal Justice building to be developed for 50 percent utilization in the WSU Research and Technology Park and 50 percent for university-related activities.
- Horace H Rackham educational building currently houses the Detroit Area Pre-college Engineering Program (DAP-CEP).
- 6050 Cass Avenue to be gutted and expanded vertically – existing building shall be preserved (listed as new development - Bldg. NI).
- Mortuary Science program has already been relocated into existing building #65; no additional space allocation is necessary.
### APPENDIX

#### WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

#### EXISTING BUILDING AND LAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/ Lot</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Land Area or Parcel (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North University Village</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Building</td>
<td>148,238</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 600</td>
<td>480 York</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>439 Burroughs</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>American Beauty Electric Iron Building</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>480 York</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Computing Services Center</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>100 Antoinette</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Pontiac Building</td>
<td>54,035</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Music Building North</td>
<td>23,950</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot O</td>
<td>9602 Second Avenue</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Lot P</td>
<td>430 Antoinette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 17</td>
<td>101 Antoinette</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>475 W. Palmer (Reconfigured)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 30</td>
<td>475 W. Palmer</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>Mather Physical Education Center</td>
<td>155,943</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>1411 Edsel Ford Service Drive</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>9500 Lodge Service Drive</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>1200 W. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>189,310</td>
<td>Ave. Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>600 W. Palmer</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>800 W. Palmer</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>801 W. Palmer</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>802 W. Palmer</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Campus continued…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Parking Structure #1</td>
<td>664,060</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>1411 Edsel Ford Service Drive</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Parking Structure #2</td>
<td>534,750</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>5211 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Lot K</td>
<td>69 Pershing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering Building</td>
<td>46,525</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>4660 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Engineering Technology Building</td>
<td>24,204</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXISTING BUILDING AND LAND AREA continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/ Lot</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Land Area or Parcel (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Lot K</td>
<td>69 Pershing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering Building</td>
<td>46,525</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>4660 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Engineering Technology Building</td>
<td>24,204</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>4660 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing Development Included on Parcel

#### Main Campus continued…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg/Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Land Area or Parcel (Acres)</th>
<th>LA = Leased Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 1.1 169</td>
<td>Bioengineering Building</td>
<td>46,973</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot E 4864 Fourth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 0.2 81</td>
<td>Auxiliary General Office Building</td>
<td>10,045</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot R 4820 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 1.9 3</td>
<td>Physics Building</td>
<td>122,966</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot R 4820 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 4.9 4</td>
<td>Room Management</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot H 4841 Cass Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 4.5 499</td>
<td>Horace H Rackham Educational Building</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 4854 Fourth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 954</td>
<td>Horace H Rackham Educational Building</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 4854 Fourth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.4 49 Buildings</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,890,693</td>
<td>Ave. Age</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### South University Village continued…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg/Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Land Area or Parcel (Acres)</th>
<th>LA = Leased Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 2.2 196</td>
<td>Forest Apartments</td>
<td>145,754</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot G 4710 Second Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 0.3 Lot SW</td>
<td>80 W. Forest</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 0.1</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 8.3 507</td>
<td>University Tower Apartments</td>
<td>354,382</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 75 W. Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 0.2</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 1.0 639</td>
<td>Federal Mogul Library Annex</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 4441 Cass Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 0.5 Lot 410 W. Canfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 1.1 503</td>
<td>ESF Building</td>
<td>20,307</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 75 W. Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 0.2 Lot 625 Alexandra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 0.6 610</td>
<td>Mortuary Science Building</td>
<td>27,668</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot S 4841 Cass Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 0.8 620</td>
<td>Bissel Theatre</td>
<td>31,657</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot S 4841 Cass Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5 16 Buildings</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>884,201</td>
<td>Ave. Age</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Medical Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg/Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Land Area or Parcel (Acres)</th>
<th>LA = Leased Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 1.2 609</td>
<td>C.S. Mott Center</td>
<td>76,021</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot D 59 W. Hancock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 9.1 629</td>
<td>Louis M. Sklar Clinical Research Building</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 75 W. Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 0.6 608</td>
<td>Vera Sifton Medical Library</td>
<td>68,854</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot SL 300 E. Canfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 5.6 612</td>
<td>Gordon H. Scott Hall, Bsc Medical Science</td>
<td>483,239</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B 450 W. Canfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 2.0 603</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy &amp; Allied Health Prof</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B 450 W. Canfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 7 Buildings</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,484,893</td>
<td>Ave. Age</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### University Owned or Leased Buildings NOT Included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>384 2761 E. Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 2751 E. Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 WSU Oakland Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 Clinical Laboratory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 Occupational &amp; Environment Health Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 Health Science Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 Shapiro Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 Hudson-Webber Cancer Research Cen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

EXISTING BUILDING & LAND LOCATION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Land (Acres)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total GSF (sq ft)</th>
<th>Building Footprint (sq ft)</th>
<th>Parking Space (Acres)</th>
<th>Available Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Research &amp; Tech. Village</td>
<td>447,046</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>189,310</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>5,890,693</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>485,829</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>884,201</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>1,484,893</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>WSU owned land</td>
<td>9,126,152</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>108.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Non-WSU owned land</td>
<td>255,820</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>9,381,972</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>110.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING BUILDING USE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Total GSF</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>% H, P, U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Administration - Support</td>
<td>1,326,176</td>
<td>63.14%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>1,532,032</td>
<td>55.06%</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Athletic - Physical Fitness</td>
<td>264,319</td>
<td>24.02%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>903,197</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>856,195</td>
<td>95.89%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
<td>2,099,011</td>
<td>24.02%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1,956,778</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Undetermined/Vacant</td>
<td>437,273</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>9,381,972</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING CAMPUS PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200 W. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1411 Edsel Ford Service Drive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8995 Lodge Service Drive</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4854 Fourth Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>475 W. Palmer (Reconfigured)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>630 W. Palmer</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5211 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4864 Fourth Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>4865 Fourth Street</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4841 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>69 Putnam</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>630 W. Palmer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>450 W. Palmer</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-1/N</td>
<td>450 W. Palmer</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-2/M</td>
<td>5190 Lodge Service Drive</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-3/L</td>
<td>45 E. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-5/O</td>
<td>501 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4820 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>237 E. Hancock</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>545 E. Canfield</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>300 E. Canfield</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Tech. Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>480 York</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>181 Antioch</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>608 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>435 Antioch</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>8902 Second Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING CAMPUS PARKING continued…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>435 Burroughs</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 W. Forest</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4441 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>610 W. Canfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>50 W. Hancock</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4710 Second Avenue</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>436 W. Forest</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>628 Alexander</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>80 W. Forest</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>4510 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>69 W. Canfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>84 W. Hancock</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING CAMPUS PARKING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Athletic Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>Main Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>East Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Medical Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>R &amp; T Village Parking Lots</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>South U Village Parking Lots</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,102</td>
<td>Total Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>Available On-Street Parking</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,263</td>
<td>Total Available Parking</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Lot S is a 39 space structured lot located on the roof of the University Services building - restricted access.
## 2020 BUILDING AND LAND AREA

### Existing Development Included on Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg./Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Parking Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Building</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Justice Bldg.</td>
<td>1/2 bldg. utilized</td>
<td>74,119</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>480 York</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485 Burroughs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Program Expansion</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (76 Beds)</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (337 Beds)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Space</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Structure-5 level (750 Spaces)</td>
<td>243,750</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pontiac Building</td>
<td>54,035</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (264 Beds)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (337 Beds)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Space</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Structure-5 level (750 Spaces)</td>
<td>243,750</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pontiac Building</td>
<td>54,035</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (264 Beds)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 BUILDING AND LAND AREA continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg./Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Parking Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Building</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 W. Palmer (Reconfigured)</td>
<td>16,427</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 Engineering Building</td>
<td>188,539</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Building Expansion</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130 Faculty/Administration Building</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Frederick Linzell House (PP&amp;C Arts)</td>
<td>6,657</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G Phit Fungy Library</td>
<td>158,518</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Academic Facility</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134 Helen DeRoy Apartments</td>
<td>206,464</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen L DeRoy Auditorium</td>
<td>13,705</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Undergraduate (247 Beds)</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Resident, Life Offices/Cafeteria</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - Undergraduate (535 Beds)</td>
<td>182,500</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Space</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kresge Library</td>
<td>64,193</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law School Classroom Building</td>
<td>22,038</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law School Expansion</td>
<td>58,048</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Science Library</td>
<td>73,045</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Science Building Replacement</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max Jacob House (Art-History Bldg)</td>
<td>8,425</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McDougall Memorial Conference Center</td>
<td>28,651</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meyer &amp; Anna Plante Building</td>
<td>64,533</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music Annex</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science Building</td>
<td>39,467</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation and Fitness Center</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Cohn Building</td>
<td>88,907</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering Library</td>
<td>111,700</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Complex Atrium</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Hall</td>
<td>137,192</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Hall</td>
<td>156,017</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Center Building</td>
<td>218,470</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water P Preuther Library, Urb &amp; Urb Affairs</td>
<td>74,564</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William C Rands House</td>
<td>19,934</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Campus continued…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg./Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres) Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Parking Structure-6 levels (700 Spaces)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Retail Space (Bookstore)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Welcome Center</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering Building</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Engineering Program Expansion</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land utilized by C19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Auxiliary General Office Building</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C21</td>
<td>Performing Arts Program Expansion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Science Program Expansion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Old Main</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Physics Building</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E1 Support Services - Computer Cen./Office</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>E2 Support Services - Administration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C25</td>
<td>E3 Housing - Graduate (182 Beds)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C26</td>
<td>E4 East Campus Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Academic/Administrative Building</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Support Services - Administraten</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Charles L Frer House (Merrill-Palmer)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509</td>
<td>Pauline Kopp Building (Merrill-Palmer)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Sidman Building (Merrill-Palmer Institute)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Housing - Graduate (182 Beds)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Beecher House (Univ Devol Office)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Lot D</td>
<td>35 W. Ferry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>University Services Building</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot S</td>
<td>75 W. Ferry (Univ. Services Bldg. Roof)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg./Lot No.</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Footprint (Acres) Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5425 Woodard (Building A)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5426 Woodard (Building B)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5429 Woodard (Building C)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12 Buildings</td>
<td>830,651</td>
<td>Ave. Age 52</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2020 BUILDING AND LAND AREA continued....

#### Medical Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>CS Mott Center Vertical Expansion</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Louis M Milman Clinical Research Building</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Vasa Shifman Medical Library</td>
<td>66,667</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Gordon H Scott Hall, Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>483,239</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy &amp; Allied Health Prof</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20,0 13 Buildings 2,163,710 Ave. Age 21.9 0.3 10.0**

#### University Owned Buildings to be Demolished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Parking Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191 31,011</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 52,910</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 6,117</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 46,973</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 43,700</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 24,204</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639 15,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 30,159</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 64,509</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 56,706</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610 27,660</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 37,990</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 35568</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 3,982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13 Buildings 507,496 Ave. Age 84**

#### University Owned Buildings NOT Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Parking Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>384 13,168</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 20,730</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 96,425</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 52,780</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 19,560</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 6,573</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 164,209</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 74,969</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Condominium - land &amp; lower floors not owned by WSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8 Buildings 488,484**

#### University Owned Property to be Transferred to the WSU Research and Technology Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>CS Mott Center Vertical Expansion</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>American Beauty Electric Iron Building</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>480 York</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot V</td>
<td>435 Burroughs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.0 2 Buildings 179,119 Ave. Age 21.9 1.6 2.4 0.6**

#### University Owned Building Shell to be Reutilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Development Included on Parcel</th>
<th>Building Area (GSF)</th>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Age</th>
<th>Building Footprint (Acres)</th>
<th>Open Space (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>6650</td>
<td>CS Mott Center Vertical Expansion</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 Building 31,013**

Note: 6050 Cass Avenue to be gutted and expanded upon vertically - existing building shell to be preserved. (listed as new development - Bldg. N)
### 2020 BUILDING & LAND LOCATION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Land (Acres)</th>
<th>Built-Up (GFA)</th>
<th>Building Footprint (GFA)</th>
<th>Parking (Spaces)</th>
<th>Parking (Spaces - Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology Village</td>
<td>696.365</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus</td>
<td>1,045.577</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>7,937.331</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>830.651</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td>1,726.169</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td>2,163.710</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,561.305</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 CAMPUS PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>5200 W. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1411 Edsel Ford Service Drive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5959 Lodge Service Drive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>630 W. Palmer</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>69 Putnam</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5-1/N</td>
<td>450 W. Palmer</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5-2/M</td>
<td>5150 Lodge Service Drive</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5-3/L</td>
<td>48 E. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5-5/G</td>
<td>5501 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>475 W. Palmer (Reconfigured)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Anthony Wayne Drive (Reconfig.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>7,719</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26 W. Ferry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>75 W. Ferry (Restricted Access)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>555 E. Canfield</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4-4</td>
<td>555 E. Canfield</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>557 E. Hancock</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5920 Second Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>756</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>515 West Warren Avenue</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>75 W. Forest</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>59 W. Hancock</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>628 Alexander</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>130 W. Forest</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>69 W. Canfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>84 W. Hancock</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 CAMPUS PARKING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Athletic Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>Main Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>7,719</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>East Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Medical Campus Parking Lots</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>H &amp; T Village Parking Lots</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>South U Village Parking Lots</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>13,956</td>
<td>13,456</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available On-Street Parking</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Parking</td>
<td>14,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Available Parking figures do not include the 200 spaces allocated to the new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions building, outside scope of 2020 Campus MP.

### University Owned Surface Parking Lots to be Displaced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Structure Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Spaces</th>
<th>HC Spaces</th>
<th>Assigned Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>W. Palmer</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>W. Forest</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 W. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 York</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 W. Canfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4854 Fourth Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Antoniette</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 W. Palmer</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5211 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4864 Fourth Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4865 Fourth Street</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4710 Second Avenue</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4841 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 W. Forest</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Putnam</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5551 Woodard Avenue</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5555 John R</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 E. Ferry (leased - non-WSU)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 Antoniette</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4820 Anthony Wayne Drive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 E. Canfield</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 E. Canfield</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6008 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4510 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 Burroughs</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Parking Lots</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustration 58: Campus Parcel Identification
Illustration 59: Strategic Vision Plan
INTRODUCTION
The Wayne State University Campus Master Plan was initiated by President Irvin D. Reid, who came to office with strong ambitions to realize a new vision for the university. At the outset Dr. Reid inspired the planning team to “create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century.” It is fitting that Dr. Reid unveiled the Strategic Vision for the campus on the occasion of his inaugural address in September, 1998.

The planning consultant team, including The Albert Kahn Collaborative Inc., Urban Strategies Inc., Development Strategies Inc., and The Hannah Group, was retained to assist Wayne State in developing the Strategic Vision for the Campus. This executive summary outlines the results of a campus planning process that involved consultations with a broad range of stakeholders from the university and the surrounding community. We are grateful for the commitment of the university’s Facilities/Campus Master Plan Steering Committee, and for the participation of all stakeholders who contributed their wisdom, articulated their interests, and shared their hopes and dreams.

The Strategic Vision for the Campus comprises both a preliminary evaluation of issues and opportunities and a framework for eliciting further participation of the university and its neighboring communities. It evaluates the uses and character of campus surroundings and prompts further thinking about alternative campus development directions. As a preliminary vision, it lays the groundwork for the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan, which is to be developed over the coming year.

In addition to suggesting a long-range plan for overall campus development, the project team prepared preliminary recommendations for six Early Action Projects – projects already included in the university’s capital outlay plan. Setting forth principles and assigning priorities to these long-term, real property commitments naturally evoked considerable discussion within the master plan team.

Throughout this effort we have been mindful that Wayne State is an emerging university in a re-emerging city. The university’s increasing international stature is matched by Detroit’s renewing, world-class potential.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
Through a series of stakeholder interviews and planning workshops the consultant team recorded a broad range of perspectives within and outside the campus community. Based on this input, the master plan team identified a number of key issues and opportunities regarding the university campus environment, function and atmosphere, including the following:

Key Issues:
- access and wayfinding to and within the campus are difficult;
- the campus is disconnected, at places even isolated from its surroundings;
- the Detroit campus actually comprises a half dozen discrete campuses, and their interconnections are tenuous;
- the campus lacks an overriding focus and sense of place;
- pedestrian malls, while beautifully landscaped and maintained, are thoroughfares rather than gathering zones;
- most campus buildings are internally focused and fail to animate the campus experience;
- parking does not effectively meet the needs of the campus population and visitors; in particular, a lack of distributed parking is a functional impediment;
- effective mass transit systems are not offered as viable, safe options for inter-campus circulation.

Key Opportunities:
- improve accessibility and wayfinding to and within the campus;
- strengthen the presence and visibility of Wayne State within the city of Detroit by implementing Early Action Projects at strategic locations;
- enhance the identity of university properties on Woodward, Warren, Anthony Wayne, and Cass;
- encourage and build upon emerging housing developments on intensifying the use of existing facilities, by developing vacant sites, and by redeveloping under-used properties;
- extend a more pedestrian-friendly environment into the surrounding community to enhance connections to the Cultural Center, Medical Campus, New Center, Woodbridge and the North Cass area;
- create a greater sense of place on the Main Campus and more active, usable green spaces;
- provide quality transit alternatives between campus centers and to key Detroit destinations;
- develop a more distributed pattern of parking amenity, especially on university properties in the south campus area.

STRAIGHTFORD VISION PLAN - GUIDING PRINCIPLES
A set of guiding principles forms the basis of the Strategic Vision for the campus. These principles emerged from the consultants’ analysis of the campus and its environs, interviews with stakeholders, focus group consultations, and intensive workshop sessions with the Steering Committee:

- a campus in the city: The Wayne State campus should embrace the city as a positive and vibrant environment offering opportunities for overlap and synergy. As a “green oasis” within the city’s Cultural Center district, Wayne State is a major Detroit asset. The city and the university are valuable resources to one another.
- a campus as an urban place of learning: The campus environment should foster academic pursuits, be accessible, walkable, and welcoming to visitors, and should encourage leisure and social activities to occur spontaneously. The campus should engender pride for all who live, work, and live on campus. A diverse student body, faculty and staff should be inspired to excel. Planned projects should strengthen the identity of the campus by enhancing key activity nodes and intensifying a sense of place. Campus edges should be made more permeable, articulated by gateways, and facilitated by coherent signage systems. Landscaped malls, open spaces and buildings should collectively offer an environment that is secure, inviting, stimulating, and distinct.
- an extended campus: The campus should reach out to its urban environment, neighboring institutions and nearby centers. Linkages between the main campus and the medical center campus should be strengthened. Future shared facilities should be sited strategically and connecting streetscapes should be improved.
- a consolidated campus: The campus should grow primarily within the territory which it already occupies. The city and the university are valuable resources to one another. The planning team to “create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century.” It is fitting that Dr. Reid unveiled the Strategic Vision for the campus on the occasion of his inaugural address in September, 1998.

The Wayne State University Campus Master Plan was initiated by President Irvin D. Reid, who came to office with strong ambitions to realize a new vision for the university. At the outset Dr. Reid inspired the planning team to “create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century.” It is fitting that Dr. Reid unveiled the Strategic Vision for the campus on the occasion of his inaugural address in September, 1998.

The planning consultant team, including The Albert Kahn Collaborative Inc., Urban Strategies Inc., Development Strategies Inc., and The Hannah Group, was retained to assist Wayne State in developing the Strategic Vision for the Campus. This executive summary outlines the results of a campus planning process that involved consultations with a broad range of stakeholders from the university and the surrounding community. We are grateful for the commitment of the university’s Facilities/Campus Master Plan Steering Committee, and for the participation of all stakeholders who contributed their wisdom, articulated their interests, and shared their hopes and dreams.

The Strategic Vision for the Campus comprises both a preliminary evaluation of issues and opportunities and a framework for eliciting further participation of the university and its neighboring communities. It evaluates the uses and character of campus surroundings and prompts further thinking about alternative campus development directions. As a preliminary vision, it lays the groundwork for the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan, which is to be developed over the coming year.

In addition to suggesting a long-range plan for overall campus development, the project team prepared preliminary recommendations for six Early Action Projects – projects already included in the university’s capital outlay plan. Setting forth principles and assigning priorities to these long-term, real property commitments naturally evoked considerable discussion within the master plan team.

Throughout this effort we have been mindful that Wayne State is an emerging university in a re-emerging city. The university’s increasing international stature is matched by Detroit’s renewing, world-class potential.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
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- enhance the identity of university properties on Woodward, Warren, Anthony Wayne and Cass;
- encourage and build upon emerging housing developments on intensifying the use of existing facilities, by developing vacant sites, and by redeveloping under-used properties;
- extend a more pedestrian-friendly environment into the surrounding community to enhance connections to the Cultural Center, Medical Campus, New Center, Woodbridge and the North Cass area;
- create a greater sense of place on the Main Campus and more active, usable green spaces;
- provide quality transit alternatives between campus centers and to key Detroit destinations;
- develop a more distributed pattern of parking amenity, especially on university properties in the south campus area.

STRAIGHTFORD VISION PLAN - GUIDING PRINCIPLES
A set of guiding principles forms the basis of the Strategic Vision for the campus. These principles emerged from the consultants’ analysis of the campus and its environs, interviews with stakeholders, focus group consultations, and intensive workshop sessions with the Steering Committee:

- a campus in the city: The Wayne State campus should embrace the city as a positive and vibrant environment offering opportunities for overlap and synergy. As a “green oasis” within the city’s Cultural Center district, Wayne State is a major Detroit asset. The city and the university are valuable resources to one another.
- a campus as an urban place of learning: The campus environment should foster academic pursuits, be accessible, walkable, and welcoming to visitors, and should encourage leisure and social activities to occur spontaneously. The campus should engender pride for all who live, work, and live on campus. A diverse student body, faculty and staff should be inspired to excel. Planned projects should strengthen the identity of the campus by enhancing key activity nodes and intensifying a sense of place. Campus edges should be made more permeable, articulated by gateways, and facilitated by coherent signage systems. Landscaped malls, open spaces and buildings should collectively offer an environment that is secure, inviting, stimulating, and distinct.
- an extended campus: The campus should reach out to its urban environment, neighboring institutions and nearby centers. Linkages between the main campus and the medical center campus should be strengthened. Future shared facilities should be sited strategically and connecting streetscapes should be improved.
- a consolidated campus: The campus should grow primarily within the territory which it already occupies. The city and the university are valuable resources to one another. The planning team to “create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century.” It is fitting that Dr. Reid unveiled the Strategic Vision for the campus on the occasion of his inaugural address in September, 1998.

The Wayne State University Campus Master Plan was initiated by President Irvin D. Reid, who came to office with strong ambitions to realize a new vision for the university. At the outset Dr. Reid inspired the planning team to “create a campus that is a model for the urban university of the 21st century.” It is fitting that Dr. Reid unveiled the Strategic Vision for the campus on the occasion of his inaugural address in September, 1998.

The planning consultant team, including The Albert Kahn Collaborative Inc., Urban Strategies Inc., Development Strategies Inc., and The Hannah Group, was retained to assist Wayne State in developing the Strategic Vision for the Campus. This executive summary outlines the results of a campus planning process that involved consultations with a broad range of stakeholders from the university and the surrounding community. We are grateful for the commitment of the university’s Facilities/Campus Master Plan Steering Committee, and for the participation of all stakeholders who contributed their wisdom, articulated their interests, and shared their hopes and dreams.

The Strategic Vision for the Campus comprises both a preliminary evaluation of issues and opportunities and a framework for eliciting further participation of the university and its neighboring communities. It evaluates the uses and character of campus surroundings and prompts further thinking about alternative campus development directions. As a preliminary vision, it lays the groundwork for the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan, which is to be developed over the coming year.

In addition to suggesting a long-range plan for overall campus development, the project team prepared preliminary recommendations for six Early Action Projects – projects already included in the university’s capital outlay plan. Setting forth principles and assigning priorities to these long-term, real property commitments naturally evoked considerable discussion within the master plan team.

Throughout this effort we have been mindful that Wayne State is an emerging university in a re-emerging city. The university’s increasing international stature is matched by Detroit’s renewing, world-class potential.
strategic Vision for the campus is balanced both by the continuing requirements of commuting students, faculty and staff, and by the evolution of the virtual classroom and learning by distance. The Comprehensive Master Plan will further investigate the physical implications of these interrelated dimensions.

**STRATEGIC VISION PLAN – PROPOSED DIRECTIONS**

Building upon the set of guiding principles outlined above, the Strategic Vision for the campus describes Wayne State’s potential to evolve as a model urban campus for the 21st century. Specific campus plan directions are recommended to apply these principles in a manner that builds upon the strengths of the existing campus and its urban context. The following Master Plan Directions are conceptual and are to be further explored as the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan is developed:

- **Create a Central Campus Green as the hub of campus activity.**
  
  A redeveloped Central Campus Green is proposed at the traversal of Gullen and Williams malls. Situated strategically at the threshold of Adamany Library, the Campus Green will become the center of gravity for campus circulation and activity. This renewed central space will support social interaction, programmed as well as spontaneous, and provide a focus for campus life. The Campus Green will be a place for solitary reflection, chance meeting and organized congregation. Key to establishing a strong sense of place will be infill development that creates firm architectural edges and new activity-generating uses, ranging from academic and retail to childcare and wellness.

- **Introduce a Lateral Campus Greenway linking the Matthaei Complex to the Cultural Center.**
  
  A green spine that would connect the Athletic Campus through the new Campus Green to the Public Library and Institute of Arts offers an exciting opportunity to strengthen each of these key assets while enhancing the cohesiveness of the campus. This landscaped pedestrian route would include a new bridge connection over the Lodge and streetscape improvements at Anthony Wayne, Cass, Putnam and Woodward to ensure continuity, safety and animation.

- **Enhance the presence and image of current university holdings on Woodward, Cass and Warden.**
  
  Woodward, Warden and Cass are not only major conduits for automobile and pedestrian traffic, but also represent the main interface between the campus and the surrounding community. Drawing campus uses to these edges will enhance the presence and integration of the university within its urban setting. Parking strategies that seek to consolidate and augment capacity by through structured and on-street solutions should be introduced. Landscape enhancements should strengthen these corridors and create an atmosphere that is both distinctive and inviting.

  - Strengthen the university’s linkages to its neighboring residential, cultural, commercial and medical communities.
  
  Wayne State’s environs include world-class cultural amenities and reemerging neighborhoods. The campus plan should strengthen key linkages to these valuable assets through strategically sited new building programs and promoting streetscape improvements. Physical linkages will complement potential collaborations between academic, cultural and neighborhood communities. Gullen Mall and the proposed Lateral Campus Greenway offer opportunities to enhance these linkages. Cass should be improved as a key integrator of the Main Campus, North Campus, the North Cass neighborhood and the Medical Campus. The university’s Woodward and Warden streetscapes should be reinforced. The redesign of Woodward Avenue itself should be supported to the extent that it converts a barrel road into a bridging street.

  - Promote additional residential and retail activity in and around the campus.
  
  The introduction of additional opportunities to live on and near campus activity centers will enhance the vitality of both the campus and its surroundings. A number of strategies may be employed by Wayne State to encourage a range of housing types and forms. The creation of a residential college on campus would further these interests. Several sites on Main Campus, the University Tower site, and the North Campus area represent opportunities for new residential facilities. Partnerships with the private sector could accelerate the pace of development. The success of a larger residential presence is dependent on the provision of retail, entertainment and other amenities that can support and attract new residents. Clusters of retail use along major corridors, including Woodward, Warden and Cass, should be anticipated.

  - Facilitate the growth of a technology and business corridor that will complement the university’s academic endeavors.
  
  Wayne State’s North Campus represents an important asset as a long-term safety valve for future university growth. In the near term, underutilized properties could be redeveloped for a range of potential purposes, including residential, retail, technology, research and business incubator uses. As a principal sponsor of a business and technology corridor, the university would advance a dual mission of academic excellence and business community outreach.

**STRATEGIC VISION PLAN – PLANNED AND POTENTIAL PROJECTS**

A number of Early Action Projects offer exciting opportunities to advance the emerging principles and key directions of the Strategic Vision for the Campus. Preliminary recommendations on the string of planned projects and other potential projects are identified in the plan:

**Planned Projects:**

- The Wellness Center is illustrated at the hub of the campus on the north side of the proposed Central Campus Green.

- The Welcome Center has been strategically sited as a gateway to the Main Campus at the corner of Cass and Warden.

- A new Sports Arena has been sited south of the Matthaei facility in conjunction with a future replacement pedestrian bridge over the Lodge Freeway.

- A Law School addition is proposed for the site north of the existing facility.

- A new College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Professions is proposed for Detroit Medical Center site at the northeast corner of John R and Mack.

**Potential Projects:**

- A redesigned Central Campus Green should be developed to provide a multipurpose hub of activity and cohesive sense of place for the Main Campus.

- The architecturally significant Rackham Building should be redeveloped as a new theatre facility, consolidating theatre teaching, practice and performance programs. Reuse of this signature building at the major intersection of Woodward and Warden would offer the university a significant presence on Detroit’s main street.

- Key locations for future academic facilities have been identified within the Main Campus, including the Helen Newberry Joy site; infill sites surrounding the Campus Green, and vacant land west and north of the Natural Sciences building.

- New residential development on campus should be accommodated in several manners. The introduction of university-sponsored housing has been recommended for locations that support clusters of existing housing, including the site west of Adamany Library, the surface lot east of Parking Structure 2, vacant land...
surrounding the University Tower Apartments, and university properties in the vicinity of Cass and Ferry. The university should additionally encourage residential development by the private sector in the North Cass, Arts Center, Woodbridge and North Campus vicinities.

- Potential sites for new childcare centers are shown in four locations: south of the Student Center; St. Andrew’s Hall; University Tower area; and as part of North Campus development.

- An expansion of the football stadium is a potential project that may evolve with the athletic program’s possible advancement to the next level of NCAA participation.

NEXT STEPS

The Strategic Vision for the Campus charts a long-term course of action and proposes key principles and directions toward realization. These proposals are preliminary and are intended to encourage response and comment from the university community as well as other interested stakeholders.

Comments offered at this stage will form the basis for commencing Phase Two of the Campus Master Plan initiative, the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan. The next phase of the plan will focus on more specific subjects, interests and needs: wayfinding and signage, academic program relationships, residential life and athletic program expansion, for example. As we learn from these more detailed analyses the Campus Master Plan will advance to a higher plane of consideration and long-term usefulness.

Executive Summary

General results from the stakeholder interview process include:

1. University stakeholders were generally constructive and well-prepared.
2. There are many positives on which to build a strategic vision for the future.
3. There is great affection for the main campus but overall more criticism than praise for the campus and its surroundings.
4. Appreciation of campus surroundings is remarkably limited.
5. There is more unanimity than debate on the issues.
6. External stakeholders cited more plans and initiatives than internal stakeholders.
7. External stakeholders cited more plans and initiatives than internal stakeholders.
8. Suggestions about how to improve the environment were issue-based and targeted.
9. Constraints to realizing campus environmental improvements are substantial.
10. Internal and external stakeholders greatly appreciated the process itself.

The following summary results are offered in approximate order of frequency:

Campus attributes most frequently cited include:
- Main Campus is a “green oasis,” compact and walkable
- Older buildings and Yamasaki master works are most appreciated
- Gullen Mall is the most memorable image of the university
- Student diversity

Campus concerns and issues most frequently cited included:
- Campus arrival, entries and barriers
- Campus signage and wayfinding
- Campus center, sense of place
- Crime
- Parking
- Academic space quantity and quality
- Funding for campus facility development and maintenance
- Linkages between Detroit campuses: main, medical, athletic, north and south
- Transition from commuter to residential campus
- ADA/barrier-free accessibility
- Parents’ concerns about safety
- University stakeholder pride

Campus facility needs most frequently cited included:
- Large lecture halls
- Intelligent classrooms
- Conference facilities
- Daycare facilities
- Research space
- Residential
- Faculty/University club
- Welcome center/student services center
- Student commons
- Fitness and recreational facilities

Contextual attributes most frequently cited included:
- Cultural center
- Central location and freeway accessibility
- Greater center city opportunities

Contextual concerns and issues most frequently cited included:
- Linkages to surroundings
- Signage and wayfinding
- Crime
- Public transportation
- I-94 redesign
- Vacant land and blight
- Shadow of Detroit’s reputation

Contextual facility needs most frequently cited included:
- Housing – all sectors and campus community
- Retail, restaurants and entertainment
- Conference facilities
- Hotels

External stakeholder appreciation most frequently communicated included:
- University is an important Detroit institution and employer
- University is an urban anchor and catalyst for revitalization

External stakeholder issues and concerns most frequently cited included:
- University development activities are viewed as secretive and independent
- University demolition activity is viewed as anti-preservation
- University fringe area ownership is viewed as arbitrary and obstructive
- Parents’ concerns about safety

External development opportunities most frequently cited included:
- Science and research park in north campus area
- Intermodal station/conference center in north campus area
- Infill housing in south campus area
- Mixed use developments in medical campus area
- Revitalizing neighborhood in athletic campus area
Interview Summary

The following summarizes stakeholder responses to posed question in greater detail:

1. What do you like most about the WSU campus?
   
   **University stakeholders say:**
   - Main campus is beautifully landscaped, clean, safe, compact, walkable... “an oasis in the city”;
   - Good access from major freeways;
   - Proximity to Cultural Center and Woodward Corridor assets;
   - Architectural diversity is appreciated by some, architectural uniformity by others;
   - Older buildings are higher quality than recent additions; of newer buildings, the undergraduate library (alone) is appreciated;
   - Diversity of students, faculty and staff is the university’s strength;
   - Commuting student body is employed and focused on vocational pursuits;
   - Street closures created a campus core that is university’s most memorable image;
   - Oakland Center is state of the art.

   **External stakeholders additionally say:**
   - Wayne State is “here,” in the city, and centrally located;
   - A major Detroit employer;
   - Wayne State’s growth is symbolic of its success.

2. What is missing?
   
   **University stakeholders are missing:**
   - Housing for students, faculty and staff – that is diverse and affordable;
   - Daycare facilities, particularly serving mature, single-parent students and staff;
   - Signage of freeways, streets, campus grounds, building exteriors and interiors;
   - Main campus parking is inadequate, inflexible, unfriendly, technologically obsolete, inappropriately furnished and inadequately maintained;
   - More recent architecture is mundane, mediocre or ugly – most particularly University Tower;
   - Main campus lacks well defined edges, gateways, landmarks and a sense of place;
   - Main campus grounds are inaccessible – metal fences and chains say “keep out”;
   - Physical linkages between campuses, and between campuses and surroundings, are missing;
   - A reliable, high quality shuttle transportation system, linking main and medical campuses and key city destinations, is needed;
   - In addition to housing and day care, specific university facilities are missing, in whole or part: faculty club, welcome center, large lecture halls, conference and banquet facility, fitness center, student center (particularly for mature students), athletic facilities, research labs, executive education center, humanities center;
   - Although generally related to “surroundings,” the following area commercial facilities and amenities are missing: restaurants, hotels, entertainment, shops, bookstores;
   - Multiple sites of many colleges and departments compromise academic effectiveness and budgetary efficiency;
   - Personal safety, property security and police presence are lacking;
   - Evening and weekend life is missing;
   - DMC is over-developed; area between DMC and main campus is under-developed;
   - An adequately funded facility maintenance program is needed;
   - Student pride and staff morale can be improved;
   - ADA/barrier-free accessibility is lacking;
   - A strategic marketing plan, an academic plan and a master plan are needed.

   **External stakeholders also miss the following:**
   - Sense of university identity;
   - Cooperation and coordination with external, public and private development;
   - University presence on Woodward.

3. What do you like most about the university’s surroundings?
   
   **University and external stakeholders say:**
   - Cultural Center resources;
   - Freeway infrastructure;
   - New Center and downtown resources;
   - Woodbridge and south campus residential areas exhibit potential revitalization.

4. What is missing?
   
   **University and external stakeholders say:**
   - Residential neighborhoods, housing supply for students, faculty and staff;
   - Most surrounding areas are in transition; much of the campus fringe is perceived as urban blight;
   - Area signage is lacking;
   - Commercial amenities missing: retail, restaurants, hotels, extended stay hotels, conference centers;
   - Police presence, area safety and security;
   - Adequate area mass transit and inter-campus shuttle services;
   - Physical connections to surroundings are missing, particularly to Cultural Center and New Center;
   - Development in the area between the main and medical campuses;
   - Research park has potential in north campus area.

5. What campus modifications would you suggest to improve the quality of the learning/teaching/research environment at Wayne State?
   
   **University stakeholders suggest:**
   - Develop housing; residential campus will reach broader market and enhance academic experience;
   - Build quality buildings; stop building cheap, short-term buildings;
   - Budget adequately for maintenance and renovation;
   - Add shuttle service to enhance interdisciplinary activities and linkages between campuses;
   - Develop more smart classrooms;
   - Improve information and communication technologies in general;
   - Expand Oakland Center as a branch campus;
   - Increase involvement with local industries;
   - Improve safety of pedestrian crossings at Anthony Wayne;
   - Small group study areas distributed throughout the campus.

   **External stakeholders additionally recommend:**
   - Develop area north of I-94 for research, housing and retail uses.
6. What long term initiatives or ambitions do you have that we should know about as we develop a new campus plan?

University stakeholders advise:
- Advanced communications network will be completed in 3-5 years.
- The Brightways Project for the main campus is underway.
- Ambition to develop centrally located research facility.
- Plan to relocate University Public School from Kresge Building to main campus area and expand programs.
- Ambition to centralize FP&M operations in one building with surface parking.
- Want to construct new engineering building at Warren and Third. Renovation of four older libraries.

External stakeholders add:
- Currently $1 billion in combined capital campaigns underway in the UCCA area.
- Idea of Science and Tech Park in north campus area is revived.
- Intermodal Amtrak station at Woodward and Amsterdam may include conference and daycare facilities.
- New Center Council is working on mixed-use development initiatives in the north campus area.
- City wants to divest its properties in general.
- Housing developments planned east of Woodward, north and south of I-94 will stabilize those areas.
- Occupancy of GM Building by state looks promising.
- Cultural Center is developing a Business Improvement District to augment city services.
- Proposed Woodward improvements include long-term potential for light rail link from New Center to downtown.

External stakeholders add:
- Current $1 billion in combined capital campaigns underway in the UCCA area.
- Idea of Science and Tech Park in north campus area is revived.
- Intermodal Amtrak station at Woodward and Amsterdam may include conference and daycare facilities.
- New Center Council is working on mixed-use development initiatives in the north campus area.
- City wants to divest its properties in general.
- Housing developments planned east of Woodward, north and south of I-94 will stabilize those areas.
- Occupancy of GM Building by state looks promising.
- Cultural Center is developing a Business Improvement District to augment city services.
- Proposed Woodward improvements include long-term potential for light rail link from New Center to downtown.

7. What are the main constraints to realizing those initiatives that could also affect the development of the Wayne State campus?

University stakeholders say:
- Limited funds from city and state; nonrecurring funding; alumni fund-raising.
- Marketing, public relations, advertising should be high priorities.
- Community resistance to university property acquisitions.
- Image of Detroit would be constraint to university entry in residential campus market, i.e., marketing residential campus to parents.
- Detroit lacks political will to assemble properties.
- Lack of Detroit master plan.
- City of Detroit departments.
- Division 1-A athletic program would involve high costs and depend on development of residential campus.
- Strained communications between university and DMC.
- Perceived cultural differences between Henry Ford and DMC are constraint to Science and Tech Park.
- High costs associated with technology upgrades.
- Power supply by public utility is unreliable.

External stakeholders add:
- University's acquisition of properties has impeded development by others, in turn negatively impacting image of the university.
- Image of Detroit is a constraint to developing residential campus.
- Proposed I-94 improvements remove Third Street bridge and take university properties; uncertainty of implementation and takings constrain development planning.
- University expansion in current climate would face competing interests.
- Detroit-owned properties are offered at unrealistically high prices.
- Cass Tech may relocate and Masonic Temple may close; these two actions would devastate the Cass park area.

B. Is there anything else we should know about as we develop the Campus Master Plan?

University stakeholders say:
- University should maintain and improve existing facilities before building new buildings.
- Campus should be an attraction.
- Strategy of suburban versus Detroit campus is debatable.
- Importance of DMC/WSU linkage is debatable.
- University needs to overcome anti-preservation image.
- Alumni would be initially passive, then supportive, of athletic facility development.
- Research park development is debatable, e.g., corporate interests versus academic freedom.
- Libraries should be central to the university symbolically and physically.

External stakeholders add:
- Stop tearing down buildings.
- A Wayne State degree is valuable.

Issues Summary

The following explores some of the key issues raised in the stakeholder interview process:

Green Oasis: WSU has created a pleasant inner landscape which has become a "green oasis" district from the city. Despite all the greenery, there are few accessible "greens" for passive use.

Compact: WSU's campus is compact and generally walkable throughout the year.

Malls: Although the malls support a healthy pedestrian life, they have become thoroughfares rather than places to meet. Most of the malls are not visible from surrounding streets. There is potential for the mall landscape to extend in all directions.

No "There": What is missing at WSU is a defined sense of place and any center or common meeting place, exterior or interior. No gateways provide a sense of arrival. People who commute to WSU need to easily find a welcoming place to retreat to between classes in order to study or meet others. Visitors to WSU find that beyond the lushly landscaped malls there is no sense of a university hub. Many believe WSU should be an attraction in addition to being a place to live.

Barriers: Chains and metal fences on campus say "keep off" or "keep out"; fences keep people off the grass and fences keep people from crossing over street medians.

Poor signage: Signage works best for people who know how to get to WSU. Visitors have few signs to assist them and these are confusing. A high visibility signage program would be a low-cost initiative that would have tremendous benefits. Information kiosks would be helpful at strategic campus locations. The need for freeway signage was often mentioned, particularly oriented to first-time visitors.

Hub location: WSU is located within one of the most active hubs of the city and the infrastructure for getting people there is excellent. Its proximity to a number of cultural institutions in the UCCA area distinguishes it from other Michigan universities.
Connections: WSU needs more physical connections to its neighbors. The main campus feels very insular. Priorities for key linkages need to be established to direct infill development, streetscape improvements and landscaping.

Common agendas: External stakeholders believe that WSU needs to improve its coordination with the community, the city, local institutions and businesses. The university is seen by many as an entity unto itself. There are many opportunities for WSU to work in concert with neighbors on common agendas, especially housing, transportation and parking. A number of large corporate entities in the area have the resources to work cooperatively.

Crime: Although WSU is a relatively limited crime area, it is plagued by fears for personal safety. The safe campus facts need to be reinforced and marketed.

I-94 threat: Proposed I-94 redesign presents opportunities for WSU to improve its access. Proposed widening and removal of bridges is a threat to existing edges and connections north, but this project has no known development schedule.

Transit: A number of people commented on the lack of transit service to downtown. Most were unaware the bus service on Woodward, Cass, Second, Third, John R and St. Antoine exists and has been improving (six minute headways on Woodward). The service lacks visibility and suffers from an image of poor safety and maintenance. Many people support the idea of a light rail line on Woodward.

Shuttle: Although WSU is a pedestrian-friendly campus, walking around in winter and getting to surrounding areas is difficult. Many people referred to the convenience of the former shuttle bus service (the "3 center mini") which looped around WSU and linked to New Center, Henry Ford Hospital and the Detroit Medical Center.

Intermodal station: The proposed intermodal station will bring more people to the area, but this contravenes the I-94 plan to diminish the number of bridges south.

Parking: WSU parking is better than at many universities in the region, but a number of problems have been identified. The largest pool of parking is in the northwest portion of the campus; facilities in the southwest are poorly served. Visitors find parking very confusing and unfriendly. The designated staff/student system is inconvenient and inflexible. Parking structures are closed at night.

Architecture: A mix of fine and mediocre architecture was offered with differing opinions on which buildings fit in each category. Few of the buildings used their entrances or activities to animate campus spaces.

Facilities: Many buildings look inward and have poor entry relation-
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PARK

1995 saw the release of the first effort of the current planning of the Research and Technology Park, located in the North Campus area. This report identified appropriate parcels, conducted market research and issued a land use plan. In January 2000, the WSU Research and Technology Park Blue Ribbon Task Force prepared a Business Plan for the WSU Research and Technology Park. This report re-identified appropriate parcels, confirmed the initial market study, issued a land use plan, and suggested a phased approach toward implementation. The idea of incorporating a research and technology park in the North Campus area is not new. The 1967 Long-Range Plan made reference to the planned Industrial Research and Development Park to be located in the same general area. "This Research Park is designed to attract "research for profit" industries and commercial concerns. Because of its relationship to the heart of Detroit and the facilities of Wayne State University, this area should prove extremely attractive to private industry. Since it was too much to expect private developers to move into essentially depressed areas, purchase present substandard buildings, clear the land and erect new structures, this Research Park, like University City, is being made possible through a joint federal-city government urban renewal project." (Long Range Plan). Several obstacles have prevented the implementation of such a park over the years, but, with the current economic climate and the desire to expand the University's research environment, there is a resurgent interest in the realization of the plan.

The current program for the Research and Technology Park calls for approximately 600,000gsf of related space on land owned by General Motors Corporation, General Motors Creative Services Building. Parking will be located in existing university-owned surface lots 4 and V, located behind the Criminal Justice building. The park is planned to expand into the General Motors Creative Services Building. Parking will be located in existing university-owned surface lots 4 and V, located behind the Criminal Justice building. The park is planned to expand into the American Beauty Electric Inn and Criminal Justice buildings. Additional expansion will result in new construction on lot V, facing Second Avenue, and on Henry Ford Health Services property at the southwest corner of Second Avenue and York Street. A 600-space parking structure is planned for Lot 4 to handle the additional parking demand. If additional parking space is demanded, a second park would be planned on the east side of Woodward Avenue in the target area along Piquette from Woodward Avenue to the historic Henry Ford Piquette Avenue Plant.

Currently, demand for land in the general area is at a record high. Competitive interests have had an effect on planning for the park. There is strong interest to locate several residential units in new and existing construction in the area. The general area considered for residential redevelopment has been dubbed the "New Amsterdam Area." Other activity in the area includes the new intermodal station planned for the existing Amtrak station site as well as the future considerations of Henry Ford Health System at One Ford Place. This activity has effectively limited the potential for any new university land acquisitions in the area. Campus expansion in the North Campus area will need to occur on university-owned land. Careful consideration over the best use of existing university assets is prudent.

The university has offered approximately five acres of land for the park. As a result, the university will be left, for all practical purposes, with two land holdings for the potential construction of new buildings. The holdings included in a superblock bounded by Cass, Bumoughs, Woodward and I-94, and a small gravel lot located on the northeast corner of Woodward and Harper. Both parcels of land are at the corner of the planned Technology Park and maintain Woodward Avenue frontage. The university will need to decide in the next few years if and how these land holdings will relate to the planned technology parks, the general revitalization of the city of Detroit, and the interests of the university.