

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Minutes of Meeting: Nov 20th, 2015
(3:00 pm – 4:30 pm, David Turpin Building A144)**

Membership			
	Voting:		Ex-Officio:
R	Valerie Kuehne, Co-Chair	√	Ron Proulx
√	Gayle Gorrill, Co-Chair	R	Tony Eder
R	David Castle	R	Bruce Kilpatrick
√	Carmen Charette	√	Alison Noble
R	Katy Mateer	√	Kristi Simpson
R	Catherine Krull		
√	Thomas Tiedje		Other:
√	Andrew Rowe	√	Joanne McGachie
√	Karena Shaw	√	David Perry
R	Brontë Renwick-Shields (UVSS)	√	Neil Connelly
√	Katrina Flanders (GSS)	√	Carmen Mailloux
√	Sheryl Karras	R	Jim Dunsdon
√	Paul Ward	R	Joel Lynn (for Jim Dunsdon)
√	Pete Rose	R	Tom Downie
		√	Ruth Young
			Guests:
			<i>Dialog BC: via video conf.</i>
		√	Jennifer Fix
		√	Antonio Gomez-Palacio
		√	Martin Nielsen
√ = In Attendance R = Regrets Noted			

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of October 13th, 2015 were approved, as presented.

3. Remarks from the Chair

Ms. Gorrill chaired the meeting and welcomed Antonio, Martin, and Jennifer from Dialog who were participating by video conference.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

No business arising from the minutes.

5. Correspondence

No correspondence to report.

6. Regular Business

1. Draft Campus Plan

A. Engagement Summary, Phase 2

Ms. Gorrill expressed that she was pleased with the progress on the project to date. She said Dialog will present a summary of the engagement feedback and proposed revisions. At the end of the meeting there will be a motion to incorporate the revisions into a final document. Moreover, it gives a near-final Plan for Mr. Gomez-Palacio to present to the Board of Governors at their Monday, November 23rd meeting.

Ms. Fix indicated in her presentation, that 600-700 distinct comments were collected during Phase 2 of the Campus Plan Update engagement process. This was collected via 11 mobile booths, 2 open houses, 1 stakeholder workshop, 3 resident association meetings, and over 25 email submissions.

Six overarching themes from the engagement summary were outlined. There was broad support expressed for the vision, goals, and big moves in the Plan. (1) The main topic of concern was Cunningham Woods. Stakeholders expressed displeasure about the possible loss of ecological function and beauty that could result if a building were to be sited there. (2) In fact, 30% of the comments received regarding natural areas were specifically on Cunningham Woods.

Another area of focus was the need for enhanced cycling infrastructure that included suggestions for improvements such as more weather-protected bike parking, dedicated cycling lanes within campus, and safer routes and connections to/from campus. (3)

Other overarching themes included requests for separated pedestrian and cycling facilities on Ring Road (4), enhanced protection, restoration, and expansion of natural areas (5), and securing a permanent location for the Campus Community Garden (6).

Mr. Connelly also said that he received several additional emails, which have not been included yet in the engagement summary. They included a submission and a petition from the group, Students for Cunningham Woods and the Native Students Union that express strong support for protecting the Woods from any potential development.

Meetings were also held with the Saanich Community Association Network, the Gordon Head Residents Association and the Mt. Tolmie Community Association. They provided commentary in regards to traffic issues, resident-only parking signs, expressions of satisfaction with the university's effort to improve transit and access (including cycling), and also the green ring concept that could provide pleasurable walking paths and a buffer between the university and neighboring communities. A meeting with the Community Association of Oak Bay was cancelled due to the storm on Tuesday that caused power outages.

Ms. Gorrill invited committee members to ask questions on the feedback presented.

Mr. Rose said that he overheard a lot of ideas pertaining to improved cycling corridors, such as a corridor that directly links UVic with downtown Victoria in a fashion similar to the Galloping Goose trail. He asked what we would be doing with input of this nature and how ideas like this could get off the ground through this process. Mr. Connelly explained that he regularly meets with municipal planning and engineering departments to discuss future community transportation plans and connections to the campus and said that he would take proposals of this nature into account when he meets with them in the future.

Dr. Tiedge suggested that there are cost effective ways to improve cycling routes through the city through signage, bike lanes, etc., and that there is more opportunity for that in Victoria, although it is not adjacent to the campus.

Ms. Gorrill said that the input received for the Campus Plan put a lot of emphasis on cycling and the fact that we have a voice among the regional transportation authorities means that there is a lot of opportunity to share this information and interest.

B. Campus Plan Revisions

Mr. Connelly remarked that the Campus Plan Update Steering Committee met on November 16th to discuss the engagement feedback and possible revisions to the Campus Plan.

1. Protect Cunningham Woods from Development

Mr. Connelly drew the CPC's attention to three options around the positioning of Cunningham Woods in the final Campus Plan. He indicated that in the discussion at the Steering Committee meeting, Ms. Renwick-Shields supported option 2, that is, remove the potential future building site from Cunningham Woods. The other Steering Committee members present generally supported option 3.

Ms. Fix reviewed the three options in detail:

Section 3.2.1 Natural Areas (pg.44-45) and Fig. 4.2.1 Potential Future Building Sites (pg.65)
Options

1. Retain the existing approach
2. Remove the potential future building site
3. Remove the potential future building site and provide for further studies and processes to be undertaken that
 - a. assesses potential building uses, needs and design, as required to meet academic needs
 - b. examines ecological impacts
 - c. provides for a comprehensive engagement process

Mr. Proulx commented that the treatment of Cunningham Woods in the draft Plan is a major stumbling block for students.

Mr. Rowe asked for clarification on the exact boundaries of Cunningham Woods, and whether it included areas outside of Ring Road. Ms. Simpson described the Cunningham Woods area and indicated that it is entirely within Ring Road.

Ms. McGachie asked why Cunningham Woods was included in the list of potential building sites. Ms. Simpson explained that it offers an important connection opportunity between the engineering and science facilities in the south east corner of the campus and the balance of the academic areas within the Ring Road to the west. Given the growing demand for space to support the engineering program, it is logical to consider sites that are in proximity to the existing site for the program.

Ms. Flanders joined the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

Ms. Young asked whether option 3 effectively designates Cunningham Woods as a potential future building site. Ms. Simpson said that option 3 sets out a higher hurdle that must be cleared before it can be deemed a potential future building site. In the event that this site is to be considered for a future building, there would be an obligation to conduct a high level of consultation and study so that its potential as a site can be more rigorously understood, with the benefit of more detailed information.

Dr. Tiedge expressed that he felt option 3 was a good compromise, and suggested that the map be clarified to indicate exactly what area would be designated in this way. Ms. Gorrill agreed that a study would be prudent to specify exactly how big the area would be and to develop a clear understanding for how it is valued and could be best used in the future.

Mr. Proulx said a study of this nature would provide the substantive detail needed to weigh future decisions against.

Mr. Connelly said that at the Steering Committee meeting, Ms. Renwick-Shields said she would be discussing option 3 with other students and would get back to us in the near future.

Ms. Gorrill asked the Committee to vote on each option. The Option 3 approach was unanimously supported.

2. Enhance Cycling Infrastructure & Separate Pedestrian and Cyclist Facilities on Ring Road

Mr. Connelly said that the vision for Ring Road as proposed in the Campus Plan would require significant study before it could begin to be put into effect. Ms. Simpson said that more study was necessary to confidently support any of the options. There is a strong need to understand the operational impacts of

any of the options proposed for Ring Road, and that further consultation is necessary, before an approach is finalized.

Dr. Tiedje suggested that the Campus Plan not preclude any one option over the other. Currently, it indicates that Ring Road will be shared between cyclists and pedestrians, but given the discussion it should say that it “may” be shared.

Mr. Connelly agreed that more discussion was needed before the language in the Plan could commit to one approach over the other.

Ms. Gorrill also indicated that the Campus Plan should set out the goals and some options, but not the solutions and final approach for Ring Road adjustments.

Ms. Fix reviewed the revisions in detail:

Section 5.2.1 Pedestrians, 5.2.3 Cycling and 5.2.7 Ring Road (pg.80- 92)

Adjust to retain principles that advance Ring Rd. as a people place that embraces walking and cycling, along with accommodating vehicle and transit needs.

Provide for further study:

- on possible road and pathway configurations, designs and phasing
- engagement with campus stakeholders
- consultation with BC Transit and the municipalities on community network impacts and connections to campus

3. Protect, Restore and Expand Natural Areas

Ms. Fix said that overall there was positive reception from stakeholders regarding the large green areas shown in the draft Campus Plan, and the external community appreciated the aesthetics of the greenway surrounding the campus.

Ms. Fix reviewed the revisions in detail:

Section 3.2.1 Natural Areas (pg.44-45)

Reinforce the renewed commitment to the overall preservation and enhancement of existing natural areas on campus by adjusting:

- the text and map to refer to one category of Protected Areas, with parts of Mystic Vale and Hobbs Creek noted as having environment covenants (rather than ‘perpetually protected’)
- the text to ‘consider development on a limited scale ...and if informed by special studies on environmental impacts....and stakeholder input.’
- the current references to Cunningham Woods

Ms. Gorrill commented that these revisions are more clarification-oriented rather than substantive.

4. Secure a Permanent Location for the Community Garden

Ms. Fix said that the term “flexibility” had caught the attention of multiple stakeholders and was not interpreted in a way that matched its intention. She reviewed the following revisions in detail:

viii. Community garden (pg.49)

- Adjust the text on the Campus Community Garden space to:
- reinforce the intention of providing space for its ongoing use over the longer term
- confirm, in the implementation section, the intent to renew of the letter of understanding
- reference the principles that provide for:
 - should the land be needed to serve academic priorities in the future, an alternate location would be determined in consultation with the community garden, and arrangements made in advance to transition between one growing season and the next.
 - regular liaison and dialogue between the university and the club on operational and planning issues

Mr. Rose inquired whether the current site is adequately sized. Mr. Connelly said that the current site is much larger than the original site, by as much as 2.5 times. The previous site was a potential future building site and the decision was made to move it to the current location to support its long term use in its current location.

5. Other Non-Substantive Adjustments

Mr. Connelly reviewed other minor revisions in summary form:

- Parking lot details (pg.19)
- Reference to Medical Sciences Building (pg.44)
- Connecting Nature graphic and concept plan (pg.33, 38, 39)
- University Drive Gateway (pg. 56-58), reference the design as an option rather than the ‘preferred’ option.
- Built Form Guidelines (pg.69) add a new reference to the opportunity to work with Saanich and Oak Bay on preparing updated and consistent campus municipal zoning regulations.
- District Heating System (pg. 71) adjustment to the reference of Parking lot 6 as a promising location for a renewable energy centre rather than a biomass facility.
- Fig. Adjustments
 - Future Cycling Network (pg.81)
 - Future Transit Network (pg.82)
 - Service Vehicle Access for New Future Buildings (pg.85)

Ms. Gorrill inquired whether the CPC had any further questions or comments. None were raised.

Mr. Nielsen said that as he has observed the campus plan update process unfold, he found that there was tremendous listening to and reflection on the input received from stakeholders.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio said that he echoes Mr. Nielsen's comment. Once the revisions are incorporated, the next stage will begin where the final Campus Plan is presented to the campus and external community.

Ms. Gorrill said that at this time, the motion to be proposed is to incorporate the revisions discussed today. At the next CPC meeting in December, a motion will be proposed to approve the Campus Plan.

MOTION (A. Rowe/C. Charette)

That the Committee recommend to the President that the draft Campus Plan, be adjusted following from the phase 2 Engagement process, to address the key themes by changing the Plan as it relates to:

- the further study of Cunningham Woods including the removal of the potential future building site and adding a study area,
- reinforcing the long term protection of identified natural areas,
- the long term location of the community garden and the requirement to provide for further study of Ring Road and cycling options,

along with various other minor changes, as discussed.

CARRIED

Note also that proxy votes were submitted by email from Dr. Mateer and Dr. Krull, as they were in agreement, given that the changes were consistent with the ones discussed at the Steering Committee meeting, which they attended.

Ms. Gorrill congratulated the CPC on achieving this milestone.

C. Implementation Actions and Schedule

Mr. Gomez-Palacio said that the implementation section will highlight the big moves and the more mature elements of the Plan, along with processes to advance the key policy directions of the Campus Plan. It does not need to include action items in fine grain detail, so as to allow room for further study and engagement to achieve the goals set out in the Plan.

Dr. Tiedge said that the Campus Plan is a mandate, or a vessel so to speak. It is the canvas on which the specific institutional decisions will occur. Ms. Simpson added that it will influence funding plans going forward as well. Ms. Gorrill said there is a need to pull out specific pieces so that it's clear where we go from here, as the CPC deliberates on the steps to be undertaken to implement the Plan.

Ms. Charette commented that the implementation section should focus on potential broad actions. It is not an "implementation plan, with specific timelines and detail". Ms. Gorrill suggested that the introduction to the Implementation Actions section could be improved to clarify its purpose. Mr. Connelly agreed that this revision would occur.

When there were no further comments to this section, Mr. Connelly advised that following the next CPC meeting on December 7th, the final Campus Plan would be posted online and an information session will be scheduled for mid-January.

7. Capital Projects Update (D. Perry)

- Regarding the new student residence facility, the Request for Proposals for the three shortlisted consultants is underway and a selection will be made in January.
- The delay to the Continuing Studies Building expansion will push the opening to sometime in February or March. A specific date should be known by the time the CPC meets next.
- Facilities Management needs to address space needs for the Saunders Building and Shops area and it has begun to draft a plan that will be presented to the CPC at a future meeting.

8. Community Liaison Update (A. Noble)

- No updates to report.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

9. Next Meeting: December 7th, 9:00 – 10:30 am
