



# UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

---

General Faculties Council  
Facilities Development Committee  
Approved Open Session Minutes

Thursday, February 27, 2014  
2-31 South Academic Building (SAB)  
1:30 PM - 4:30 PM

---

### **ATTENDEES:**

#### Voting Members:

Olive Yonge (Delegate)	Chair, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Elisabeth Le	Vice-Chair, Academic Staff
Monty Bal (Delegate)	Member (Delegate), Graduate Students' Association Vice-President (Student Services)
Debbie Feisst	Member, Academic Staff
Cheryl Harwardt	Member, Academic Staff
Phil Haswell	Member, Support Staff
Don Hickey	Member, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Loren Kline	Member, Academic Staff, Cross-Representative from GFC APC
Josh Le (Delegate)	Member, Students' Union Vice-President (Academic)
Erasmus Okine	Member, Academic Staff
Joanne Profetto-McGrath	Member, Academic Staff

#### Non-Voting Members:

Bernie Kessels (Delegate)	Member, Vice-Provost and University Registrar
Ben Louie	Member, University Architect
Pat Jansen (Delegate)	Member, Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

#### Presenter(s):

Doug Dawson	Executive Director, Ancillary Services, Planning and Infrastructure
Don Hickey	Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Kelly Hopkin	Senior Campus Planner (Architecture), Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Martin Jones	Principal, GEC Architecture
Ben Louie	University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Olive Yonge	Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

#### Staff:

Garry Bodnar, Coordinator, GFC Facilities Development Committee  
Andrea Patrick, Scribe

### **OPENING SESSION**

#### 1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter:* Olive Yonge, Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Motion: Kline/Le

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Agenda.

**CARRIED**

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of January 30, 2014

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter:* Olive Yonge, Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Motion: Le/Le

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Minutes of January 30, 2014.

**CARRIED**

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves and commented on a number of items of interest to members.

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. East Campus Village (ECV) Infill Housing Residences at 90 Avenue – Schematic Design Report

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Doug Dawson, Executive Director, Ancillary Services, Planning and Infrastructure; Kelly Hopkin, Senior Campus Planner (Architecture), Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations

*Purpose of the Proposal:* This project will increase the amount of purpose-built student housing on campus in alignment with the University's goal of accommodating 25% of the University's full-time enrollment in residence housing. Students who reside in purpose-built on-campus housing with supportive programming tend to have a more fulfilling and enriching academic experience at the university. Expanding on-campus housing assists the University in meeting institutional goals and objectives by providing a learning environment conducive to personal and academic success. Smart growth campus development enhances community building, student life, and campus experience, all while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The development will be a financially-viable project enhancing the residence portfolio through resource stewardship and reducing deferred maintenance.

A total of four (4) houses (11009, 11013, 11029, and 11031) on the south side of 90 Avenue between 110 Street and 111 Street will be removed to make room for the new infill development. This development consists of two new on-campus cohort residences for approximately 70 new graduate, international, and upper years' student bed spaces. The façades on the new buildings will replicate the form of select existing houses in the ECV district consistent with the Preservation Plan, Design Guidelines for Infill development, and the Long Range Development Plan.

*Discussion:*

Mr Dawson provided a brief synopsis of the proposal, noting that it is part of the East Campus Village (ECV) development. Further, he noted that this project feeds into the broader institutional goal to accommodate 25% of all full-time students in residence which, itself, is a part of a continued effort to support students' academic and social success while on campus. He noted that, as this will not receive funding through the Provincial Government, priority has been made to ensure that this project is financially viable, further commenting that the project will help to connect and engage students with the immediate area and beyond.

Mr Hopkin described some of the challenges in relation to this project, including the preservation of building scale and neighborhood character. He stated that the project team has worked hard to achieve a suitable balance. He highlighted a number of the unique opportunities related to this project, including student-friendly design and focus of the spaces and that the designs are sustainable. He added that this project will not be impacted adversely by parking constraints within the immediate vicinity.

Mr Hopkin, aided by visual renderings, provided information to members regarding the existing homes within the area as well as Sector 8 Plan implementation. He briefed members, using architectural drawings, regarding the new residences as described within the proposal, including interior and exterior design details and residence amenities.

Mr Dawson explained that this project will utilize the benefits of cohort-based living arrangements.

Mr Hopkin provided information to members regarding the elevation of the project, site sections, and the site plan.

During the discussion regarding this item, members expressed several comments and questions, including, but not limited to: the impact of the planning on existing residents in ECV; clarification about the need for two staircases within the structure; confirmation of the amount of natural light within the bedrooms; clarification about fencing between the buildings; concerns regarding kitchen spaces planned with the residences; clarification about bathroom facilities within the residences, including the ratio of bathrooms to bedrooms; concerns regarding perceived space constraints within the design of the residences; concerns that the lower levels of the residences might pose accessibility challenges to those with limited or restricted mobility; clarification about parking requirements; concerns about the location of individual student food storage in relation to each residence's communal kitchen; a suggestion for additional dishwashers to be included in the kitchens; clarification regarding consultation surrounding religious and cultural beliefs in relation to the residential experience; clarification regarding which cohorts have been identified to reside within these facilities; and that there needs to be a way to attract students to the new residences.

Motion: Hickey/Kline

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 East Campus Village (ECV) Infill Housing Residences at 90 Avenue - Schematic Design Report (set forth in Attachment 2) as the basis of further planning.

**CARRIED**

5. East Campus Village (ECV) Leadership Residence – Schematic Design Report

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Kelly Hopkin, Senior Campus Planner (Architecture), Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Martin Jones, Principal, GEC Architecture

*Purpose of the Proposal:* This project will increase the amount of purpose-built student housing on campus in alignment with the University's goal of accommodating 25% of students in residence housing. Students who reside in purpose-built on campus housing with supportive programming tend to have a more fulfilling and enriching academic experience at the University than those who do not. Expanding on-campus housing assists the University in meeting institutional goals and objectives by providing a learning environment conducive to personal and academic success. Providing smart growth development enhances community building, student life, and campus experience while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The development will be a financially-viable project that will enhance the residence portfolio through resource stewardship and reduce deferred maintenance cost.

The University proposes to construct 144 new student spaces in a multi-purpose building on Saskatchewan Drive between 110 Street and 111 Street in ECV. This development will be a multi-purpose residential building featuring bedroom configurations of one and two bedrooms. The residence will have common areas, a dining hall, and the appropriate amount of amenity and programmable space to deliver support services and host lectures. In order to foster a sense of community, students will take meals together in a dining hall (meal plan) to be designed as a "flex" space able to accommodate guest speakers and host functions. A total of (seven) 7 houses along Saskatchewan Drive between 110 and 111 Streets will be removed to accommodate this development. All students and faculty affected by the construction will be accommodated elsewhere within the institutional building inventory. The proposed residence will contribute 9.6% additional beds towards the 1500 bed full build out of the ECV district. A total of seven (7) houses (11025, 11029, 11039, 11045 and 11051 Saskatchewan Drive and 11044 and 11050 – 90 Avenue) between Saskatchewan Drive and 90 Avenue and between 110 Street and 111 Street will be impacted as per the Preservation Plan and Sector Plan.

*Discussion:*

Mr Louie began by highlighting for members the names of individuals on the Leadership Residence Project Steering Committee.

Dr Yonge reported that the name "Leadership Residence" is a placeholder for now and that the official name will be determined at a future time and could be tied to philanthropic donation(s).

Mr Dawson explained that this project falls in line with the University of Alberta's goal to accommodate 25% of full-time students within student housing and that this will support students' academic success as well as aid with recruitment and retention. He noted that the project promotes smart growth campus development and sustainability and that the aim is to build a financially-viable residence. Further, he reported that the project will provide a residence for 144 undergraduate students in one- and two-bed unit configurations, adding that some of the unique ideas for the residence include common areas, a dining hall, the ability to host guest lecturers, high-tech capabilities to promote learning and research opportunities for students, and other special areas to promote, in total, a vibrant residence experience.

Mr Hopkin noted that the challenges in planning this project included maintaining the integrity of the character of the neighborhood, working with the evolving ideas which are shaping the future of this project, and balancing the need for functionality, capital costs, and the need to preserve the surrounding natural landscape of the area. He stated that several opportunities exist in relation to this project including providing creative new building typology, sustainability, and engagement with the City of Edmonton's WinterCity Strategy. He then outlined for members the architectural guiding principles of the residence.

Mr Hopkin reported that the Leadership Residence is pursuing Green Globes certification and will focus on sustainability and briefed members on the main floor plan and the program development.

Mr Jones provided details regarding the concept massing for this residence. He noted that the ground floor and courtyard spaces were designed to mirror the landscape of the nearby river valley. Aided by the PowerPoint presentation, he briefed members regarding details of the residence's main floor plan, emphasizing that the space has been planned to maximize socialization and community gathering, and its bedroom units. He continued with a description of the third and fourth floor plans. He noted that the fifth floor plans were still being developed to incorporate more gathering spaces. He stated that they continue to collaborate with the Leadership Residence Project Steering Committee to develop the design details for the residence.

Mr Jones provided members with artistic renderings of the exterior of the building, including the landscape plan for the residence.

Members provided comments and questions in relation to this item, including, but not limited to: clarification regarding parking provisions; whether the entrances could be made larger in order to appear more inviting; a suggestion to add another focal point in the residence; that there are other locations nearby for physical exercise and that the fitness room might not be necessary; a suggestion to include a café within the residence to provide another gathering space; clarification about access to the fitness centre within the residence; clarification regarding the location of the kitchen; that students should be encouraged to utilize existing physical fitness facilities on campus; whether there are laundry facilities on the third and fourth floors; concern about the open nature of the residence in relation to on-site waste management; support for the design plans of the fifth floor and a suggestion to amend the planning to allow for barbecues and other roof-top gatherings; concern that the gathering spaces might prove to be noisy for residents within their bedroom units; clarification regarding the naming of the residence; that there are sensitivities around the use of the word "leadership"; clarification surrounding how the residence connects to HUB; and clarification regarding the barriers to the courtyard.

Mr Le proposed an amendment to the Motion to remove the word "Leadership" from the name of the proposed residence. Mr Hickey, upon questioning from the Chair, indicated he was agreeable to this amendment. Members, too, noted they agreed generally with this revision. Mr Louie suggested that, since there are several residences currently being planned by the University, it was important members provide a working name for this project. To that end, Mr Louie suggested this project be termed the "Saskatchewan Drive Residence." Mr Le, as well as the original Mover and Secunder of the Motion before members, agreed to treat this as a 'friendly amendment'.

Mr Bodnar asked whether the meeting material presented today will require amendment to reflect the new name. A member suggested that the title page alone could be amended to reflect the new name of this residence. [Subsequent to the meeting, Facilities and Operations provided University Governance with a revised ECV Saskatchewan Drive Residence – Schematic Design Report in which all iterations of the name of this facility had been altered to reflect its new placeholder name.]

Motion: Profetto-McGrath/Harwardt

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 East Campus Village (ECV) Saskatchewan Drive Residence – Schematic Design Report (as set forth in Attachment 2, as amended) as the basis for further planning.

**CARRIED**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 6. Projects Update from Facilities and Operations

There were no documents.

*Presenter(s):* Don Hickey, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

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

*Discussion:*

Mr Hickey provided an update to members regarding the following ongoing institutional projects:

- Physical Activity and Wellness Centre (PAW) – construction is ongoing and on schedule.
- University Hall Redevelopment – construction is ongoing and on schedule.
- St Joseph's College Women's Residence – construction on this facility has begun.
- Innovation Centre for Engineering (ICE) – work is back on track on this project after some recent, unanticipated setbacks.
- SLOWPOKE – decommissioning of this facility is under review.
- Camrose Performing Arts Centre (CPAC) – construction on this facility is in its final stages.
- Edmonton Clinic Health Academy (ECHA)
- Li Ka Shing Building
- Katz Building
- Medical Sciences Building (MSB)
- Butterdome
- Michener Park Residences
- Aboriginal Gathering Place – planning continues on this project.
- Student's Union (SU) Building – work will begin shortly on the SUB renovations.

A member enquired whether the decommissioning of SLOWPOKE (Safe LOW-POwer Kritical Experiment) will impact the planning for the eventual redevelopment of the Dentistry/Pharmacy Building.

### 7. Question Period

A member enquired about plans to visit Augustana Campus, a topic discussed at a recent past meeting of GFC FDC. The Chair noted that the Committee would still be invited to visit the Campus but that, due to a number of factors, it was necessary to defer this trip until the early Fall of 2014.

## **INFORMATION REPORTS**

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

There were no items.

### 9. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items.

## **CLOSING SESSION**

### 10. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:40 pm.

R:\GO05 General Faculties Council - Committees\FAC\13-14\FE-27\Minutes\Final-Minutes.docx