

# UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

## CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Minutes of Meeting: December 7, 2015 (9:00 am – 10:30 am)  
Administrative Services Building Boardroom 120**

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

### 1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Kuehne welcomed everyone to the meeting. Agenda is approved as circulated.

### 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF November 20, 2015

Minutes approved as circulated.

### 3. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

No remarks from the chair.

### 4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

No business arising.

## 5. CORRESPONDENCE

No correspondence.

## 6. REGULAR BUSINESS

### Final Campus Plan

Neil Connelly indicated that over the last few weeks work has been undertaken to finalize the Campus Plan and incorporate the feedback received from the Committee. Antonio will speak to the final Plan as circulated to the Committee.

Antonio Gomez-Palacio provided a presentation where he reviewed the process, the vision, principles, big moves, revisions to the Oct 14 draft, implementation strategy, and next steps. His notes included:

- We designed a three phase program and we are now at the end stages. Everyone has had an opportunity to review the draft Plan and provide comments throughout the process.
- Vision: This needs to be at the forefront of every presentation of the CPC because it is very easy to lose sight of the reason why we undertook the process, and also allows us to measure everything we do against the vision. Prevents us from going off track and making incremental decisions that are misaligned with it.
- Principles: Academic priorities are at the forefront of the Plan, and development decisions will give priority to the academic, teaching, and research needs of the university.
  - A vibrant campus encourages the establishment of destinations, uses, and services to create an active, healthy, vibrant, 24/7 campus. How we move ahead without first set of investments in the campus, like the new residence, it will be important that we reflect this principle.
  - Maintaining a positive relationship with the campus and broader community
  - Natural areas are a topic that arose a lot of passion among stakeholders and the campus plan is positioned to reflect this.
  - Open space system is one of the hallmarks of the plan, and is an important way that the identity of the campus is captured.
  - Compact growth manages development carefully, seeking to develop a campus that encourages synergies and an efficient use of land. There was a lot of support for this.
  - Sustainable buildings and facilities demonstrate the university's commitment to sustainable practices and positive relationships with open spaces surrounding the buildings.
  - Spirit of place enhances social interaction on a scale that is friendly to people on foot, recognizes First Nation history and presence, and preserves the unique Pacific Rim island character of the campus.
  - Movement and accessibility – the university is committed to prioritizing pedestrian movement, making walking or wheelchair use convenient, and everyone buys into this. The challenge is in how this is implemented, etc.

- **Big Moves:** Connecting nature through the “green ring”. It supports the identity of the campus, and creates a green threshold that everyone, no matter what direction they access campus from, pass through. This is a positive undertaking because we can engage a lot of expertise from the community to develop a trail network, extend our natural areas and ecologies, and think about the entirety of the campus as part of the natural system.
  - A renewed commitment to walk-ability was loved by many. Upgrading the “Grand Promenade” will allow people to see how we are delivering on the Campus Plan. It can be done cost effectively with large visual impact to the campus.
  - A Compact Campus
  - Ring Road as a People Place: this was a “revolutionary” idea at the beginning. People are excited about it but eager to get into details about how it would be designed. The whole notion of changing the character of Ring Road is widely accepted.
  - New and invigorated centres of animation. This will be a longer-term goal, but it engages the arts, the sciences, and will take time to develop.
  - Enhancing cycling and transit on campus and in terms of how the campus is interconnected with regional traffic flows. The university will have to work with municipalities and cannot deliver on this alone.
  - Grand Promenade – a real opportunity to do a big bang with modest cost.
  - A focused first phase would allow us to keep our early investments contained so we can shift the perception of the campus and deliver on the plan.
  - Long-term flexibility for outlying lands presents an opportunity, and shows that the plan is not a blueprint for construction but a framework for decisions.
- Engagement activities included:
  - 11 Mobile Booth Locations
  - 2 Open Houses
  - 1 Stakeholder Workshop
  - 3 Resident Association Meetings
  - 25+ Emails
  - TOTAL: 600-700 distinct engagements
- Antonio concluded by emphasizing that there has been great support for the Plan, but lots of interest in getting into the details. There’s excitement and so we need to use that momentum to move into the first focused phase.

### **Revisions to Oct 14. Draft Plan:**

#### Open Space:

- Some confusion between “protected areas” and “perpetually protected” areas – the term perpetual was intended to reflect the fact that there are covenants in place, but many people were confused by the difference between them, and so we have collapsed the terms.
- A study area has been identified in a small section of Cunningham woods. In the previous draft, the north part of Cunningham woods was shown as a potential building site, which was controversial. Upon further review, and recognizing that there is no immediate building needs for that site, we would reserve the opportunity in the future to conduct further study should such a program and building proposal arise in the future.
- The intent for ongoing use of the Campus Community Garden in the current location has been

clarified. It is not the intent that the site be changed in the future, and so language has been added to reflect this.

- Language has also been added to clarify that the Concept Plan is not intended to be delivered as rendered, but rather, that it is illustrative only. We have moved some of the schematics used to illustrate potential options to the Appendix and expressed that additional study and consultation would be undertaken prior to any development.
- Removed Figure for Service Vehicle Access for New Future Buildings, as this is an operational detail.
- Emphasized the goals for Ring Road while moving design options as shown in road sections and policies to Appendix 1: Potential Road Design Options.

Implementation Strategy items include:

- Studies for the Grand Promenade, Athletics Precinct, University Drive Gateway, Natural Areas and Grounds Management Plan, Public Realm Improvements, etc.... The Grand Promenade might be one of the earlier undertakings that could capture imaginations and that there is a lot of interest in.
- Renew the 5-year Letter of Understanding with the Campus Community Garden
- Update the 2004 Stormwater Management plan

Land Use and Built Form

- Prepare building and campus sustainability guidelines
- Prepare Master Plans for outlying lands
- Update the 2011 Campus Energy Master Plan

Mobility:

- Prepare plans for universal accessibility and cycling
- Prepare a Ring Road study
- Monitor campus traffic and improve transportation demand management
- Liaise with BC Transit and municipalities

Engagement:

- This is not the end of engagement – it will carry on and that needs to be clear to our community. Maintain active collaboration, harmonize zoning, monitor and report on our progress, and it is good practice to review the Campus Plan every ~10 years.

Next Steps:

- Mid-Jan: Present the Campus Plan to the Campus and Broader Community
- Dec.-Jan: Provide updated communications on changes and the final Plan
- Late-Jan: Campus Plan recommendation and report to the Board of Governors meeting

Antonio also indicated that there were a number of areas where minor text changes and edits were

made. (grammar, etc...).

Dr. Kuehne asked if we could pause and consider whether there are any questions or comments from the Committee for Antonio.

Mr. Connelly noted that there is a Centre for Forest Biology research compound on the Cedar Hill corner which was not previously shown in this area, and it is important because it reflects the fact that there is use of this site now that is directly tied to our academic mission.

Dr. Kuehne confirmed that the Committee was comfortable with small edits being made to the Plan after its approval today.

Ms. Gorrill reminded the Committee that at the last meeting there was discussion that the Implementation section of the plan not drive specific actions but rather highlight key areas, and so this means there is more work for the Committee.

Ms. Charette said that from a communications perspective, should we consider the implementation section to be items that all need to be done in the next 10 years?

Ms. Simpson noted that it is a long term vision with components that will extend beyond 10 years.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio said as part of our communications we will need to think about how we communicate when we deliver on different aspects of the Plan. He noted that it is important to focus on milestones rather than number of years (i.e. if there were undertakings tied to say, student enrolment, then the specific timing does not need to be defined and it allows the plan to be based on need).

Ms. Charette suggested that we remove the words “next several years” so that the living-document aspect is the focus rather than the timing. Committee members agreed.

Dr. Tiedge said it is important that we don't convey that there is funding and focus on landscaping and aesthetics when academic building development is badly needed but can't start without substantial budgetary and donor-based activity.

Ms. Gorrill said there is nothing in the Implementation section that covers communication. The Committee agreed that it should be added under item #18, Monitoring and Progress Reports.

After the discussion, the following motion was proposed:

**(Karras / Shaw)**

***THAT the Campus Planning Committee recommend to the President that the final Campus Plan, be adopted.***

**CARRIED**

No opposition.

### **Next Steps**

Dr. Kuehne thanked Ms. Simpson for her excellent leadership and she also thanked Mr. Connelly for his efforts to ensure deep engagement. She then thanked the Steering Committee members for the detailed work they undertook since the fall of 2014. She also extended a special thank-you to Antonio and the team at Dialog for the way that they have worked with the CPC and with everyone that needed to be engaged on the project.

Ms. Mailloux was thanked by Dr. Kuehne for ensuring that all the administrative and engagement details were sorted out for the project. Ms. Simpson also thanked the Steering Committee for being

so dedicated and for their patience throughout the last 15 months.

Ms. Gorrill thanked Ruth Young, Tom Downie, Jim Dunsdon and Joel Lynn – people we sought additional advice and insight on for specific aspects of the Plan.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 10:00am.

**8. NEXT MEETING:** April 18 2016, 12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m., ASB Lobby Boardroom 120.