

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Minutes of Meeting: November 30, 2017 (9:00 am – 10:30 am)
Michael Williams Building Boardroom 120**

Membership			
	Voting:		Ex-Officio:
√	Valerie Kuehne, Co-Chair	√	Ron Proulx
R	Gayle Gorrill, Co-Chair	√	Tony Eder
R	David Castle	R	Bruce Kilpatrick
√	Carmen Charette	√	Jennifer Vornbrock
R	Nancy Wright	√	Kristi Simpson
√	Catherine Krull		
√	Thomas Tiedje		Other:
√	Andrew Rowe	√	James Pepler
√	Karena Shaw	√	David Perry
√	Tanya Tran (GSS)	√	Mike Wilson
√	Sheryl Karras	√	Melanie Groves
√	Michael Hawkshaw		
√	Lesley Patten		Guests:
R	Pierre-Paul Angelblazer (UVSS)	√	Betsy Moyer
		√	Noah Friedman (Perkins + Will)
		√	Jana Foit (Perkins + Will)
		√	Kathryn MacLeod
			Tony Heesterman
√ = In Attendance R = Regrets Noted			

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF March 09, 2017

The minutes were approved as circulated.

3. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

Valerie Kuehne welcomed new members to the committee. After a roundtable of introductions, Valerie delivered a brief synopsis of the committee's Terms of Reference, responsibilities, and functions.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

No business arising from the minutes.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

No correspondence.

6. REGULAR BUSINESS

a. 2017/2018 Five Year Capital Plan

- Ms. Simpson presented on the 2017/2018 Five Year Capital Plan. She outlined the priorities included expansion, deferred maintenance and seismic priorities formed through discussions with campus leaders, deans, AVPs, the Executive team, and others and aligned with government priorities. Ms. Simpson explained about the Ministry space standards and how it drives the conversations with government on how much space campus will be allocated.
- The #1 capital priority with respect to expansion is Student Residence. Costs are evolving due to the potential to add food and current construction market price escalation. Additions to Engineering and the Computer Science Building, Business and Economics Building, the Fraser Building, seismic upgrades, and an Indigenous Legal Lodge are all expansion and renewal projects in planning.
- Planning priorities include Social Sciences and Science. Consultants were brought in to explore space optimization and better ways to use space for a few faculties and will continue in 2017/18. Health Services space pressures and related renovations as well as classroom expansion programs are also moving forward.

b. New Residence Facility Planning

Recommendation:

THAT the Campus Planning Committee recommend to the President, that Site 3 (Ring Road), Site 4 (Cadboro Commons), Site 5 (Parking Lot 1 – West), and Site 6 (Parking Lot 1 – East) be approved for new student residence buildings.

Moved: Catherine Krull
Seconded: Carmen Charette
Abstained: Sheryl Karras
CARRIED

Committee Discussion Included:

- Mr. Wilson provided a presentation of the proposed Student Residence Site Recommendation.
- Program objectives for the new student residence facility includes the increase of at least 600 beds that consist of ~350-400 dorm-style rooms and ~200-280 pod-type rooms with shared kitchen and living spaces. Including food facilities in this project could mean replacing or renewing Cadboro Commons, which will address current issues within that building.
- Campus Plan objectives that are guiding the program include improvements in connectivity within Campus, bringing uses to Ring Road, activating the promenade areas, and looking at new and renewed public spaces. Mr. Wilson explained that they are exploring opportunities related to building heights, essentially looking to build 'up' rather than 'out'.
- The site selection process supports the building program objectives, maximizes the objectives of the Campus Plan, meets the operational needs of Residential Services, and supports a new food facility. The project committee narrowed site options to 4 locations, which are all being recommended. One of the challenges for this form of development is the low-density development and ease of wayfinding. A shift in the way the university builds is need to complete the objectives in our new campus plan.
- The proposed north/south promenade will aid with wayfinding, and act as a spine for future development.
- The scale of the program requires two buildings to be developed. Sites 3 & 4 are the Ring Road and Cadboro Commons option, which requires the demolition of the Margaret Newton and Emily Carr Residences and the removal of Cadboro Commons. Sites 5 & 6 include Parking Lot 1 West and East, and requires the removal of R. Haig Brown and Poole House residences. The

Campus Planning Committee is being asked to support each of these sites, however only two of the four will be developed. Sites 3 & 4 would be chosen if a new food services facility is added to the project. Mr. Wilson continues to explain some of the history of Cadboro Commons and the upgrades it needs concerning long-term maintenance issues. Phase 1 of sites 3 & 4 would be the deconstruction of the existing residences, replacing them with a mixed-use building fronting Ring Road, with residences above. Phase 2 would require the replacement of Cadboro Commons with a new residence facility. Sites 5 & 6 also include the deconstruction of buildings with deferred maintenance issues. This option also includes the removal of ~140 parking stalls, does not include a food services facility, but can be completed in one phase.

- The project is looking to explore opportunities for additional heights. Ranges in 25-39 meters are being considered. Mr. Wilson showed examples of differing building heights on campus for comparison. This project represents looking at an incremental height increases to support densification and a compact campus, both are commitments in the new Campus Plan.
- Public realm improvements in this plan include creating Ring Road as a 'people place', implementing the Grand and South Promenade, creating centres of animation, increased walkability, and a focused 1st phase of the East side of campus. A key focus is to make the ground floors more animated, visible, and active from the promenades.
- Planning of the North/South Promenade include efforts to make it a main street for residences and build community among different buildings through a public space while keeping it as a pedestrian and cyclist-oriented pathway. Planning will also establish it as an access for future building development. It will be 18-20 meters in width, so residences are not crowded, avoiding windows that look into each other.
- The Grande Promenade will link east campus to west, will be pedestrian- and cycle-oriented, and a place for people to hang out and socialize. The width will be a minimum 12 meters wide. Transparency at grade is, yet again, another focus for the project.
- The South Promenade will link the east and west of south campus, will be a minimum width of 6 meters, and espouse the same themes as the other promenades.
- Community engagement is a key part of the planning process. Engagement with both on and off-campus stakeholders is crucial. We will be holding formal and informal open houses, on and off campus. A comprehensive engagement plan is being developed for 2018. The Community Engagement Framework is guiding the external engagement. Feedback is already being collected from students, and the gathering of input from a broad range of on-campus and off-campus stakeholders will follow.
- Next steps include discussions on a consultation approach, as a part of the Community Engagement Framework, with the Community Association Liaison Committee, submitting a business case to Board of Governors for the food service facility – this will drive which sites will be developed, followed by community consultations on site principles, then back to the Campus Planning Committee in March 2018 for the approval of the program, and finally to the Board of Governors for the program approval.
- Ms. Tran asked how close the project team is working with those in the Cycling Plan? Mr. Wilson explained that he is the lead for the cycling plan and that these developments will help to create a better cycling experience on campus.
- Ms. Karras asked about the site that might go into the parking lot, and how this will affect the general demand. Mr. Wilson explained that they have a traffic consultant who is looking at the overall campus supply and demand, looking at optimal parking occupancy rates at peak times, and how many stalls will need to be replace elsewhere.
- Mr. Rowe commented that Haro road access ought to be explore no matter which site is chosen, specifically if site 5 &6 is chosen given that Parking Lot 1 is such a traffic choke point. Ms. Simpson and Mr. Wilson both agreed that increased access in that area would be beneficial.
- Ms. Charette asked if the development team has a preferred site, and if so, is that being expressed to the community? Mr. Wilson responded that the prospect of a new food facility is the main driver for the desired site, which hinges on the financial plan to be presented and voted on by the Board of Governors in January 2018.
- Ms. Karras asked about other drivers for favouring site 5 & 6. Ms. Simpson explained that their first choice is the Ring Road, Cadboro Commons as it lends itself to many needed upgrades

and renewals for campus including a forward-thinking food operation that is flexible and business-case driven.

- Ms. Patten commented that she agrees with the concept of an open and active promenade environment, which is better for security.
- Ms. Kuehne asked if there are any other aspect of the student residence project that are different. Mr. Wilson explained that a big change with this project would be the scale. It will be much bigger, and they want to maintain and enhance the green aspects and beauty of the campus through this project.
- Mr. Tiedje commented that a 600 bed increase is a good start but still falls short of the need. Are we thinking of where to put the next residence building? He also commented that we should make the residences as high as possible. Ms. Simpson responded that the site planning work can be used for future developments, however the university's inability to take on more debt and borrow stymies our ability to move forward on additional student residence projects. Ms. MacLeod added that operationally it would be quite a strain to increase the number of new beds on campus to more than 600 at one time. Mr. Tiedje then stated that Parking Lot 1 is already full and in demand, the removal of many of these spots will create plenty of anger. Mr. Wilson responded that the team understands the loss of the parking stalls will be an adjustment, but it is a sacrifice needed to improve the overall campus and pedestrian experience. Mr. Tiedje then commented that the South Promenade should be wider than 6 meters, especially if there will be a cycling route going through. Mr. Wilson responded that the widths of the Promenade are driven through feedback from the Campus Plan process.
- Ms. Vornbrock commented that we should be mindful of aspects that we are excited about that may pose challenges to the community Mr. Proulx added that this is the first project that is expected to respond to the Campus Plan, which had heavy community involvement. It will be important to make that connection apparent.

c. Campus Cycling Plan

Presented for Information

Committee Discussion Included:

- Mr. Wilson gave a presentation on the Cycling Plan for the committee's information. A significant message from the campus community is that they want improved levels of comfort and safety on shared roads. Mr. Wilson spoke about the current and desired campus modal splits and outcomes of the plan. They are looking to engage the campus community throughout the processes to refine the plan. The largest issue the plan will tackle is to improve safety and separation between cyclists and vehicles, and cyclist and pedestrians as necessary. They are also looking at how to best cycle around, and cross, Ring Road, lessen instances of near-misses within Ring Road, and cycling etiquette. Mr. Wilson stated that they are also looking at end-of-trip facilities, convenience, and repair stations.
- Phase 1 of the plan, which consisted of the generation of programs and ideas, is complete. Phase 2 looks to draft options for consultation of the physical changes to campus that may be required to improve cycling on campus. Phase 3 will take feedback from Phase 2, refine those concepts and physical changes into a draft plan which will be taken back to the community to see if they have met the objectives of the plan.
- Phase 1 included a very successful launch event, pop-up engagement events, an online survey with 1300 responses, and engagement with Engineering classes that looked at ways to enhance cycling on campus. A traffic survey that gathered data about on-campus intersections was also completed. Mr. Wilson led a cycling tour of campus with a consultant team to observe interaction between pedestrians and cyclists.
- Next steps for the Cycling Plan include consolidating a 'what we heard document' and working with an internal advisory team and technical advisory group through the development of the Cycling Network Plan. Finally, Mr. Wilson and his team will come back to the Campus Planning Committee in March or April 2018 to get feedback, and Phase 3 will include returning to the Campus Planning Committee for a recommendation to the President.

- Mr. Rowe asked if there is more opportunity to get people onto bikes and if campus was saturated with the current number of cyclists. Mr. Wilson responded that campus was designed largely for vehicles, and that the changes proposed in the cycling plan should make it easier and safer for cyclists. These changes are well timed in that Saanich is also making physical improvements for cyclists.
- Mr. Hawkshaw asked how the Uvic modal split compared to other universities. Mr. Wilson was able to speak about UBC's 70/30 split and the different challenges Uvic faces.
- Mr. Tiedje commented that the perceived risk and difficult access to campus negatively affects cycling numbers. He would like to see Ring Road reduced to one traffic lane, keeping another for cyclists and pedestrians. Mr. Wilson responded that they are in the early stages, and improvements to Ring Road will be looked at in Phase 2. Ms. Simpson added that there has been discussion on changes to Ring Road in the past, but there has yet to be consensus on any one option.
- Ms. Tran commented that graduate students represent a large percentage of cyclists who are dispersed all over campus, and that consideration should be made for well-lit areas and shelters all across campus.

d. Capital Projects Update

Committee Discussion Included:

- Mr. Perry spoke about the District Energy Plant. It is a LEED Gold building, and includes new vehicular charging stations that will be operational very soon. The building is in construction for another year and should be up and running this time next year. The plant replaces very old plants on campus, which frees up space and makes Uvic more energy efficient.
- The new Facilities Management Services Building is nearly complete and should be up and running in January 2018. It will house maintenance vehicles and Grounds, freeing up crowded spaces in other facilities, some of which are having seismic upgrades.
- The science building renewals includes \$20M from the government for lab upgrades in Petch. Cunningham and Elliot buildings have cooling and mechanical system upgrades for their lab spaces which will influence the South Promenade for at least another year.
- Seismic work from past KIP planning for buildings that are nearly tender-ready include the McPherson, Clearihue, MacLaurin, Elliott Lecture, and Farquhar Auditorium buildings.
- Preliminary program planning has begun for the Engineering addition and Fraser Building addition.
- Ms. Vornbrock commented that the District Energy Plant is a very cool and innovative addition to campus, and that we should think about an Open House that invites the community to see the building and highlight our commitment to sustainable energy.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Community Liaison Report

Ms. Vornbrock updated the committee on recent activities:

- Ms. Vornbrock began with a brief description of the function of the Community Association Liaison Committees (CALC). There has been two CALC meetings since the last CPC meeting. They have been very positive.
- There is a lot of interest in Mr. Wilson's housing presentation for the next meeting as surrounding communities are quite invested in any physical changes to campus.
- From time to time the university receives calls about off-campus student 'party houses'. We must remind the community that the university is not responsible for private citizens off campus, but the university does address these issues through bylaws, student codes of conduct, orientations, and our website.
- Queenswood continues to be an area of interest from the community perspective. Work will begin on how to best define and highlight this new space through the VP Research, with an opening likely in June 2018.

- Finally, meetings with Municipal Liaisons continue.
- Ms. Charette added that the cycling project is very important, with plenty of opportunity with Biketoria and liaising with surrounding municipalities.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

- 9. NEXT MEETING:** March 15th, 2018: MWB Boardroom 120 (9:00 – 10:00 am).