In Attendance:

Lynda Collins	Human Resources
Cindy Ferencz Hammond	Governance
Paul Donoghue	CAO, UTM
Aubrey Iwaniw	Environmental Projects
Devin Kreuger	Office of the VP Research
Ulrich Krull	Office of the VP Research
Meredyth Daneman	Department of Psychology
Mary Ann Mavrinac	Chief Librarian, UTM
Diane Crocker	Office of the Registrar
Emmanuel Nikiema	Language Studies
Nancy Copeland	English/Drama
Angela Lange	Department of Biology
Nicholas Collins	Department of Biology
Stepanka Elias	Facilities Management and Planning, UTM
Bill Yasui	Facilities Management and Planning, UTM
Paull Goldsmith	Facilities Management and Planning, UTM
Kris Horvath	Grounds, UTM
Jane Stirling	Office of Advancement
Alan Walks	Department of Geography
Sarah Gonsalves	President, UTMAGS
Nick Collins	Department of Biology
Christopher Rizzo	Capital Projects
Hugh Gunz	Department of Management
Jeremy Cruz	Full time Undergraduate Student
Elizabeth Sisam	Campus & Facilities Planning
Gail Milgrom	Campus & Facilities Planning
Sarah Birtles	Campus & Facilities Planning

UTM Master Plan Update, Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, February 10, 2010
9:00am – 12:00pm, Room 3130 South Building

9:00am	Background -What is a Master Plan -Master plan Process -COU -2000 UTM Master Plan -Development Sites	(1 hour)
10:00am	Opportunities and Challenges	(45 minutes)
10:45am	Break	(15 minutes)
11:00am	Planning Principles	(45 minutes)
11:45am	Next Steps	(15 minutes)

Paul Donoghue: Welcome and Introductions

Elizabeth Sisam: The South Building comprised the UTM (Erindale) campus when it first opened. The plan sought to link further developments to the South Building with corridors or 'internal streets'. Building design at that time did not take advantage of views of the natural environment surrounding buildings. More recently, UTM has incorporated environmental elements into building design.

What is the definition of a master plan?
A master plan is not a building plan; it will not specifically articulate buildings with windows and doors, for example; nor will it identify locations of disciplines. The updated master plan for UTM will provide direction by identifying building sites, building envelops and planning principles. It will enable the campus to make decisions on individual projects. Opportunities arise that require UTM to have a plan, often necessitating quick planning approvals. For example, the Instructional Centre funding, through the Knowledge Infrastructure Program (KIP), stipulated a March 2011 construction completion. (less than two years to design and construct a $70 million project)

SLIDE: UTM-PHYSICAL SPACE INVENTORY Gail Milgrom

There is 114,000 gross square metres of space on the UTM campus, including residences. UTM has 63,000 net assignable square metres on campus; of the assignable or programmable space, 36% of that space is in residences which is higher than for the other campuses.

SLIDE: HOW MUCH SPACE DO WE NEED? Gail Milgrom

In the late 50s-60s new campuses were built to accommodate the baby boom population. The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) developed space standards to assist in determining how much space would be required. COU space standards continue to be well-regarded. For example, in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, the Ministries use the space formulae to distribute money. In Ontario, COU space entitlements are linked to renewal funds.

COU space standards address 15 space categories (classrooms, libraries, athletics, etc.) Institutions in Ontario are slipping further away from target space provisions due to increased enrollment yet activities of students and faculty continue to be accommodated. Recognizing this, the new internal target set for University of Toronto is 85%. (where traditionally it was 100%)

SLIDE:COU SPACE GUIDELINES Gail Milgrom

The COU guidelines consist of a number of components: a space classification scheme; input measures; space factors and utilization assumptions.

To determine space requirements, input measures are used as the demand factors; some are difficult to calculate. Weekly laboratory contact hours are the number of hours students are in the lab, being taught. The approved standard for laboratory utilization is 18 hours per week, by comparison classroom space should be used a minimum of 34 hours per week.

FTE refers to Full-time-equivalent, defined as a student taking 5 courses. In comparison, Headcount refers to an actual count of students regardless of whether they are full time or part time. i.e. 10 FT and 5 PT=15 Headcount, but the FTE may only be 11. The University uses FTE in reporting to the Ministry on physical facilities and for other reporting purposes.

Elizabeth Sisam: Visitors and visiting scholars/students are included in evaluation of departmental space. Adjustments are made internally for planning but the FTE is consistently reported to the Ministry.

Gail Milgrom: The COU guidelines are used as a benchmark when planning a major renovation or new building; unique features are taken into consideration on individual projects.

SLIDE:CONTEXT: GTA DEMAND AND OUR FUTURE Gail Milgrom

This slide shows the projected growth based on the 18 yr old population in the region. Although considerable growth has already occurred, more is expected. UTM will be affected by anticipated growth in the west end (Halton and Peel Regions) of the Greater Toronto Area.

SLIDE: CHANGE IN SPACE REQUIREMENTS OVER TIME Gail Milgrom

What has happened over time?

UTM has experienced an 80% enrollment growth from 01/02 to today; however assignable space will have only increased by 69%, once the Health Science Complex and the Instructional Centre are operational.

The projected FTE for 14/15 of 10,000 is an estimate, as the numbers are under review and discussion. The 2030 plan identifies 13,000 FTE.

The Bar Graph indicates that as a result of the double cohort and other enrollment growth. UTM slipped from 81% of COU to 68% in 04/05; by 14/15 that number increases to 77% (factoring in the new construction projects). If no more building occurs, based on growth projections for 2030 UTM may be at only 58% of COU. Additional capital construction would be required to accommodate 13,300 FTE.

Nick Collins: Are the space standards changing?

Gail Milgrom: Yes, they have changed over time. For a long time space for computing was treated separately – now the COU standards make no special allowance for computing, except in study space. Provincial auditors are looking at the utilization of teaching space at all Ontario Universities and the COU standards may be adjusted to reflect that survey. The flexibility of the University to accommodate more students without a corresponding increase in space reflects changing needs for students. A UofT decision has been made to target 85% of COU.

Gail Milgrom continues: There are two bands,1) Instructional and Library space, and 2) All other space, which includes food services, recreational space, and the physical plant). The first band has been reviewed in depth by the COU, and the second band is reviewed less frequently. The Mike Harris Government led to increases in partnerships within universities (recall student levy that provided funds for the Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre and the Student Centre). Another factor is the suitability of the space for the function accommodated within it. As space ages it may not be appropriate for today's method of academic delivery. Examples are the laboratory and science facilities that are currently technologically out of date. The university receives from the Ministry $5,000,000 for deferred maintenance projects for all three campuses including the federated colleges. The actual deferred maintenance need for the University is in the area of $275,000,000, where UTM alone requires $18,000,000 for the deferred maintenance needs but only receives a few hundred thousand.

Paul Donoghue: Our campus electrical and steam lines are 30-40 years old and need our attention first, our unfortunate strategy has been running the machines until they break, rather than strategic replacement, which is preferred. Unfortunately, the repairs that the public does not see are what must be repaired first, rather than, for example, building a new research lab.

Gail Milgrom: There is an issue of the suitability of space in addition to the quality of space. The former standard for teaching lab space is no longer suitable for today's curriculum, as there are not enough fume hoods or service space. Not all nasm are

created equal. The total space allocation may not represent the actual amount of suitable space. At times the reverse may also be true.

Alan Walks: Is the FTE statistic more flexible then? How possible or beneficial would it be to cap the campus population growth, providing more space per student?

Diane Crocker: The funding intent is to address the university system in relation to the growth of the GTA enrollment needs, which is why you see further universities like Waterloo creeping in. There have been huge discussions with multiple university administrators about the possibility of capping the growth.

Elizabeth Sisam: This is a very complicated discussion, but considering that we are funded through FTE statistics, capping enrollment would provide the university with less funding. It is a balancing act. For every new building request the government approval bodies will ask "How many new students will this building allow for?" due to political reasons.

Angela Lange: The new buildings being constructed now are a direct result of allowing more students into UTM.

Gail Milgrom: SuperBuild asked the question, "How many more students can you take?" Some institutions replied that they would not increase, Queens University for example declined.

Ulrich Krull: If we are to move towards more grad student enrollment we will be funded less. The body count (FTE) will balance out more funding. Graduate students take up more space than undergrads due to their office and research needs, so the space factors budget more space required than undergrads; they are further categorized into science or humanities graduates which also have varying space needs.

SLIDES:UTM AERIAL MAP AND UTM 2000 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN Elizabeth Sisam

Retaining the bucolic setting of the land was a priority for original planning. A traditional 'no build zone' was identified along Mississauga Road. At that time there was a debate about the impact of cars, primarily left turn access into the campus off Mississauga Road.

SLIDE: KEY ELEMENTS OF THE UTM 2000 MASTER PLAN Elizabeth Sisam

1. Main Link
2. Five Minute Walk
3. Courtyards
4. Entry Plazas
5. New Entrance
6. Main Quad
7. Connected Residences
8. Integrated Built Form
9. Coordinated Parking, Service and Traffic Plan

Key elements of the 2000 plan, extrapolated from the initial plan of 40 years ago, centred on how buildings would be connected. The plan recognized the 5 Minute Walk, the temporary North Building, and the possibility of a courtyard, like on the Oxford campus with open space. This former plan also required entry plazas, or forecourts, for all buildings (which are present now for all of the newest UTM buildings). A new vehicle entrance was also proposed at the South end.

The Main Quad feature located where the north sports field is now is approximately the same size as the front campus on the St. George campus. In the future, once new construction intensified this area, the field area will become a quadrangle.

Rather than having individual residential townhouses the plan could offer the opportunity to build communities through a denser layout. Integrated built form (The CCT Link and the connected buildings), coordinated parking and servicing and a traffic plan are necessities in this plan.

Parking and servicing must be both disguised and easy to access. The premium for underground parking is $35,000 per space, in comparison to surface and structured parking. Budgets for the construction of parking areas are funded through increased user fees through the ancillary budget. Transportation demand management initiatives are increasingly important for this campus; St. George is fortunate to have a variety of transit options that are attractive, including two subway stops.

SLIDE:PLANNING PRINCIPLES FROM THE UTM 2000 MASTER PLAN Elizabeth Sisam

1. Land Use
2. Design Principles
3. Heights, Build-to Lines and Microclimate
4. Built Form
5. Ecological Principles
6. Landscape
7. Open Spaces

There were two land use designations: a no-build zone and an academic area. Should these areas be more mixed? The campus has traditionally been low, with no high-rise construction. Considering the constraint of the Credit River you may wish to consider building higher.

Popular study areas and cafes are very open; this contrasts the South Building plan. What kind of open space would best address campus requirements? How should this campus engage with the community beyond UTM? In the future, with an increasing Mississauga population this campus will be even more desirable than ever before by the community.

SLIDE: UTM CAMPUS PLAN 2000-PRESENT Elizabeth Sisam

Mary Ann Mavrinac: What about expansion of existing building sites?

Elizabeth Sisam: What issues should be considered for a campus plan? How the campus will expand relative to the existing buildings is to be discussed. The Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre (RAWC) is a good example. The RAWC site was relocated adjacent to the South Building due to financial constraints for a stand-alone building. This development was an opportunity to create a building while also improving the South Building. It has created a more sensible and usable entrance than the original South Building entrance.

SLIDE: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES Sarah Birtles

Possible sites for future development: an expansion of the original Campus Master Plan, 2000.

SLIDE: DEVELOPMENT SITES Sarah Birtles

The Kaneff Centre, the North Building and the Student Centre have all been considered for expansion possibilities. The parking structure could be a combination site, where the structure could be hidden from view by academic space constructed at a later phase.

SLIDE: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SECTORS Sarah Birtles

An understanding of the campus sectors is necessary, when developing the planning guidelines for this campus. What issues should be addressed? Specifically, Sector D includes the Credit River and is very different from the dense Sector A. Sector B incorporates open space with the UTM quad; will UTM convocation occur here in the future? Should ceremonies be incorporated in the quad? Sectors E and F contain the residential space. Intensification in this area is possible if desired. Sector G was not identified as development zone, rather to be maintained as available research space.

SLIDES: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES Sarah Birtles

PARKING
This slide raises the challenge of minimizing the visual impact of parking in order to preserve and enhance the view of the natural context. Every development site on this campus removes more parking spaces, particularly the North Building development as it is a massive structure. Future strategies could include using the slope of the site to conceal parking as partially below-grade; continuing to screen parking lots with trees, vegetation or topography; or wrapping buildings and land around the parking garages.

SERVICING
Loading, shipping & receiving, drop-offs; all of these land forms must be planned for. Buildings need a back, to be serviced. This creates operational challenges for dealing with the garbage and deliveries. Long enclosed corridors work for pedestrians but not for servicing (i.e. South Building/CCT connection). Direct connections to the Ring Road for servicing future development should be considered.

TRANSIT
The U-Pass (fare-free Universal Bus Pass) has improved access to the campus. Into the future, will there be more than one transit hub on campus? The provision of a

sheltered environment for transit users is critical. Transit must be considered with new development sites.

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS
The CCT Building operates as a campus connector; it acts as a pedestrian street, an interior 5-min walk. Vegetation along the 5 Minute Walk provides shelter and gives the walk interest. These examples offer campus community members predictable connections. The RAWC is a positive example of connection (to parking). Connection through, and transparency to active spaces, shows strong consideration for campus context. Some are referring to it as a new front door to the campus.

GATEWAYS & LANDMARKS
The front door to the campus has traditionally been the South Building but this may no longer be the primary entrance. The HMALC is a meeting place that isn't the "Meeting Place". The pedestrian crossroad is at the Student Centre, a gateway and landmark for pedestrians. How best would gateways and landmarks be addressed in the plan?

EDGES
Improving campus access to the residential areas and preserving the street edge while recognizing the campus as a distinct and unique is important. A former Master Plan, 2000 principal was to enhance the connection to the Credit River. Ecological preservation while improving linkages needs to be balanced.

STREET FURNITURE & AMENITIES
Images shown include intentional and unintentional street furniture, including a gas meter on the Link road, visible from the outside, as well as front the interior corridor in CCT.

Street furniture, way finding, and amenities should be campus-wide and tie the campus together through continuity. The design of the CCT building blurs the boundary of interior to exterior, which is positive.

4-SEASON OPEN SPACE
What is the greenspace on campus in winter and in inclement weather? The plan should program and design the campus for all seasons.

Mary Ann Mavrinac: Despite our unique character, are there any best practices at other institutions that share our campus size for amenities and ceremony space? What are we missing that campuses of our size have?

Elizabeth Sisam: A unique feature is that the UTM campus is already the same size as a University. In the United States there are many universities that are the same size but function independently.

Mary Ann Mavrinac: What about the technological advancements? Additionally, what about buying things like aspirin where we feel that we need to leave the campus grounds to get it? What do we want to be?

Elizabeth Sisam: There are technical advancements that should be considered when planning for the future campus. We already have video conferencing capabilities at the

University. Should zoning be changed to allow for retail? If so, how would retail be controlled? How is the local community served through provision of services?

Diane Crocker: In the United States there are a number of institutions that share our structure; we are very similar to the University of Michigan. The Registrar's Office is reviewing practices at other universities. I am most interested in the Dearborn campus at the University of Michigan, 20 miles from Ann Arbor. It does not perfectly mirror our community (Dearborn is an inner city campus) but they are on the leading edge. Tufts has a parking structure with a building wrapped around it; the façade took the ugliness away from the structure. York University offers an undesirable parking structure example, where the Tufts structure is positive. It is built into the hill.

Elizabeth Sisam: What are your aspirations? We welcome your input and will discuss this question further in our second meeting in March.

Mary Ann Mavrinac: UTM is a campus of choice and recognized by the government as a regional university. What does that mean? Our infrastructure still does not have all the pieces that a regional university should have, such as a ceremony space, event space beyond our Faculty Club, places where we can have music and public lectures. Art gallery space and other arts venues are needed as are more sophisticated, quality eating spaces. These are features of a mature campus.

Diane Crocker: Laurier is a conglomerate of poor buildings and they lost all their greenspace. It is really important to look at where and how we grow; we need more graduate student to mature us. We try to hold onto that for the 2030 document. We need to have the space and people that will attract them. We need married student residences to attract grad students.

Elizabeth Sisam: Opportunity comes with population growth. Growth will provide the mechanism to mature. Services cannot be offered without a significant population without subsidy.

Diane Crocker: There are many Ontario Universities that are smaller and have all the needed services. A new theatre could enhance the quad plan. We have a good sized campus already and we need to attract graduate students with competitive services.

Alan Walks: How about merging the campus Master Plan with the City of Mississauga Master Plan? We could be leaving our offices to get groceries in the future. Our campus cannot support this today. If we were incorporated into the community plan the increased density would help service the campus.

Elizabeth Sisam: Once the plan is developed we will be working with Ed Sajecki, Commissioner of Planning and Building for the City of Mississauga. Mississauga is encouraging us throughout this process and suggested that changes to zoning will serve our needs. The City of Mississauga plan and Mississauga Master Plan must align with each other. This campus Master Plan will be a Secondary Plan that will discuss rights to build on our land. This City of Mississauga bylaws must be addressed for our unique culture; the bylaw tells us that we need more parking based on additional construction. However, a more appropriate method to determine the parking requirements may be to link them to the campus population rather than the amount of built space.

Nancy Copeland: (Through her theatre responsibilities she is aware of the need for community integration as there are both patrons and enters of the theatre space.) The total volume and especially convenience of parking is important to these users. The patrons will not go all the way to the CCT parking garage for a theatre event. This has an immediate financial implication to theatre operations. If parking lot 1 is lost it may undermine the theatre operations and the community. Currently, 1/3 of the patrons are senior citizens and convenience for parking is essential.

Elizabeth Sisam: This is definitely a challenge of the plan. Balanced intensification is the aim. No one wants the theatre to suffer through future development plans.

Paul Donoghue: This Lot 1 area is sighted as a redevelopment site. There are many discussions about what will happen to the North Building and when. We are looking for comment: It is time to turn our attention north.

Our priority is the South Building main entrance…should this remain the main entrance? Yes, perhaps, but not as it looks now. It is time to plan the student services cluster including food services and then look plan the north campus next. The North Building is a very large building, constructed as a temporary building, and it may be more viable to rebuild it.

If it is redeveloped there will be additional parking issues. An underground parking structure could not be constructed because it has a geothermal system that permanently protects the space from development. The 2000 Master Plan showed the old orchard as a future parking lot site; such an option could take years to get approvals because of the strong reaction of the adjacent neighbours. The existing 'meadow' currently used as an academic site (weather tower and fenced enclosure for forensics) may be a better site for parking in so far as approvals. Swapping these are decisions that must be made. If we are going to re-build our north campus parking must be discussed in the plan.

Diane Crocker: Considering the student complaints about using the gymnasium for exam writing, we need to think about increased exam space. A multi-purpose facility for testing incorporated with a field house that could be used for convocation may be another potential development. A testing facility is required for UTM.

BREAK

Paul Donoghue: Everyone is encouraged to speak with colleagues and bring information back between now and the March meeting. Paul will remind this group to comment via email so that everyone can feel comfortable to comment outside of this forum.

Elizabeth Sisam: The Planning team would be happy to meet with small groups of colleagues as needed. The Master Plan Update timeline can be adjusted if necessary. It is important to get it right.

SLIDES:PLANNING PRINCIPLES (SUMMARY)

SLIDES: PLANNING PRINCIPLES

LAND USES

- *Foster a connection between Residential and Academic Life.*
- *Integrate on the ground floor level, with transparency between indoor and outdoor spaces.*
- *Coordinate parking, servicing and traffic planning relative to new and existing buildings, to ensure a visionary Campus Plan.*

Sarah Birtles: Land use options within the plan are being investigated. For example, should the campus continue to have a delineated plan with residential zones? In the 2000 Master Plan, the North Building plan is identified as non-academic. This may no longer be appropriate.

Elizabeth Sisam: When the original plan was approved it addressed the University community only; no one was expected to frequent Starbucks except campus members. Will we be able to support entrepreneurs and the local patrons? Mixed use to allow for access by the community would require a zoning change with the City of Mississauga.

Sarah Birtles: Community patrons could enjoy cafes; the theatre, the HMALC and the RAWC are all University facilities but available to the public. Are the planning principles too broad?

PUBLIC REALM

- *Support and encourage a vibrant public realm.*
- *Relate to buildings and create a sequence of movement; provide shelter and active travel between buildings.*
- *Maintain and enhance a central unified open space, as a unifying element on Campus*
- *Integrate the Campus with the surrounding Credit River Valley.*

Integration with the Credit River Valley will require identified responsibilities in relation to safety and security.

Elizabeth Sisam: When planning, the notion of a Public Realm is encouraged. There is a balance here to consider; the University is privately owned. The first objective might be to enhance the area for the University and describe primary uses and activities. Regulation of community cars is an issue to be addressed given the lack of parking to meet UTM's requirements.

Paul Donoghue: Institutionally-related events from the theatre or public lectures are different from the use of open land. Most of the people who use the campus to walk are within a small radius of the campus. Appealing to the broader community will attract people from a larger radius, and everyone drives. By bringing the broader community in to enjoy our trails and protected spaces, there could be have the undesirable impact of needing to build parking to serve the additional use, which would encroach on existing green space. Does it make sense to encourage more use of UTM's green space by the

outside community if that means we need to sacrifice green space to accommodate cars?

Elizabeth Sisam: It seems appropriate to change the "public realm" wording in the Master Plan Update to a "Vibrant University Community''. This may avoid the confusion.

Nick Collins: We have identified where the buildings will be but built into this plan as a declaration that we will plan intensively to use spaces between the buildings. Managing the natural corridors makes us distinctive. Landscaping costs are often sacrificed in capital plans, but should be a central part of the whole design.

Elizabeth Sisam: When these concepts were discussed with the Design Review Committee it was suggested that the urban landscape and the naturalized landscape need to be integrated through the development of the construction.

Meredyth Daneman: There are several lovely landscaped areas at the UTSC campus, with sculpture and waterfalls.

Angela Lange: The CCT courtyard does not have these types of features.

Elizabeth Sisam: That was one of the earlier key elements. Now when the buildings are constructed these spaces (such as the CCT courtyard) can provide for sculpture gardens and similar features.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- *Incorporate technological advancements in building and landscape design*
- *Encourage bicycle commuting and transit-oriented modes of travel*
- *Enhance, connect and respond to the Campus' ecological context.*
- *Achieve a minimum of LEED Certified standards or equal for new buildings*

Sarah Birtles: The UTM campus has a number of positive examples of sustainable building, including some LEED projects, such as the RAWC's green roof etc. Is Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) still relevant as a standard? The City of Mississauga is developing Green Development Standards; these may be more appropriate.

Cycling and transit also tie into sustainability. Bike storage options, both interior or exterior, should be identified. The City of Mississauga is including bike routes in their Master Plan.

Elizabeth Sisam: Sustainability has emerged as an important and significant issue.

Aubrey Iwaniw: When developing the campus plan, it is important to note the changing paradigm. All of the Mississauga Transit buses are equipped with bike racks now. We currently have students cycling on walking paths because they do not feel safe on our roads. Future roads should include bike lanes, especially on a university campus.

Alan Walks: More bus routes through the campus with bike racks are desirable.

Paul Donoghue: We talk to the City as often as possible about adding new routes to the campus, especially serving more dense areas to the campus.

Meredyth Daneman: How many student residence spaces are there?

Paul Donoghue: We have about 1400 beds, which makes up the largest percentage for all of U of T. We are undergoing transit and student surveys and will do cluster analyses with hard data into the future.

Alan Walks: A GO bus connection it would be helpful for UTM.

Sarah Birtles: It may be a question of making minor changes to existing systems. i.e. extending the GO line to campus, or adding a stop to the express bus route at Mississauga Road. What if UTM became a regional transit hub?

Bill Yasui: Transit services need to make a profit. Changes to routing must also address summer when ridership declines. At times transit schedules do not overlap or connect well; this could be addressed while cooperating with university and City Master Plans.

Elizabeth Sisam: Transit is an accounting problem; where transit investment is considered a subsidy, roads are considered infrastructure and stimulus projects.

HERITAGE

- *Protect and maintain heritage properties and landscapes*
- *Respect contextual value of heritage elements*

Sarah Birtles: The campus itself is a heritage landscape, as is Mississauga Rd.

Nancy Copeland: Is Alumni house a potential development site? What changes can be made to the building?

Elizabeth Sisam: Alumni House has to be very carefully planned, but changes are possible.

Alan Walks: Springbank/Alumni House is an ideal site for the public as it is an interface to the community.

Paul Donoghue: The gravel lot behind Alumni House could be a potential development site.
Sarah:

Sarah Birtles: The development sites that have been identified are within the Ring Road, working outward. Other sectors will also be reviewed.

Bill Yasui: The gravel lot was considered for the Health Sciences Complex at one time.

Nick Collins: We could start investigating the connection to what is across the creek on the other side of Mississauga Road. The Sawmill Creek is a destroyed stream and we could build across the road with no objection.

ACCESSIBILITY

- *Buildings and landscape must accommodate a diverse population in an open and inclusive campus.*
- *Adhere to the principles of universal design and AODA.*

Sarah Birtles: Since most of the academic buildings on campus are relatively new, much of the campus is in compliance with the building code, with respect to accessibility. Much of the challenge is with landscape improvements, illustrated by an image of a pathway to bridge transition, and details such as ensuring the right kind of push button is installed, and well-located. The centre image is the ramp at the South Building main entrance. While the ramp meets code, how could we make this or other ramps invisible, integrated into the environment, so that everyone uses the ramp?

Angela Lange: Will Springbank/Alumni House be made accessible?

Elizabeth Sisam: The challenge to that project is the funding. Most UTM spaces are generally accessible but the new AODA guideline requires all rooms be accessible and, for example, there are no size standards for scooters.

Bill Yasui: The South Building ramp was a response to a need, added on to the original building, but those needs and requirements are changing again.

MASSING *Form and scale should be appropriate to the surrounding context, topography and neighborhood edges.*

- *Enhance the Campus' sense of community through sensitive scaling and positioning of new buildings.*
- *Expansion must account for microclimate, shadow and wind conditions.*

Elizabeth Sisam: Massing refers to scale. Can we intensify the campus without adding height ? i.e. Paris example: achieving density through mid-rise development. Wind patterns need to be considered when creating structures to avoid generating wind tunnels as this type of planning decision will determine micro-climate. We need to consider the whole environment with the eventual build-out in mind.

Sarah Birtles: Note the potential for linking height to gateways and landmarks on campus. i.e. the campus does not have to be all the same scale. The South Building front entrance is example landmark that could be enhanced.

Emmanuel Nikiema: Are we limiting the plan to the buildings on campus? What about plans for sites across the street?

Elizabeth Sisam: This Master Plan will only address development potential on University property.

Lynda Collins raised concern for building a multi-storey structure on the North Building. Is it possible, structurally?

Elizabeth Sisam: The plan would be to rebuild on that site.

Alan Walks: Any planning done should be done in a flexible way so that additional height is possible in future; consider architecture able to support additional floors in the future for expansion projects.

Bill Yasui: Rooftops can be built to accommodate future expansion (so that they become floors later), but we need to consider vertical movement such as elevators and stairways. Planners also recognize that building codes change so that what is planned for in construction may not be feasible in the long term.

Elizabeth Sisam: This potential cannot be provided for every building. (it would not be cost-effective)

Alan Walks: If most of the buildings are built to be extendable, this allows for green roofs in the short term.

Angela Lange: Are some of the graduate townhouses reaching the point where they are not worth renovating? A new building could look different with offices and study space incorporated into the residential building design.

Paul Goldsmith and Paul Donoghue confirm that some of the townhouses are expensive to maintain and not worth renovation.

<u>INTENSIFICATION</u>

- *Balance the desire for consolidation and the desire to connect to the outdoor environment.*
- *Enliven and shape the spaces between and within buildings.*
- *Strive to achieve the appearance of a complete Campus at each phase of the plan.*
- *Ensure the adjacent community is addressed in scale and presence, while the image of an academic institution is presented.*

Elizabeth Sisam: How does UTM intensify in a balanced way? This principle is about shaping the spaces in between buildings, as a connective tissue; designed to make the environment and context feel complete. It is important to maintain the landscape budget in capital projects. The hardscape complement of landscaping is usually 70% of the landscape budget, and a very small portion of the overall budget.

Kris Horvath: And then we have to pay twice that amount to fix the problems with the landscape and hardscape after the project is complete.

Nick Collins: We found it impossible to plant trees in the new storm water pond area that were greater than 10cm diameter. Why is it that on the downtown campus they get 20cm, more mature trees provided in the project budget? We keep getting told it is not possible.

Elizabeth Sisam: When the project scope was being determined, the trees would be identified as part of the project budget.

Kris Horvath also noted that the rate of survival is better for smaller trees than larger trees.

Sarah Birtles noted that St. George campus has established a tree donation program. It was successful to the point that there are very limited remaining donor opportunities. Is this something that UTM could consider, perhaps with alumni?

Angela Lange: There is some concern with donor programs and ongoing 'ownership'. For example, there was a dedication bench installed at Lislehurst. The donor often sits on the bench, which is right outside our house.

Kris Horvath: We are working with Advancement to designate a space for tree dedication at the new storm water pond. There are all kinds of questions to consider such as what happens if a tree needs to be cut down at some point. What is the relationship to the donor at that point?

Diane Crocker raised the issue of transportation safety on campus. The new library drop-off zone is tricky due to space constraints. Will we consider an underground tunnel to the other side of the roadway? People don't pay attention to the crosswalks; neither does the shuttle bus. We should consider overpasses and underpasses and drop-off areas in the new campus plan.

Paul Donoghue: There is a traffic study currently underway that is looking at the drop-off points to address these issues for a long term plan. Underpasses and overpasses are not a part of that.

Alan Walks: A lack of drop-off points is an issue. If each new building had a drop-off that is accessible for wheelchairs, then there would be an even distribution of drop-off spots around the campus.

Elizabeth Sisam: All new buildings are being designed to have drop-off lay bys.

Paul Donoghue: The new Instructional Facility will have a properly designed drop-off area and will serve as the shuttle bus stop.

NEXT STEPS

Elizabeth Sisam encouraged everyone to send comments to: masterplan.2010@utoronto.ca with "UTM" in the subject line.

The presentation is available on the master plan website.

The next meeting will be held March 9th.