

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of Meeting: June 24th, 2015 (11:30 pm – 1:00 pm, DTB A144)

Membership			
	Voting:		Ex-Officio:
√	Valerie Kuehne, Co-Chair	√	Ron Proulx
√	Gayle Gorrill, Co-Chair	√	Tony Eder
R	David Castle	R	Bruce Kilpatrick
√	Carmen Charette	√	Joy Davis
R	Katy Mateer	√	Kristi Simpson
√	John Archibald		
√	Thomas Tiedje		Other:
√	Andrew Rowe	√	Joanne McGachie
√	Karena Shaw	√	David Perry
√	Bronte Renwick-Shields (UVSS)	√	Neil Connelly
√	Katrina Flanders (GSS)	√	Rhonda Ljunggren
√	Sheryl Karras	R	Jim Dunsdon
	Paul Ward	√	Joel Lynn (for Jim Dunsdon)
	Pete Rose	√	Tom Downie
		√	Ruth Young
		R	Rachael Scarth
		√	Rosaline Canessa
			Guests: Dialog BC:
		√	Jennifer Fix
		√	Martin Nielsen
		√	Antonio Gomez-Palacio (via video conf.)
		√	Joe Fry
√ = In Attendance R = Regrets Noted			

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of May 20th, 2015 were approved as circulated.

3. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Kuehne chaired the meeting and noted that this is an important committee meeting focusing on a key step in the Campus Plan Update process. Therefore, there will be no capital projects or community liaison updates at this meeting. She also noted that this is the last meeting for Dean Archibald, who was thanked for his contributions to the committee. In addition, this was also the last meeting for Joy Davis, who was thanked by the chair for her contributions to both the campus environment and the committee. A welcome was extended to new member, Social Sciences Dean, Cathie Krull – with Rosaline Canessa attending to observe, at her request, for this meeting.

Dr. Kuehne noted that the draft concept plan has already been reviewed by the Campus Plan Update steering committee, and the members can provide some background to the discussion, if necessary. This meeting is an opportunity for feedback, discussion and next steps as the committee moves towards the preparation of the draft plan.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

No business arising from the minutes.

5. Correspondence

No correspondence to report.

6. Regular Business

1. Campus Plan Update – Draft Concept Plan

Mr. Nielsen introduced Mr. Palacio, who led the presentation of a slide deck on the draft concept plan via videoconference. He began by noting the milestone nature of this moment in the process and thanked the committee, many of which have been immersed in the process.

The presentation encompassed four main sections:

- 1) Process – Developing the Concept
- 2) Big moves
- 3) Draft Concept Plan
- 4) Next Steps

Concept Development

- Building on revised vision, principle and goals, with reference to the revised vision statement
- Keys – academic priorities and aspirations, innovation, respect for First Nations history
- Revised goals – walkability, commitment to engagement
- Revised principles – natural areas, open spaces, compact growth, sense of place, vibrant campus

Big Moves

- Connecting Nature – campus identity from natural setting, research & pedagogy, green belt
- Renewed commitment to walkability – the preferred mode of moving around campus
- Ring Road as a people place – signature element of campus, currently used as vehicular space; creating people spaces along Ring Road; interspace connecting with nature
- A Compact Campus – grow inwards, exchange of uses, functions, ideas, walkability
- New & invigorated centres of animation/vibrancy – amenities and services; west side near Fine Arts building seems to be forgotten; also east side near residences
- Elevating cycling & transit – great options for arriving on campus
- A Focused First Phase – east/west nodes; get the move value from resources and expenditures; east/west connections
- Long term flexibility for outlying lands – example – Queenswood, and the need for future-proofing characteristics for long-term unknown needs that serve the university's mission.

Draft Concept Plan

- Brings together many aspects into a single rendering (aerial graphic) – existing buildings, potential new building sites, potential new pathways and parking structures.
- Might take 40 years to reach this level
- Identifying needs for future potential & protecting them in the interim

Open space framework:

- Existing forested areas (“green capital”/Mystic Vale)
- Bring trees onto streets and pathways
- Current inventory of landscaped areas
- Potential future programs for open space
- Space for big events & every day
- Active spaces and living lab – teaching moments in open spaces – not just wasted space; should be programmable and contributing to capital

- System of hydrology – connecting the water bodies – UVic sits on 3 water sheds; Petch fountain sits at culmination of these 3 bodies; need to bring clarity to this space and amplify

Mobility framework:

- How people arrive on campus and how they move about
- Diverse pedestrian connections
- Bring in a comprehensive network and system
- Build on “soft-scaped” trails
- Sidewalks, pedestrian paths, shared path, separated cycling paths
- Some existing instances of a promenade feature – near library; important symbolic environments with sitting areas
- Future pedestrian framework – existing connections outlined
- Refining and adding layers to drawing and linkages to spaces

Discussion points by the Committee:

- Improving pedestrian access involves a range of initiatives relating to lighting, crosswalks, the location and condition of pathways, wayfinding, the interface with vehicles, cyclists and transit
- East/west connection – can see that being really exciting with the addition of benches and other amenities, at a limited cost
- From safety/security perspective – given the isolation of some pedestrian areas; increasing visibility, lighting, crime prevention approaches are required
- What constitutes the “iconic heart” for the campus? Central quad is physically and programmatically the heart of the campus. Would like to see more of these areas on campus, more opportunities for people to mingle and meet. Campus visitors have different perspectives and may view the University Centre as the focal point
- Two areas needing “animation:” West side of campus near the Fine Arts building; east side near residences
- Shared pathways – service vehicles, couriers, delivery bays/loading zones – may need more clarification on shared pathways.

Multi Modal Circulation on Ring Road:

- Cycling – strategy of incrementally slowing down cyclists
- Transit – viable and attractive ways of moving on campus – maximize existing transit stops

Existing conditions on Ring Road - Options:

- 1) One vehicular lane/one cycling lane + median (within existing road dimensions)
- 2) Bi-directional vehicle lanes + 2 unidirectional cycling lanes (exceeds existing road dimensions)
- 3) One vehicle lane/one parking lane + separated multi-modal connection (pedestrians & cyclists) – (road dimensions similar)

Discussion points by the Committee:

- Ring Road walkability and pedestrian safety – with 2 lanes of fast traveling vehicles
- Potential parking lane – service vehicles needing dedicated drop areas
- Concern with single lane from a Campus Security perspective – one accident/breakdown and access for emergency response vehicles
- Finding a way to limit service and other vehicles inside the Ring
- People wanting to cut through campus with their vehicles for inter-city travel
- Having cafes and seating areas along Ring Road will encourage the greater community to park and enjoy the campus

Next Steps:

- Develop draft Campus Plan: July to mid-August
- Review draft plan with Steering Committee – late August
- Review draft plan with CPC – September 21st meeting
- Campus & community engagement – drop-in open house October 21st
- Create final Campus Plan: November – December, with consideration to the feedback received from the phase 2 engagement activities

Final discussion by the Committee (thoughts/ideas/red flags, etc.):

- Process question re Ring Road development options- how granular is Dialog getting?
 - Not a blueprint for construction but more a framework for ideas/concepts – which will then require a layer of planning/details
- Is everything in the draft concept plan physically possible?
 - Some pieces would need creativity/nothing insurmountable.
- Easier to get support for removing vegetation, obtaining permits, etc., if is part of a larger scheme with the plan
- Will location of new student housing be included in community consultation?
 - New development will be concentrated in current area, with the possibility of a pod of development on the west side of the campus
- “Focused first phase” slide might conflict with academic programming and the priorities that are set for capital development
 - Suggestion made for North-South band from BEC expansion southwards. Opportunity to adjust to recognize a blended approach
- Re potential building sites slide (#70) – a couple of sites are missing, as well as parking lot 2
 - This was an oversight
- Next step in outreach, relating to Ring Rd. options is more “inform” in nature rather than consulting, although feedback will still be received
 - Consideration will be given to a phased approach in the development of the overall transportation network

- There was concurrence on taking the two way Ring Rd. option #2 off the table; need for long term approach which calms/reduces/slows down campus traffic.
 - It was noted that the Ring Rd. approach requires discussion on the use of the second lane, relative to cycling, transit, service vehicle and possible parking uses.
- Further discussion is needed re Ring Road options, including access for people with disability and parking options for the different lots.
 - It was noted that lot 1 has Ring Rd. access only. In addition, lot 6 which is designated for a future parking structure is some distance from the facilities within the ring. Opportunities may exist in the future to reallocate parking spaces that are currently assigned to the student residences.

The committee offered thanks to the Dialog team for their great work, and for listening and discussing the various points and concerns outlined.

8. Adjournment

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

9. Next Meeting: September 21, 2015 – 2:30 – 4:30 pm ASB Lobby Boardroom 120