



General Faculties Council  
Facilities Development Committee  
Approved Open Session Minutes

Thursday, October 24, 2013  
3-07 South Academic Building (SAB)  
1:30 PM - 4:30 PM

---

**ATTENDEES:**

Voting Members:

Colleen Skidmore	Chair (Delegate), Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Elisabeth Le	Member, Academic Staff (and Vice-Chair)
Monty Bal (Delegate)	Member (Delegate), Graduate Students' Association Vice-President (Academic)
Phil Haswell	Member, Support Staff
Bart Becker (Delegate)	Member, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Josh Le	Member (Delegate), Students' Union Vice-President (Academic)
Shannon O'Byrne	Member, Academic Staff

Non-Voting Members:

Ben Louie	Member, University Architect, Observer
-----------	--

Presenter(s):

Emily Ball	Community Relations Officer, University Relations
Bart Becker	Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Kelly Hopkin	Senior Campus Planner (Architecture), Office of the University Architect, Planning and Project Delivery, Facilities and Operations
Josh Le	Vice-President (Operations and Finance), Students' Union
Ben Louie	University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Colleen Skidmore	Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Staff:

Garry Bodnar, Coordinator and Scribe, GFC Facilities Development Committee

**OPENING SESSION**

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Le/O'Byrne

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Agenda.

**CARRIED**

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of September 26, 2013

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Haswell/Becker

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Minutes of September 26, 2013.

**CARRIED**

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair commented on a number of items of interest to members.

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. Landscape Plan for the Students' Union Building (SUB) Expansion

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Josh Le, Vice-President (Operations and Finance), Students' Union

*Purpose of the Proposal:* To seek GFC FDC's approval for the landscape plans for the Students' Union Building (SUB) expansion so that it may be tendered and constructed by the project general contractor; and to create student friendly outdoor places that integrate campus pathways, reinforce open spaces, enhance campus experiences, and integrate into a larger vision of open space and pathway design for the North Campus.

*Discussion:*

The Landscape Plan for SUB was introduced to members by Mr Louie. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, he spoke to the 'Campus Open Space' and landscaping goals for the institution, generally; to SUB landscaping 'deliverables', specifically; and to the details of the Landscape Plan for this facility (as set out in the material before members). He provided members with a series of illustrations representing this space when completed.

Mr Le complemented the presentation by describing the wide range of programming and those activities anticipated to take place in SUB's renovated spaces and its new landscaped plaza. He commented on a further series of illustrations of the area along 89 Avenue, south of the building.

Mr Louie continued by speaking to the type of vegetation, much of which would be indigenous, to be deployed in support of this Landscape Plan; to the lighting that would be incorporated into the affected spaces; and to the manner in which this plan would be integrated with the landscaping around the Physical Activity and Wellness (PAW) Centre and along 87 Avenue.

During the ensuing discussion, members provided questions and comments including, but not limited to, the following: clarification on access to SUB at its south face, directly across from the PAW Centre; clarification regarding construction logistics and how these will affect pedestrian and vehicular flow between the two facilities; whether or not rodent infestations were considered to be an issue/problem in the late Fall and into the Winter, particularly in the newly-renovated lower elevation of SUB; clarification on the timeline associated with the project and how student services affected by this work would be accommodated during construction; the nature and type of exterior seating incorporated into the Landscape Plan; whether or not vehicular traffic would be allowed along that stretch of 89 Avenue between SUB and the PAW Centre, after construction and landscaping were completed; where smokers would be situated outside a newly-renovated SUB; and clarification on how the planners would ensure the lower levels of this renovated facility would not be susceptible to flooding.

Motion: Becker/Haswell

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council and on the recommendation of Planning and Project Delivery, the proposed Students' Union Building (SUB) Landscaping Design Development (set forth in Attachment 2) as the basis for further development of design documents.

**CARRIED**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 5. North Campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Amendment

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Bart Becker, Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations); Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Emily Ball, Community Relations Officer, University Relations

*Purpose of the Proposal:* To seek additional stakeholder feedback from GFC FDC on proposed land use changes as presented to the wider community on September 25, 2013; and to amend the University's North Campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and, more specifically, on Sections 6 and 7 of the 2002 documents with a focus on Sectors 1 to 11 located at the University's North Campus.

#### *Discussion:*

This item was introduced to members by Mr Becker. In his brief presentation, he spoke to the consultation on sector planning that had occurred with the wider community since 2002, when the LRDP was first introduced. He noted the amendments to the North Campus LRDP were the culmination of all the activities that had taken place on the Campus since that time. He pointed out to members the illustrative boards that had been set up before the start of the meeting around the venue's perimeter—each board illustrated a different aspect of the original sector planning and, by extension, demonstrated the activity that had taken place between 2002 and the present and then extrapolated further activity into the immediate and medium-

term future. He noted that he would walk members through each board in turn in the same manner in which they had been presented to community members and solicit members' feedback accordingly.

Ms Ball continued the presentation by summarizing community responses, noting that they had been solicited based on a well-established consultative process utilized each time the LRDP is to be amended. For the most part, she stated, the community representatives had been happy with the material presented to them by the University. Further, the concerns they had raised could be described, generally, as follows:

- The closure of 89 Avenue to pedestrians only and questions raised on how vehicles would be accommodated after the closure took place.
- The northwest corner of the North Campus was an area requiring further study; the University would ensure the community was engaged when the institution planned to move to possible changes to the area.
- The increase in the number of students living on the North Campus and the impact that this increased density would have on surrounding communities.
- A series of operational issues (eg, expropriation of land).

Ms Ball concluded her presentation by outlining the University's plan for further consultation with the wider community, including an Open House to be held on November 19, 2013.

Mr Louie provided further context with regard to the boards provided for members' review and detailed the information contained therein. He noted they exemplified updates to the 2002 LRDP, which was seen originally as a 30-year plan. They 'spoke' to land use; campus life; open space; public vehicular transportation systems and parking; and pedestrian and bicycle circulation. (A brief recess was called by the Chair to allow members the opportunity to review the poster boards more closely.)

During the ensuing discussion, members provided questions and comments including, but not limited to, the following: a query as to whether or not the silence of the wider community on facilities-related issues is a good sign or not; clarification as to whether or not the University's Administration works with the executives of the surrounding community associations; clarification on how University open houses were advertised to capture the interest and attention of community members and to encourage them to participate in these sessions; commentary that, despite the complexity of the information contained in the poster boards, they were very self-explanatory and good distillations of a great deal of data; and clarification on how institutional lands would be deployed in the future for academic uses and academically-purposed buildings.

## 6. Future East Campus Village (ECV) Development

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Bart Becker, Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations); Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Kelly Hopkin, Senior Campus Planner (Architecture), Office of the University Architect, Planning and Project Delivery, Facilities and Operations

*Purpose of the Proposal:* To discuss and receive feedback on the materials that were presented to the public during focus groups and open houses regarding the future developments of East Campus Village (ECV), with the feedback received from GFC FDC to be incorporated into the consultative process as Facilities and Operations proceeds with long-term planning for the development of ECV.

*Discussion:*

Mr Becker introduced this item to members by stating that the University has a very good idea of how this area of the North Campus is likely to be developed over the next five-year period. He spoke to the phasing plan for ECV, noting that the institution is addressing competing demands from the community. The plan, he commented, included not-yet-approved projects (ie, certain aspects represent 'blue-sky thinking', albeit grounded in solid planning). He noted that this plan was still in its very preliminary stages and that GFC FDC will see more of this as it unfolds.

Mr Louie, aided by a PowerPoint presentation, continued the presentation by speaking to Sector 8 planning, addressing what is being maintained; what the proposed changes to this sector are; and specific elements of the developments in this area. Mr Hopkin then worked through the 'weather map', with additional commentary from both Mr Louie and Mr Becker, addressing: development as of December, 2012 (685 residence beds available in this sector); potential and actual development as of December, 2013 (905 beds); potential development as of December, 2014 (985 – 1005 beds); and potential development as of December, 2015 (1420 – 1475 beds). Further, Mr Hopkin spoke to the issues of: the Garneau Historic District, construction, and replication; the preliminary concepts for 89 Avenue through this sector; a future ECV Student Residence (Preliminary Program and Design Study); and a future Leadership College (residence) (Preliminary Program and Design Study).

During the ensuing discussion, members provided questions and comments including, but not limited to, the following: a query as to whether North Garneau was, for the City of Edmonton, a prime area considered for densification; what the next steps were for a Leadership College and where the idea for such a college originated; clarification on why the Garneau community was concerned about having academic buildings in close proximity; what the nature of consultation had been that led to the concepts for programming for the College and which other like colleges had been used as models for this one; commentary on the use of the terms "leadership" and "college"; commentary on the 'packaging' of the University's residences; and expressed concerns about the perceived elitist nature of the proposed 'Leadership College' and its location.

The Chair noted that GFC FDC would continue to be engaged in discussion centring on the future development plans for ECV.

7. Projects Update from the Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

There were no documents.

*Presenter:* Bart Becker, Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

*Purpose of the Proposal:* For information/discussion.

*Discussion:*

Because of time constraints, Mr Becker provided a brief projects update to members, referring to: the Michener Park redevelopment open house; the progressing work of the Campus Open Spaces Committee; and the 'good news' associated with the development of the Bike Library in the Students' Union Building (SUB).

8. Question Period

There were no questions.

### **INFORMATION REPORTS**

9. Items Approved by the GFC Facilities Development Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items.

10. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items.

### **CLOSING SESSION**

11. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.