

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of Meeting: Sept. 21, 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
√	David Castle	R	Bruce Kilpatrick
√	Carmen Charette	√	Alison Ducharme
√	Katy Mateer	√	Kristi Simpson
√	Catherine Krull		
√	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
			Guests: Dialog BC:
		√	Jennifer Fix
		√	Martin Nielsen
		√	Antonio Gomez-Palacio
		√	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 June 24th, 2015 were approved as circulated.

3. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Kuehne chaired the meeting and welcomed new committee members Catherine Krull, Dean of Social Sciences and UVSS representative Bronte Renwick-Shields. Following round table introductions, Dr. Kuehne welcomed the consultants, Dialog BC, to the meeting and commended the good work of the campus plan update steering committee over the summer, as well as the work by Dialog to take feedback and incorporate it into 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 Campus Plan, Dated Sept 14, 2015

Mr. Nielsen opened the Dialog presentation by noting the milestone nature of this meeting; almost a year ago the campus plan update process began with stakeholder interviews, seeking input on the direction of the plan.

Mr. Nielsen turned the presentation over to Mr. Gomez-Palacio, who outlined the three phases of the plan (Phase 1 – begin the conversation; Phase 2 – develop the plan; and Phase 3 – finalize the plan), as well as several ongoing campus initiatives informing the plan, including:

- Strategic Plan 2012
- UVic Edge 2015
- Ongoing work of the Campus Planning Committee
- Various studies – including those on parking, open space & naturalized areas, buildings & infrastructure, energy, and so on.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio then made note of the “big moves” of the plan, including:

- 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 have less profile and attention; also east side near residences
- Elevating cycling & transit – great options for arriving on campus
- A Focused First Phase – east/west nodes; get the most 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.

Frameworks:

1) Open space –

- Huge part of UVic’s character
- Connecting open spaces together
- Identification of natural areas
- Green belt surrounding campus
- Landscaped & programmable areas – complementary ties/recognition of key corridors & linkages
- Ring Road & proposed promenades

2) Built form –

- Structures/buildings/interface framing open spaces
- Future building sites – based on premise of infilling/framing areas of circulation & open spaces
- Multiple objectives
- 10-40 years – long term opportunities
- Architectural character & heritage
- Outlying lands – ISC, Cedar Hill Corner and Queenswood – short-term uses/tenants/protect future function over the long term

3) Movement/Mobility –

- Reinforcing walkability
- More movement options
- Viable and attractive options
- Cycling network/infrastructure
- Reimagining Ring Road – making it walkable/more of a people place

Discussion by the committee followed, including the following points:

- The need for bigger and flexible classrooms to reflect new teaching styles
- Possibility of outdoor classrooms and recognition of learning happening in more informal peer to peer settings across campus

- Importance of trans-disciplinary dialogues
- Connection between physical learning environment and academic learning
- Flexible spaces for collaboration/idea sharing
- Add more words in the Principles section (Principles 1 and 9) to reflect “extraordinary learning environment,” the availability of ‘spaces for the sharing of ideas and collaborative learning’ and, ‘a more vibrant learning community’. Re-order so that Principle 9: Vibrant Campus is moved next to Principle 1: Academic Priorities section to reflect key plan foundations. Vibrant campus – includes those spaces with flexible learning opportunities
- Extended campus hours
- Choice of East-West promenade versus North-South connections
- Opportunity for added vibrancy along promenade with addition of limited cost seating areas, etc... – huge investment not needed
- New development adjacent to Ring Road will make it more attractive and friendly for use by campus neighbours/communities
- Repairing and enhancing connections on campus, particularly to the Arts area
- Pedestrian conflict areas on Ring Road
- Amending Figure 1.4.4 Existing Conditions: Pedestrian Circulation to identify the crosswalks at the area by parking lot 1 and the bus stop
- Need to address/resolve current congestion in the area of the Quad before proceeding with a promenade concept
- Feasibility of single lane on the east side of campus with parking lot/bus stop/pedestrian issues and the exiting of traffic from Parking lot 1
- Safety issues – McKenzie/Gordon Head area at the north west corner of the campus, forested area near the Engineering / Computer Science building
- Extending the East-West promenade to the student residences area of campus
- Cedar Hill Corner, Fig. 4.2.3 Outlying Lands on page 70 needs to be adjusted so that the boundary excludes the forested area on the west side, adjacent to Hobbs Creek
- Longer term possibility of accessing parking lot 1 without using Ring Road, may be available through the use of the undeveloped Haro Road right of way owned by the District of Oak Bay
- Ring Road parking issues- creates buffer/distance from moving cars, which increases pedestrian comfort. Functions as restricted short term parking for visitors/mobility challenged/drop offs and pickups. Vehicles tend to travel more slowly through areas with parking.
- Safety concerns if the single lane of traffic gets blocked; however, all promenades will be configured in order to accommodate vehicles if this situation arises. Additional emergency planning would likely be needed for possible scenarios involving a traffic lane that is totally blocked
- The discussion on the Future Design of Ring Road, section 5.2.7 on page 86, should reference the fact that further studies will have to take into consideration the large number of vehicles that exit from Parking lot 1, which would be impacted by a reduction in the travel lanes from two to one
- Concern with language/bullet point around possible changes to natural areas inside and outside of Ring Road, page 44, Protected Areas (South Woods, Garry Oak Meadow, Bowker Creek, Cunningham Woods) – language needed regarding process/consultation around limited changes or developments within natural areas
- Need for more explicit language around the potential for more land-based learning related to indigenous culture history and interests, natural area reclamation work
- Early History section on page 9 – reference to Douglas treaty – some further review is needed

As the Committee discussion concluded, Dr. Kuehne drew attention to 6 issues in the draft Plan needing further attention and review:

1. Principles section – the important linkages between academics and research and the physical spaces on campus need further recognition with adjustments to Principles 1 and 9.
2. Parking lot 1 and bus stop area crosswalk with pedestrian and vehicle conflict – adjustment to include on Figure 1.4.4 Existing Conditions: Pedestrian Circulation.
3. Providing clarification and additional direction under which development of a limited scale could be considered within the natural protected areas referenced on pg. 44 3.2 Open Space Policy Directions.
4. The need to reference the potential for land-based learning related to indigenous culture history and interests, including natural area reclamation work. Further review will be undertaken on the paragraph which references the Douglas Treaty, in section 1.3 Uvic Yesterday: History and Evolution on page 9.
5. The discussion on the Future Design of Ring Road, section 5.2.7 on page 86, needs to include reference to the fact that further studies will have to take into consideration the large number of vehicles from Parking lot 1 which have only the Ring Road to access the lot and to exit from and which would be impacted by a reduction in the travel lanes from two to one lane.
6. Cedar Hill Corner, Fig. 4.2.3 Outlying Lands on page 70 needs to be adjusted so that the boundary excludes the forested area on the west side, adjacent to Hobbs Creek

At the conclusion of discussion, the following motion was proposed:

MOTION (D. Castle/A. Rowe)

THAT the Campus Planning Committee recommend to the President that the draft Campus Plan dated September 14, 2015, be adjusted as discussed, to provide for a revised draft Plan to be prepared for engagement and review with the campus and external community, as scheduled, in October.

CARRIED

Dr. Kuehne commended Dialog for not only their hard work, but how they've engaged and listened to feedback as part of the process. Ms. Gorrill offered thanks to the steering committee, along with Ms. Simpson and Mr. Connelly, who have led the process for the university.

7. October Campus and Community Engagement Activities (Dialog)

- Steering committee meeting – Oct 7th
- Campus Planning Committee meeting – Oct 13th
- Mobile booths – Oct 19 and 20
- Campus and 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
- January 2016 – bring back a final Plan for approval

8. Capital Projects Update (D. Perry)

- Fairly busy summer – lots of repairs to tripping hazards/sidewalks. Concrete maintenance, including sidewalk repair/extension/asphalt repairs, will continue into the fall.
- Replacement of a major sewer line from the University Centre
- McKinnon renovations – temporary excavations/small gym and racquet court floors
- Continuing Studies expansion – more detail on site cleanup coming from contractors, with completion on schedule for January occupancy
- New student residence facility – Request for Expressions of Interest (REI) from consultants – shortlisting for a Request for Proposals (RFP) with planning exercises scheduled into January/February 2016

9. Community Liaison Update (A. Ducharme)

- Community Association Liaison Committee (CALC) meeting last week – presented overview of consultation process around the campus plan update and invited representatives to the October 21st workshop. Mr. Connelly has offered to attend individual community association meetings to give updates, if requested.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

9. Next Meeting: October 13, 2015 – 3:00 – 4:30 pm ASB Lobby Boardroom 120
