

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 54 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**October 19, 1999**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, October 19, 1999, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)  
Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Adel Sedra,  
    Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Michael Finlayson,  
    Vice-President, Administration and  
    Human Resources  
Professor Derek McCammond,  
    Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Carl Amrhein  
Mr. Brian Burchell  
Dr. John Challis  
Professor Ruth Gallop  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Mr. Arvin Hariri  
Professor Susan Horton  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. Elan Ohayon  
Professor Paul Perron

Ms Nancy Reid  
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones  
Professor Fred Wilson  
Ms Judith Wilson  
Mr. Vilko Zbogar

**Non-Voting Assessors:**

Dr. Jon Dellandrea, Vice-President and  
    Chief Development Officer

**Secretariat:**

Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary  
Ms Susan Girard  
Mr. Neil Dobbs

**Regrets:**

Professor Raymond Cummins  
Ms Jacqueline Orange

**In Attendance:**

Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services  
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor Emeritus Peter Boulton, Chair, Users' Committee and Project Manager  
Professor John Browne, Director, Residence Development  
Professor Michael Charles, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor David Farrar, Chair, Department of Chemistry  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Ivan Gottlieb, Administration and General Services, Facilities and Services  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Office of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Safwat Zaky, Chair, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ITEMS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, AND 11 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting of the Committee for 1999-2000. He noted that the meeting was scheduled to end at 8:00 p.m. If there was insufficient time to discuss some of the 'for information' items that appeared at the end of the agenda, they would be discussed at the next meeting. He reminded members that items 4 to 11 would be considered at the Academic Board in two days' time and that he would be giving an oral report of the Committee's discussion to the Board. Members of the Board had received full documentation to ensure that they could have an informed discussion on the items. The Chair emphasized that members should not feel pressured by the contracted time frame; items that, in the members' view, required more work should not be recommended to the Board.

The Chair then reviewed the Committee's structure, its rules and procedures, and invited members to get in touch with him, the Provost, or the Secretariat at any time throughout the year if they had questions.

1. Reports of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 53 (July 20, 1999) was approved.

2. Business Arising

(a) Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that the following allocations were approved:

- Academic Priorities Fund:
  - \$480,000 OTO and \$89,576 in base in support of the initiatives in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design; and
  - \$546,000 OTO and \$150,000 in base in support of the initiatives for the Information Commons; and
  - \$2 million OTO to create a fund administered by the Provost for start-up and retention support for faculty.
- Academic Transitional Fund:
  - \$34,700 OTO to provide temporary operating support for 1999-2000 to the University Art Centre.
- The Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund/UIIF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 1999-2000.
- An allocation of \$100,000 from the UIIF to fund the increased scope of renovations in the basement of Sidney Smith Hall for the Department of Psychology.
- An allocation of \$148,000 OTO from the Administrative Transitional Fund to ensure that the University is in substantial compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*.

(b) Joker's Hill

In response to concerns voiced by a member at the previous meeting Professor Sedra reported that the Joker's Hill Endowment Committee was scheduled to meet in November.

2. Business Arising (cont'd.)

(b) Joker's Hill (cont'd.)

The Committee would discuss the potential use of the site for academic purposes, and the facilities and equipment required to support the academic initiatives appropriately. He noted that two of the ways to proceed included: raising funds in the amount of approximately \$10 million for an endowment to support the existing and new research facilities, and approximately \$5 million to construct new facilities; or, the partial divestment of that part of the property not designated for its particular environmental value, in order to raise the funds necessary to support the remaining property and facilities. He further noted that the second option did not appear to be either feasible or attractive.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Sedra reported on the following:

**Planning Process.** In the *Raising Our Sights* planning process divisional plans would arrive in the Provost's office beginning in the late fall and early winter of this year. In the spring, the Provost would bring forward plan summaries and recommendations for allocations from the APF.

**Budget.** The new budget for 2000-2001 would be coming to the Committee in February or March.

**Residence Expansion.** The University planned to expand residence capacity by 50%, by over 2300 spaces. This was not in reaction to the "double cohort" expansion. Rather, the proposed expansion was part of the *Raising Our Sights* planning process, approved by Governing Council in the previous year. Its purpose was to enhance the student experience.

**Enrolment Expansion.** The Provost and President were preparing a discussion paper on the positive and negative implications of enrolment expansion. It would be presented either to the Committee or directly to the Academic Board for advice. The report would address the possible consequences of the double cohort and demographic changes, and provide an analysis of the conditions under which expansion was warranted, on which campuses it should occur, and in which programs.

**Research Chairs.** The federal government announced in the throne speech that 1200 new research chairs were to be phased in over the next three years. A further 800 chairs would in all likelihood be added at a later date, bringing the total number of chairs to 2000. The \$200,000 allotted for a senior chair, and \$100,000 allotted for a junior chair was to pay for salary and overhead expenses. This was the first instance in which the government had provided funds to cover the indirect costs associated with research. At an average cost of \$150,000 for each of 1200 chairs, the total cost would amount to \$180 million. The funds would be distributed as follows: 35% to Medical Research Council (MRC) disciplines, 45% to Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) disciplines, and 20% to Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) disciplines. Based on the current percentage of funding received from the granting councils, Professor Sedra anticipated that the University could expect to receive about 22% of the MRC chairs, 11% of the NSERC chairs, and 12.5% of the SSHRC chairs. If the full program materialized, the total share for the University of Toronto could be as much as 300 chairs, potentially adding over \$45 million to base budget funding. Professor Sedra noted that a newspaper article erroneously reported that faculty holding these chairs would not have teaching

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd.)

responsibilities. Teaching was, however, a vital aspect of the University of Toronto faculty responsibilities; research chairs at this institution had, and would continue to have, teaching responsibilities. Research chairs would be allocated pursuant to divisional academic plans and would be treated as an expansion of the Academic Priorities Fund (APF). A member noted that the MRC would cease to be in operation as of the upcoming year and asked if this funding was a carryover of the MRC funding or if it was additional money. Professor Sedra replied that this was new funding. In response to another question Professor Sedra said that, similar to the case of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) funding, those small Canadian universities that had not been as successful in competing for research grants would be provided special access to funding.

*SuperBuild Growth Fund.* Professor Sedra noted that the current capital plans were the most extensive of the last 30 years. He drew members' attention to the provincial government initiative called the *SuperBuild Growth Fund*, which would provide \$10 billion over 10 years to provincial capital infrastructure. Of that amount the Province has announced the allocation of \$660 million for universities and colleges for this year. The University was submitting its proposals to the government (for a Monday, October 25 deadline, and subsequent deadlines of November 15 and December 15) from those that had already been identified in the current capital plan.

School of Continuing Studies (SCS). As of October 8, SCS had 9,500 registrations. This was an increase compared to the previous year's total, which had been 7,000. The total the year before had been 9,200. A possible merger was being discussed in which the SCS would become a unit within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Details would be forthcoming in due course.

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Users' Committee Report

The Chair noted that the Committee considered reports of users' committees and recommended to the Academic Board approval in principle of capital projects. The four elements to be taken into account in making its recommendations were: site, space plan, cost, and sources of funds. In the case of the Centre for Information Technology (CIT), the Committee was also being asked to recommend approval of expenditures from the University Infrastructure and Investment Fund (UIIF) as one of the sources of funds.

The Chair welcomed Professors Michael Charles, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and Safwat Zaky, Chair, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services, Professor Emeritus Peter Boulton, Chair of the Users' Committee and Project Manager, and Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Office of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget.

Professor McCammond noted that the CIT was planned in order to accommodate institutional teaching and research priorities in the field of information technology. The CIT would integrate the Advanced Technology Research Facility (ATRF) and the expansion of the teaching programs in computer science and engineering. He reported that the total project cost of the CIT was estimated at \$88.1 million. This included costs related to the provision of classrooms and facilities for approximately 1520 new undergraduate students, 160 new graduate students and 64 new faculty, as well as relocation of activities now accommodated in buildings on the site, relocation of services, and landscape improvements. It was to be built between St. George and Huron Streets, north of College Street, behind the Fields Institute and the Koffler Student Services Centre.

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Users' Committee Report  
(cont'd.)

The Province of Ontario's Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP), which required matching funding, would provide over \$10 million to support this expansion. The University would be seeking a further \$26.7 million in funding from the Government of Ontario's new *SuperBuild Growth Fund*. The Government had cited the CIT as an appropriate type of project for support through the *SuperBuild Growth Fund*; consequently, the Provost was confident of securing funding from the *SuperBuild Growth Fund* for the CIT. A further \$10 million would come from the UIIF. Any remaining amount would be obtained through fundraising or would be borrowed, with the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and the Faculty of Arts and Science carrying any loan repayment, without any draw on University operating funds.

Professor McCammond explained that the Advanced Technologies Research Facility, to be accommodated in the CIT, was a group of four research initiatives with private-sector partners, including Bell Canada, and Nortel Networks. Three of the four initiatives had been firmly funded providing \$11.8 million towards the building cost. An application was pending to provide a further \$600,000 from a fourth research initiative.

A member asked the following questions. Had sufficient consultation taken place with students and other members of the community? Had access for the disabled been adequately addressed? Had relocation of the current occupants of the houses been considered? Were private-sector partners steering the University's fundraising efforts? Did partnership with commercial enterprises compromise the University's mission, and was the University's research focus being prescribed by private-sector partners? Was there an over-balance of support in favour of the sciences to the detriment of the humanities? Dr. Dellandrea assured the Committee that this proposal had not steered fundraising efforts; they had been based on approved academic plans. He pointed out that 51 of the 95 endowed chairs established through the Campaign were, in fact, in the Humanities and Social Sciences. He also noted that every agreement entered into by the University began with a statement of the overriding principle of academic freedom. Professor Sedra reminded members that all agreements were entered voluntarily and did not constrain the faculty's research. He noted too, that all agreements with private-sector partners were available for perusal through the Governing Council Secretariat.

A member noted that \$43 million of the funding was unsecured. What would be the likely consequences if that funding was not secured? Professor Sedra noted that it was his expectation the funding would be secured within the next 4 to 6 weeks. In the event that it was not, a revised proposal would be brought to the Committee. He further noted that the two Faculties involved were willing to take on the responsibility of a loan with its attendant service charges, if required. The member noted that the costs of borrowing had not been included in the proposal.

In answer to a question regarding the feasibility of the proposal to build on the north side of 44 St. George Street, Ms Sisam noted that the artist's rendering shown to the Committee had been produced prior to the discovery of the underground oil tanks and that construction would not cover the corner site.

In answer to the concerns voiced by the member, Professor McCammond assured the Committee that the student-activity space accommodated in the two houses on the building site would be relocated to equal or better space. Miss Oliver also assured the Committee that the elimination of the chemical waste facility on the site would have no negative environmental consequences. Until other arrangements were established, chemical waste would be removed directly from the site of origin.

4. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Users' Committee Report  
(cont'd.)

A member expressed concern over the community perceptions associated with naming. Dr. Dellandrea noted that the University had a *Policy on Naming* and there were Provost's *Guidelines on Donations*.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Centre for Information Technology, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A," be approved in principle,

THAT the project cost of \$88,136,578 funded as described on page 3 of Professor McCammond's memorandum dated October 6, 1999, be approved, and

THAT an allocation of \$12,673,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund, \$10 million, to provide quality improvement space and \$2,673,000 as the University's contribution to the infrastructure cost of the Advanced Technology Research Facility, be approved.

5. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Parking Garage

The Chair noted that this project would need the concurrence of the University Affairs Board because it involved an ancillary operation.

The Chair welcomed Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services, and Mr. Ivan Gottlieb, Administration and General Services, Facilities and Services.

Miss Oliver explained that the significant level of development planned for the St. George campus would displace some of the parking that was currently available. In order to meet the University's parking commitment required by the City of Toronto and to provide service to the high density medical and engineering complexes, it was being proposed that a 308 parking space garage be constructed beneath the CIT. The estimated cost was approximately \$10.3 million. The Parking ancillary would use its capital reserve to fund the project, with secure long-term borrowing for the balance of the capital cost.

Miss Oliver informed the Committee that proposed capital plans over the next five years would displace parking space on the south campus that was currently in heavy use. The CIT site offered the largest space available for a parking garage. The number of proposed parking spaces was calculated by evaluating space needs for a large loading dock for both the CIT and the Koffler Student Services Centre and by the cost-effectiveness of constructing below a particular level. Due to water table problems, the optimum depth for construction would allow for 308 spaces.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

5. Capital Project: Centre for Information Technology - Parking Garage (cont'd.)

THAT a parking garage be constructed beneath the Centre for Information Technology, for a cost of \$10,280,000 plus bridge financing, funded from the Parking ancillary's capital reserve and long-term borrowing, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "B."

6. Capital Project: Lash Miller Chemical Labs - Addition and Renovation

The Chair explained that under its terms of reference the Committee was asked to consider major changes to the scope of, or sources of funding for, approved projects. In this case, the Committee was being asked to recommend approval of a change in the staging of renovations and construction. This Committee recommended approval of the original Users' Committee report in May, 1998 and some alterations to the project in April, 1999.

The Chair welcomed Professor David Farrar, Chair of the Department of Chemistry.

Professor McCammond reminded the Committee that following its original approvals, the success of the University's CFI application matched to the Davenport gift now enabled the Department to fund fully the renovation and construction plan. The current priority was to renovate the lobby, construct the Davenport seminar room, fit out the library, renovate the stair tower, and complete some renovations to the fourth floor.

In response to a question from a member, Miss Oliver noted that the changes proposed would affect the look of the exterior of the building in a positive way. With the removal of the brick on the tower, the stairs would become visible to the street; the glassed in lobby would open up access, and create a clear view to the plaza on the west side of the building.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the Department of Chemistry proceed to complete the renovations identified in the Users' Committee Report in the revised priority sequence, at a cost of approximately \$3.6 million, as described in Professor McCammond's memorandum dated October 7, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C," be approved.

The Chair noted that the motion was carried unanimously.

7. Enrollment Growth Fund: Allocations

The Chair noted that the Committee was responsible for recommending the creation and allocation of general University Funds. Members would recall that the Enrollment Growth Fund was created in the *Revisions to the Approved Budget for 1999-2000* from the revenue generated by enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program, and in computer science and engineering under ATOP.

Professor McCammond reiterated that revenue generated by the enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program, Computer Science, and high demand areas in Engineering, under the Access to Opportunities Program, was directed into the Enrolment Growth Fund. If

7. Enrollment Growth Fund: Allocations (cont'd.)

approved, the proposed allocations would be used to provide additional faculty, administrative, and technical staff, increased teaching assistant assignments, faculty recruitment expenses and start-up funding, laboratory equipment, and general operating expenses.

The Committee had some concerns regarding the different levels of funding allotted to teaching assistantships in the Faculties of Arts and Science and those to Engineering. Professor McCammond explained that as a multi-phase project the divisions submitted their funding requests at different times and, once provided with the monies, distributed funding as they deemed appropriate.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the following allocations be approved:

Enrollment Growth Fund:

\$719,000 in each of 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-03 to OISE/UT for expenses associated with the B.Ed. program;

\$998,323 in base and \$505,000 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP;

\$88,688 in base and \$120,000 in One-Time-Only to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for expenses associated with ATOP; and

\$1,153,177 in base and \$337,500 in One-Time-Only to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D."

8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF): Allocations

The Chair reminded members that the Committee recommended approval of expenditures from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund.

Professor McCammond stated that these allocations were requested for two renovations. The first was to refurbish and update a 40-year-old student laboratory in the Faculty of Dentistry. The second was for renovations at St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of the Departments of Italian, and Slavic Languages and Literatures.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT an allocation of \$99,000 from the UIIF for the refurbishment of a student laboratory in the Faculty of Dentistry; and

8. University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF): Allocations (cont'd.)

THAT an allocation of \$875,000 from the UIIF for the renovations at St. Michael's College to accommodate the relocation of the Departments of Italian, and Slavic Languages and Literatures, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "E."

9. Administrative Transitional Fund: Allocation

The Chair explained that the Committee recommended approval of expenditures and allocations from the Administrative Transitional Fund. He reminded members that this OTO fund had been created to assist administrative divisions as they implemented operational and service changes.

Professor McCammond stated that the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources was requesting one-time-only funding to support a SAP systems upgrade, the demand for AMS and other staff development courses, union negotiations, and production costs for the updated *Orientation Guide for New Academic and Administrative Staff Members*.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT an allocation of \$125,000 from the Administrative Transitional Fund, for the Human Resources Department in the portfolio of the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources, be approved.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "F."

The Chair noted that the motion was carried unanimously.

10. Funds for Matching Programs

The Chair reminded the Committee that it was responsible for recommending the creation and allocation of general University Funds established in the Operating Budget, Capital Renewal Fund or elsewhere.

Professor Sedra noted that among the most attractive features of the current fundraising campaign was the matching program. A \$270 million endowment had been created for student support, and 95 endowed chairs using \$110.5 million of matching funds had been established. However, new sources of matching funds needed to be approved in order to continue the matching programs. In order to meet the firm commitments already made, an additional \$18.9 million in central matching funds was needed. If it were decided to honour all outstanding chair proposals, applying a discount factor, that figure would rise to \$43 million. If the additional projects shown in Table 2 for which no funding had yet been raised were added, the total amount required would rise to \$99.7 million.

Three sources of additional funds had been identified to meet the firm commitments. The Connaught Committee had agreed to the use of the capital of the I'Anson Fund to provide \$18 million of the matching funds for chairs in the Health Sciences including Social Work. The second proposed source was the University's General Endowment, which currently

10. Funds for Matching Programs (cont'd.)

stands at \$27.6 million. The \$1.4 million of yearly revenue generated from the Endowment for use in the operating budget would be replaced by an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund thus holding harmless the University's bottom line. The third proposed source of funds was the savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03, amounting to \$18 million. It was noted that Scarborough would receive a contribution under the RCB/RCM protocol.

Members expressed support of the proposal because it would facilitate the continuance of the matching programs. Several members, however, questioned the use of the funds arising from the employer pension contribution holiday. It was suggested that the funds should more properly be used to support items that would directly benefit faculty and staff or students. A motion to split the motion and consider the sources of funds separately was defeated. In his response to the members' concerns, Professor Sedra noted that using these monies to double available funding to support academic activity was, in his opinion, the best use of the funds. The funds were OTO and if they were used for a tuition freeze or salary increases, for example, they could only be used for one year. Finally, in the current circumstance in which the pension fund was in surplus, the University was prevented by law from making a contribution to the fund.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED**

THAT the transfer of the I'Anson Fund capital to support matched chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work, with the transfers to occur as the full external matching funding for each Chair is received, be approved, and,

THAT the following sources of funds be used to provide matching support for chairs and other matching programs be approved:

The I'Anson Fund, \$18 million, to be used to provide matching for Chairs in the Health Sciences, including Social Work;

The University's General Endowment, \$27.6 million. As previously approved, the Academic Priorities Fund (APF) will continue to bear the cost to hold harmless the University's bottom line for any matches made under the New Matching Chairs program;

Savings from the employer pension contributions in 2002-03, \$18 million.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "G."

11. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto

The Chair explained that the Committee was responsible for recommending approval in principle of capital plans and projects. Here, the Committee was being asked to endorse a planning framework for expanding residence capacity. Users' Committee reports would be forthcoming for individual projects. He noted that the second part of the motion would permit the administration to focus on specific sites immediately.

The Chair welcomed Professor John Browne, the Director of Residence Development.

11. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd.)

Professor McCammond reminded members that the initiatives set out in *Raising Our Sights* placed additional residences high in the University's priorities. The companion document to *Raising Our Sights*, *Student Housing: A Plan for the Next Phase*, quantified those requirements. The Provost had appointed Professor John Browne as Director of Residence Development and Professor Browne had drafted the report that was now before the Committee. Professor Browne had drawn together the known proposals for increasing residence capacity and examined the issues that expansion would entail. The report also identified potential and available sites for development to meet the residence needs.

Professor Browne's presentation to the Committee focused on the following: the location and number of spaces that were currently available; the target number of spaces for undergraduate, graduate, second-entry, and family housing; the ancillary services and policy issues related to housing; and potential sites for residence development, including expansion targets for current residences. *Raising Our Sights* recommended that the University of Toronto increase residence capacity in order to be able to provide spaces for 25% of students, the current number of spaces housed 16% of students. (A copy of Professor Browne's presentation is attached as Appendix "H.")

A member drew attention to the need for faculty housing in light of the plans for faculty recruitment and recommended that these needs be considered in tandem with the expansion of student residences. Another member noted that in planning for student housing, it was vital to consider the need to create a dynamic community that included intellectual, social, cultural, and athletic elements. He noted, as well, that attractive residences would be an effective tool in student recruitment. Another member stressed the need for student and community participation in planning discussions.

In answer to a question Professor McCammond noted that the University currently had approval from the City to build on the sites under discussion with the exception of the following unnumbered sites: the back campus behind University College, and the New College wrap-around.

During discussion, comments were made about several of the proposed sites. With respect to site 4, beside the Robarts Library, a member wished to know whether that site would be needed by the Library for future expansion and asked that the Chief Librarian be consulted on this matter. The unnumbered University College site, on the back campus along Hoskin Avenue, drew concerns about disappearing green spaces on campus. Several members were anxious that any residence construction be done in conjunction with the implementation of the *Open Space Plan*. It was noted that a residence on Hoskin Avenue could have open walkways on the ground floor that would allow glimpses of the green space behind the building. It was also not definite that the residence would be placed at the north end of the back campus; all possible placements on the site would be considered. Professor Sedra stressed that the report supplied a direction for planning; detailed capital projects would return to the Planning and Budget Committee for consideration and approval.

A member reminded the Committee that Governing Council had declared site 21 - Varsity Stadium - surplus to institutional needs. Was it therefore necessary to request from the Governing Council a further change to the site's status to permit residence development? The Secretary of Governing Council explained that the decision taken by Governing Council had been permissive: it allowed commercial development but did not preclude residence construction. Another decision was therefore not necessary. Another member noted that the site would not, as the recommendation implied, be used primarily for

11. Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto (cont'd.)

residence development. There would, of course, be a new Varsity Stadium on that site, as well as a renovated arena in addition to the residence. He asked that the motion be amended to reflect this. His revision was accepted by the administration and the mover and seconder.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the directions and priorities outlined in *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*, dated October 8, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "I," be endorsed, and

THAT, sites 4, 5, 12, 21, and 26, subject to discussion with the City of Toronto, New College and University College, be approved as primary sites for residence development. In the use of site 21, the development of a student residence will not take place without the simultaneous development of a new Varsity stadium and renovated Varsity Arena.

12. Items for Information

The Chair noted that the following items for information would be added to the agenda of the November 16 meeting:

- Varsity Stadium: Future Development
- Users' Committees - Membership and Terms of Reference

13. Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday, November 16, 1999 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary  
October 19, 1999

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair