

R	-Chair	R	Tony Eder
---	--------	---	-----------





1. Retain the existing approach
2. Remove the potential future building site
3. Remove the potential future building site and provide for further studies and processes to be undertaken that
  - a. assesses potential building uses, needs and design, as required to meet academic needs
  - b. examines ecological impacts
  - c. provides for a comprehensive engagement process

Mr. Proulx commented that the treatment of Cunningham Woods in the draft Plan is a major stumbling block for students.

Mr. Rowe asked for clarification on the exact boundaries of Cunningham Woods, and whether it included areas outside of Ring Road. Ms. Simpson described the Cunningham Woods area and indicated that it is entirely within Ring Road.

Ms. McGachie asked why Cunningham Woods was included in the list of potential building sites. Ms. Simpson explained that it offers an important connection opportunity between the engineering and science facilities in the south east corner of the campus and the balance of the academic areas within the Ring Road to the west. Given the growing demand for space to support the engineering program, it is logical to consider sites that are in proximity to the existing site for the program.

Ms. Flanders joined the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

Ms. Young asked whether option 3 effectively designates Cunningham Woods as a potential future building site. Ms. Simpson said that option 3 sets out a higher hurdle that must be cleared before it can be deemed a potential future building site. In the event that this site is to be considered for a future building, there would be an obligation to conduct a high level of consultation and study so that its potential as a site can be more rigorously understood, with the benefit of more detailed information.

Dr. Tiedge expressed that he felt option 3 was a good compromise, and suggested that the map be clarified to indicate exactly what area would be designated in this way. Ms. Gorrill agreed that a study would be prudent to specify exactly how big the area would be and to develop a clear understanding for how it is valued and could be best used in the future.

Mr. Proulx said a study of this nature would provide the substantive detail needed to weigh future decisions against.

Mr. Connelly said that at the Steering Committee meeting, Ms. Renwick-Shields said she would be discussing option 3 with other students and would get back to us in the near future.

Ms. Gorrill asked the Committee to vote on each option. The Option 3 approach was unanimously supported.

## 2. Enhance Cycling Infrastructure & Separate Pedestrian and Cyclist Facilities on Ring Road

Mr. Connelly said that the vision for Ring Road as proposed in the Campus Plan would require significant study before it could begin to be put into effect. Ms. Simpson said that more study was necessary to confidently support any of the options. There is a strong need to understand the operational impacts of

any of the options proposed for Ring Road, and that further consultation is necessary, before an approach is finalized.

Dr. Tiedje suggested that the Campus Plan not preclude any one option over the other. Currently, it indicates that Ring Road will be shared between cyclists and pedestrians, but given the discussion it should say that it "may" be shared.

Mr. Connelly agreed that more discussion was needed before the language in the Plan could commit to one approach over the other.

Ms. Gorrill also indicated that the Campus Plan should set out the goals and some options, but not the solutions and final approach for Ring Road adjustments.

Ms. Fix reviewed the revisions in detail:

Section 5.2.1 Pedestrians, 5.2.3 Cycling and 5.2.7 Ring Road (pg.80- 92)

Adjust to retain principles that advance Ring Rd. as a people place that embraces walking and cycling, along with accommodating vehicle and transit needs.

Provide for further stud3( s)c 0.006 Tw(l)-3(a)-3(n)ud3( gi)3(x r)-3(o)1(63(u)-1(r)8(t)-6(h)-1(e)-6(r)-37(m)5(m)-6(o)-

#### 4. Secure a Permanent Location for the Community Garden

Ms. Fix said that the term “flexibility” had caught the attention of multiple stakeholders and was not interpreted in a way that matched its intention. She reviewed the following revisions in detail:

##### viii. Community garden (pg.49)

- Adjust the text on the Campus Community Garden space to:
- reinforce the intention of providing space for its ongoing use over the longer term
- confirm, in the implementation section, the intent to renew of the letter of understanding
- reference the principles that provide for:
  - should the land be needed to serve academic priorities in the future, an alternate location would be determined in consultation with the community garden, and arrangements made in advance to transition between one growing season and the next.
  - regular liaison and dialogue between the university and the club on operational and planning issues

Mr. Rose inquired whether the current site is adequately sized. Mr. Connelly said that the current site is much larger than the original site, by as much as 2.5 times. The previous site was a potential future building site and the decision was made to move it to the current location to support its long term use in its current location.

#### 5. Other Non-Substantive Adjustments

Mr. Nielsen said that as he has observed the campus plan update process unfold, he found that there was tremendous listening to and reflection on the input received from stakeholders.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio said that he echoes Mr. Nielsen's comment. Once the revisions are incorporated, the next stage will begin where the final Campus Plan is presented to the campus and external community.

Ms. Gorrill said that at this time, the motion to be proposed is to incorporate the revisions discussed today. At the next CPC meeting in December, a motion will be proposed to approve the Campus Plan.

***MOTION (A. Rowe/C. Charette)***

That the Committee recommend to the President that the draft Campus Plan, be adjusted following from the phase 2 Engagement process, to address the key themes by changing the Plan as it relates to:

- the further study of Cunningham Woods including the removal of the potential future building site and adding a study area,
- reinforcing the long term protection of identified natural areas,
- the long term location of the community garden and the requirement to provide for further study of Ring Road and cycling options,

along with various other minor changes, as discussed.

***CARRIED***

Note also that proxy votes were submitted by email from Dr. Mateer and Dr. Krull, as they were in agreement, given that the changes were consistent with the ones discussed at the Steering Committee meeting, which they attended.

Ms. Gorrill congratulated the CPC on achieving this milestone.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio said that the implementation section will highlight the big moves and the more mature elements of the Plan, along with processes to advance the key policy directions of the Campus Plan. It does not need to include action items in fine grain detail, so as to allow room for further study and engagement to achieve the goals set out in the Plan.

Dr. Tiedge said that the Campus Plan is a mandate, or a vessel so to speak. It is the canvas on which the specific institutional decisions will occur. Ms. Simpson added that it will influence funding plans going forward as well. Ms. Gorrill said there is a need to pull out specific pieces so that it's clear where we go from here, as the CPC deliberates on the steps to be undertaken to implement the Plan.

Ms. Charette commented that the implementation section should focus on potential broad actions. It is not an "implementation plan, with specific timelines and detail". Ms. Gorrill suggested that the

introduction (at (1e)8 (c) 2 (e) 70 228-1 (v) 48 page 3 (ie) 1 w01228019 002 10.caf 3 (ts) 2 (j) 1 (e) 3 (h) 2 (a) We-1 (s) 1 (a)-3 (9.002 T

- Regarding the new student residence facility, the Request for Proposals for the three shortlisted consultants is underway and a selection will be made in January.
  - The delay to the Continuing Studies Building expansion will push the opening to sometime in February or March. A specific date should be known by the time the CPC meets next.
  - Facilities Management needs to address space needs for the Saunders Building and Shops area and it has begun to draft a plan that will be presented to the CPC at a future meeting.
- 
- No updates to report.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

---