THE PROTECTION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

[In the 1950s] the University [was] under pressure to abandon its established style of architecture. It has realized, however, that in doing so, it would inevitably merge into a general stream of conformity, whereas by keeping its regional character it possesses an individuality of appearance which belongs to it alone, a very great asset.

John Gaw Meem, 1960

Not only has the university been working to preserve its historical architecture, style and sense of place, but as a state institution, there are laws and regulations to help guide this process. As a state institution, the University of New Mexico falls under state historic preservation policy set forth in the New Mexico Cultural Properties Act (N.M. Stat. §§ 18-6-1 through 18-6-17, as amended). Created in 1969 in response to the National Historic Preservation Act passed some three years earlier, the Act declares that the state’s historical and cultural heritage is one of its “most valued and important assets,” and that the public has an interest in preserving historic sites, structures, objects, and similar places. Furthermore, the Cultural Properties Act provides for the preservation, protection and enhancement of structures, sites, and objects of historic significance in a manner conforming with the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-665).

The National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, is the guiding force behind the federal historic preservation policy. In Section 1(b), the Act states in part:

- The spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;
- The historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life;
- Historic properties significant to the Nation’s heritage are being lost or substantially altered, if inadvertently, with increasing frequency; and
- The preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.

In addition to creating guiding principles for historic preservation, both the National Historic Preservation Act and New Mexico Cultural Properties Act set up similar processes to identify historic resources and review the effects of federal or state projects (defined as “undertakings”)
on these resources. Both statutes establish registers of cultural and historic properties worthy
of preservation, known at the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and the
State Register of Cultural Properties (State Register), respectively. Both acts call for the state
historic preservation officer (SHPO) be given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the
proposed effects of any modifications to a building, structure, site, or object listed on either the
National or State register.

Whenever the University performs general maintenance, proposes modifying, or considers
demolishing a “historic building,” that is a building listed or eligible for listing on either the State
or National Register, this is considered an undertaking. When this occurs, the University must
consult with the SHPO on the potential effects of the project upon the historic characteristics of
the building. In other words, the University must determine whether or not the proposed project
will damage or harm the structure’s historic qualities, which are often stated as the “character-
defining features” of a building (see below). During consultation, the University and the SHPO
are required to find ways to mitigate, or minimize, any adverse effects to the property. This may
include changing the specifications of the project to avoid damage to a building’s historic
characteristics, agreeing to specific preservation standards to preserve the building’s character-
defining features, or carrying out more detailed historical or architectural studies
(“documentation”) of the building prior to implementing a project that will significantly alter or
demolish all or parts of the property.

The New Mexico Cultural Properties Act (NMCPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act
(NHPA) define certain categories of historic resources or groups of resources. These terms are
commonly used by historic preservation specialists and should be familiar to UNM staff working
with such properties:

- “Historic resource” or “historic property” (NHPA) means any prehistoric or historic
district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on the
National Register of Historic Places (National Register), including artifacts, records, and
material remains related to such a resource or property. It also includes any properties
of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe that meets the National
Register criteria.

- “Cultural property” (NMCPA) means a structure, place, site, or object having historic,
archaeological, scientific, architectural or other cultural significance.

- “Registered cultural property” (NMCPA) means a cultural property that has been placed
on State Register on either a permanent or temporary by the state’s Cultural Properties
Review Committee.

- “Building” – “Structure” – “Site” refers to different categories of historic properties.
Buildings refer to places that shelter human activity, while structures are related to
purposes other than human shelter. Sites are locations of significant events (prehistoric
or historic in time) with historical, archaeological, or cultural value regardless of whether or not there is standing building or structure.

- “Individually eligible property” (NHPA) means a single building, structure, site, or object that meets the National Register criteria. If such a property is a building or a structure, it may include interior as well exterior features, and may also include landscaping features immediately surrounding the property. Whether such features are significant is determined by the University in consultation with the SHPO, and defined on the evaluation form.

- “Historic district” (National Register) means a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. An historic district has prescribed geographical boundaries, and may be comprised of resources that are not “individually eligible,” but when considered as a whole are historically significant. A district can consist of “contributing” and “noncontributing” buildings, structures, sites, objects, or landscapes. Contributing features are those that compliment the historical or architectural nature of the district. Noncontributing features are those that do not contribute to the district’s historic significance, for example, because they were added to the district at a later date, are in a style not relevant the district’s historic design, or have been modified to such an extent that they have lost their historic significance. All features – buildings, structures, and landscapes – located within an historic district should be identified as “contributing” or “noncontributing.” Noncontributing resources are not considered to be historic properties, and thus are not protected under the NHPA.

- “Cultural landscapes” are a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals herein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or that exhibit other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: Historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.

- “Cultural resources” are commonly considered under the same definition as “cultural property” or “historic resource;” however, the term often has a broader definition that includes those features of both the natural and built environment that have a cultural value to some socio-cultural group. This concept incorporates the larger mosaic of things, values, beliefs, perceptions, customs, traditions, and symbols that make the cultural environment.

No matter what term is used, it is important to note that when someone is talking about cultural or historic properties, cultural resources, or historic districts, they are talking about specific classes of buildings or structures that have certain safeguards protecting their significant historic qualities under state and federal law. Therefore, facilities managers, their staff, and university planners must know which properties are “historic,” the process for getting approval of projects that affect them, and the standards that must be used in their rehabilitation and maintenance.
Character-Defining Features

It is essential to identify an historic building’s character-defining, architectural or landscape features in order to preserve, rehabilitate, or restore these significant components that may have become lost or damaged through weathering, previous rehabilitation, or improper maintenance. These features are integral to a building or structure’s historic and architectural significance and integrity. Character-defining features generally include the physical make-up of the building, structure, or landscape, such as the overall shape, design, materials, craftsmanship, decorative features and aspects of site layout or landscape context.

It is important when designing a project for an historic property that one identifies the building or structure’s character-defining features and considers how the project will affect them. The project design should not adversely impact these features unless there is no other viable alternative. If there will be an unavoidable adverse effect to the features, they should be thoroughly documented by an architectural historian using a documentation plan approved by the University in consultation with the SHPO.

Historic Preservation Standards

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary Standards) should be consulted as a guideline for the maintenance and rehabilitation of University historic buildings and structures (Secretary’s Standards located in Appendix D). The Secretary’s Standards consist of four categories:

- **Preservation:** involves maintaining the property’s existing form and materials, with very minimal changes. Although upgrading mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems are permitted, additions to the building are not usually allowed under this standard. The property usually retains its integrity by continuing its original use, e.g., an historic house continues to be used as a house. In general, the Preservation standard allows very little flexibility with regard to materials, use, and form.

- **Rehabilitation:** involves the compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, building code upgrades, and additions while preserving those character-defining features that convey its historical, cultural or architectural values. In general, the Rehabilitation standard recommends preserving distinctive materials, features, and building characteristics, repairing rather than replacing historic features, and permits building additions or exterior alterations so long as the character-defining features of the building are not destroyed.

- **Restoration:** involves selecting a specific time period in the building’s history and making the building look as it did at that time. This may include removing additions and features from other periods of time, and restoring features that had been removed.
Reconstruction: involves the new construction of all or part of a building or structure that no longer exists. The new construction replicates the appearance of the property a specific period of time and in its historic location.

During the project planning phase, the appropriate type of standard treatment should be discussed with the SHPO.

Implementing Preservation

Applying the Secretary’s Standards
The University frequently remodels and updates its buildings in response to the needs of new academic standards and building space requirements. As such, very few buildings have not been modified or added onto or are still used for their original purpose. Therefore, the University should use the Secretary Standard for Rehabilitation for its maintenance and renovation projects that affect historic properties.

Guidelines for Maintaining Building Integrity
UNM is charged with the responsibility for maintaining the “integrity” of its historic properties. But what does historic integrity mean? According to National Register Bulletin 15, integrity is the ability of the property to convey its historical significance.¹ To do this, it is important to understand its place in history and its important physical features – its character-defining features. Generally, this means that the building or structure should still sit on its original location; it should retain its basic original design; and still have visible most of its original building materials.

When planning an addition to an historic building, there are several key characteristic-defining features that need to be considered:

- **Location.** In most instances, it is recommended that an addition to a building be placed towards the rear of the structure. As an alternative, an addition could be placed to the side where it would be the least intrusive on the building’s historic character.

- **Massing.** The addition’s massing should not overwhelm the original building. In other words, if the original structure is one-story, the addition should be no more than one-story tall. Similarly, if the original building is 2,000 sq ft, the addition should be similar in size or smaller, so it does not draw attention away from the historic property.

- **Style.** The style of the addition should clearly differentiate the new building from the old. At the same time, the addition should be designed to be architecturally sensitive to the original building and be compatible in materials and style.

- **Construction.** During construction of the addition, care should be taken to preserve the character-defining features of the original building.

When planning an addition or significant alteration to a historic property, it is recommended that the University use architects and engineers experienced with designing sensitive and compatible upgrades to historic buildings.

**Programmatic Agreement**

In order to ease implementation of the historic preservation plan, it may be advantageous for the University to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) that would specify the standard treatment and routine maintenance requirements for each historic property. Such an agreement would assist maintenance staff in understanding what is required of them and eliminate the need for constant SHPO consultation on each individual project.

Whether under a PA or not, when planning projects and following-up on individual building or landscape recommendations made in this preservation plan, the facility engineers, consulting architects, and maintenance staff should familiarize themselves with the historic building, noting its character-defining features, and take care to follow the recommended repairs in conjunction with the Rehabilitation standards.
PRESERVATION PLAN GOALS

General Project Purpose
According to University staff, historic buildings are at a disadvantage within the current campus planning and development matrix because of functional obsolescence and high maintenance costs. The current backlog of over $140 million in deferred maintenance costs, with only $2 million in annual allotted budget, places enormous pressure on older campus structures. The Regents and Administration face tough choices. Despite the compelling architecture and beauty of the main campus, the University serves a poor state. The University lacks an endowment for its campus infrastructure, and the State Legislature is hard-pressed to serve its constituents in basic education as well as in its universities. Sensitive to designing appropriate repairs and the maintenance costs of historic buildings, decision makers are anxious for a meaningful survey and analysis of the campus that will complement the nearly completed UNM Strategic Plan. While all concerned wish to preserve the campus legacy, it is apparent that creative planning and resource development are now imperative.

The University envisions the Heritage Preservation Plan as the first and foremost component of a longer-term comprehensive preservation and revitalization plan for the campus. A Heritage Preservation Plan will provide the Regents and Administration with policy recommendations to most effectively maintain and preserve its unique buildings and landscapes. The University’s Heritage Preservation Plan seeks to expand previous master planning efforts beyond buildings and campus boundaries to survey a more comprehensive historic context, including such resources as cultural landscapes, interiors, public art, and historic furniture designed using Spanish Colonial prototypes.

Goals and Objectives
The following are the goals and objectives of this Heritage Preservation Plan:

- Identify the features of the UNM Central Campus that contribute to its recognized sense of place.
- Develop tools that foster the preservation of UNM heritage sites.
- Advocate for the importance of settings, including buildings and spaces between them, rather than the common separation of buildings from settings.
Provide necessary information for decision makers to form policies that will preserve UNM’s heritage properties and its sense of place.

Provide information on important cultural properties on the UNM Main Campus so that those properties may be preserved in the face of development pressures.

Provide general design guidelines to be developed into more precise guidelines as a later effort. The next level of guidelines will be used to influence the design of future construction that impacts important UNM heritage properties.

Provide general guidelines for maintenance of designated cultural properties.

Become part of current and future Campus Development Plans and Strategic Plans

**Preservation and the Campus Development Plan, 1996**

The following are goals, objectives, and policies from the Barton Myer Campus Development Plan of 1996 relevant to heritage properties identified in this report:

Campus Development Plan goals were:

- The Central Campus will continue to be a community resource and contribute to the quality of life in the community through its performing and visual arts activities, museums and public events, and open spaces (C.2 Goal).

- Maintain the desirable physical character of the Central Campus (C.6 Goal).

- To develop an environmentally sustainable campus (E.4 Goal). [Sustainability includes the embodied energy of materials, i.e. the reuse of historic buildings.]

Campus Development Plan objectives were to maintain:

- The essential elements of the Meem-influenced Pueblo revival style as guidelines for architectural design of new buildings: ascending mass; massive walls and earth colors; covered portals, terraces and enclosed courtyards; human scale; organic footprint;

- The current building coverage and heights in new development – average 20% building coverage and average 2.5 stories above ground;

- The tradition of locating related academic divisions in clustered building zones;

- The pedestrian malls as open space and extend those spaces as the academic core expands to the north;

- The Duck Pond area;

- The landscaped open areas using native plantings requiring minimum watering and general maintenance.
Campus Development Plan Policies pertaining to historic preservation:

“2.2.1 Historic Preservation

The University of New Mexico Central Campus contains several building of historic significance and value. Because of University President Dr. William G. Tight, UNM became one of the first institutions in New Mexico to adopt and promote the [Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style] as an important regional architectural style. The campus contains some of the earliest non-residential interpretations of the [Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style]. Some buildings also have historic significance because of the architects who designed them. John Gaw Meem, a highly respected New Mexico architect who helped develop the southwestern [Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style], was retained as campus architect from the early 1930’s to the late 1950’s and was responsible for 38 campus buildings. Some of the larger buildings, including Zimmerman Library and the Anthropology Building are among his most significant design projects.

It is important that the University recognize the value of its physical heritage and establish a policy of historic preservation for the campus – individual buildings and historic campus contexts.

2.2.2 Maintaining Low Density and Existing Character

In a related policy, the University should establish a standard for new development areas on campus based on the density and exiting character of those parts of the Central Campus which are generally considered most successful. Standard characteristics should be described in terms of density and building height and massing, as well as through contextual design guidelines.

2.2.3 Large Open Space

One of the dominant characteristics of many successful campuses is a large central open space. Open spaces tie different precincts of the campus together, creating a shared physical context.”

Summary

The 1996 Campus Development Plan continues a long tradition of maintaining the architectural character and sense of place of the campus. Many of the goals and policies set forth in the plan are in line with historic preservation principals. As such, this Heritage Preservation Plan builds on past University development policies and provides recommendations to preserve the historic character of the campus which meet historic preservation standards.
CAMPUS PLANNING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION AT UNM

“Planning for the orderly growth of the University of New Mexico requires a continuous process of institutional analysis and self-study.”

John Carl Warnecke

Almost immediately upon the creation of its one-building campus in the fall of 1892, University administrators and the Board of Regents made plans to expand and beautify the campus. Over the years, this process included both informal and formal plans, and plans created by individuals and consulting firms from both inside and outside the university. Some of the earliest landscaping plans, such as President Tight’s grove of pine trees which were first planted in 1905, still exist today, while other campus design plans, such as Francis Barry Byrne’s classic entryway from Grand Avenue, were either never adopted or have since disappeared amidst the tumult of new construction.

The awareness of the historic preservation was first raised nationally in 1966 with the creation of the National Register, followed locally by the New Mexico Cultural Properties Act of 1969. In 1970, the University’s Hodglin Hall was saved, and by 1999 the University developed policies to address the need to consider its historic buildings. Both the Board of Regents and the administration have continued to develop policies to consider historic preservation concerns in the campus planning process.

This section will briefly summarize various planning and preservation efforts brought forward over the past 100 years or so. Their concepts and degree of implementation offer insights into the heritage of the University’s built environment, and establish foundations for preserving this heritage while recognizing that the planning process must continue as the university’s facilities expand for future growth.

A Brief History of Campus Planning

During William G. Tight’s presidency (1901 – 1909), the number of campus buildings increased from one to eight and it was decided that some sort “master plan” for the layout of future campus buildings should be drawn up. According to former university architect, Van Dorn Hooker, the Tight Plan was probably devised by E. B. Cristy, a local architect who worked
closely with William G. Tight to develop the campus’ earliest Pueblo Revival style of architecture.\(^2\)

The plan shows a rudimentary axial alignment with the east-west axis paralleling Central Avenue, while the north-south axis splits the campus in half and is oriented perpendicular to Central (Figure 2). The north-south axis, Terrace Street, appears from the drawing to have a ceremonial arch-like structure that functions as a gateway into the campus at its south end, and is anchored at the north by a library and auditorium building.\(^3\) Neither the entry structure nor the library building was constructed using this plan. An athletic field was located just north of where Grand Avenue would have extended from the west; however, this facility was never built either.

As noted above, landscaping the campus was an early priority in Tight’s plan as he enlisted dozens of male students to gather young pine trees from the nearby Sandia Mountains to plant around the Administration Building (Hodgin Hall). Also in 1905, forty cottonwoods were planted around the newly completed “arbotheater” in the northwest corner of the campus. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, the Campus Improvement League had planted more than 5,000 trees and plants around the university campus.\(^4\) Except for the now-towering pines in Tight Grove, none of these plants survived the construction of new buildings in this part of the campus.

William G. Tight was succeeded by David Ross Boyd who embraced Tight’s preference for the Spanish-Pueblo style architecture, even though the recent remodeling of Hodgin Hall and the construction of other new buildings in this style caused quite a controversy among faculty, staff and the community as a whole. However, while the Spanish-Pueblo style was being used as the design for new buildings, the use of the Tight Plan for campus development was never put into place and, as such, by 1914 the university had very little structure to its campus layout.

---


\(^3\) Interestingly, the drawing appeared in the 1908 university yearbook, *Mirage*, but has not been located separately in any other archive.

\(^4\) Hooker, 2000, 17.
President Boyd sought to rectify this situation and in 1915 he contacted noted architect and planner Walter Burley Griffin to design a comprehensive campus building plan. The result was the so-called “Nucleus Plan” that placed low-lying (1-2 story) buildings in a classic university quadrangle arrangement along an axial alignment again centered on Terrace Street (Figure 3). The buildings were marked by an undecorated exterior massing that actually related to Mayan architecture and the popular Prairie School design rather than the preferred Spanish-Pueblo Revival style (the “x” on the plan below was drawn by the designer to show the axially of the plan). The center of the campus was punctuated by a tall, pyramidal tower-like structure.

Figure 3: Griffin’s Nucleus Plan

It is not clear whether or not the university ever received an official submittal of this plan since Griffin was working at the time in Australia and communication was slow and cumbersome.

---

5 Griffin was devotee of famed Chicago architect Louis H. Sullivan, and the designer of Australia’s capital of Canberra.
6 Hooker, 2000, 34-35.
between the two countries. Instead, in 1916 Griffin’s partner in Chicago, Francis Barry Byrne, sent President Boyd a plan of his own design, which was designated the Byrne Plan. The Byrne Plan was axial, and divided into quadrangles; however, Byrne shifted his main axis from a north-south alignment to one oriented east-west along Grand Avenue (now Martin Luther King Boulevard). The plan featured courtyards with fountains, and streets lined with colonnades in the Beaux-Arts tradition (Figure 4). The main concentration of buildings was again centered in southwest corner of the university’s property, along University Boulevard (then called Plum Street) and Central Avenue. Dormitories were placed towards the eastern edge of the campus, and for the first time, parking spaces for automobiles were taken into account and hidden in a picturesque landscape (Figure 5).7

Figure 4: Axonometric of the Byrne Plan, note courtyards and axiality of plan

Figure 5: Byrne Plan

A significant new feature of the plan was the large open space designed for the eastern half of the campus. Byrne designed a park-like area with a lake and winding roadways that camouflaged parking areas and inserted agricultural fields tied to central campus via footpaths. This part of the plan clearly reflected the pattern of urban growth in the university area, which is to say the only platted subdivisions at this time were to the west and south of the campus, and these were still as much a developer’s dream as they were actual houses on the ground.

Sanborn fire insurance maps created in 1924 for the university show no hint of Byrne Plan being implemented (Figure 6). Instead, the map indicates that the University is comprised of fourteen main buildings and twelve cottages used for male student housing loosely clustered near the corner of Central and Plum. There is no evidence of a central point for the campus, nor any axial alignments of buildings or thoroughfares.

Figure 6: 1924 Sanborn Map

This pattern, or lack of it, continues for the next ten to twelve years as the University seems to stagnate as far as new construction is concerned. Between 1936 and 1938, however, the picture changes dramatically with the influence of John Gaw Meem as the university architect. While there is still no formal campus plan on paper, Meem shapes the development of the campus through the placement of his newly designed Administration Building, Student Union, and Main Library. These three buildings are aligned east to west at the north end of Terrace Street, with the Administration Building (Scholes Hall) acting as a focal point for the main north-south axis (Figure 7). A circular drive in front of Scholes Hall directs traffic through the heart of the campus and provides access to classroom buildings and dormitories. The result of this new layout is that almost all university facilities are within a block of this central drive and the campus has shifted significantly to the north. It is a pattern that is still recognizable today.

Figure 7: New axially engendered by Meem
In 1955, President Thomas Popejoy told the regents he wanted a campus master plan to work with since the University had undergone a tremendous growth spurt following World War II. The campus was bulging at the seams with new students and buildings and Popejoy hoped to get some control on this heretofore uncontrolled expansion. The result was the so-called Meem Master Plan, which pushed campus growth towards Girard Boulevard on the east and just beyond Lomas Boulevard to the north (Figure 8).

Figure 8: 1955 Meem Master Plan

The Meem Plan, which was reviewed by the newly formed Campus Improvement Committee, was produced not by Meem himself but by his associate, Edward O. Holien of the office, Meem, Holien, Buckley, and Associates, Architects, located in Santa Fe.\footnote{Prior to 1944, there were standing committees on planning for the university, instead university presidents made these decisions. However, that year the Building Committee was formed, followed ten years later by the formation of the Campus Improvement Committee, and finally in the 1960s by the Campus Planning Committee, which is an administrative advisory group that recommends architects, reviews and approves changes to the master plan, building sites and design, landscape plans, parking issues, streets, and walkways (Hooker, 2000, 190-91).} Holien’s ideas centered once...
again around a modified quadrangle plan where related disciplines in the sciences, arts, and humanities were grouped in buildings located near each other. There was no particular center point to the campus, but there was to be a main plaza located just west of the new student union building at the corner of Ash and Cornell, and dorms would be located to the east of the main campus. At the time this plan was being produced, the University was already implementing some of its features including the construction of Hokona and Coronado dormitories to the north and east of the library, a new auditorium south of the new student union, and a new gymnasium south of Mesa Vista Hall. This new construction immediately shifted the campus significantly eastward from the old center axis of Terrace Street.

Landscaping was a major feature of the Meem plan, a “Permanent Park” planned for the area between Mesa Vista and Hokona Halls. The campus was still very accessible to vehicular traffic with Cornell, Yale Avenue, and Terrace Street providing north-south access, while Ash and Roma crossed the campus from east to west. A minimal number of parking spaces were identified around the new gymnasium (Johnson Gym) and fronting Central Avenue east of Cornell.

There was little recognition of the historic resources on campus. The plan called for the removal of the football stadium to the vaguely defined “North Campus,” and the removal of several significant buildings, including the President’s House, and two of the University’s earliest structures Hodgin and Rodey Halls.

As Van Dorn Hooker points out, there were several weaknesses in the Meem Plan, in part because it was done without the benefit of open space studies, enrollment projections, and other planning tools that would have provided a better perspective on the university’s future development.9 Nonetheless, as Hooker notes, this design greatly influenced future campus planning.

Within two years of the Meem Master Plan, the University decided that it needed a more formalized plan that related better to projected enrollments and use of space. In 1958, the regents contracted with the well-known planning firm of John Carl Warnecke and Associates from San Francisco, California. The Warnecke Development Plan, adopted in 1960, and still the planning document used today, established six guiding principles:

1. The Central Campus should be used primarily for academic functions with Zimmerman Library as the focal point of the campus.
2. Related subject fields should be grouped together (as they were in the Griffin, Byrne, and Meem plans).
3. The North Campus should be used for the future medical school, student housing, and the campus physical plant.

4. The South Campus should be used for intercollegiate athletics, student housing, and research facilities.
5. Land coverage by buildings should be limited to 20 percent of gross land area.
6. The average height of all buildings on the Central Campus should not exceed two-and-one-half stories above ground level.\(^{10}\)

Arguably the most radical innovation put forth in Warnecke Plan was the elimination of vehicle traffic on the Central Campus, thus creating a pedestrian friendly atmosphere (Figure 9). Traffic would be rerouted around a loop road on the edge of the campus (today’s Redondo Drive). The plan also called for a reflecting pool situated in a park-like setting to the west of Zimmerman Library. And, of course, all new construction would pay homage to John Gaw Meem’s Spanish-Pueblo Revival style.

---

\(^{10}\) Hooker, 2000, 136-39.
Like the Meem Plan, the Warnecke Plan was not sympathetic to the university’s oldest, historic buildings. It recommended the demolition of Hodgin Hall and the Sara Reynolds classroom building, as well as other “older” structures.

To compliment the Warnecke Development Plan, the regents decided to develop a formal landscape plan for the campus, and in 1962, they hired the firm of Eckbo, Dean, and Williams, from South Pasadena, California to create this plan. The Eckbo Plan was designed by the recognized landscape architect, Garrett Eckbo, who focused on creating a design that featured native plants from the area’s three major ecological zones – mountain, mesa, and desert – while keeping in mind the arid and windy climate conditions of the locale.11

Perhaps the most significant feature of the plan, in addition to the transformation of the campus into a large pedestrian mall, was the creation of a water feature now affectionately known as the “Duck Pond.”12 This feature has become the focal point on campus as witnessed by the daily congregation of students around it, and its use as a campus reference point (“I’ll meet you after class at the Duck Pond,” or “Turn left at the Duck Pond to get to Mitchell Hall”). But the Eckbo Plan also brought more subtle landscape changes to the campus, changes which now reflect the heritage of the University’s built environment (Figure 10).

The foundation of Eckbo’s design was the creation of open spaces marked by a variety of natural and sculptural features, interconnected by a series of ell-shaped malls that parallel the streets (Cornell, Yale, and Terrace Street) that once ran through the campus, but that now formed pedestrian corridors. The entry malls were set off by small plazas and parks that “humanize” the mall’s scale. On the other hand, Smith Plaza located on the south side of Zimmerman Library represented what Eckbo called a “monumental” feature – a large open space that offered the university a space in which to hold bigger events. Close-by, between Scholes Hall and the Alumni Chapel, Eckbo designed a park-like setting with large trees, grassy berms, flower gardens, and benches to create a more sublime, contemplative atmosphere – not unlike those imagined by William G Tight some sixty years earlier (Figure 10).

The Eckbo Plan also respected the past. It retained the large Ponderosa pine trees to the west and north of Zimmerman Library, a remnant of WPA landscaping. Eckbo was guided by the idea that the campus’ open spaces were for living, studying, and socializing. As such, they would become as much a part of campus life as the lecture halls and science labs.

11 Garrett Eckbo, “The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico,” (Garrett Eckbo & Associates, no date).
In the fall of 1996, Barton Myers Associates, Inc. produced the Campus Development Plan as an offshoot of *UNM 2000*, a comprehensive vision statement prepared in 1990 (revised in 1995) to examine all facets of the university’s programs and services. The Campus Development Plan focused primarily on expanding the pedestrian campus onto North Campus including the all-important linkage across Lomas Boulevard.

The plan set forth specific policies (Section 2.2) pertaining to the development plan, including recognizing the importance of historic preservation in maintaining campus architectural heritage. It also called for maintaining a low building density, preserving the existing architectural character of the Central Campus, and noted that large open spaces were successful components of a modern university’s landscape plan. This aspect of the plan offered the most dramatic recommendation for linking the Central Campus with the North Campus by extending a mall-like feature north from the Duck Pond across Lomas. The proposal called a greenbelt...
corridor that was “deeply rooted in the heritage and character of New Mexico,” and preserved several historic buildings, such as the President’s Residence, and Meem’s Naval ROTC building (originally the Co-op Dorm).13

Although the plan only briefly discussed historic preservation, and appeared to not completely understand the issues involved (for example, it refers to the campus’ Spanish-Pueblo Revival style as the “adobe” style), it did embrace the idea of open spaces that characterize the existing Central Campus and noted that, along with strengthening east-west view corridors, maintaining these spaces was an important component of the campus’ visual heritage. The plan, however, did not provide a connection between these spaces and the historic buildings: it viewed the university’s historic properties as stand alone entities.

Historic Preservation on Campus

The campus building boom of ‘50s, ‘60s, and ‘70s resulted in the loss of some historically significant university buildings. In 1971, however, a seminal event in the history of campus development took place with the demolition of the then run-down, dilapidated building known as Rodey Hall. It had been built in 1909 adjacent to Hodgin Hall and served many functions – auditorium, chapel, and archaeological museum – during its 60 years of existence. It had become a fire hazard and its demolition made way for the completion of Redondo Drive around the campus.

A retired university English professor, T. M. Pearce, witnessed the demolition and feared for the fate of neighboring Hodgin Hall, which also fallen upon architecturally hard times. Not wanting the University’s first building to fall to the wrecking ball, Pearce enlisted the aid of the Alumni Association to spearhead a renovation project for the building. Bolstering this effort was the fact that Hodgin Hall had just been put on the National Register, which had been created some five years earlier to protect historic resources such as the University’s first Administration Building. In 1975, the Board of Regents approved the appointment of an historical architect, Joseph D. Burwinkle, to oversee the $1.3 million renovation project. Private donations were raised, and in 1983, the project was completed. The historic building, with its restored exterior and interior, has become a showplace for visitors to the University, and is home to the Alumni Association.

This effort to restore the glory of Hodgin Hall, together with an increase in community and alumni awareness of the issue, and the growing influence of the state’s Cultural Properties Review Committee, which oversees historic preservation on state lands, eventually led new appreciation of not only the University’s unique Spanish-Pueblo Revival architectural style, but a
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greater understanding of historic preservation issues in general by the Board of Regents and University administrators. This culminated in additions to the Regent’s policy manual, first in 1996 where the “Pueblo Revival style” was officially adopted as the architectural style of the Central Campus, and in 1999 where it became the University’s official policy that all buildings, landscapes and places or objects of historic significance be preserved and protected. The University Historic Preservation Committee was established to oversee this policy and designate these places of historic importance.

With this formal adoption of policy, the University has taken new steps towards preserving its historic resources, and thus its unique “sense of place,” while at the same time planning a campus of the future. The heritage zones discussed in the following section take the next step in understanding the relationship between “space and place” that is essential to preserving the University heritage.

Table 1: Historic Campus Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Planner/Architect</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>William G. Tight</td>
<td>UNM President</td>
<td>Drawing of proposed layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Griffin and Byrne</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>General plan for compact, continuous ‘pueblo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>John Gaw Meem</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Hired by regents over a number of years to complete 38 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>John Gaw Meem</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Master Plan for campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Carl Wernecke</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Master Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Garrett Eckbo</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Landscape Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Barton Myers Associates</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Campus Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Summary and Preservation Philosophy for Future

Although preservation has not been a priority, the lack of specific attention to historic resources does not mean that historically significant patterns of land use have not been maintained on campus. In the late 1990s with the formulation of a campus historic preservation policy and the University established a Historic Preservation Committee to address the campus heritage.

A constant theme running through various planning documents, from William G. Tight to Carl Warnecke, has been axiality to the campus’ layout. This was first accomplished by the extension of city streets, such as Terrace, from Central Avenue to its intersection with Grand Avenue or Ash Street. As the campus expanded to the east, other thoroughfares such as Yale and Cornell were incorporated into this axiality. As streets and avenues, these were open spaces that were marked by the construction of university buildings and dormitories on either side of these corridors across campus.
With the adoption of the Warnecke Plan, vehicular traffic was limited to a loop road around the edge of the University, thus closing off the streets and avenues that crossed the campus. Interestingly, with the exception of Logan Hall, which blocked the view of Scholes Hall from Central Avenue, these open space thoroughfares have been retained as de facto corridors, which have become integral features of the University’s landscape (Figure 11). Now referred to as “pedestrian malls,” these features are in fact historical remnants of original campus planning schemes. They continue to provide orientation for visitors and new students and serve as utility corridors.

Figure 11: Birdseye view of campus in 1942 (note axiality of Scholes Hall on Terrace Street)

In recent years, these pedestrian malls have created a place for themselves in preserving the heritage of the University’s built environment. Landscapes such as the open space between Zimmerman Library and the Anthropology Building, have been recognized as culturally significant places worthy of preservation regardless of age. In addition, just as when they were
city streets, the malls continue to function as spatial boundaries for groups of buildings, many of which are now significant historic structures.

It is these historically derived corridors that form the basis for proposed “Heritage Zones” that are detailed in the following section. These Heritage Zones are a combination of open space and the built environment that emphasizes the important relationship between the two and are critical aspects of preserving the University’s campus heritage and sense of place.