

CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
REPORT TO SENATE  
November 26, 2009

Since its last report to Senate (October 23, 2008), members of the Campus Planning and Development Committee (CPDC) have met five times (December 5, 2008, March 6, 2009, May 1, 2009, August 5, 2009 and October 2, 2009). Noted below is a description of the capital projects that were considered by CPDC (including appointment of architects, allocation of funds, approval of design and awarding of tender). This report also describes other projects, studies and initiatives currently being undertaken by the University. These matters were presented to and discussed by CPDC.

**Part 1. Major New Capital Construction and Major Renovations (Completed and /or In Progress/Planning Stage)**

**Richardson Hall Renovation**

**Project Costs:** \$12.25 million

**Architect:** GRC Architects/Gansen Lindsay Design Consultants Inc.

**General Contractor:** T. A. Andre and Sons

**Project Description:** Renovated facilities to address major building deficiencies including the need to make the building fully accessible. The exterior masonry was re-pointed and repaired. This project provides accommodations for the senior administrative management team of the University; providing offices for the Principal, Vice-Principals, University Secretariat, Institutional Planning, Internal Audit and Research Services, the Associate Vice-Principal (Finance) and the associated staff within the Financial Analysis and Budgeting group.

**Status:** Complete December 2008.

**Artificial Field/Parking Structure**

**Project Costs:** \$34.7 million

**Architect:** CS&P Architects

**General Contractor:** Pomerleau Inc.

**Project Description:** The project addressed the need for an artificial field on the main campus and replacement of parking being lost as the campus has developed over the years. A new 580 vehicle permit parking structure was developed under the former Mackintosh-Corry parking lot with a new artificial field over the structure.

**Status:** Complete May 2009

**Etherington Hall**

**Project Costs:** \$1.1 million

**Architect:**

**Project Description:** New School of Kinesiology and Health Education, 1 varsity and 2 practice gyms, locker room, fitness area, pool, dance and combative rooms, squash and racquetball courts.

**Status:** Phase 1 started in August 2006. The initial value engineering exercise found a savings of

**Gordon-Brockington Hall**

**Planning Costs:** \$50,000

**Architect:** Shoalts & Zaback/Gansen Lindsay

**Contractor:** TBA

**Project Description:**

Residences are currently exploring how to decrease the staging period while balancing fiscal responsibility and concerns over fee increases.

### **Applied Science Building**

The Faculty of Applied Science is proposing to build at the site of the Dupuis Hall parking lot. A visioning session was held on July 15<sup>th</sup> with HDR/Mill & Ross Architects facilitating. The new building is integral to implementing the Faculty's vision. The building will have space for Mechanical Engineering and possibly Civil Engineering. Research space will be composed of interdisciplinary research clusters, optimization of technical support and research infrastructure, with no departmental barriers and intermingling of graduates, undergraduates and faculty.

### **Emergency Management Communications**

The Principal and Vice-Principal's Committee has approved funding for an alert and notification device as part of the emergency management communication system for the campus. QUFA, QUSA, CUPE, AMS, SGPS and other groups on campus all support the system. The real-time notification system will disseminate clear information before, during and after an emergency situation. The external public address/siren system will be mounted on 3 buildings on main campus and at McArthur Hall and will not be

projects brought forward by QSAC and to allocate resources. The group would present to PVPs to inform

interiors. The work is to support the University's objective of being accessible for people with disabilities in a manner that respects their dignity, and allows for full integration and participation on campus. Disabilities include mobility and physical dexterity, visual (blindness, low vision, including the use of service animals), aural (deaf, deafened and hard of hearing), and learning as it applies to way finding and ability to engage in educational sessions.

Campus Planning is working with the consultant to set agreed-to criteria that will identify various physical accessibility requirements (and cross-disability) as required by the Ontario Building Code, application of the Ontario Human Rights code, and regulations emerging from the AODA. The document will describe current conditions. From this document, the Accessibility Committee can make recommendations for the prioritization of projects with target dates for removal of the identified physical barriers; and suggest processes to prevent new barriers.

and Procedures reflects the concepts from the previous policy (May 2005). This rewrite expands and clarifies on roles, responsibility, all the suggestions and fn.240d-5lback policy

~~supervisor of the body of the committee~~  
University

states that Queen's (s) 8(s) 5(u)-2(l) 4(l) 4( an) 4(d) 7(o)-2(l) 4(e) 2( ) 6(ow) 5(ner) 5(s) 1(h) 4 ip of works

standard design (material, font, and layout) and content of plaque to label outdoor art

- specifications will be given for campus directory at lobbies, interior signs for student residence rooms and stairways, information signs at classrooms, and other cues for way finding
- conditions for illuminating exterior signs or special lighting for individual or temporary displays will be specified
- the University will request proposals to supply signage in a timely and reliable manner and at a fair market price
- flexibility, ease and economy of update, repair and replacement (in cases of damage, theft, or changes in regulatory requirements, building name, function or occupancy) is being considered, such as using computer desktop generated inserts vs. special orders from the print shop
- content, media, and management of displays of educational, awareness and campus life information may be coordinated with Queen's Department of Marketing and Communications regarding the Digital Information Network (DIN) electronic signs

#### **Queen's/City of Kingston Joint Housing Committee**

This committee undertook to review student housing issues generally, and in particular licensing options for residential rental properties. The committee reported its findings and recommendations to Kingston City Council on March 24, 2009.

The report noted that Queen's is committed to ensure that there is an adequate supply of safe, healthy, affordable and accessible accommodations for students. Ninety-four percent of Queen's full-time students live in university-owned residences, in units operated by Queen's Apartment and Housing, or in privately owned housing. Over two-thirds of this housing is within one kilometer of the main campus. It was recommended that Queen's continue to see that student housing needs are met through an appropriate balance between the on campus and community rental units, and that programs such as the accommodation listing service and the contract with participating landlords be supported.

The Alma Mater Society was encouraged to continue to play a key role in advocating for the housing needs of students, and to educate them regarding their rights and responsibilities as residents of Kingston, and the resources available to them through enforcement of City by-laws.

The City was encouraged to continue with its proactive approach to enforcement of property standards and noise by-laws.

Support was also given to a proposed Public Nuisance by law, new Urban Design Guidelines and regulation of the number of bedrooms in rental properties through zoning by-laws.

Considerable attention was given to whether licensing of residential rental properties could address some of the long-standing issues in neighbourhoods with many student residents. Experience with licensing to date in Oshawa and Thorold (first municipalities to pass a rental licensing by-law, in May and October 2008, respectively) has been fraught with problems, negative press, and a possibility of a Human Rights challenge as the by-law seems to unfairly target students. While access to the interior of residential units for municipal inspection would be gained, there is no conclusive evidence that residential licensing will improve the quality and supply of units. The committee recommended that licensing not be pursued at this time. The City of London very recently adopted a proposal to proceed with licensing on city wide basis, but deferred action until a legal opinion could be obtained on the implementation of the licensing by-law. The situation will continue to be closely monitored.

To date, the Kingston Landlord's Association is against licensing; the Kingston Rental Owners Property Association has stated they do not support licensing.

Queen's will likely continue its "wait and see" approach – continue to support efforts to improve current services for students in partnership with the City, increase efforts on property inspections and by-law enforcement and improve tenant/landlord education and communications.

Three incidental observations by the committee are worthy of comment. A recent survey of undergraduate students found a high degree of satisfaction with their accommodations. The current supply of student housing is adequate to meet student needs. The committee found "no direct observable connection" between the quality of student housing and student behaviour.

The City Council received the report and will deal with it later this year.

**City of Kingston and Queen's University Working Group on Urban Planning and Official Plans**

Both the City and Queen's are currently working on their respective plans (the Official Plan for the City of Kingston and the Campus Plan for Queen's) and intend to finalize them in 2009. This working group meets six (6) times a year to investigate and collaborate on strategies to deal with urban planning issues of mutual interest to the City and University. This ongoing communication is intended to avoid duplication of effort and increase the likelihood that initiatives desired by one or both institutions are compatible with the short- and long-term intentions of the other. Beyond a courtesy communication, it is intended that the developments by the City and the University will be mutually supportive of and beneficial to their respective organizations and the shared objectives for global needs such as land use planning, energy-conservation, sustainability, accessibility, and fiscal responsibility.



1. Description of the obstacles and opportunities for this type of development given the specifics of this site and available infrastructure – from below the ground up (soil conditions, prevailing climate, current load and capacity for expansion, etc.).
2. Using the information from above, concept drawings were prepared of possible site layouts that worked to the strengths of the site and met the vision of the ARIP. Conceptual sketches offer a possible look and feel of how the site might be arranged, the types of energy-effective and innovative construction that can be used so the site is a demonstration of sustainable development.

Currently the office is exploring including specific research facilities (linked with CFI grants) in the development and the optimal zoning for the site, given the range of needs for potential tenants.