INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The SFU Burnaby 2065 Campus Master Plan provides a comprehensive physical vision and flexible planning and decision-making framework to guide the evolution of the campus over the next 50 years.

THE NEED FOR A CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

SFU first opened on September 9, 1965 as the “Instant University”, having grown from an idea to a built campus with 2,500 students in only 30 months. Arthur Erickson and Geoffrey Massey’s original vision for the campus has provided a strong foundation and enduring legacy, helping to guide the first 50 years of incremental campus growth and development.

SFU Burnaby has now physically expanded beyond the area originally contemplated by the Erickson/Massey framework, with some aspects of the original vision for a modern university campus proving to be more successful than others. In this time, some new ideas such as UniverCity have come to fruition, alongside continued planning for others, such as the Gondola transit link. The University’s success has also led to the development of satellite campuses in Surrey and downtown Vancouver. To continue this success, it is time to establish a comprehensive physical vision and framework to guide the evolution of the Burnaby campus as it continues to respond to this changing context, and the broader contemporary opportunities and challenges that face all post-secondary institutions.

The SFU Burnaby 2065 Campus Master Plan takes this leap forward, providing a foundation and structure to strengthen SFU Burnaby as an inspiring and beautiful destination for academic learning, cutting-edge research, and broad community engagement. The Plan responds to the need to provide a sustainable campus, to support truth and reconciliation and the indigenization of the campus, and to respond to changes in pedagogy, research, and student expectations.

The Campus Plan is structured by an overarching Vision which considers the elements of the campus that should be preserved and enhanced, areas where renewal and new development should occur, and the structure of the interior and exterior public spaces and connections that support ease of movement and community life across the campus. Building on the specificity within this framework, guidelines and precinct plans provide more specific guidance for future development projects to ensure the vision is realized over time.

SFU BURNABY 2065 AND OTHER PLANNING PROCESSES

This Plan is one of the key tools that will support SFU’s efforts to maintain itself as a highly competitive academic institution with a full complement of facilities and campus environment that not only attracts the best and brightest students, faculty and staff, but that also welcomes and actively engages broader communities in SFU’s academic, research, athletics, and arts and cultural activities.

The Plan works to align the evolution of the SFU Burnaby’s physical campus with SFU’s broader mission. As such, it has been informed by and should be considered in the context of other ongoing planning processes at SFU, including academic planning, spatial needs planning, and strategic planning among others.
The Study Area

SFU's land holdings include much of the peak of Burnaby Mountain, in addition to lands in Surrey and Downtown Vancouver. This Plan contemplates the future of the SFU Burnaby campus only, as illustrated below. As the UniverCity lands are controlled by SFU Community Trust, they were not formally included within the Study Area. However, the importance of the relationship and connections between the SFU Burnaby Campus and UniverCity have factored prominently in the development of this Plan.
The SFU Burnaby 2065 Campus Master Plan process was managed by SFU Campus Planning and Development, led by a core Management Committee and guided by an Executive Steering Committee. The Management Committee worked directly with the consultant team appointed to the project, meeting regularly with the Executive Steering Committee to review and refine the Plan as it was developed.

An interdisciplinary consultant team was appointed to provide a variety of expertise during the planning process and preparation of the Plan. The team was led by Urban Strategies (Campus Planning & Development, Urban Design), with PFS Studio (Landscape Architecture, Urban Design, Planning), Stantec (Architecture), Bunt (Transportation), and Kerr Wood Leidal (Civil Engineering). The Campus Plan team engaged Ouri Scott, a Tlicho Dene architect of Urban Arts Architecture and participant on the Campus Design Review Panel, to advise on engagement of indigenous communities during the planning process.

A Campus Design Review Panel was convened at three key points in the planning process to review and provide feedback on work-in-progress. The panel was made up of design experts from a variety of perspectives, including leaders in contemporary modernist architecture, landscape architecture, indigenous architecture, and heritage architecture, with a focus on experience with the Erickson/Massey legacy at SFU Burnaby. The SFU Burnaby 2065 Campus Master Plan is the result of the efforts of many individuals, including SFU’s core Management Committee, the Executive Steering Committee, the Board of Governors, the President, and the many members of the broader SFU Burnaby community who shared their thoughts and comments throughout the process.
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THE CAMPUS PLANNING TEAM

Elizabeth Starr (Project Manager) Campus Planner
Ian Abercombie Director, Campus Planning and Development
Kera McArthur Executive Director, President’s Office
Larry Waddell Chief Facilities Officer

EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Martin Pochurko [Chair] Vice President, Finance & Administration
Joanne Curry Vice President, External Relations
Michael Den Haan Vice President, Advancement & Alumni Engagement
Joy Johnson Vice President, Research and International
Dr. Jonathan Driver* Vice President, Academic & Provost pro tem
Kera McArthur Executive Director, President’s Office
Larry Waddell Chief Facilities Officer

CAMPUS DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
James Cheng James KM Cheng Architects
Larry Beasley Beasley & Associates Inc.
Lee Gavel Consultant & former SFU Chief Facilities Officer
Cynthia Girting School of Architecture & Landscape Architecture, UBC
Michael Heeney Surrey City Development Corporation
Norm Hotson Hotson Architecture
Donald Luxton Donald Luxton & Associates
Ouri Scott Urban Arts Architecture
John Wall Public

*Dr. Peter Keller was the Vice President, Academic & Provost and was an Executive Steering Committee Member from the initiation of the project in 2018 until September 2019, when Dr. Jonathan Driver stepped into this role.
The SFU Burnaby 2065 Campus Master Plan was initiated in January 2018, and completed in late 2019. The planning process followed a six phase work plan with strategic opportunities for community engagement positioned during each phase of work. These opportunities for broad community consultation and engagement were structuring elements of the planning process, providing meaningful opportunities for the university community to inform the development of Campus Master Plan.

Figure 1-1. Process diagram
The six-phase planning process was built around a multi-faceted engagement program, providing several opportunities for students, faculty, staff, SFU residents, UniverCity residents, alumni, and participants from the broader public to participate and provide input on work-in-progress on the Campus Master Plan throughout the planning process. Major engagement activities undertaken are illustrated below and to the right.
The Campus Plan is divided into seven chapters, each briefly described below to help orient and direct the reader.

**CHAPTER 1**
**INTRODUCTION**
This chapter provides background on the planning and engagement process, and an overview of the Campus Master Plan.

**CHAPTER 2**
**SETTING THE CONTEXT**
This chapter explores the history and evolution of Burnaby Mountain, including its indigenous history, the historic build out of the campus, and current projects and initiatives.

**CHAPTER 3**
**THE CAMPUS TODAY**
This chapter summarizes analysis of the physical campus and Erickson/Massey legacy, concluding with a series of overarching Physical Directions that guide more detailed recommendations in later chapters.

**CHAPTER 4**
**THE CAMPUS VISION**
This chapter establishes Guiding Principles, Big Moves, a Long-Term Demonstration Plan, and a series of Visualizations that together provide a Vision for future evolution of the campus.
CHAPTER 5
THE CAMPUS PLAN
This chapter provides more detailed directions for major campus systems including land use, movement, and open spaces, as well as key University Projects that are integral to achieving the Vision.

CHAPTER 6
DESIGN GUIDELINES
This chapter provides high level design direction for projects to ensure they successfully contribute to the broader vision for the SFU Burnaby Campus.

CHAPTER 7
PRECINCT PLANS
This chapter will serve as a key implementation tool, providing a convenient set of tools with which to plan, evaluate, and coordinate campus projects.
Providing guidance for the future, the Campus Master Plan reflects the past and is grounded in the present. This chapter acknowledges the SFU Burnaby campus lands as the traditional territories of the Coast Salish People, and traces the origins and evolution of the campus up to the present day.

### 2.1 HISTORY OF THE LAND

**TRADITIONAL TERRITORIES**

Simon Fraser University’s Burnaby campus is on the traditional territories of the Squamish (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw), Tsleil-Waututh (səl̓ilwətaʔɬ), Musqueam (xʷməθkʷəy̓əm) and Kwikwetlem (kwikwəƛ̓əm) Nations. The history of First Nations people on Burnaby Mountain goes back thousands of years. While villages were located at lower elevations, resources were collected on a seasonal cycle. The mountain was used as a place to hunt and to gather arbutus bark and other plant resources.

The four Nations shared resources and utilized the land of Burnaby Mountain in various ways. The Musqueam (xʷməθkʷəy̓əm) have a history documented for over 4,000 years with a focus on the Fraser River. The Squamish (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh) have numerous village sites dating back 3,000 years over a territory with boundaries that embrace all of Howe Sound, Burrard Inlet and English Bay as well as the rivers and creeks that flow into these bodies of water. Many locations hold a particular significance for the Squamish Nation because of their relationship with the land.

The Tsleil-Waututh (Səl̓ílwətulh) people occupied a vast area of land in Greater Vancouver, ranging from areas around the Burrard Inlet, Deep Cove in North Vancouver, Coquitlam Lake, Howe Sound, to south of the Fraser River. The Kwikwetlem (kwikwəƛ̓əm) First Nation are Sto:lo people who now live in Coquitlam near the mouth of the Coquitlam River where it flows into the Fraser River.

Christopher Lewis, who is a member of SFU’s Board of Governors and a member of Chiefs and Council for the Squamish Nation, provided information in an interview for The Peak that the shoreline of the mountain was a place where Coast Salish People collected sea urchins and participated in other low tide harvesting activities. Ron Johnston, Pro-tem Director for SFU’s Office for Aboriginal Peoples, mentioned in his interview with The Peak that Burnaby Mountain was also a place for hunting and gathering and was an especially popular place for harvesting Arbutus Wood. Johnston noted that like most mountains and higher places where such activities took place, Burnaby Mountain was a special place for prayer, solitude, and reflection so that one could connect with the Creator.

When SFU was being built in 1965, Burnaby Mountain was not part of any First Nations reserves, although people from many nations lived nearby and considered it within their unceded territories. The First Nations were not consulted on the choice of site or other aspects of building the university.

References:
WALK this Path with Us, Report of the SFU Aboriginal Reconciliation Council, 2017
The history of Coast Salish peoples on Burnaby Mountain, The Peak, Bernice Puzon, February 28, 2017

Declaration of Spirit
TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

In 2017, SFU underwent a comprehensive review of how the University could respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action. The findings and recommendations from the process are outlined in the report, *Walk this Path with Us, Report of the SFU Aboriginal Reconciliation Council (ARC Report)*.

The ARC Report acknowledges that, although a number of programs and supports for Indigenous students staff and faculty have been put in place at SFU, “there yet remains much work to be done. Throughout the five-month consultation process of the Aboriginal Reconciliation Council (ARC), Council members listened to stories of pain, racism, and disillusionment, from Aboriginal students, staff, faculty, and alumni. Each of the recommendations in [the] Report was crafted to create, support, and sustain a changed and better environment for SFU’s Aboriginal students, staff, and faculty. The enduring legacy of ARC will be a change in our own University culture, in the way we think, act, and interact with each other and with the Aboriginal communities on whose traditional and unceded territories Simon Fraser University is built.”

In addition to providing a vision for an indigenized campus, a number of recommendations in *Walk this Path with Us* provide specific guidance over the course of the Campus Master Plan:

- Expansion of the Indigenous Student Centre
- Visible Inclusion and Representation of Aboriginal Peoples
- Indigenous Art and Commissioned Artifacts Installation
- Removal of Existing Colonial Art and Artifacts
- Creation of a Safe, Respectful, and Inclusive Campus Community
- Ceremonial Spaces
- Indigenous Student Spaces
- Indigenous Student Housing
- Indigenous Visual Representation and Wayfinding

The Campus Plan team engaged Ouri Scott, a Tlicho Dene architect of Urban Arts Architecture, to advise on engagement of indigenous communities during the planning process. This has informed a number of processes and protocols, that should continue to be undertaken through future planning initiatives, including:

- Inviting the Squamish (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Ûxwumixw), Tsleil-Waututh (səl̓ilw̓ətaʔɬ), Musqueam (xwməθkwəy̓əm), and Kwikwetlem (kwikwaƛ̓ am) Nations on whose traditional territories Simon Fraser University’s Burnaby campus is located to provide insight and direction
- Inviting off-campus Indigenous community organizations to specific workshops and to public open house events
- Creating a safe space and following protocols when engaging with Elders and Indigenous communities
- Reaching out to Local Nations with respect and use of protocols
- Acknowledgment of traditional lands and territories at gatherings
- Incorporating ceremony
- Sharing food at gatherings
- Recognizing and reducing barriers to participation
The origins of the SFU Burnaby campus began with a remarkable and rapid turn of events, bringing the campus and its architectural legacy from idea to fruition in only 2.5 years. The recommendation for a new University to serve the BC Lower Mainland was first identified in January 1963, and assent from the BC Legislature to establish SFU was received only two months later. In May of 1963, Dr. Gordon M. Shrum was appointed Chancellor, and tasked with selecting the University's location from a variety of sites. Burnaby Mountain was selected for its views of the Burrard Inlet, Fraser River, Vancouver Harbour, and the surrounding mountains. The Chancellor initiated a design competition for the University. The Vancouver firm of Erickson/Massey won the competition, launching Arthur Erickson’s career. The four other selected firms – William R. Rhone and Randle Iredale; Zoltan Kiss; Duncan McNab, Harry Lee, and David Logan; and Robert F. Harrison – each designed at least one building within the Erickson/Massey plan. Construction began in the spring of 1964 and 18 months later, on September 9, 1965, SFU opened to 2,500 students. SFU Burnaby was dubbed the ‘Instant University’, with the distinct mountaintop location and innovative design competition both contributing to campus’s award-winning architectural legacy.

With initial construction of the core campus beginning in 1964, SFU Burnaby has experienced five decades of incremental growth and development, which have primarily been guided by the Erickson/Massey 1963 Simon Fraser University Development Plan and subsequent 1990 update by Arthur Erickson Architects. With the last update undertaken almost 30 years ago, over time the campus has expanded beyond the extent of the original Development Plan with some developments demonstrating inconsistencies, or in some cases, a full departure from the original Development Plan. With a number of new exciting initiatives and opportunities on the horizon, such as the continued build out of UniverCity, interest in the Gondola connection to the Production Way SkyTrain station, and construction of new residences and amenities on the west campus, it is increasingly important to provide a contemporary planning framework to guide the continued evolution of the campus in the decades to come.

References:
1. "History of Simon Fraser University" - https://www.sfu.ca/students/calendar_archives/08.09%20calendar/historyofSFU.htm

Historical view of the campus
A FOCUS ON UNIVERCITY

The Erickson/Massey 1963 Development Plan always envisioned SFU Burnaby as an anchor for a residential community on Burnaby Mountain. This vision was advanced in the mid 1990s as SFU negotiated with the City of Burnaby on the Official Community Plan (OCP) and related zoning by-law amendments that have guided the development of UniverCity. As part of the negotiation to permit the development of a dense, mixed use community on University-owned lands, SFU transferred more than 320 ha of its land holdings to the City to expand the Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area. In return, the OCP permits up to 4,536 residential units on approximately 65 ha of land surrounding the campus, along with school facilities, neighbourhood parks, a commercial core, and other community facilities.

SFU had two key aspirations in advancing UniverCity. Because the campus’ removed location, UniverCity presented an opportunity to create a more complete community with a broader range of housing choices and commercial shops, services and amenities to serve both UniverCity and SFU. This development also established an Endowment Fund to support teaching and research, allowing SFU to leverage the value of its land holdings to support its academic mission. Now that UniverCity is nearing its full build out, it has been highly successful in both of these regards. UniverCity has also demonstrated significant innovation and leadership in sustainable building practices, stormwater management, and district energy, providing inspiration and raising the bar for future development on the mountain.

References:
“History” - http://univercity.ca/about-us/history/
“MEASURING PERFORMANCE: 4 x E = SUSTAINABILITY” - http://univercity.ca/sustainability/

A view of campus with UniverCity in the foreground
CURRENT PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES

At the time of writing, a number of current development initiatives are underway and at various stages, from initial concepts and ideas to more detailed planning, approval and funding, and construction. For projects that are less advanced there has been an opportunity for this Plan to not only anticipate and respond to these projects, but also to inform how they are advanced in relation to Master Plan directions and recommendations. Projects that were fully approved, funded and or under construction, were incorporated within the Campus Master Plan as the newest elements of the campus.

The images to the right feature exciting new initiatives at SFU, which at the time of writing have been advanced to the point of developing these illustrative renderings.

Student Residence building - Phase 1

Corix Biomass Renewable Energy Centre

Student Union building

Student Residence Building - Phase 2
In planning for the next 50 years of development and evolution at SFU Burnaby, it is important to understand the key issues and opportunities for the campus today.

This chapter revisits foundational concepts from the original 1963 Erickson/Massey Development Plan and 1990 AEA update, reflecting on whether or not these have been successfully achieved, and their continued relevance to the future of the campus. Building on these original ideas, a series of new overarching Physical Directions are provided to ground more detailed recommendations and physical planning into the future.

3.1 REVISITING FOUNDATIONAL ERICKSON/MASSEY CONCEPTS

The Erickson/Massey legacy is a significant and enduring part of the campus. The last 50 years of incremental growth and development have been guided by the original 1963 Development Plan and 1990 update by Arthur Erickson Architects. However, the campus has now expanded beyond the area of the 1963 Plan, and in some cases development has occurred that varies from original concepts.

In planning for the next 50 years of development and evolution, it is important to understand the successful, enduring aspects of the original vision that remain relevant and should be celebrated, preserved and built upon. It is also important to understand concepts that were less successfully achieved, or that may be less relevant today and over the next five decades.

Over the following pages, foundational concepts and illustrative text have been collected from the 1963 Development Plan, as summarized in 1990 AEA update, along with discussion of the success and continued relevance of these elements of Erickson and Massey’s original vision for the campus.

Figure 3-1. Erickson/Massey diagram superimposed on SFU’s existing campus. The campus today has far outgrown the extent and vision of the original Erickson/Massey Plan.
Analysis of Foundational Erickson/Massey Concepts

1. AXIAL ARRANGEMENT OF SPINE ALONG MOUNTAIN RIDGE

“Linear organization of the campus, along the central mall, maintaining its axial views and enhancing its processional character”

The central ceremonial axis remains a highly successful and enduring organizing element at the core of the campus today, and will continue to serve as a primary east/west organizing element into the foreseeable future.

2. TERRACED MASSING IN RESPONSE TO LATERAL TOPOGRAPHY

“Stepped, terraced building form, responding to the natural shape of the hill-top site, maximizing the lateral views from the mall and other upslope buildings, and ensuring special sensitivity in the rooftop treatment”

This pattern has already been broken as the spatial design and needs of contemporary buildings have required greater floor plates in some locations. While this concept should continue to be contemplated in certain areas, particularly in relation to views from the ceremonial axis for example, as a foundational concept this has already proven to be problematic and unrealistic in relation to the need for contemporary facilities and spaces.

3. HIERARCHY OF BUILT FORM AND ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

“Stronger architectural statement and larger scale of buildings along the central mall, with the more ‘neutral’ architectural character and smaller scale of buildings to either side of the mall”

Over time, as the campus continues to expand beyond the primary ceremonial access, campus edges and arrival sequences will continue to shift, particularly with the introduction of the Gondola. In the context of future expansion, shifting edges, and new arrival sequences, it will increasingly be less relevant to focus the most prominent architecture along the axis at the core of the historic campus. New hierarchies and focal points for strong architectural statements must be considered as the campus continues to evolve and expand.
WEST AND EAST ANCHORS

“Balance of activity and development at the east and west ends of the campus, and integration of the residential and social areas with the academic areas of the campus”

Unlike the campus development around the Academic Quad, the western residential precinct has continued to be built out with little regard to the cohesive vision for that portion of campus illustrated in the original 1963 Development Plan. The scale and success of UniverCity and its High Street have also worked to shift the centre of gravity of the campus to the east, resulting in a failure to achieve this aspiration. More cohesive development of future west campus residences, focused on a strong anchor that supports activity and community life for the western residential precinct will be essential for this area of campus, recalling and better achieving Erickson and Massey’s original intentions.

WEATHER PROTECTED PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

“Overall pedestrian orientation and network of weather-protected pedestrian connections between all different areas of the campus, punctuated by activity foci such as lecture theatres, study areas, information centres, food services and informal gathering places”

While much of the campus is connected by internal and exterior weather protected walkways and connections, the legibility and quality of this network is challenged, with poor wayfinding and pedestrian experiences being cited as a core concern for the campus through engagement activities. New strategies are required to enhance the pedestrian experience across the campus and improve connectivity, including closer relationships to the outdoors and natural setting.

CLARITY OF EXPANSION, ACCESS AND EXTENT

“As university training is based upon contact between individuals, the campus must be kept minimal in size and human in scale. The size should be based on a pedestrian time measure.”

The success of the institution has meant that the existing campus is challenged to address the human scale, and has already extended well beyond its original planned edges. Areas of the campus such as the Sciences Complex have incrementally expanded beyond a manageable scale, and other areas such as the Discovery Building in the South Neighbourhood have been located beyond the reach of a convenient pedestrian walk. Future development is expected to further expand the edges of the built campus. While ensuring clarity and minimizing unnecessary expansion both remain important aspirations, it is no longer realistic or desirable to minimize the size of the campus, or to consider walking distances as primary limiting factors. However, enhancing the human scale experience of the campus and facilitating pedestrian access remain important priorities.
FOREST EDGE RELATIONSHIP

“Major green areas at either end of the main axis, including the academic quadrangle and the highest portion of the hill, with natural green fringes along the north and south edges of the campus and green “fingers” extending into the heart of the campus from either side.”

Contrary to the notion of extending green fingers into the heart of the campus, the incremental expansion of the campus has established the ring roads as a clear dividing line between the forest on one side and the built campus on the other. In the context of contemporary and future interests in sustainability and resilience, enhancing the relationship between the built campus and forest and finding opportunities to extend green features and functions back into the heart of the campus will remain an important imperative into the future.

VIEW CONSIDERATIONS

“Throughout the campus (along the east/west axis) runs a system of open spaces intended to heighten the effect of the transition along the axis towards the west view of Vancouver City, the east view of Fraser River and the Border Peaks.”

As the campus has continued to develop, other view considerations have evolved in addition to those identified in the original 1963 Development Plan. The quality of the views from atop Burnaby Mountain were an important part of the original decision to locate the campus here, and continuing to identify, restore and enhance views will continue to be important into the future.

APPROACH SEQUENCE UP GAGLARDI WAY

“Celebration of the approach sequence and the main vehicular arrival/dropoff points, giving special consideration to the buildings and open spaces that directly contribute to the approach and arrival experience, most notably the meadow which provides a foreground to the theatre, academic quadrangle and science complex”

With the build out of UniverCity, primary approach sequences are already changing and will continue to shift over time with the introduction of the Gondola, potential shift towards autonomous vehicle technology, and more generally with the continued expansion of the campus. The Gaglardi Way arrival sequences should continue to be celebrated, but cannot realistically be assumed to remain as the main approach to campus into the future; identifying and enhancing other important approach sequences will be equally important.
In planning for the next 50 years of development and evolution at SFU Burnaby, it is important to understand the key issues and opportunities for the campus. The Physical Directions are structured around three important questions that the Campus Master Plan works to address.

> What from the Erickson/Massey Development Plan is to be celebrated?
> What elements of the campus need to be reassessed?
> Where and how is the campus to grow?

Building on the analysis of the original foundational concepts from the Erickson/Massey 1963 Development Plan in the previous section, the answers to these questions are central to understanding the campus today and how it should continue to evolve into the future.

The following Physical Directions represent core objectives and recommendations to address key strengths, issues, and opportunities for the campus today. These high level directives are reflected in the Campus Master Plan’s Vision and more detailed recommendations. They also offer a means for evaluating future projects and amendments to the Campus Master Plan.
What from the Erickson/Massey Development Plan is to be celebrated?

At the scale of the mountain, aspects of the original Erickson/Massey Plan have been highly successful, both in terms of organizing the campus and responding to its distinct natural context and surroundings.

The Physical Directions below identify the enduring elements of the Erickson/Massey legacy that should continue to inform the character and organization of the campus, and its relationship to its context.

RESPECT AND REINFORCE THE CEREMONIAL AXIS

The central axis functions as a successful central organizing element at the core of the campus, responding to the natural contours of the mountain and aligning with key views.

REINFORCE AND IMPROVE EXISTING PLACES OF ENTRANCE

Key points of entrance into the axis should be improved and reinforced to continue to celebrate the importance of the central axis.

PREPARE THE ENSEMBLE OF ICONIC SPACES AND BUILDINGS

The Academic Quad, WAC Bennett Library, Convocation Mall, Transportation Centre, and related open spaces represent successful, enduring elements of the core historic campus.

IDENTIFY, RESTORE, AND PRESERVE KEY VIEWS

Protecting and enhancing key views both to and from central axis and iconic buildings and spaces must continue to inform the evolution of the campus and strategic management of the forest.
What elements of the campus need to be reassessed?

Many of the central, enduring elements of the Erickson/Massey legacy are successful in organizing the core campus, and supporting grand ceremonial functions and the overall experience of an academic campus atop a mountain. In contrast, the day-to-day human scale experience of the campus is often compromised. This is due to a lack of alignment between patterns of movement, placemaking, and land use. Pathways between key destinations are often unclear or unfriendly. Some of the most beautiful areas of campus that should support community and day-to-day life are not well-positioned within the fabric of places and movement corridors, and the quality and sense of place erodes towards the campus edges. The Physical Directions below identify key aspects of the day-to-day, human scale experience of the campus that need to be reassessed and better resolved through future development, investment, and placemaking initiatives.

IMPROVE THE CAMPUS EXPERIENCE AND ADDRESS DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

For example, constrained loading and servicing areas create barriers that detract from the pedestrian experience and ease of access around the campus.

FIND PLACES FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES

The places that support different campus communities and day-to-day life are fragmented and dispersed at SFU. In contrast Ryerson’s Student Learning Centre provides a central place of arrival that also supports a variety of day-to-day community functions and special events.

SIMPLIFY AND IMPROVE THE PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

The existing pedestrian network is complex and lacks both spatial hierarchy and clear wayfinding.

BETTER KNIT OPEN SPACES INTO THE DAY-TO-DAY LIFE OF THE CAMPUS

Although the landscape of the Academic Quad is beautiful, it does not support the day-to-day social life of campus. At Harvard University, Harvard Yard is both an iconic place and a key social space that was enhanced through the simple addition of ample moveable seating to invite broader use of the space.
EXPLORE OPPORTUNITIES TO EXTEND THE FOREST BACK INTO THE CORE CAMPUS

Erickson and Massey’s notion of extending ‘green fingers’ into the campus has not been successfully achieved. UBC’s Wesbrook Village’s provides clues about how to connect the campus with the forest, and accommodate circulation.

CLARIFY AND ENHANCE ARRIVAL SEQUENCES

Many arrival sequences, such as east campus road approaching the east transit exchange, do not provide a clear or pleasant arrival experience.


The Erickson/Massey vision did not adequately anticipate the impact of vehicles. The 2065 Burnaby Campus Plan must better accommodate arrival sequences, parking, and the extent and character of road ways to ensure they support all users.

IMPROVE MOVEMENT ACROSS THE CAMPUS

While the primary east/west axis is a successful organizing element of the campus, overall accessibility and connectivity across the campus is in need of improvement for all users.
How and where is the campus to grow?

As a 50-year plan, understanding the potential of all of SFU’s lands and providing a framework to guide appropriate growth and expansion over time is a central consideration. The Campus Master Plan is able to plan for the near term with greater certainty, but must also consider the entirety of SFU’s lands on Burnaby Mountain. In the near term, it is not anticipated that SFU Burnaby will experience significant growth in traditional enrollment. Despite this, the need for new campus infrastructure, facility renewal, and new buildings to meet contemporary needs will continue to drive investment in the campus into the immediate future. Further, the continuation of historic patterns of continued campus growth and the opportunities for University-related partnerships and mixed use/residential growth must be contemplated in a long-term Campus Master Plan. The following Physical Directions provide guidance on how to answer these important questions about how and where the campus should grow as it continues to evolve over time.

**DEFINE INFILL CAPACITY AND DEVELOP A FUTURE-THINKING PARKING STRATEGY AS SURFACE LOTS ARE REDEVELOPED**

Surface parking lots are key near-term development opportunities due to their immediate proximity to existing development, mobility systems, and other infrastructure and servicing.

**STUDY AREAS FOR SENSITIVE GROWTH AND EXPANSION INTO THE FOREST**

For example, Cornell University’s Lab of Ornithology provides clues about how development within the forest can sensitively integrate with its surroundings and respond to rigorous environmental protection criteria.

**CONFIRM AREAS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT WITHIN THE FOREST**

The protection of environmental features and the definition of development capacity must be considered concurrently, along with the exploration of ways to support low-impact recreational enjoyment of natural areas.
The SFU Burnaby 2065 Vision is described over the following pages through a combination of words and images that together illustrate how the physical campus should evolve over time.

This Vision includes the following elements and sections:

4.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

4.2 BIG MOVES

4.3 LONG-TERM DEMONSTRATION PLAN

4.4 ILLUSTRATING THE VISION

This diagram above provides a conceptual illustration of the essence of the vision. It is used throughout the document to illustrate how specific recommendations relate to the physical structure of the campus and the evolution of the Erickson/Massey concept.

Figure 4-1. The vision diagrams
The Guiding Principles are broad-based and mutually supportive planning objectives that the Campus Master Plan must achieve, and are grounded in the University community’s values and priorities. They provide comprehensive direction for the Campus Master Plan as a foundation to inform physical recommendations, and offer a means for evaluating future projects and amendments to the Campus Master Plan.

**Support Simon Fraser University’s Mission**

1. Align campus planning and investment in the physical campus with the University’s institutional mission, mandate and core values
2. Develop a renewed vision for a vibrant and distinct campus setting that promotes and supports SFU’s dynamic integration of education, research and broad community engagement
3. Provide a flexible campus framework that is responsive to the needs of the 21st Century Learner and the evolution of research and pedagogy over time
4. Foster the creation of open and flexible collaborative spaces that facilitate inter- and trans- disciplinary learning, research and innovation
5. Provide a physical campus environment that supports and promotes equity, diversity, inclusion, health and well-being

**Build a Complete Community on the Mountain**

1. Undertake integrated planning of academic facilities, social spaces and amenities, and residential communities to enhance the campus experience, build community and attract bright minds
2. Expand and enhance social, cultural and recreational spaces to support a vibrant experience and high quality of life for students, staff, faculty, visitors and residents, including UniverCity
3. Develop a critical mass of diverse housing options supported by high quality services and amenities
4. Integrate diverse spaces and opportunities for programming and rituals into the fabric of the physical campus to support and welcome the broad spectrum of communities that SFU seeks to engage
5. Position the campus as a home away from home by creating welcoming spaces, facilities and amenities that invite commuter students to remain on campus between classes to engage in academic activities and broader campus life

**Weave Opportunities to Support Indigenization throughout the Campus**

1. Acknowledge the campus lands as the traditional territories of the Coast Salish people: the Squamish (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw), TsleilWaututh (səll̓iwaʔɬ), Musqueam (xwməθkwəy̓əm), and Kwikwetlem (kwikwəƛ̓ am) Nations
2. In accordance with local tradition, integrate the campus with its environment in a way that respects all aspects of nature, and supports the restoration and enhancement of natural systems
3. Integrate facilities and spaces for Indigenous ceremony, protocol, engagement, and educational and pedagogical opportunities within the broader context of the campus and local environment
4. Utilize Indigenous concepts of welcoming and gathering within placemaking initiatives to foster dialogue, welcome all diverse communities, enrich broader campus life, and celebrate SFU’s unique West Coast environment and eco-system
5. Ensure meaningful engagement with representatives of Indigenous communities throughout the campus master planning process, and through future efforts to renew and update the Campus Master Plan
Thoughtfully Celebrate Erickson and Massey’s Original Aspirations for the Campus

1. Identify, celebrate and restore the core elements and values within the Erickson/Massey vision for the campus that remain relevant and valuable today
2. Develop a new vision that clarifies the potential of all campus lands beyond the scope of the original Erickson/Massey vision
3. Prioritize investment in legacy buildings and spaces to reinforce the physical identity of the campus while responding to contemporary needs
4. Support the sensitive integration of old and new, allowing the campus to respond to contemporary expectations for buildings and open spaces
5. Create a consistent high quality experience and sense of place across the full campus

Position the Burnaby Campus as a Destination for Active Engagement

1. Create an inviting setting to facilitate broader community participation in academic exploration, facility-sharing, programming and events
2. Capitalize on the campus’ architectural heritage, mountaintop setting, and natural features as key assets and attractions
3. Reinforce the campus as a mountain retreat, connected and engaged but with a distinct sense of place and natural setting
4. Create a supportive environment for partnership opportunities and development
5. Strategically invest in infrastructure, amenities, facilities and diverse programming to attract visitors, alumni, students, staff and faculty

Enhance Connectivity and Movement

1. Enhance and extend streets, paths and other connections to ensure a unified and connected campus setting
2. Promote and facilitate connectivity and transit access across the campus, and between the campus, Burnaby and the broader region
3. Improve weather protection, wayfinding and legibility to ensure an intuitive, safe, and comfortable experience throughout the campus during all seasons
4. Create a convenient and inviting experience for visitors accessing the campus
5. Eliminate physical barriers to ensure universal accessibility across campus, and minimize barrier impacts of the natural terrain
6. Facilitate convenient and sustainable mobility options to connect all campus communities, expanding opportunities for active transportation on the mountain
7. Manage parking to address demand, while continuing to promote and provide alternatives to driving

Foster Sustainability and Resilience

1. Sensitively integrate the campus within its natural setting to enrich the campus experience and minimize negative impacts on the surrounding environment
2. Promote facility renewal to maintain the condition and quality of legacy buildings
3. Ensure enduring quality in new buildings and infrastructure
4. Minimize energy use and emissions by pursuing innovation and best practices in building renewal, new development and infrastructure planning
5. Carefully manage natural systems to enhance features and functions while supporting opportunities for future development
6. Ensure readiness for emergency and disaster scenarios through the provision of resilient buildings and infrastructure
7. Implement planning processes that integrate disciplines, engage communities and help achieve the long-term campus vision
4.2 THE BIG MOVES

The Vision is based on seven ‘Big Moves’ that describe the physical nature of change and opportunity at the highest level. Taken together, these big moves support the Guiding Principles and set the stage for more detailed recommendations.

Preserve, repair, and enhance the ceremonial axis and ensemble of iconic spaces and buildings

Together, the central ceremonial axis and related ensemble of iconic spaces comprise a spatial experience and iconic presence that is powerful, memorable and unique. The campus plan will protect the essential defining character of these spaces and buildings including the ceremonial axis, the places and patterns of arrival, the key iconic buildings at the heart of the campus and key views within, to and from the campus. Although there may be substantive evolution of the campus in the next 50 years, returning alumni must be able recognize these key spaces and buildings as an enduring part of Simon Fraser University’s experience and identity.

Preserving these core elements does not mean that they should remain static. While these buildings and spaces should be preserved as core elements of the campus over the decades to come, they will need to continue to adapt and take on new roles, programming and functions in order to remain relevant and best serve an evolving and dynamic campus.

Figure 4-2. Preserve, repair, and enhance the ceremonial axis and ensemble of iconic spaces and buildings

- Preserve, repair and enhance
Renew, revive, or replace aging buildings and places that extend from the axis

Many elements of the built campus that extend out from the core ceremonial axis and academic quad are in need of more significant renewal or even potential replacement, particularly over the 50-year time frame of this plan. A focus on renewal will allow Simon Fraser University to address deferred maintenance and improve wayfinding while creating facilities that support emerging best practices in pedagogy and provide additional places for gathering and identity that are contiguous to where people learn, socialize and work. This will improve both the function of facilities and sense of community on campus for groups large and small.

Connect and expand the system of open spaces, including a broader athletics and recreation precinct to serve the full community

As highlighted in the Physical Directions, the green spaces of the campus can do much to support both the experience, function, and image of the campus through better design, programming, and integration with existing and proposed movement corridors and placemaking. This can be achieved through a focused investment in a new athletic and recreational landscape, and through better integration with the natural setting, such as the reintroduction and connection of the natural structure of streams and forested corridors back into the heart of campus. Trails could lead directly to academic spaces and views could be reintroduced in the distance. Portions of the campus would feel more within the forest rather than being surrounded by the forest. A new athletic and recreational landscape could also mediate between the existing athletic facilities and the forest, providing places for both varsity fields and passive recreation while contributing to the ceremonial sequence of arrival to the Transportation Centre.
4 Extend patterns of development and placemaking to the edges

Experience of place currently erodes moving outwards from the campus core towards the edges, where buildings and surface parking lots have extended to the ring roads without a clear theory about the design and character of the campus edges. Over time, these surface parking lots represent some of the best opportunities to accommodate new development and infill. New development must be guided by a strong framework to better support placemaking, movement, and integration with existing development, as well as establishing a more welcoming relationship that addresses and engages with the campus edges.

5 Extend a new east/west Mobility Corridor across the campus to enhance connectivity and serve future development

A new east/west Mobility Corridor will enhance access and accessibility across the campus while providing critical infrastructure to support the long-term development of the southern campus lands. As the campus expands, this corridor will provide frontage, identity and access for new development, as well as supporting convenient access across the full campus. The proposed corridor follows a relatively even grade across the campus, positioning it to better support all modes of transportation and universal accessibility, creating opportunities to introduce new programs or technologies to expedite movement across the full campus as expansion continues.
Guide expansion into the forest to meet future needs, based on research into environmental constraints and opportunities

The forested slopes to the south of the existing campus represent a significant opportunity for campus growth, if sensitively implemented to preserve and enhance existing environmental features and functions. While demand for development into most of these areas is limited today, the 50-year time frame for this plan requires exploration of the potential of these areas to accommodate future needs and opportunities. New development should generally work to avoid significant environmental features in order to minimize impacts and to limit costly interventions in natural systems. These lands offer the University the opportunity to explore new patterns of placemaking that may depart, yet complement, the highly integrated complex of buildings envisioned in the original Erickson/Massey Development Plan.

Introduce new north/south connections along the axis to connect the existing campus to future development opportunities

Today, buildings and spaces are primarily organized around the east/west ceremonial axis, with limited consideration of movement, access, and spaces in a north/south alignment. In conjunction with implementation of the athletic and recreational precinct, the east/west Mobility Corridor and future development to the south, a series of new or enhanced north/south spatial corridors must be considered to support a well-connected campus. Proposed connections are positioned at key places of entrance into the central ceremonial axis, presenting opportunities to provide a clear, comprehensive network of connections across the full campus over time. For these connections to be successfully realized, they must be considered as investment occurs both within existing areas of the built campus and within any future expansion to the south.
The Long-Term Demonstration Plan illustrates the full range and capacity for future development over the 50 year horizon of the Campus Master Plan, highlighting the integration of new buildings, open spaces and movement patterns. The Long-Term Demonstration Plan shows one potential interpretation of the Guiding Principles, Vision, and Big Moves, demonstrating how the campus can evolve over time. Given the 50 year time horizon of this plan, SFU will need to continue to evaluate the need for new spaces and facilities on the Burnaby Campus. Whereas the Long-Term Demonstration Plan illustrates the full capacity of SFU’s lands atop Burnaby Mountain, over time the need for expansion into new areas along the southern slopes must be considered alongside opportunities for expansion closer to the campus core, and the potential for expansion on other SFU owned lands and campuses.
Erickson/Massey’s central campus core and axis trace the Burnaby Mountain ridge and establish a linear sequence of ceremonial spaces and framed views. Taken together, this axis and spatial ensemble heightens the experience of the mountain and its location within the lower mainland. It is an experience that connects the sublime to the communal and the individual.
The Campus Master Plan works to repair and extend Erickson and Massey’s central axis in a way that celebrates and recalls foundational aspirations of the original 1963 Development Plan, some of which have yet to be realized.
The Burnaby 2065 Plan complements the central Erickson/Massey axis with the addition of a second, informal corridor that also traces an east/west route across the mountain, but provides an experience that is integrated within, rather than imposed upon the landscape.

A series of new places will emerge along this Mobility Corridor as the campus expands to the south over time. Following the informality of this new corridor, new development, athletic fields and landscapes will also sit within a more natural setting.
The Mobility Corridor facilitates multi-modal and universally-accessible connections across the full campus, playing an important role in the experience of arrival to and movement across the campus.
'The Fields' introduces an improved setting to the campus, consolidating new and renewed athletic fields, facilities, and recreational landscapes, with improved connections between them. This major landscape will help to mediate between the formality of the central campus and more natural areas to the south.
Where 'The Fields' meet the core campus, respectful enhancements to central places like Maggie's Field, Terry Fox Field, and the Transportation Centre will knit together new and existing areas of the campus as it continues to expand and evolve over time.

Figure 4-21. Diagram showing "The Fields" and development opportunities.

Figure 4-22. View looking west to the athletic fields. See Section 5.4.4 University Projects - The Fields for further description of this initiative.
Maggie’s Field will be recreated as a gently sloped amphitheater, providing a place for both programmed events and unprogrammed gathering. It will contribute to the arrival sequence to campus, preserving and enhancing views from Gaglardi Way.
Lateral ‘Green Fingers’ recall Erickson and Massey’s original aspirations for inviting nature into the campus, providing primary connections between the central axis and Mobility Corridor to integrate the spatial structures of the campus.
This expanded campus structure will preserve the key experiential qualities of the SFU Burnaby campus, providing a framework to organize future development and the evolution of the campus over time.
Within this structure, there is substantive capacity for SFU to grow and engage new communities on Burnaby Mountain over the 50 year horizon of this plan, continuing to build a critical mass of activity and positioning the campus as a vibrant, community-oriented destination.
Figure 4-28. View looking east from campus above
The Vision in Chapter 4 provides a framework that will guide the growth and evolution of the campus over time. This Chapter provides a more detailed look at the major systems that contribute to this framework, including land use and development, open space, and mobility. Implementation of these systems, including specific major University Projects, will ensure that the Vision, Guiding Principles, and Big Moves in Chapter 4 are realized.

This Chapter includes:

**5.1 LAND USE SYSTEM AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**
This section provides a structure for the organization and location of development opportunities and land use across the campus.

**5.2 OPEN SPACE SYSTEM**
This section describes the fabric of places and settings that connect campus buildings to one another, and to the surrounding Conservation Area.

**5.3 MOVEMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**
This section explores how mobility systems can evolve over time to seamlessly support all modes of travel and enhance connectivity across the campus.

**5.4 UNIVERSITY PROJECTS**
This section details large-scale initiatives that are key to implementing the vision, shaping the campus structure, identity, and experience.
This section of the Campus Master Plan provides a broad structure for the organization and location of development opportunities, and the distribution of academic, residential, athletics and recreation land uses across the campus. Within these broader land uses, it also provides direction on the integration of supporting amenities and services, and social and community-oriented uses.

**This section includes:**

**5.1.1** A **DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK** provides a high level framework illustrating the integration of buildings, open spaces and movement corridors, illustrating development opportunities.

**5.1.2** A **LAND USE PLAN**, which applies land use designations across the campus to provide direction on the overall structure and strategic location and clustering of various uses.

**5.1.3** A series of drawings that outline a **STRATEGY FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY** by integrating social and community-oriented uses within the overall physical and spatial structure of the campus.
5.1.1 DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

The Development Framework integrates elements of the mobility, open space, and land use systems to create an overall framework to guide future development.

It synthesizes elements of the land use, open space, and movement systems described throughout this chapter to illustrate opportunities for renewal, infill, and new development. These are more prescriptive within the campus core, where opportunities for near term strategic infill and renewal can build upon and extend the existing campus fabric, organized around the central ceremonial axis.

Development to the immediate south of the existing core campus is organized around the proposed east/west Mobility Corridor, which in combination with the introduction of related new streets can open opportunities for expansion to the south by providing access, servicing, and building address.

Moving further down the southern slopes, development parcels and mobility elements are less prescriptive, and are intended to provide high level guidance on future development potential and capacity, as needs arise over the 50-year time horizon of the plan.

The various elements that make up the Development Framework are described in greater detail over the following pages.
DEVELOPMENT PARCELS

Redevelopment Parcels:

As existing campus buildings continue to age, they may require various forms of renewal, including maintenance, expansion, or over the time-frame of this plan, potential replacement. Renewal projects can address not only facility condition issues, but also provide transformative opportunities, such as addressing high priority university space needs, responding to changing pedagogical needs, enhancing the usability of buildings and space, and creating operating efficiencies.

Infill and Near-Term Expansion Parcels:

Infill and development areas are identified on surface parking lots and at the edges of the existing built campus. Development parcels in these areas can generally be easily accessed and serviced with existing infrastructure and connections, presenting the simplest and/or least costly opportunities for near-term new development. Focusing new development on infill areas that have a close relationship with the existing campus core is part of creating a compact and connected campus, with a critical concentration and mix of uses that support active transportation and a vibrant, community-oriented experience.

Future Expansion Parcels:

University-owned lands along the southern slopes present opportunities for significant expansion if and when the need arises. The Development Framework depicts a street and block pattern for these areas, illustrating development capacity and servicing strategies without detailed prescription of use or built form. While this parcel fabric works to protect and allow for strategic management of known sensitive environmental features such as stream corridors, future development in these areas will require further examination of environmental constraints and servicing requirements. Generally, it is recommended that incremental growth and development of primary university facilities be addressed through renewal or replacement of aging facilities, and/or through infill development, reserving future expansion areas for major opportunities that may arise over the 50-year lifespan of the plan.

MAJOR OPEN SPACES AND NATURAL AREAS

Natural areas protect known environmental features, such as stream corridors. These help to inform the broader framework of major open spaces, which seek to extend ‘green fingers’ back into the core campus. This framework of major open spaces and natural areas helps to structure movement, provide views, and inform the character, location, and orientation of future development. Outdoor spaces also provide integral opportunities to advance other priorities for SFU, such as building community, supporting the indigenization of campus, promoting outdoor learning, advancing best practices in sustainability, and supporting opportunities for recreation, health, and wellness.
**MAJOR INTERIOR/COVERED PEDESTRIAN NETWORK**

This network helps to illustrate primary interior/covered pedestrian routes across the campus, and how development parcels can connect into, expand, and enhance this network. If and when expansion into the lands on the southern slopes is pursued for campus uses, further consideration should also be given for how to extend this important network.

**EAST/WEST MOBILITY CORRIDOR**

The east/west Mobility Corridor is included on the Development Framework to highlight the important role it plays in extending east/west connections across the campus. This corridor may initially be pursued solely as an active transportation route to address mobility and accessibility objectives across the full campus. It is designed as a multi-use pathway that can function on its own, or be integrated within existing or future streets. For example, in the fullness of time, where development parcels are shown along the south side of the Mobility Corridor west of Gaglardi Way, the Mobility Corridor is envisioned as an element within a new complete street. Extending a future street here will be necessary to provide vehicular access and servicing to unlock those development parcels.

**THRESHOLDS**

A key recommendation of the Master Plan is to introduce “thresholds” positioned at major intersections of the interior/covered pedestrian network, particularly where this network connects with existing buildings, new development, and major outdoor spaces. These thresholds are important nodes for clear and intuitive transition between interior and exterior pedestrian networks and spaces, and between the various vertical levels of the interior pedestrian networks. They are intended to seamlessly integrate horizontal and vertical circulation, as well as creating important places of entry, access, and activity for new development.
The Land Use Plan identifies how different uses should be organized across the campus, reserving space for academic activities at the core of the campus and encouraging a greater integration of different uses in strategic locations to facilitate academic interaction, support community building, encourage sustainable modes of travel, rationalize infrastructure and generally improve the quality of life on campus.

The Land Use Plan incorporates a framework of major open spaces integrated within the full campus to support day-to-day life. It also provides opportunities to leverage economic benefits by seeking development partnerships, such as through the provision of commercial uses, residential development, athletic facilities, and employment uses interested in partnerships with academic and research activities. The University should remain flexible and responsive to market conditions to best leverage its land assets, seeking or responding to these types of partnership opportunities as they arise.

The Land Use Plan is made up of the following land use designations:

- Academic
- Academic Mixed-use
- Residential
- UniverCity
- Athletics and Recreation
- Mixed-use/Athletics and Recreation
- Special Policy Area: Expansion
- Major Open Space

These designations are described over the following pages, providing guidance on appropriate uses in respective areas of the campus.
Figure 5-2. Land Use Plan

Academic
Academic Mixed-use
Residential
UniverCity
Athletics and Recreation
Mixed-use/Athletics and Recreation
Special Policy Area
Major Open Space
Academic areas intended for teaching and research facilities, administrative uses, childcare, and related ancillary services and amenities. This area seeks to maintain and enhance the cluster of academic uses at the campus core to facilitate both intra-disciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations, and to facilitate easy movement between classes, lectures, research facilities and other academic activities. As such, residential uses are generally not intended in this area. Buildings in this zone are strongly encouraged to incorporate adequate ancillary and support services such as common areas, study spaces, student services, lifestyle recreation facilities, and food services. Integration of these ancillary uses is integral to the functioning of the academic core, supporting the day-to-day needs of students, faculty and staff, and advancing University objectives related to building community and supporting the campus as a ‘home away from home’.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Academic areas are the appropriate place for new, core academic facilities to be constructed.
2. Continue to enhance academic and administrative functions through additions, renovations and new construction on key infill sites.
3. Focus on the integration of integral support services and amenities, such as common areas, study spaces, lifestyle recreation facilities and food services.
4. Residential uses are generally not intended in this area.
ACADEMIC MIXED-USE

Academic mixed-use areas can include secondary or peripheral academic uses that do not need to be spatially tied to the academic core. They are also encouraged to integrate student residences, market residential uses, and private/partnership employment uses. This area is strategically located adjacent to the academic core, with the Gondola landing where these two mutually supportive zones meet. The academic mixed-use zone is positioned to respond to the transit investment, supporting partnerships to leverage investment, increased density, and innovative new uses. It seeks to attract the broader community to the mountain in a way that supports SFU’s core interest in broad community engagement, cutting edge research, and academics.

Figure 5-4. Land Use Plan - Academic Mixed-use

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Academic mixed-use areas are further from the academic core of the campus, and are more appropriate for secondary or peripheral academic uses that are not programmatically tied to the core.

2. Capitalize on investment in the Gondola by encouraging density, partnerships, investment, and innovative uses that bring the community to the mountain.

3. Ground floors of buildings should contain cultural, community hub and/or retail uses that help to animate adjacent streets and open spaces.

4. At the Gondola landing new buildings should present a clear, welcoming gateway into the University for visitors, students, faculty, and staff.
Residential areas should incorporate student residences, market residential uses, childcare, and ancillary amenities and support uses such as residence support services; study and collaborative workspaces for students; food and beverage; food stores and convenience retail; and lifestyle recreational uses. Expanding the extent of student housing on campus can help to foster a sense of community and activity at all times of day. UniverCity has been incredibly successful at bringing the community to the mountain, providing a critical mass of market housing to leverage the introduction of new retail, restaurants, a food store, and other amenities and services. However, with this success, UniverCity has shifted the campus’ centre of gravity to the east, as students, faculty, staff, and residents who live on both the east and west ends of campus gravitate to the new services and amenities on the UniverCity High Street. This shift highlights the lack of similar ancillary services and amenities in the west student-oriented residential precinct.

Figure 5-5. Land Use Plan - Residential and UniverCity

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to invest in student and market housing to bring the community to the mountain.
2. Introduce new centrally located ancillary services and amenities to better serve the west residential precinct, providing a western node for activity and community building, acting as a counterpoint to the UniverCity High Street.
**MAJOR OPEN SPACES, NATURAL AREAS, AND GREEN CONNECTIONS**

Natural areas, major open spaces and green connections help to inform the character, location, and orientation of future development; structure movement; and protect known environmental features and supporting opportunities for green infrastructure. As structuring elements of the campus, these areas are shown on the Land Use Plan. Recommendations related to the character, design, and use of these spaces is described in more detail in the Section 5.2 Open Space System and Section 5.4 University Projects. Smaller secondary/local open spaces are encouraged in all areas of the campus.

*Figure 5-6. Land Use Plan - major open spaces, natural areas and green connections*
ATHLETICS AND RECREATION

Athletics and recreation areas are located to respond to the existing cluster of recreational facilities and sports fields, including the Lorne Davies Complex. Student residences, hotels, ancillary teaching and research facilities, and other ancillary retail, services and amenities are also encouraged in this area. Whereas this area of the campus is intended to create a primary cluster of athletic and recreational facilities, secondary 'lifestyle' recreational uses are also encouraged in all other land use designations to provide all students, staff, faculty, and the broader community with a range of conveniently located recreational opportunities across the campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Enhance the primary cluster of athletics and recreational uses to serve the full range of athletic and recreational activities occurring on the mountain.
2. Encourage secondary uses that can capitalize on their proximity to these primary uses, such as sports medicine facilities or hospitality-related academic programming.
3. Introduce and improve facilities and amenities that support spectators and athletes engaged in events, supporting athletics as a community-building activity.
MIXED-USE/ATHLETICS AND RECREATION

This area of the campus provides flexible opportunities for the expansion of primary athletic fields and a range of supportive uses. Because there are few opportunities to develop new athletic fields on the mountain, consideration of future needs and protecting appropriate sized development parcels for new athletic fields should be prioritized here.

This area is also intended to provide flexibility to respond to other future needs due its larger development parcels. This could be an appropriate area to seek and respond to partnership opportunities that seek to capitalize on the proximity to athletics and residential uses.

A full range of complementary uses are appropriate, including major athletic fields and facilities, teaching and research facilities, administrative uses, student residences, market residential uses, private/partnership employment uses, childcare, and ancillary services and amenities.

Development in this area may be tied to investment in the new east/west Mobility Corridor and related infrastructure to provide servicing and vehicular access.

Figure 5-8. Land Use Plan - Mixed-use/Athletics and Recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Advance planning to confirm athletic facility capacity and needs, and prioritize investment in any additional needed playing fields, as well as complementary facilities, and/or uses that require the types of large parcels in this area.

2. Consider partnerships to attract complementary uses, and/or support cost sharing for the infrastructure investment required to unlock development in this area.

3. As development replaces areas of surface parking elsewhere on the campus, consider interim surface parking in this area, which can help finance grading and future construction of playing fields to replace interim surface parking, concurrent with strategies to reduce the demand for parking over time.
Areas for future expansion provide substantive capacity for future growth, positioning the campus to respond to a range of opportunities that may arise over the 50-year time horizon of this plan. Development parcels here are large enough to accommodate major comprehensive initiatives, whether these are tied to SFU’s academic mission or market related opportunities like UniverCity. However, future development in these areas will need to consider extensive servicing requirements alongside environmental constraints and impacts.

SFU should continue to prioritize incremental development of key campus facilities closer to the core campus on already-serviced lands, reserving these future expansion areas for major comprehensively planned initiatives. This will ‘future proof’ long-term opportunities, as well as supporting the creation of a more compact and connected campus. Focusing incremental growth in the core will also help to create a critical concentration and mix of uses that supports active transportation and a vibrant, community-oriented campus.

In the near-term, these future expansion areas provide important opportunities for interim or temporary uses, such as interim surface parking to unlock development potential closer to the campus core, and/or impactful ‘backyard’ servicing, academic or research-related activities that are less appropriate in the core. Temporary or interim uses can be strategically located at the edges of these future expansion areas, where they can be appropriately screened and serviced by existing roads and infrastructure in a cost effective manner. To the extent that these types of uses are permitted and encouraged here, they should be truly temporary and interim in nature so as not to preclude major future opportunities for comprehensively planned development that cannot be located elsewhere.

As forested areas, these lands also provide important opportunities to pursue strategic environmental management to enhance the quality of natural features and systems. This can include planting of native species, managing invasive species, and other initiatives to improve wildlife and riparian habitats and systems.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Incremental development of key campus facilities should primarily be located closer to the core campus on already serviced lands.
2. Future expansion areas should be reserved for major comprehensively planned initiatives that require larger parcels, and that do not necessarily need to be co-located with primary campus functions.
3. Strategically locate interim and/or temporary ‘back-yard’ servicing, parking, and/or academic research activities at the edges of these areas, where they can be appropriately screened from the core campus, while still serviced in a cost effective manner.
4. Future-proof opportunities for major expansion by ensuring that any near term development in these areas is in fact temporary, interim, or does not otherwise preclude longer-term capacity to respond to major opportunities that may arise.
5. Explore opportunities to enhance the management and quality of natural areas and systems.
SFU should continue to anticipate construction of the Gondola, and consider the opportunities this creates not only where the Gondola lands at the top of Burnaby Mountain, but also where it lands. At the time of writing, various alignments for the Gondola are under consideration. This plan has been developed based on the assumption that the Gondola will follow the alignment shown to the right, running from the SFU campus to the foot of the mountain at the Lake City Business Centre.

Compared to forested lands on the slopes of Burnaby Mountain located further from the academic core, in some ways lands surrounding the Gondola landing at the foot of the mountain will in fact be located ‘closer’ to the campus in terms of ease and time of travel. These lands will have a direct relationship with both the Sky Train and Gondola, and also have the benefit of already being serviced. Because residential uses are not currently anticipated on these lands (as per the City of Burnaby’s Lake City Business Centre Guide Plan), these lands may be relatively affordable and appropriate for a variety of non-residential partnerships and other University uses.

Lands surrounding the Gondola landing at the bottom of the mountain provide excellent opportunities for partnerships with public and private organizations and businesses who are interested in engaging with SFU on research initiatives, creating work-study opportunities for students, and/or other partnership initiatives. For some such organizations, investment in new facilities may be more desirable in closer proximity to the SkyTrain than at the top of the mountain.

Once the Gondola is realized, these lands will also be strategically positioned as a gateway into the campus. As such, it would benefit SFU to be able to create a first impression by having a presence at both ends of the Gondola, positioning a variety of information and welcome functions to assist students and visitors.
5.1.3 BUILDING COMMUNITY: SOCIAL SPACES AND PROGRAMMING

Hierarchy of Places and Community Activity

To build a stronger sense of community and support a more vibrant campus life experience, the campus should better accommodate a broad range of social activities and programming. This section outlines an approach to build community and related social spaces and programming within the planned campus structure by considering a hierarchy of places and activities.

The campus needs more community-oriented spaces that respond to multiple social and community hierarchies. These include spaces where the broader campus community can gather for larger events and functions, as well as spaces for distinct communities such as student groups, cultural or religious groups, or faculty and staff lounges. These places should be both indoors and outdoors, and are needed for many forms of socialization: group study and collaboration, events and functions, sharing and celebrating research and academic work, sports and recreation, rest and relaxation, health and well-being, arts and culture, religious activities, dining, drinking, and so on.

Indigenous values related to ‘welcoming’ and ‘gathering’ are well aligned with the need to create additional community-oriented places. This highlights an important opportunity to support the Indigenization of the campus, and for Indigenous values to help inform the design, naming and programming of new inclusive community-oriented spaces.

Within a large university like SFU, a hierarchy of spaces to support community is required. This hierarchy is described over the following pages, and includes:

> Major Social Hubs
> Secondary Social Hubs
> Tertiary Social Hubs

This hierarchy is then used to inform a spatial framework and recommendations for positioning community oriented spaces and activities within the structure of the campus.

THE CAMPUS AS A ‘FESTIVAL’

During the planning process, the ‘Future of the Campus’ public event included a keynote speaker, Dr. John Moravec, and a panel discussion with other thought leaders including Dr. Peter Keller (SFU’s Provost), Carole Jolly (Director of Community Development, UBC), Andy Yan (Director, SFU City Program), and Christopher Lewis (Deputy Board Chair, SFU & Councillor, Squamish Nation). Dr. Moravec spoke about the campus of the future resembling a ‘festival’, a notion that is well aligned with the recommendations in this section.

“To me, the university of the future needs to look more like a festival — a gathering space. I don’t mean a festival like a big party, but a festival where:

> People from diverse backgrounds come together and share;
> It is a fundamentally creative space - to learn, work, live, and play;
> Serendipity is enabled. Not everything is pre-programmed;
> Self-organization by students to discover and learn what is important for their own individual development. I think this goes beyond instructor-student co-creation as students need to become the source of their own learning direction;
> Movement is rapid: you follow the flows of your own interests. Groups of people form their own seminars;
> It’s not just a formal experience. There are many other, ‘invisible’ ways of learning that are attended to; and,
> Space is used fluidly [and designed fluidly] to allow for flexibility and repurposing.

The qualities of a festival mirror those that are needed for an organization such as SFU to thrive well into the future.”

Dr. John Moravec
Education Futures Founder & Principal
Major social hubs function as key anchors within the overall framework of the campus, providing space and programming for the full community on Burnaby Mountain. These spaces are part of the overall campus identity. They are used for a wide variety of temporary activities including orientation and related rituals, convocation, displays, rallies, concerts, as well as functioning as a general lounge space for day-to-day use. SFU already has some community spaces that function at this scale, such as Convocation Mall. However, to-date these spaces have been challenged to support day-to-day community beyond their use for a few major, specialized functions, such as SFU’s well-known convocation ceremony. Where these highest order community spaces already exist within the structure of the campus, recommendations are provided in the following sections to enhance and improve their functions. As the campus continues to expand, recommendations for the strategic positioning of new major social hubs and related programming are also provided.

Secondary social hubs are also key shared spaces, but often play a dual role as places of identity for distinct groups or faculties that use these spaces for more specific community-oriented uses. These spaces must be strategically positioned within the fabric of the campus, inviting the broader community in, while providing visible places of belonging that highlight distinct community identities. These social hubs must be individually designed to support various distinct social uses and functions, which together should provide opportunities to support a full range of diverse needs for distinct communities. There is a significant shortage of secondary social hubs at SFU, which contributes to the campus’s challenges in building community, a sense of belonging, and a vibrant environment. The framework in the following sections highlights opportunities to locate these spaces and the types of uses and programming they should support.

Tertiary social hubs are at a finer grain and smaller scale, including spaces such as staff, faculty, and student lounges. These spaces are tied directly to the facilities and uses around them and should be planned in conjunction with the creation of new facilities, or the improvement of existing facilities, to respond to the specific communities that use them. Given the wide range of potential locations for these specific and localized tertiary social hubs, it is not possible or appropriate to locate them within the Campus Master Plan. However, there are some general recommendations to be considered in planning for such places.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Tertiary social hubs for various user groups should be easily found and clearly identified within broader patterns of use and circulation.

2. Academic hubs such as clusters of faculty offices should be planned together with tertiary social hub spaces for both faculty and graduate students.

3. All new facilities should consider creation of tertiary social hub spaces in their program development, in consultation with intended users of those spaces.

4. Informal, undedicated tertiary social hubs should also be developed adjacent to, or within circulation areas, particularly in relation to the ‘Thresholds’ identified within the Development Framework and Social Hub Framework diagrams in the following section.
Locating, Designing, and Programming Major Social Hubs

The Master Plan provides a framework to position and connect social hubs within the overall structure of the campus, aligning spatial hierarchies with the hierarchy of community and social activities. This strategy seeks to not only build community and support a broad range of social activities, it also seeks to improve campus legibility and wayfinding by positioning vibrant social activity at important and visible locations in the structure of the campus.

Major social hubs should be located at key areas of intersection between land uses, major pedestrian circulation routes, and major open space networks. This allows for various distinct uses at respective major social hubs to inform their character and programming. With the central axis and new east/west Mobility Corridor providing primary connections across the full campus, major social hubs are located at regular intervals along these two corridors, where they are intersected by major north/south open spaces and connections. This positions major social hubs as key gateways into the campus, providing hubs for activity that are within close walking distance of each other and the surrounding areas between them. Each major social hub is also positioned to incorporate major open spaces, allowing for indoor spaces and uses to relate to, and spill out onto adjacent outdoor spaces.

Specific discussion of the design, use, and programming of respective major social hubs is located in the following section.
Figure 5-13. Major social hubs
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THE CORE

This social hub is the original area of focus for the institution, where the Bennett Library, Convocation Mall, the Diamond Family Auditorium, and other primary student life components are clustered. With Convocation Mall providing a large space for the full university community to gather, this social hub has been the location of not only convocation ceremonies but historic rallies and protests, outdoor concerts, orientation activities and club days, and other various programming and events.

The most recent additions to this cluster of social uses are the new Student Union building, and new pub, which are working to better support a sense of community.

While this social hub - Convocation Mall in particular - is very successful in accommodating large programming and special events, these types of events are a somewhat infrequent occurrence. On a day-to-day to basis, Convocation Mall is of such a large scale that activating and animating this space for intimate activities is a challenge. Weather and climate also pose challenges to enjoyment of this space during colder months.

Maggie’s Field is also strategically positioned to form a part of this social hub, though to date it remains an underutilized and unprogrammed space. Building on recommendations in Section 5.4.4 The Fields, the creation of a more intentionally designed open space here will create new opportunities to facilitate community-related activities and programming in this highly visible central space, as well as more direct relationships with adjacent facilities.

The following recommendations and precedents highlight opportunities to reinforce and strengthen this social hub, to allow it to better function as a vibrant node of social activity that helps to build and support community at the heart of the campus.

Enhance indoor/outdoor relationships and animate edges: The social hub should be considered as a series of open spaces and buildings, with efforts made to improve synergies and break down barriers between indoor and outdoor spaces. This should include improved circulation, transparent materials to enhance views in and out, and orienting active uses within buildings to front onto and spill into outdoor spaces. Lighting, weather protection, heating, and other interventions should be introduced to enhance habitability of outdoor spaces during all seasons.
Increase the regularity of major events: Make additional efforts to program more regular large events in Convocation Mall and Maggie’s Field, creating opportunities to draw the larger SFU community together, and potentially invite other communities to the mountain.

Introduce moveable seating: Introduce moveable seating in Convocation Mall, and build seating into the design of Maggie’s Field to enhance amenity and opportunities for people to stay and enjoy these spaces.

Expand day-to-day programming and fun interventions: Introduce smaller scale, regular programming and interventions in public spaces. This could include food and beverage offerings via shipping containers or food trucks; recreational programming such as table tennis, foosball, or even beach volleyball; cultural ceremonies or celebrations; and/or demonstration or celebration of academic/research activities and achievements.
ACADEMIC/SPORT/RESIDENTIAL HUB

The academic, sport and residential hub is located where the West Green intersects the Central Axis. The social hub is focused upon the proposed West Commons, a new open space that recalls Erickson and Massey’s original vision for a residential quad here that was never realized (see Section 5.4.3 West Green).

The creation of this social hub will not only support localized west campus communities, it also provides a critical counterpoint to UniverCity, helping to rebalance the campus’s centre of gravity by enhancing the provision of food services and other indoor and outdoor amenities at the heart of the west campus.

This proposed new open space is lined with the Dining Hall along its west side, the Lorne Davies Complex along its east, and is in close proximity to the West Mall Centre and proposed new student residences. As such, it provides a central, informal ‘living room’ for the west campus community, allowing for a variety of social activities to spill into the outdoors, such as dining, study, lounging, and informal sports and recreation. These types of uses could be encouraged and supported by programming such as food trucks or other enhanced food and beverage offerings, and smaller footprint athletic activities such as table tennis, fooseball, volleyball or basketball. In the summer months, this space could also support intermittent larger scale athletic events or gatherings, such as ‘field day’ type activities for summer campus.

Introduce programming to support activity and community building: providing fun food and beverage offerings to support outdoor dining, as well as informal recreation sports will attract activity and animate this social hub.

Provide strong indoor/outdoor relationships: utilizing transparent materials and positioning active uses fronting outdoor spaces helps to create a sense of activity and safety, visually connecting indoor and outdoor spaces.

Support passive sitting, dining, and studying: outdoor spaces should be designed with seating and weather protection to allow for dining, studying, and recreational activities to spill into public outdoor spaces.
A new social hub should be created in the heart of the western terminus of the central axis, surrounding the proposed West Prospect space [see Section 5.4.2 West Axis]. This should consist of a combination of buildings, facilities and outdoor spaces, creating a destination at the western edge of the campus that better serves the needs of the local residential community, while also drawing the broader University Community and visitors to the west end of the campus. The West Prospect contemplates a direct connection to the Trans Canada Trail system and Burnaby Mountain Park, which would potentially position this social hub as a western gateway into the campus and amenity for recreational visitors on Burnaby Mountain.

Programming and uses could include a fine-dining option for residents and visitors, which should capitalize on views from the axis to the west. A student-oriented cafe, pub and/or music venue to support after hours community and opportunities to showcase student music, art, poetry, and other forms of local art and cultural expression should also be considered. A range of other services and amenities should also be included to support day-to-day needs of the community and visitors alike. These could include food and beverage services, a small grocery store or market, health and/or beauty services, automated banking, bike repair, and daycare/child services among others. New residential uses should also consider incorporating hotel or other temporary stay facilities for visitors, helping to generate activity and demand for facilities and services.

**Capitalize on views:** new food services and other indoor and outdoor spaces can draw people to this new destination by capitalizing on striking views from the west end of the axis.

**Incorporate a range of amenities and services** to meet the day to day needs of residents and visitors alike, supporting quality of life and community.

**Provide venues and spaces to support local music, art, and culture,** creating nightlife and opportunities for community building and interaction for residents on the mountain.

**Ensure new buildings and facilities have a strong relationship with outdoor spaces,** allowing social activities to activate public spaces.
Positioned where the SFU and UniverCity communities come together, this emerging social hub is located in proximity to a series of existing and proposed arts and cultural uses including the Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, the Trottier Observatory and Science Courtyard, and the proposed Art Museum. This hub should continue to be programmed and designed to support this growing cluster of cultural activities that serve and support the convergence of town and gown communities.

With Strand Hall and the proposed new Strand Commons open space at its heart, this hub is also the symbolic setting for the University’s administration. Strand Commons is uniquely positioned as a vibrant central quad, providing a new green open space that can work together with the existing Town Square to provide a place for passive recreation and formal events and ceremonies.

With the introduction of the Gondola, this area is also positioned to become a primary gateway and point of entry into the University for students and visitors alike. As such, incorporation of welcome and information services, convenience retail and food and beverage services, washrooms and water stations, and wayfinding and interpretive signage to highlight and direct new students and visitors to key destinations and features of the campus is particularly important here.

Support existing cultural facilities with enhanced wayfinding, interpretative signage and regular programming to invite students, UniverCity residents and the broader regional community to engage.

Continue to cluster cultural uses, new open spaces, information services and convenience retail at the Gondola landing to reinforce this area as a cultural node and key point of arrival and activity.
Future major social hubs should be considered if and when the campus expands into southern lands. These future social hubs should be positioned where patterns of movement, land use and open spaces come together, incorporating indoor and outdoor facilities. They should generally be considered along the new east/west Mobility Corridor, where this new axis intersects with key north/south open spaces and movement corridors. While notional locations for future social hubs are illustrated on diagram below, the appropriate location of these hubs will need to be studied and considered as these areas of the campus are developed.

These new social hubs should be designed as places of arrival, intersection, and gathering at these key crossroads within the campus, supporting and responding to the needs of local communities as well as creating key destinations that are inviting to the full community on the mountain and beyond.

In keeping with the recommendations for existing major social hubs, future major social hubs should:

- Provide strong indoor outdoor relationships with active and animated edges
- Support a range of major and day to day programming to ensure regular activity
- Integrate food services and other amenities to support convenient day-to-day life
- Integrate indoor and outdoor seating, weather protection, and public art to invite people to enjoy spaces
- Be designed in a place-specific manner, responding to any distinct attributes and uses in the surrounding area

Ensure new buildings and facilities are integrated with landscape improvements to activate public spaces.

Provide cultural and academic activities inside and out with strong indoor/outdoor visual connections, including public art and interpretation strategies that can advance SFU’s mandate and core values.
Like major social hubs, secondary social hubs should also be located at key intersections within the campus’ broader patterns of land use, open space and movement. Whereas major social hubs are positioned where the major east/west and north/south connections come together, secondary social hubs may be considered in relation to the ‘thresholds’ identified in the development framework (see Section 5.1 Land Use System and Development Framework).

These thresholds are intended to provide a clear and intuitive transition between horizontal/vertical and interior/exterior movement, also acting as places of entrance and address for related buildings and outdoor spaces. As such, they are also natural places to locate secondary social hubs and the activity they will generate. Secondary social hubs located at these thresholds should be clearly visible, should respond to adjacent uses, and where possible should bridge and animate both indoor and outdoor spaces.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Locate secondary social hubs at thresholds, providing clear visibility and opportunity for indoor and outdoor activity to animate key places of entry and movement.

2. The use and programming of these spaces should specifically respond to the identity and interests of the local communities that occupy the surrounding facilities. They should also be shared and public in nature, providing opportunities to celebrate activities and successes, or otherwise engage and invite the broader SFU community in.

3. Types of uses and programming within these spaces may include:
   - Events to share or celebrate research, academic work, or other success and achievements
   - Non-traditional learning, research and/or engagement - “learning commons”
   - Arts and cultural activities
   - Ceremonies, rituals or protocols tied to specific faculties, groups, cultures or religions
   - Recreation, health and well-being activities
   - Local hubs for dining and drinking
   - Space for group study and/or collaboration
Figure 5-15. Locating secondary social hubs
5.2 OPEN SPACE SYSTEM

Over the past 50 years, SFU Burnaby has become known for Erickson and Massey’s architectural vision and their response to the unique mountain top setting. For the next 50 years, the 2065 Campus Master Plan seeks to elevate the campus’s network of open spaces to mirror the status of the architectural legacy, similarly through creative and innovative responses to the campus’s unique setting.

The Open Space System provides the fabric of places and settings that connect the campus’s notable buildings to one another, and to the surrounding Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area.

Burnaby Mountain serves as the headwaters for eight different creek systems, and is part of the traditional territories of the Coast Salish peoples. In the decades to come, the Open Space System must respond to contemporary sustainability and resilience imperatives, particularly as these relate to the mountaintop setting. As SFU advances new placemaking initiatives, this system must also support the University’s truth and reconciliation efforts, and broader objectives related to building community, and providing a vibrant and engaged campus environment.

The system mapping in this section characterizes the different landscape and open space typologies that make up the overall fabric of places that knit the campus together. Each of these typologies is discussed in detail over the following pages. Recommendations seek to better align these places with patterns of land use and movement, as well as ensuring that the Open Space System responds to contemporary objectives related to sustainability and resilience, indigenization of the campus, building community, and supporting new and innovative ways of learning outside of the classroom.

Further detail about the design, character and programming of many specific spaces is also described in 5.4 University Projects.
CONCEPTUALIZING THE OPEN SPACE FRAMEWORK

At the heart of the Open Space System are three major landscape typologies – the Central Axis, the Fields, and Green Fingers - each of which is made up of a series of distinct, individual spaces. The conceptual diagram below highlights these typologies, which can also be seen on the plan diagram on the following page.

The different elements of the Open Space System are described over the following sections, and illustrated on the system plan on the following page:

5.2.1 CENTRAL AXIS describes and provides recommendations for the series of spaces along the axis.

5.2.2 THE FIELDS is a major new consolidated landscape made of new and renewed athletic and recreational facilities.

5.2.3 GREEN FINGERS are a series of new linear spaces that structure new development, movement, and natural functions.

5.2.4 MINOR QUADS AND COURTYARDS provides direction for integrating new open spaces in future development.

5.2.5 OPEN SPACES WITHIN DEVELOPMENT PARCELS provides direction for integrating new open spaces in future development.

5.2.6 GREEN STREETS provides recommendations for the forested streets that contribute to arrival and departure experiences.

5.2.7 BURNABY MOUNTAIN CONSERVATION AREA provides guidance on how the campus should relate to the surrounding landscape.

Figure 5-16. Conceptual diagram of open space framework
Figure 5-17. Open Space System

- Green Fingers
- Central Axis
- Quads and Courtyards
- Recreational Open Spaces
- Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area
- Mobility Corridor
- Fields
- Open Spaces within Development Parcels
5.2.1 CENTRAL AXIS

The Central Axis is a key defining and organizing element of the original campus plan. It accommodates both ceremonial and day-to-day circulation, organizing and connecting a number of buildings and open spaces. While generally axial in nature, there is a great deal of variety in the character and types of open spaces located along the axis. These spaces are identified on the drawing to the right, and described over the following pages.

Recommendations seek to reinforce, extend and repair the axis to enhance connectivity, movement and placemaking across the full campus. Opportunities to enhance programming and use of existing and new spaces are also considered, to advance objectives related to building community. In some cases, where the places along the Central Axis overlap with other areas of this Plan, more fulsome descriptions and recommendations are located elsewhere and cross-referenced here.

Recommendations

1. Preserve and enhance the linear, axial quality of the axis, including long views.
2. Maintain the axis as the key address for significant iconic community buildings and ceremonial functions, and more generally buildings and spaces that extend from axis.
3. Preserve the Erickson/Massey experience of ascension from the Transportation Centre to the Academic Quad.
4. Utilize building and landscape materials that are consistent with and/or sympathetic to legacy architecture and spaces. This should be balanced with opportunities to introduce design elements that support Indigenization, incorporating Indigenous culture and values.
5. Provide active programming along the access, to enhance its role as a key spine connecting a series of social nodes.
6. Minimize grade changes to the greatest extent possible, mitigating where unavoidable to enhance universal accessibility.
7. West of the Transportation Centre to the Dining Hall, prioritize the 300 level as the key/primary level through. The spatial hierarchy and clear and direct routes through this area should be maintained and enhanced to create a continuous, direct connection across campus (see University Project 5.4.2).
1 **WEST PROSPECT**

This proposed place is located at the western terminus of the Erickson/Massey axis, providing a potential distant view to the Lions Gate Bridge and downtown Vancouver. This place may be realized as a distinct open space, or closely integrated within new development (See University Project 5.4.2 West Axis).

2 **RESIDENTIAL QUAD**

The Residential Quad is envisioned as a green space for passive recreation at the heart of the western residential community, reclaiming and greening the existing central surface parking lot as an extension of the central axis (See University Project 5.4.2 West Axis).

3 **WEST COMMONS**

The West Commons is located at the interface of the West Green and West Axis, providing an important new open space that recalls the original residential quad from the Erickson/Massey plan that was never realized. It is envisioned as a place for passive and active recreation, providing a ‘living room’ for the west campus residential community (See University Project 5.4.2 West Axis).

4 **WEST AXIS**

The West Axis is an evolving movement and view corridor that links the western residential community, West Mall complex, and Lorne Davies complex to the Transportation Centre and Convocation Mall on the 300 level. (See University Project 5.4.2 West Axis).

5 **TRANSPORTATION CENTRE**

The Transportation Centre is a built open space and key point of ceremonial arrival, tied to the Erickson/Massey notion of ‘ascension’. Today the Transportation Centre is dominated by vehicular activity, which compromises the character of adjacent public spaces. Identified as a University Project in Section 5.4.1, recommended improvements seek to reposition the Transportation Centre to better function as a key gateway into the University that supports both ceremonial arrival functions and day-to-day use and social activity.
6 CONVOCATION MALL
Convocation Mall is a legacy plaza space from the Erickson/Massey plan, functioning as a central space for day-to-day student life and ceremonial functions on campus (see Heritage Conservation Guidelines 6.2).

7 ACADEMIC QUAD
The Academic Quad is a key iconic place within the historic campus fabric. This major quad provides a green landscape with key views, facilitating gathering, movement, and day-to-day rest, relaxation and reflection (see Heritage Conservation Guidelines 6.2).

8 TROTTIER OBSERVATORY LANDSCAPE
This is an existing successful open space, which extends south from the central axis, providing the setting for Strand Hall. The Trottier Observatory provides opportunities for passive enjoyment and programming, which help to animate this space. The broader landscape that the Observatory sits within is adjacent to the current preferred site for the First People’s Gathering House initiative. Whether or not this prominent development site is selected for the Gathering House, the design and function of this landscape will need to respond to its new role as the setting for future development to the east.

9 STRAND COMMONS
Strand Commons is envisioned as a new green open space located on the areas of surface parking to the east of Strand Hall. This area is a particularly important and central location for a central green commons where the UniverCity and SFU community can come together, building on the existing success of Town Square (See University Project 5.4.6 East Green).

10 UNIVERCITY HIGH STREET
This main street functions as an extension of SFU’s central axis, located within UniverCity and outside of the study area for the Campus Master Plan. It should continue to support both UniverCity and the broader SFU campus community. The streetscape supports a broad range of movement, and is lined with a number of retail functions that spill out onto and animate this successful place.
5.2.2 THE FIELDS

The Fields are a large common space that mediates between the formality of the western portions of the campus and the natural qualities of the forest to the south. The Fields include a number of existing formal athletic fields that are programmed for both active and passive recreational use.

The Campus Master Plan envisions expanding and formalizing this area to incorporate broader opportunities for passive recreation at the east and west ends of The Fields, with an opportunity for a new athletic field or future development on the south side of the new east/west Mobility Corridor.

Identified as a University Project in Section 5.4.4, descriptions and recommendations for each of the existing and proposed spaces that make up The Fields are described in further detail in that section.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Introduce new passive recreation opportunities at the eastern and western ends of The Fields.

2. Provide an east/west movement corridor along the northern edge of The Fields, as well as north/south lateral connections between athletic fields, creating a highly permeable and well connected landscape.

3. Introduce plantings and landscape treatments that unite the district as a distinct place that mediates between the formal areas of the campus to the north and natural areas to the south.

4. Avoid fences wherever possible, and where required, utilize high quality materials that complement and form part of the overall landscape treatment.

5. Position The Fields as a destination by enhancing opportunities for communities on and off the mountain to gather, both as spectators and participants in athletic events. This should include introducing improved seating, weather protection, supporting services and amenities, and clear wayfinding.

6. Minimize light pollution, particularly from large stadiums, respecting surrounding residences and natural areas to the south.
5.2.3 GREEN FINGERS

The Green Fingers are linear spaces that are primarily north/south in orientation, connecting the historic campus to the surrounding Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area in a way that highlights the natural environment, views, water, wildlife, and habitats. The Green Fingers seek to provide a juxtaposition to the formal quads and malls of the historic campus core. Building on Erickson’s notion of ‘green fingers’ extending into the heart of the campus from either side (1990 AEA Master Plan Update), these spaces seek to connect and invite nature into the centre of the campus.

These spaces will act as a central organizing principle for future development patterns. They accommodate arrival, create views, and facilitate north/south movement and green infrastructure. They also provide opportunities to embody indigenous notions of respect for the land, and to support indigenization of the campus more generally.

Green Fingers are more natural in character, but they may contain more formal plazas and hardscape areas, particularly as they intersect with the historic Erickson/Massey campus and extension of the central axis. The character of the various green fingers are described in greater detail over the following pages.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Support a transition from more urban open space typologies at the core of the campus, towards more natural typologies as the green fingers extend down the southern slope of Burnaby Mountain.
2. Repair and enhance the quality of environmental features and systems through strategic planting and environmental stewardship initiatives. This may include strategically locating green infrastructure and stormwater management features.
3. Explore opportunities to advance the indigenization of the campus through naming, programming and design of these spaces.
4. Introduce and/or enhance trails and pedestrian connections through these spaces, connecting into primary pedestrian routes through built areas of the campus.
5. Create and enhance long views from the core campus to natural areas to the north and south.
Located along the northern edge of Gaglardi Way, this Green Finger supports the Erickson/Massey ceremonial arrival sequence to the campus, providing a green edge along Gaglardi Way. Its character should continue to support the experience of driving or moving through the forest, creating a moment of reveal for the campus’s historic ensemble of buildings that come into view as one moves northeast along Gaglardi Way. This view should be considered as part of the historic landscape, and any modification should be carefully considered. Similarly, any views of new buildings prior to this reveal are strongly discouraged.

This Green Finger contains a creek, presenting opportunities to incorporate stormwater functions for west campus. Trails or walkways may be considered following the creek, and lateral driveways and walkways that cross the green may be considered over time to ensure north/south connectivity, particularly where this green finger meets the West Green.

The West Green is a linear open space, providing opportunities for enhanced north/south movement by connecting from the west axis through The Fields to new development to the south (See Section 5.4.3. West Green).

Silver Creek Tributary is located to the east of Naheeno Park, crossing a number of areas where future development may be considered. Introducing a green connection extending approximately to the north of the creek corridor may be possible through the Science Complex and up to the Academic Quad, which would provide an important moment to invite nature back into this area of the campus.

Consideration of future development in the areas to the east and west should be organized so as to protect and enhance the creek corridor and function. The creek provides an opportunity to structure development, providing natural amenity and opportunities for progressive stormwater management. Movement connections across the creek are envisioned, which may be vehicular, or may be restricted to active transportation. The nature of these connections should be explored further if and when planning proceeds for development on the surrounding southern slopes.

Naheeno Park is a significant forested landscape. The original Erickson/Massey plan anticipated a forested landscape in this location, both as part of the arrival sequence up Gaglardi Way and views to the south from the Transportation Centre. Subsequent planning through the decades continued to anticipate a natural green space in this location, which is reflected in the City of Burnaby Official Community Plan (OCP) for the campus.

SFU’s 2010 Development Plan considered the potential for development along the northern edge of Naheeno Park. Because of the significance of the Erickson/Massey arrival sequence and views, the historic commitment to protect this area, and abundant development opportunities elsewhere on the campus, the 2065 Campus Master Plan maintains this important natural landscape, providing further...
guidance to refine its character, use, and physical extent.

The park is defined on its east and west edges by two permanent stream corridors within the Burnette River Watershed. Slight modifications to the creek at the northeast corner of the park to accommodate an important road connection are proposed, representing a modification to the OCP boundaries for Naheeno Park. Whereas the OCP anticipated the relocation of the southern extent of this same creek, this plan recommends adjusting the park boundaries to include the creek corridor in its existing location, following its natural course. These two recommended boundary adjustments result in a net increase in the area of the park.

Areas located to the east of the eastern creek and to the west of the western creek are recommended for further study to confirm the extent of secondary environmental features, such as significant areas of forest and wildlife habitat. Additional boundary adjustments to the park could be considered in this area based on the findings of further study.

Overtime, Naheeno Park has the potential to become a significant location in South Campus. Low impact uses should be considered to invite use and enjoyment of this landscape, including trail connections, gardens, and pavilion buildings that are well integrated into the landscape, among other uses. Opportunities for strategic management and environmental stewardship should also be pursued, to repair and enhance natural systems and functions. Given its centrality and importance, opportunities to support the indigenization of the campus should be incorporated into the Park. This could include re-naming of this landscape, as well as aforementioned introduction of low impact uses and strategic environmental stewardship initiatives that advance truth and reconciliation objectives.

The City of Burnaby SFU Official Community Plan (OCP) formalized the notion and boundaries of Naheeno Park. Any modification to the boundaries of this area may require an amendment to the OCP.
A network of formal quads and courtyards, existing and proposed, are envisioned across the campus. These spaces are inherently architectural in nature, framed and defined by the buildings around them. These are places of arrival, amenity, and formal and informal gathering, that allow activities within adjacent and nearby buildings to spill out into the public realm. Whereas major quads positioned along the axis act as destinations that serve broader areas of the campus, minor quads and courtyards are locally oriented, primarily serving adjacent buildings.

These smaller, locally-oriented spaces can be designed and programmed in a variety of ways. These spaces should respond and interface with adjacent buildings, encouraging regular activity and use in a way that supports local communities and provides an animated public realm. The programming and experience of these spaces is tied to the design of buildings. They should be iconic, and designed based on ideas about their use and relationship to specific communities within the buildings they serve.

The following recommendations can serve to enhance the use, experience, and access to existing and minor quads and courtyards, many of which are poorly utilized due to a lack of programming, design amenities, poor climate control, and/or unclear access and wayfinding.

Future quads and courtyards should be included within new development (see Section 5.2.5 Open Spaces within Development Parcels).

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Resolve the interface, design and function of minor quads and courtyards to respond to the uses and users within adjacent buildings.

2. Ensure a strong interface with adjacent buildings, including clear views, wayfinding and access to and from quads and courtyards, encouraging indoor and outdoor relationships.

3. Provide seating, weather protection and other amenities that encourage regular use and habitation of these spaces.

4. Consider active, locally-oriented programming to activate and encourage regular use of these spaces.

5. Design these spaces to function as a refuge from the heat during times when the campus experiences extreme summer weather.
5.2.5 OPEN SPACES WITHIN DEVELOPMENT PARCELS

As future development occurs on the development parcels illustrated in the Campus Master Plan, targets are established in the precinct plans to ensure appropriate creation of new quads, courtyards, and open spaces. These open spaces provide the setting for new buildings, knitting the campus together and providing integral amenity for the users of the building. These spaces provide important opportunities for active and passive recreation, outdoor learning, and community building activities. While the Campus Master Plan provides clues as to the orientation and size of these spaces, their actual location and detailed design must be conceived in conjunction with planning for new development.

Figure 5-23. The open spaces that will be built within development parcels

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure the design and programming is conceived in relation to, and in consultation with, the communities that will occupy adjacent buildings.
2. Explore naming, programming and use of new open spaces as important opportunities to advance the indigenization of the campus.
3. Provide clear connections, views and wayfinding into these spaces from adjacent buildings, and internal and external movement corridors, aligning patterns of land use, open space and movement.
4. Prioritize the preservation of natural features, vegetation, and environmental functions.
5.2.6 GREEN STREETS

Today, many of the ring roads that form part of the arrival and departure sequence from the campus are characterized by generous rights of way with green or forested edges. These green arrival streets provide a key interface with the mountain and forest landscapes. Even though the campus occupies much of the mountain top, these green streets provide an experience of driving through the forest, allowing for key moments of reveal and arrival as the campus comes into view. The Campus Master Plan envisions maintaining and enhancing this experience, while also improving these streets to ensure they support all forms of movement.

These streets and their generous rights-of-way also provide important opportunities for integrating green infrastructure and stormwater management features.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Maintain the experience of driving through the forest along with key moments of reveal and arrival by minimizing visual disruption from new buildings.
2. Provide space for all forms of mobility within these generous right of ways, including pedestrians and cyclists.
3. Consider traffic calming where warranted to enhance the experience and safety for pedestrians, cyclists and other forms of active or alternative mobility.
4. Introduce improved signage and wayfinding, particularly as the campus expands, to ensure a clear and legible arrival and departure.
5. Integrate green infrastructure and stormwater management features, such as bioswales, to reduce and clean runoff from the campus.
5.2.7 BURNABY MOUNTAIN CONSERVATION AREA

The Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area recalls the original setting on the mountaintop, prior to the construction of the SFU Burnaby Campus. While the Conservation Area is an important part of the setting for the SFU Burnaby Campus that sets it apart from other institutions, today the campus is not well connected to the Conservation Area or trail network. The Campus Master Plan recommends strategies to strengthen this relationship through enhanced connectivity and wayfinding, as well as strategic management and environmental stewardship. This may include maintaining and enhancing access to recreation trails, sensitive forest management to protect or enhance key views from the campus, and enhancing the quality of natural systems and habitats through planting of native species, stormwater management and other strategic initiatives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Buffer and create an appropriate transition to the Conservation Area through the design of adjacent open spaces and landscapes.
2. Enhance trail connections and related wayfinding to encourage low impact recreational use and enjoyment, and improved connections between the campus, Naheeno Park, the Conservation Area, and the nearby Burnaby Mountain Park.
3. Advance strategic environmental stewardship, such as through the planting of native species, creation or enhancement of wildlife habitat, and innovative management of stormwater quantity and quality between the campus and adjacent creek systems.
4. Strategically manage tree heights to protect and enhance key views.
Great university campuses are highly walkable places that can also be easily traversed by bicycles, public transit, automobiles, and service vehicles. Seamlessly accommodating all modes of movement will only become more important over the decades to come, with a number of new technologies poised to create major shifts and disruptions in the ways people move to, from, and across the campus.

SFU Burnaby’s mountaintop setting creates unique grading challenges for the campus’s movement network. Except for a few dedicated cyclists and pedestrians, the vast majority of travel to and from the campus is completed by vehicle, whether car or bus. Once on the mountain, changing topography and a reliance on stairs and internal walkways continue to limit movement options.

The movement network should better accommodate all modes of travel. It will need to be improved and expanded to better support active and other sustainable modes of transportation, including walking, cycling, skateboards and in-line skates, new micro-mobility technologies, public transit use, and autonomous vehicles. In particular, the anticipated future investment in the Gondola creates a number of new opportunities that the Campus Master Plan must anticipate and support. Given the degree of uncertainty regarding how autonomous vehicles and micro-mobility technologies will continue to disrupt transportation choices and patterns, the movement network must maximize its flexibility and ability to accommodate future shifts on the horizon, and will need to be revisited over time as the impacts of emerging technologies are better understood.

The character and recommendations for the different layers of the movement network and related infrastructure are explored over the following sections:

5.3.1 STREET AND TRANSIT NETWORK
The street network will continue to provide vehicular connections across campus for cars, transit, and service vehicles. Strategies to respond to anticipated increasing demands of curbside space for autonomous vehicles are also considered.

5.3.2 PEDESTRIAN NETWORK
The network of indoor and outdoor pedestrian connections will be expanded and repaired, by extending and clarifying primary routes and introducing clear ‘thresholds’ and wayfinding between indoor/outdoor and vertical/horizontal movement.

5.3.3 CYCLING AND MICRO-MOBILITY NETWORK
Expanding and improving the system of on and off-street connections to support cycling and other forms of faster, wheeled micro-mobility technologies across campus will increase options and reduce the time required to travel more significant distances.

5.3.4 PARKING AND SERVICING
Locations and strategies to accommodate parking and serving needs are detailed, working to limit the impacts of these back of house uses on streets and public spaces across the campus. Strategies to reduce the demand and need for parking are also considered.

5.3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE, UTILITIES, SERVICES AND SUSTAINABILITY
This section outlines key elements of SFU’s network of infrastructure, utilities and services, and provides recommendations related to the efficient and sustainable maintenance and extension of this network over time, including discussion of stormwater and creeks.
The Street and Transit Network builds on the existing network of campus streets, identifying new connections to support mobility and campus development.

Looking forward to the decades to come, this network explores how to respond to a number of important considerations and opportunities including:

- Providing access and address for new development
- Advancing ‘complete streets’ principles
- Responding to the Gondola
- Introducing a new local transit shuttle loop
- Curbside management and autonomous vehicles
- Updating emergency access and readiness

**ACCESS AND ADDRESS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT**

The street and transit network illustrates new street connections to provide access, servicing, and addresses for new development parcels if and when the campus expands into these areas. New streets have been proposed to logically extend and complete the existing network, supporting access and movement for all types of mobility.

**ADVANCING ‘COMPLETE STREETS’ PRINCIPLES**

SFU’s streets are not only spaces for cars and transit vehicles, but should also embody ‘complete streets’ principles: providing adequate and safe spaces to accommodate all other forms of mobility, including pedestrians, bikes, skateboards and inline skates, other emerging micro-mobility technologies, wheelchairs and other accessibility-related devices, strollers, and so on.

Ensuring space for non-vehicular users should factor prominently into the design of any future roadways, with street right of ways providing safe and dedicated spaces to address the needs of all future users.

Similarly, existing roadways should be improved and retrofitted over time to enhance their ability to serve all users. Recognizing that many existing right of ways are not wide-enough to accommodate the needs of all users, traffic calming measures to slow vehicles and maximize space for other users should be considered, along with pavement markings and signage to remind all users to safely share available space on the roadway.

**RESPONDING TO THE GONDOLA: RECONSIDERING BUS ROUTING AND STOPS TO ENHANCE THE TRANSPORTATION CENTRE**

At the time of writing, stakeholders at SFU, the City of Burnaby, and TransLink are all advancing planning for a future Gondola, responding to the benefits and strong business case for this important initiative. While the route, details and funding are still to be determined, once the Gondola is realized, this new link between the Production Way/University SkyTrain stop will become a primary means of accessing the campus via public transportation.

The Road and Transit Network focuses future bus pick up and drop off at two key locations: the reconfigured eastern bus loop just north of the Gondola, and along University Drive, just north of the Transportation Centre. Preliminary analysis indicates that as demand for buses is reduced over time, the Transportation Centre stop could be located on University Drive, eliminating the need for buses to drive north/south through the Transportation Centre along Gaglardi Way. Removing bus activity here is part of a broader recommendation to limit north/south vehicular movements through the Transportation Centre, allowing the area surrounding the Transportation Centre to become a ‘pedestrian-first’ environment with a more active and vibrant public realm (See Section 5.4.1).

**LOCAL TRANSIT SHUTTLE LOOP: ADDRESSING GROWING TRAVEL DISTANCES AS THE CAMPUS EXPANDS**

A local shuttle loop is recommended to better connect a number of key destinations across the campus and mountain, reducing travel time and supporting connectivity for differently-abled campus users. While the capacity and demand for this service requires further study, it is recommended that multiple vehicles would traverse this loop in both directions to ensure regular pick up times less than 10 minutes.
apart, or ideally less than 5 minutes apart, as well as ensuring that vehicles have adequate capacity to move large numbers of people at times of peak demand (e.g. when classes turn over, and when full buses or Gondola cabins arrive on campus). The location of Shuttle Stops should also be further considered in relation to the location of existing and future social hubs as the campus expands over time (see Section 5.1.3).

**CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT AND AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES**

Despite continued and growing interest in autonomous vehicles, experts continue to debate the various scenarios and related impacts this disruptive technology may have on the design of streets and adjacent public spaces. However, there seems to be a general consensus that the demand for roadside pick-up and drop-off space will be increasingly important over time, building on the existing shift in this direction caused by the growing popularity of ridesharing and food delivery services.

SFU must continue to monitor these trends and consider how to appropriately manage curbside space:

> Ample curbside pickup and drop off space should be protected for in the design of future roadways, particularly at the entrances to major buildings and along the Mobility Corridor.
> Curbside spaces should be factored into any investment, improvements and retrofits of existing roadways. In the near-term, these spaces can be used as interim street parking, reducing demand in larger parking lots.
> Pick up and drop off areas should also work to maximize safety and minimize the potential for conflicts between vehicles and other road users, ideally with dedicated space for other road users physically separated from vehicular lanes and pick up and drop off areas.

**UPDATING EMERGENCY ACCESS AND READINESS**

Today all vehicles traveling to and from the mountain must travel through a single intersection, where Burnaby Mountain Parkway, Gaglardi Way and University Drive east converge just north of the Kinder Morgan tank farm. With an increasing focus on resilience, it is important for SFU to plan for a number of emergency scenarios to ensure strategies exist to allow for safe access and egress from the Burnaby Campus. This should include consideration of extreme weather events, earthquakes, and other scenarios that could disrupt vehicular access and utilization of this intersection.

The introduction of the Gondola provides a very important benefit in this regard, building additional redundancy into the movement network by allowing people to move on and off of the campus without accessing this single intersection. The introduction of a future road extending west from South Campus Road may also allow for an emergency access connection directly to the west through Burnaby Mountain Park. All of these options should be considered further and implemented in relation to SFU’s planning for emergency scenarios.
Figure 5-26. Road and Transit Network

- **Proposed New Road**
- **Existing Road**
- **Transit Loop and Stops**
- **Gondola Line/Gondola Landing**
- **Transportation Centre/Transit Hub**
- **Regional Transit Connections (Existing)**
- **Potential Emergency Route**
### 5.3.2 PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

Building on the road and transit network, the Pedestrian Network explores an optimal hierarchy for pedestrian routes through the campus. Clear connections between the new east/west Mobility Corridor, exterior pedestrian pathways, and a network of primary interior/covered pedestrian connections are envisioned, with clear ‘thresholds’ and places of entrance between these systems. Enhanced connections with the Trans Canada Trail System will ensure pedestrian connectivity between the campus and the surrounding Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area.

Key elements and recommendations for the Pedestrian Network are outlined below including:

- Improve universal accessibility
- Introduce ‘thresholds’ to align indoor/outdoor and vertical/horizontal movement
- Repair and extend the interior/covered pedestrian network
- The People-Mover: escalator connections between the Gondola and Discovery district
- Enhance connections into the Trans Canada Trail System

### IMPROVE UNIVERSAL ACCESSIBILITY

Universal accessibility is a particularly challenging issue on the SFU Burnaby campus due to the mountaintop setting. Significant grade changes across the campus including along the Central Axis, and the historic architecture’s focus on grand staircases to address these, has made it challenging to retrofit areas of the core campus to ensure universal accessibility. The new Mobility Corridor, which follows a relatively even grade across the campus, will provide a new universally accessible east/west route across the entire campus.

SFU must also continue to explore innovative best practices to address universal accessibility along the Central Axis and within historic buildings. Recommended improvements to the Transportation Centre and West Axis work to achieve this [see Section 5.4.1 and Section 5.4.2]. More generally, the Pedestrian Network works to establish primary pedestrian pathways that follow even grades between ‘thresholds’ [see the following section], which provide clear points of accessible vertical circulation, providing a clear and accessible network connecting new and existing buildings.

All new campus facilities, buildings and open spaces should be designed to exhibit best practices in universal accessibility, allowing seamless access across the full campus for all users, regardless of ability and/or use of wheeled mobility devices and strollers.
Figure 5-27. Pedestrian network

- Trans Canada Trail System
- Interior/Covered Pedestrian Network
- Thresholds
- Pedestrian Connections
- New East/West Mobility Corridor
- Gondola Line/Gondola Landing
- Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing
INTRODUCE ‘THRESHOLDS’ TO ALIGN INDOOR/OUTDOOR AND VERTICAL/HORIZONTAL MOVEMENT

Thresholds are introduced at key junctions across the campus, shown on the Pedestrian Network. These are strategically positioned where indoor and outdoor major pedestrian connections meet. These thresholds must accommodate clear, legible transitions between indoor and outdoor pedestrian pathways, as well as facilitating seamless and accessible vertical movement between campus facilities on all levels.

These spaces should utilize transparent materials and clear wayfinding to help orient pedestrians as they navigate the campus, ensuring thresholds are highly visible and have a strong relationship with adjacent indoor and outdoor spaces. Thresholds are also important locations to introduce day-to-day services and amenities, such as food and beverage uses, and spaces for study and collaboration.

REPAIRING AND EXTENDING THE INTERIOR/COVERED PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

Extending from the thresholds, primary covered and interior pedestrian pathways through the campus are shown on the Pedestrian Network map. Where these connections already exist, design improvements should be made to introduce transparent materials and natural light where possible. Clear wayfinding should also be provided, all of which should work to elevate and clarify the importance and legibility of these primary connections across the campus.

This Pedestrian Network also illustrates how these connections should extend to serve new development parcels and connect to the future Gondola. Wherever possible, new connections should be accompanied by exterior connections, providing users options to walk outdoors along familiar routes when weather permits, facilitating indoor/outdoor views and natural light to assist with natural wayfinding. The Section 5.4 University Projects explore more detailed recommendations for some of these pathways, including the West Axis, which works to establish a primary level for horizontal circulation to clarify connections across the western portion of the campus.

THE PEOPLE-MOVER: ESCALATOR CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE GONDOLA AND DISCOVERY DISTRICT

As future development occurs along the southern slopes surrounding the existing Discovery building and Fraser International College, it will be increasingly important to strengthen this area’s connectivity to the main campus, UniverCity High Street and future Gondola landing. Thresholds and covered interior pedestrian connections paired with exterior walkways will assist in creating a clear connection back to the campus.

An escalator - the ‘people-mover’ - could enhance this connection and reduce travel time as the campus grows. This idea should be explored further as the east parking lot and lands within the Discovery District are planned for future development. For such an initiative to be successfully realized, each building would need to contribute to the series of escalators, which should be positioned at the western extent of new buildings fronting on to the East Green (see Section 5.4.6), providing an active frontage, clear visibility and strong relationship with this important open space.

ENHANCING CONNECTIONS INTO THE TRANS CANADA TRAIL SYSTEM

SFU Burnaby’s mountaintop setting and adjacency with the Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area and Park are amazing assets for the campus. However, today these connections are generally poorly marked and difficult to find from the campus, contributing to an underutilization of the trail system by the campus community. Enhanced and integrated signage and wayfinding into the trail system is recommended, as well as investing in other improvements, such as managing vegetation and improving paving or gravel to enhance the legibility of entrances into the trail system.

As other improvements are pursued across the campus, including extension of the central axis to the west and improvements to the Transportation Centre, new connections into the trail system should be considered, elevating and encouraging its use and helping to bridge the gap between the campus and its natural setting. These recommendations are considered further in Section 5.4 University Projects, the Transportation Centre (Section 5.4.1) and the West Prospect (Section 5.4.2).
5.3.3 CYCLING NETWORK AND MICRO-MOBILITY

Due to challenging grades and reliance on stairs for primary routes across campus, cycling and other forms of micro-mobility are uncommon at SFU Burnaby today. With the success of UniverCity and potential for continued expansion of the campus over time, the distances people travel continue to increase, positioning cycling and other emerging micro-mobility technologies as quick and desirable ways to move around the campus.

The Cycling and Micro-mobility network provides a vision for a comprehensive network of off-street multi-use pathways, on-street dedicated lanes, and on-street shared facilities to support cycling and micro-mobility options as viable alternatives to driving or walking. Key elements and recommendations for the Cycling and Micro-Mobility Network are outlined below including:

- Realizing the east/west Mobility Corridor
- Prioritizing dedicated facilities over shared spaces with vehicles
- Managing changing, disruptive micro-mobility technologies
- Introducing sharing programs and other support facilities

**REALIZING THE EAST/WEST MOBILITY CORRIDOR**

The new Mobility Corridor creates a second continuous east/west route across the full campus. This dedicated multi-use pathway follows a relatively flat path across the mountain, providing bi-directional dedicated lanes for bikes and other micro-mobility devices to traverse the full connections, with regular north/south connections to access key destinations along the central axis. Providing an integral alternative to the Central Axis, with its changing grades and pedestrian pathways that rely on stairs, this connection is at the foundation of a strategy to support the viability of cycling, skateboarding, in-line skating, scooters and other emerging motorized micro-mobility technologies. More detailed recommendations for the design and realization of this integral connection are provided in Section 5.4.5.

**EXPANDING THE NETWORK, AND PRIORITIZING DEDICATED LANES OVER SHARED ON-STREET FACILITIES**

The Mobility Corridor is a critical piece of new infrastructure to create a cross-campus connection for cycling and other forms of micro-mobility, but it is just as important to create and enhance other connections and pathways leading between the Mobility Corridor and key destinations across the campus. Wherever possible, these should take the form of dedicated lanes that are either separated from vehicles and pedestrians within the roadway, or located on off-street multi-use pathways.

Where dedicated on-street or off-street facilities cannot be accommodated, traffic calming measures should be utilized to slow vehicles and maximize space for other users. Pavement markings and signage should also be employed to remind all users to safely share available space on the roadway.
MANAGING CHANGING, AND SOMETIMES DISRUPTIVE MICRO-MOBILITY TECHNOLOGIES

In many ways, emerging technologies such as e-bikes, e-scooters, e-skateboards, and other motorized micro-mobility technologies provide exciting opportunities for a campus on a mountain. Today, biking up Burnaby Mountain on a traditional bicycle requires a level of exertion and extensive travel time that discourages all but the most dedicated cyclists. However, with the increasing availability and decreasing cost and size of electric, motorized, and/or power-assisted bicycles, it may become an increasingly attractive alternative to driving to the campus.

Once atop the mountain, for users that have to travel greater distances across the campus, traditional and e-bikes, motorized skateboards, micro-scooters, and other emerging technologies can provide an excellent way to zip across campus, so long as the necessary connections and facilities exist. As these new technologies are increasing in popularity in other locations in North America and abroad, they are often raising safety concerns and conflicts with traditional road and sidewalk users, as well as cluttering public spaces. Given safety concerns and uncertainty in technologies, SFU will need to continue to monitor trends and plan for safe and convenient facilities for all types of mobility to ensure they have a positive presence and role on campus.

The previous strategy related to prioritizing dedicated lanes/pathways for traditional bikes and other mobility technologies that are of a similar size and speed is an important first step in encouraging safety and managing these technologies. This strategy should be supported by new rules of the road where necessary to manage any future concerns that arise. The following recommendations related to sharing programs and other support facilities are another important part of the equation in managing the potential impacts of emerging technologies within buildings and public spaces.

INTRODUCING SHARING PROGRAMS, AMPLE PARKING AND OTHER SUPPORT FACILITIES

In conjunction with creating new routes and connections, SFU should also consider investing in sharing programs to encourage the use of these alternative mobility modes. Sharing hubs should be strategically positioned at primary destinations along new routes, bringing users as close to key destinations as possible. Ample, secure and conveniently located parking with weather protection is also important, both for privately owned bikes and devices and sharing programs. Parking facilities could be provided in sheltered outdoor areas, or within buildings, but in either case should be safe and clearly visible. For users of traditional bikes, skateboards, and inline skates, providing changing and shower facilities can further support their use. Larger areas for bicycle parking should be provided near shower and change facilities to cluster these mutually supportive facilities.
Figure 5-28. Cycling Network
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5.3.4 PARKING AND SERVICING

The Campus Master Plan provides strategies to manage the demand for parking, along with considerations for how to sensitively provide back of house servicing for new and existing facilities.

PARKING STRATEGY

Reduced reliance on the private automobile, and associated demand for parking will encourage sustainable transportation modes, while freeing up space for placemaking and new development. In summary, these include investment in the Gondola, along with improved facilities, routes and connections for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and other mobility users. However, the impacts of these strategies will take time to realize, and there will be a continued demand for some extent of parking on campus likely throughout the entire lifespan of this 50 year plan. The Parking and Servicing Plan highlights locations where parking can continue to be accommodated on campus, subject to the following recommendations. These areas take into account the feasibility of providing parking across the campus; where footprints are too small or access is challenging, on-site parking is generally less feasible and thus discouraged.

PARKING STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to reduce the parking supply on campus over time as part of a suite of other transportation demand management strategies that work to both encourage and provide other realistic alternatives to driving.
2. Large surface parking lots are generally discouraged as a long-term use. They are land intensive, generally have a negative influence on surrounding public spaces, and represent some of SFU Burnaby’s best near-term development opportunities. Notwithstanding, creating interim surface parking lots on future development sites are preferable to investing in standalone parking structures, given interim surface lots require significantly less investment and are comparatively easy to redevelop in the future.
3. Interim surface parking lots should be shielded from the public realm through tree planting, and should be strategically positioned in areas where future development is anticipated.
4. Above grade structured parking is discouraged because of its cost and impacts to the public realm. Where unavoidable, animate frontages and plan for potential retrofits and/or conversion to other uses over time.
5. New development should incorporate parking and servicing facilities in below grade areas, ensuring these ‘back of house’ uses do not negatively impact surrounding public spaces. The supply of below grade parking must be carefully considered in the near term to avoid over-constructing costly below grade facilities that will generally be challenging to convert to other uses in long-term scenarios where they may not be needed.
6. Access to parking facilities should follow the access points illustrated on the Parking and Servicing Plan to minimize the need for curb cuts, and other related impacts on public spaces and movement corridors.
7. During the development of new playing fields, and/or the investment to resurface or otherwise retrofit existing playing fields, it may be possible to include one level of parking below athletic fields in a cost-effective manner given the campus’s significant grade changes.

SERVICING STRATEGY

The Parking and Serving Plan to the right illustrates primary servicing routes as well as primary points of access into servicing courts and/or below grade parking and servicing facilities. This approach ensures that all existing and future buildings can be serviced, while encouraging these areas to be internally focused within courts or below grade to avoid safety and visual impacts on adjacent public spaces. In most cases a single point of access is recommended; these access points are positioned away from primary/active building frontages, again to minimize impacts. Where there are options for multiple servicing access points, these have been illustrated as well.
Figure 5-29. Parking and Servicing Plan
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5.3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE, UTILITIES, SERVICES AND SUSTAINABILITY

OVERVIEW

The Campus Master Plan outlines efficient patterns of development and movement that provide an inherently sustainable framework, by working to make the most efficient use of already serviced land, and by enhancing and encouraging non-vehicular mobility options. The University’s infrastructure and utilities similarly provide an important means to achieve sustainability objectives by efficiently servicing existing and new campus buildings over time. Key infrastructure and utilities include the Corix Biomass district energy plant, water and wastewater systems, stormwater, electricity and telecommunications networks, and other minor utilities.

Major elements of this system are shown on the Infrastructure, Utilities and Services Plan (figure 5-30). More detailed, comprehensive planning for infrastructure, utilities and services will be required as development proceeds, particularly if and when the campus expands to areas where servicing is not already in place. Continued planning for infrastructure, utilities and services should demonstrate alignment with the Campus Master Plan.

OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE SUSTAINABILITY

The new Corix Biomass district energy plant has significant estimated capacity to continue to connect new and existing buildings to the system, providing an efficient and sustainable means of heating campus buildings. The University should continue to expand and improve this network, along with other utility systems to support future campus development and users over time. This should be accompanied by continued attention to energy conservation, carbon emission reductions, water conservation, on-site stormwater management to minimize downstream impacts, and other strategies to advance SFU’s 20-year sustainability vision and related commitments. It should be noted that the Campus Master Plan’s Sustainability and Resilience Guidelines work to reinforce and advance these commitments as the campus evolves over time (see Chapter 6).

MAINTAINING & EXPANDING MAJOR FACILITIES

The Facilities and Services Complex should continue to serve as a primary hub for its current functions, such as the University’s salting operation and workshop space. Over time, it may be necessary to expand, relocate, and/or develop satellite facilities to address the needs of potential campus expansion. Of particular importance, the Fire Pump Station located at the east corner of this lot services the entire campus. Given recent investment in this facility, its location should be maintained for the foreseeable future.

It should be noted that the East Green University Project anticipates the relocation of the current Facilities and Services Complex in the fullness of time, to create a major “Green Finger” in this area of the campus (see 5.4.6 University Projects). Relocation of the complex should be considered at a time when major
Figure 5-30. Infrastructure, Utilities and Services Plan
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replacement, upgrades and/or expansion are required due to campus development, or the normal maintenance of key elements of existing systems. At such a time, further study will be required to identify a suitable location(s) for these services and functions. This would need to include consideration of maintaining or relocating the existing Fire Pump Station as an enabling project.

A suitable location for this complex is shown on the plan on the previous page, which was selected due to the following considerations:

- Central location that is still generally screened from primary campus facilities;
- Proximity to the Corix facility;
- Frontage on a planned service road; and
- Large parcel size.

This potential location is intended to illustrate one suitable option; other similar location(s) may also be appropriation, and will need to be confirmed in the long-term future when needs are better understood.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. SFU should continue to provide efficient and cost-effective utilities and services to existing and new campus buildings in a manner that achieves the University’s financial objectives, advancing SFU’s 20-year sustainability vision and other sustainability commitments.

2. Replacement, upgrades and extension of infrastructure and utilities to new areas of campus should be prioritized within street right of ways to service adjacent new buildings, as opposed to continuing the historic pattern of extending services through interconnected buildings.

3. Regular assessment of campus utilities and service network capacities should be undertaken to identify potential needs for upgrades, particularly in conjunction with planning for new development and the evolution of existing facilities.

4. Planning for ongoing replacement and upgrades to services and infrastructure should be part of the capital planning process and should demonstrate alignment with the Campus Master Plan.
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT & CREEKS

SFU has approximately 12,000 m of storm sewer piping on campus. A condition assessment was last completed in 2013, outlining rehabilitation and replacement estimates for the next 20 years. At the time of writing, SFU does not have clear stormwater management criteria for new development. This should be addressed through the implementation of stormwater management criteria and best management practices, which could best be accomplished through a comprehensive stormwater management master planning exercise.

Stormwater flows from SFU are conveyed to the base of Burnaby Mountain via several permanent and non-permanent steep creeks. These creeks have been studied and classified as category “B”, meaning non-fish-bearing but having significant food/nutrient value to downstream fish-bearing watercourses.

In relation to potential new development in the south campus lands, the southern slopes of SFU have many small streams spaced closely together, such that their riparian areas cover a significant portion of the hillside. To realize long-term development potential of these lands, consolidation, relocation or removal of some of these streams may be necessary. The Campus Master Plan assumes that, should development be pursued along the southern slopes, non-permanent creeks are the best candidates for relocation, consolidation and/or removal. Further study of these environmental constraints will be required in relation to future development of the southern slopes.

More specifically, it should be noted that to consolidate and remove these streams would be a challenging process that would involve regulatory agency approvals, compensation for lost wetted area and lost riparian area, monitoring, and potentially resizing the remaining streams to be able to safely convey what would be larger flows. Compensation for habitat harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) typically involves replacing the lost habitat at some higher ratio (e.g. 2-for-1 or 3-for-1 area compensation) at another location within the watershed that may benefit from such enhancements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. SFU should consider a comprehensive stormwater management master planning exercise to implement stormwater management criteria and best management practices.

2. As new stormwater infrastructure or upgrades become necessary, they should be designed with climate change impacts considered. Source controls may also provide resiliency against climate change by intercepting a portion of the rainfall and delaying flows.

3. New development along the southern slopes should respect the location of existing creeks, and should seek to minimize impacts, relocation and/or consolidation of these creeks, particularly with regards to permanent creeks.

4. If relocation or consolidation of non-permanent creeks is pursued in relation to future development, required approvals processes and related compensation should be treated as an opportunity to advance best practices and should result in a net gain in the quality and quantity of riparian systems and habitats on Burnaby Mountain.
University Projects are large-scale initiatives that will play a central role in implementing the Vision, informing the location, orientation, access and character of future development. These projects will help to shape the identity and experience of the campus, providing an overall structure for specific areas that ties together existing and future development.

University Projects will need to be created incrementally in conjunction with new development, requiring centralized implementation and management by university administration due to their scale, complexity, and the fact that they are not necessarily tied to specific faculties and individual capital projects.

The Chapter 7 Precinct Plans provide further detailed information about the relationships between these University Projects and the incremental development of specific development parcels, providing a road map for how to implement and realize these large scale initiatives over time. The numbering conventions used in the Precinct Plans are reflected in this chapter to assist with cross referencing.

This section includes:

5.4.1 THE TRANSPORTATION CENTRE (U1)
A vibrant, pedestrian-oriented gateway into the campus

5.4.2 THE WEST AXIS (U2)
A community-oriented green space connecting through the athletics precinct

5.4.3 THE WEST GREEN (U3)
An extension of the ceremonial axis to anchor the west campus community

5.4.4 THE FIELDS (U4)
Enhancing connectivity and community oriented recreation

5.4.5 THE MOBILITY CORRIDOR (U5)
Expanding cross-campus connectivity for all types of movements

5.4.6 THE EAST GREEN (U6)
A new place of arrival, providing north/south connections from the Gondola

University Projects throughout this document are cross-referenced using the U1 to U6 numbering format above.
5.4.1 TRANSPORTATION CENTRE (U1)

A vibrant, pedestrian oriented gateway into the campus

The Transportation Centre occupies a key location within the campus. Today, its transportation function is constrained and dominated by vehicular activity, and its other important function as a primary place of arrival and first impression of the campus has not been fully realized. Recommendations for its transformation over the following pages focus on transitioning from its function today as a transit node dominated by vehicular movement, to an active and animated space that better supports a ceremonial arrival experience, pedestrian movement and day-to-day use and amenity. Renewing the Centre and incorporating other uses can bring new vitality to this iconic place at the heart of the campus.

Figure 5-31. View to the Transportation Centre
Transportation Centre: Existing Conditions

The Transportation Centre is dominated by four lanes of north/south vehicular traffic with additional areas for vehicular pick-up and drop-off in some locations, with limited crossings and space for other users.

The arrival and pedestrian experience is unpleasant and compromised by extensive vehicular/transit movement, a lack of wayfinding, dark conditions, and deferred maintenance.

Seating and public space are limited, and the interface with the transportation centre building is dark and void of active uses resulting in a public realm that offers little amenity.

The security building/information kiosk blocks views and pedestrian movement to/from the Transportation Centre, including blocking views of the grand central stairs that are part of the Erickson/Massey experience of ascension as one enters the Transportation Centre.

Erickson and Massey’s reliance on stairs to create the experience of ascension creates challenges for universal accessibility.

Areas within the building have been filled in to create office functions and student space, which limits north/south views and channels horizontal movement into dark narrow corridors that lack visual clues for wayfinding.

The office spaces at the 200 level block views from within the space to the north and south, disrupting natural wayfinding clues and contributing to a sense of disorientation moving up the series of stairs and landings.

The existing rotunda space at level 300 provides a great opportunity for transformation into a central symbolic ceremonial space.
Transportation Centre: Level 100

EXISTING CONDITION

Figure 5-32. Existing condition of level 100

PROPOSED CONDITION

Figure 5-33. Proposed condition of level 100

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Remove the security building/information kiosk to create space for an expanded public realm, opening views to the central stairs, enhancing legibility, and supporting Erickson/Massey’s idea of ascension.

2. Reduce the width and number of vehicular lanes and explore opportunities to reduce or open north/south vehicular movement through the Transportation Centre. Consider pavers or other hardscape treatments to slow drivers and signal that this is a pedestrian priority area.

3. Introduce new covered areas and plazas on the north and south sides of the Transportation Centre, to be programmed with welcome functions, active uses and amenities.

4. Introduce clear elevator access to ensure universally accessible entrances are visible and not positioned as secondary entrances into the building.

5. Enhance east/west connectivity for pedestrians, including a crossing between the athletic fields to the west and Maggie’s Field to the east.

6. Introduce a wide, raised crossing to encourage ease of access and north/south connectivity for pedestrians, connecting north into the trail system.

7. Reposition bus functions along University Drive, removing or reducing the need for north/south bus movements through the Centre.

Legend
- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Existing parking garage
- Enhanced views and movement into the central area
- Open Space and Trails Connections
Transportation Centre: Level 200

EXISTING CONDITION

PROPOSED CONDITION

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Remove offices in this area to create continuous pedestrian movement, and to open views.

2. Improve the spatial transition from the 200 level to Convocation Mall by enhancing signage, universal accessibility and ground plane materials.

3. Improve the existing covered pedestrian walkway at the 200 level to the West Axis (see section 5.4.2 for more details on this important walkway).

4. Enhance views to the north and south through the Transportation Centre, creating a more open experience that will assist with wayfinding and the overall legibility of the space.

Legend:
- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Level 200
- Existing units to be removed
- Existing parking garage
- Enhanced view corridor
**Transportation Centre: Level 300**

**EXISTING CONDITION**

1. **Figure 5-36.** Existing condition of level 300

**PROPOSED CONDITION**

1. **Figure 5-37.** Proposed condition of level 300

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Remove offices in this area to create continuous pedestrian movement.
2. Remove the staircases to the 400 level, which confuse wayfinding and contribute to lower ceilings and dark conditions as one ascends from the 200 to 300 level.
3. Build a central symbolic ceremonial space, which integrates new staircases to the 400 level.
4. Open and maintain north/south views.
5. Improve the existing interior/covered pedestrian walkway at level 300 to the Academic Quad.
6. Improve spatial transition to the 200 level by enhancing signage, accessibility and materials.
7. Cover the public space below with a glass canopy, providing weather protection, natural light and skyscapes.
8. Extend elevators to the Transportation Centre roof (level 400).

**Legend**

- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Level 200
- Level 300 (Convocation Mall)
- Existing units to be removed
- New symbolic ceremonial space
- Potential canopy
- Existing parking garage
- Enhanced view corridor
The Erickson/Massey Plan proposed a dramatic east/west ceremonial axis around which the campus is organized. Although this axis was realized to the east, its development to the west has not been as successful. In some places it was either not created, or was realized as two parallel corridors, diminishing its effectiveness and spatial clarity. The consolidation and extension of this axis to the west will provide a strong idea about how to organize movement and views, as well as positioning new development and open spaces in a way that connects to the east campus and promotes synergies within this portion of campus.

**5.4.2 WEST AXIS (U2)**

An extension of the ceremonial axis to anchor the west campus community

The Erickson/Massey Plan proposed a dramatic east/west ceremonial axis around which the campus is organized. Although this axis was realized to the east, its development to the west has not been as successful. In some places it was either not created, or was realized as two parallel corridors, diminishing its effectiveness and spatial clarity. The consolidation and extension of this axis to the west will provide a strong idea about how to organize movement and views, as well as positioning new development and open spaces in a way that connects to the east campus and promotes synergies within this portion of campus.

**Figure 5-38. Site plan of West Axis**
West Axis: West Prospect (U2-4)

The West Prospect is proposed at the western terminus of the Erickson/Massey axis, providing a distant view to the Lions Gate Bridge and downtown Vancouver. This place may be realized as a distinct open space, or closely integrated within new development. In either case, views to the west should be maximized, factoring prominently into the design. The West Prospect should be actively programmed as a destination for the full campus community at the west end of campus, though should prioritize serving the needs of the surrounding west campus residential community providing a central hub for amenities, services and social activity. This place is one of the four major social hubs identified in the Section 5.1.3, with more detailed recommendations on programming located there.

RECOMMENDATIONS

> Protect and enhance views to the west through strategic management of the forest, and design of indoor and outdoor spaces.
> Provide active programming to position the west prospect as a destination for the full campus that prioritizes the needs of the local residential community.
> As contemplated in some of Erickson’s work on the residential village in the 1980’s, explore the potential for a pedestrian bridge across University Drive to provide a new interface between the axis, the Trans Canada Trail, Burnaby Mountain Park and surrounding natural areas.

Figure 5-39. Rendered view of West Prospect, looking west
**West Axis: Residential Quad (U2-3)**

The Residential Quad is envisioned as a green space for passive recreation at the heart of the western residential community, reclaiming and greening the existing central surface parking lot as an extension of the Central Axis. Its creation will necessitate strategies to replace and/or reduce the demand for this parking. This space supports east and west linear views, interfacing with the West Prospect to the west and West Commons and Dining Hall to the east. A number of lateral north/south pedestrian connections link this space to University Drive W to the north, and Residence Lane and the new east/west Mobility Corridor to the south. Servicing access will need to continue to be located along the northern edge of the Quad, which must be carefully integrated with the landscape to not detract from the sense of place or amenity. Over time new buildings should address this space as a point of focus and amenity, both through renovations and new development.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Future development should have active frontages and primary entrances that face and frame the Quad.
2. New development must support north/south porosity by creating pedestrian connections through building courtyards, connecting into and extending existing connections to the south.
3. Existing pedestrian connections to the south should be enhanced and extended to Residence Lane, and beyond where possible.
4. West Prospect should front and integrate with the Residential Quad, functioning as the terminus of the axis and a key node of social activity.
5. The service drive along the northern edge of the Quad should be integrated with the landscape, maintaining a vehicular connection to servicing areas to the east, as well as accommodating other mobility uses such as pick-up and drop-off functions and pedestrian and bike use.
**West Axis: West Commons (U2-2/U3-1)**

The West Commons is located at the interface of the West Green and West Axis, providing an important new open space that recalls the unrealized residential quad from the Erickson/Massey plan. It is envisioned as a place for passive and active recreation, providing a ‘living room’ for the west campus residential community. The West Commons are part of a key social node that also includes the Dining Hall and future active uses along the West Axis (see the Section 5.1.3). It contains a key ‘threshold’ that provides vertical and horizontal pedestrian connections into the Central Axis, with the broader West Green providing additional connections to the south.

In the near term, the preservation of parking screened with active uses and a raised open space work to repair the axis and activate the Commons. Over time, demolition of the western parking garage could facilitate the creation of a larger open space to better resolve the west green’s relationship with the West Axis.

---

**NEAR TERM RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Demolish Shell House to create the West Commons open space, incorporating areas for passive recreation, new plantings, and pedestrian walkways along key desire lines connecting into surrounding areas.

2. Build a new transparent frontage for the garage that incorporates vertical/horizontal access to all levels, incorporating active uses, services and amenities to activate the West Commons.

3. Provide a vertical circulation node connecting from the Commons into the West Axis, supporting clear legibility and wayfinding between the Commons and primary pedestrian circulation corridors on level 300.

4. New development should present active frontages facing the West Green.

---

*Figure 5-41. Near term view and recommendations for the West Commons*
LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Demolish the parking garage and extend the West Commons to the Phase 2 Residence building, and beyond to the trail system to the north.

2. Create a pedestrian crossing to the new residence and its courtyard, with paving and materials to signalize that this is a pedestrian priority area. This will mitigate the impacts of maintaining a servicing drive for loading areas access through this area.

3. Create a staircase to connect into the main access at the 300 level. As a grand architectural gesture and gateway into the central axis, these stairs should complement the experience between Convocation Mall and the Academic Quad. The stair feature could incorporate or be used for tiered seating, supporting events and gathering within the West commons.

4. Maintain the existing Dining Hall frontage and the proposed atrium between it and the new Dining Hall, which will provide clear views, wayfinding and access from Commons into the Residential Quad and areas to the west.

5. Build a new frontage for the Lorne Davies that incorporates vertical/horizontal access to all levels of the building, and presents an active frontage with amenity space and/or services facing the West Commons.

6. Build a transparent addition with active uses on the eastern frontage of the new Dining Hall, to address and activate the West Commons.

Figure 5-42. Long-term view and recommendations for the West Commons
West Axis: West Mall Existing and Approved Condition

To realize the Campus Master Plan’s long-term vision for the West Mall, the following constraints must be resolved.

Today, the 300 level is the primary level for pedestrian circulation between Convocation Mall and the Transportation Centre. At the transportation centre, the axis is bifurcated into northern and southern pedestrian walkways. Today the southern walkway extends as far as Lorne Davies at the 300 level, where a confusing transition to the 200 level occurs.

The pedestrian connection west of Transportation Centre is challenged. The current way through forces a disorienting transition from the 300 to 200 level, where lack of wayfinding and dark conditions lead to a disorienting and unpleasant pedestrian experience. East of Transportation Centre, the 300 level is the main way through, providing a clue as to how to repair and maintain this connection at the 300 level.
The new dining hall, approved and to be located here, interrupts pedestrian access and views. This complicates recommendations that consider either reclaiming the roof of the parking garage or demolishing it to allow for the extension of the West Axis and West Commons through this area of the campus, recalling the original Erickson/Massey vision for a centralized open space for the west campus.

The pedestrian experience between the west and central campus is compromised by the parking garage, which forces pedestrians to either walk on or alongside this unpleasant feature.

Shell House sits in the location of the proposed West Commons, and will need to be demolished to realize this space and broader intentions for the West Green (see Section 5.4.3).
NEAR TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Create a new interior, covered pedestrian walkway at the 300 level, extending from the existing southern walkway west of Transportation Centre to the Dining Hall. This walkway should provide a wide and clear way through, avoiding grade/level changes. Clear wayfinding, and transparent materials to allow for natural light will assist with pedestrian orientation.

2. Build a new frontage for the parking garage that incorporates the 300 level walkway, and a double height transparent atrium that provides vertical and horizontal access to all levels. This should be programmed with active amenity spaces and services fronting the West Commons.

3. Vertical circulation thresholds should be incorporated at the east and west ends of the new atrium, providing clear entrances from the West Commons.

4. Maintain West Parking Garage. One row of parking will likely have to be removed to accommodate for a larger enclosed walkway and atrium.

5. Maintain the buildings between Lorne Davies and the Business School. Whereas in the long term these buildings should be removed to provide a more generous central open space that spans the entire 300 level of the axis, in the short term it is still possible to enhance the southern walkway (as per #1) without demolishing these buildings.

6. This rendering shows the West Commons which will require demolishing Shell House. Investment in the 300 level walkway should likely be considered in relation to investment in the West Commons.

West Axis: West Mall (U2-1)

The west axis and mall is an evolving movement and view corridor that links the western residential community, West Mall complex, and Lorne Davies complex to the Transportation Centre and Convocation Mall. A series of options are explored to repair the axis and realize this space over time, building from early investments to improve circulation and address on the 300 level through to longer term reconfiguration or development of the parking garage.

This portion of the axis is as key lobby for the West Mall and Lorne Davies complex. The plan envisions this space as a primary corridor lined with active uses that support social life and interaction. As one of the four major social hubs identified in Section 5.1.3, more detailed recommendations on programming of this space are located there.

This space also provides a point of transition and connection through to the western residential community. Over time, design interventions should seek to create a more consistent quality of space and clear pedestrian connection that draws people through to the western terminus of the axis. Options to improve this space over time are explored over the following pages.

Figure 5-44. Near term view and recommendations for the West Mall.
LONG-TERM OPTION

Building on the near term recommendations, in the long term the Campus Master Plan envisions the full removal of the parking garage allowing for the West Commons to extend all the way north to the Phase 2 residence building.

This option maximizes the size of the West Commons and its ability to provide north/south canvass and a strong relationship with the west axis.

Detailed recommendations are provided over the following pages, illustrating this Long-Term Option level by level.

LONG-TERM ALTERNATIVE OPTION

This alternative long-term scenario maintains a portion of the parking garage, with the west axis extending over it onto the roof of the new Dining Hall, connecting down to the residential quad to the west of the Dining Hall. Further study would be required to determine the technically feasibility of this rooftop space, given structural load on the Dining Hall roof. If feasible, this extended rooftop space would support long views to the south along the west green and west to the proposed West Prospect, Lions Gate, and Downtown Vancouver.
West Mall: Level 100

EXISTING CONDITION

PROPOSED

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Remove a portion of the visitor parking to allow for the creation of the West Commons.
2. Demolish Shell House to allow for the creation of the West Commons.
3. Create a new frontage on the western facade of Lorne Davies to improve the interface between the building and West Commons.
4. Maintain the majority of visitor parking provided on the 100 level.

Legend
- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Existing parking garage

Figure 5-47. Existing condition of level 100

Figure 5-48. Proposed condition of level 100
West Mall: Level 200

EXISTING CONDITION

PROPOSED

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Remove parking on Level 200.

2. Replace the exiting spaces/offices/classrooms at 200 level with new learning/office spaces that emulate the design of the successful “Math West” spaces (transparent materials and wood, excellent lighting, clean architectural expression and design).

3. Active spaces following the “Math West” design could also be introduced in the area of the former parking garage to enhance amenity and activate this space.

4. Improve the existing covered pedestrian walkway at the 200 level.

5. Maintain the existing courtyard.

6. Provide access to the new stairway between the 200 level and West Commons.

Legend

- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Level 200
- Existing parking garage
West Mall: Level 300

EXISTING CONDITION

PROPOSED

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Remove parking on Level 300.
2. Remove the 300 level portions of the buildings located in the Central Axis between the West Mall Centre and Lorne Davies Complex.
3. Build a grand staircase that transitions from the 300 level to the West Commons.
4. Build a generous open space that extends the Central Axis from the Transportation Centre to the West Commons, positioning the 300 level as the primary level for pedestrian circulation.
5. Build interior pedestrian walkways on either side of this open space, connecting into existing walkways to the east, providing primary points of access into the Lorne Davies Complex and West Mall Centre.
6. Build an extension to Lorne Davies Complex as a threshold that incorporates vertical circulation, connecting all levels.

Figure 5-51. Existing condition of level 300

Figure 5-52. Proposed condition of level 300

Legend
- Expanded public space
- New elevators
- Level 200
- Level 300
- Existing parking garage
5.4.3 WEST GREEN (U3)

A community-oriented green space connecting through the athletics precinct

The West Green is a linear open space, providing opportunities for enhanced north/south movement by connecting from the West Axis through The Fields to new development to the south. It will support long views to and from the campus, and incorporate environmental functions such as stormwater management.

At its northern extent where it intersects the Central Axis - the West Commons (West Axis: West Commons [U2-2/U3-1]) - it recalls the original western residential quad in the Erickson/Massey Plan, providing a living room for the west campus residential community.

Where it intersects with Gaglardi Way and the new east/west Mobility Corridor, the West Green creates a new secondary gateway into the campus, connecting between these two primary east/west corridors. The location and design of existing and future athletic fields and facilities should accommodate the creation of this important landscape and the north/south connections it provides.

Figure 5-53. Site plan of West Green
West Green: Athletics Central Commons (U3-2)

The Athletics Central Commons provides a key north/south connection between the new east/west Mobility Corridor, through the West Commons to the Central Axis. Lined on both sides with existing athletics fields, this space ensures clear access and connections through these large features as the campus expands to the south, as well as opening long views to and from the campus. This is not only a space for movement, it can also provide informal space for spectators to enjoy formal athletic activities and should be designed to support passive recreation, occasional programming and events, and general community enjoyment.

Building and landscape design should reinforce community and recreational activities, providing a generous space for spectators, as well as informal recreation and play, formal programming, and day-to-day enjoyment by the full SFU community.
West Green: Gateway (U3-3)

The West Green Gateway provides a new entrance bridging between the existing campus to the north, and potential future development in the south neighbourhood. This space should create a sense of arrival and movement towards the north, providing a transition and key connection between the Mobility Corridor and Gaglardi Way. It is envisioned as a hardscape plaza with generous tree planting, supporting movement while also creating a transition from more urban areas of the campus towards the more natural areas to the south. Tree planting along Gaglardi Way should screen new development, and maintain a sense of driving through the forest as part of this important arrival sequence to the campus.

As a central open space positioned between potential future development, this space should be conceived in relation to the development. It should anchor and provide a point of focus for new development, with buildings positioning front doors and active frontages that integrate with and activate this space.

New spaces and landscapes will create a sense of arrival and support movement across the campus. While this is an important space for movement, solutions to grade changes can provide informal seating, inviting users to stay and activate the space.

Figure 5-55. Rendered view of the West Green Gateway, looking northeast
5.4.4 THE FIELDS (U4)

Enhancing connectivity and community-oriented recreation

The Fields are made up of new and renewed athletic fields and passive recreational spaces, with enhanced connections between them. This new major landscape mediates between the formality of the western portions of the campus and the green and natural qualities of the forest to the south.

Community Open Spaces anchor the east and west edges of The Fields, providing broad recreational opportunities for surrounding communities.

Sports fields - existing sports fields will continue to serve structured athletic activities, with opportunities for new sports fields or facilities south of the new Mobility Corridor on the ‘Field 5’ site.

Connections improve north/south porosity between large sports fields, connecting the new east/west Mobility Corridor through to the Central Axis and west residential community.

Figure 5-56. Site plan of The Fields
The Fields: Maggie’s Field (U4-1)

Maggie’s Field is an existing space with a grassy sloped open space located at the heart of the campus. While it forms an important part of the arrival experience and first impression of the campus, its lack of design interventions, programming and poor interface with adjacent buildings have all contributed to its chronic underutilization.

Comprehensive design improvements are recommended, which must respond to the natural slope in a way that encourages passive recreation, and broader use and enjoyment of the space. This may include the creation of an outdoor amphitheater for concerts and events, among other uses and programming. The location immediately east of this open space is currently under consideration for the First People’s Gathering House, which would provide other clues to assist in the redesign, programming and/or naming of Maggie’s Field.

Separated from the rest of the fields landscape by Gaglardi Way and the Transportation Centre, the creation of an east/west active transportation connection across Gaglardi Way along the northern edge of Maggie Field will be critical to providing east/west connectivity, integrating with and positioning Maggie Field as a gateway into this broader landscape.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Extend a pedestrian crossing to the Transportation Centre across Gaglardi way.

2. Consider a redesign of the space to incorporate tiered seating and/or an amphitheater, providing places for informal gathering, passive recreation, and programming, events and functions to activate the space.

3. The student union building has a new front door onto this space, which should be connected via a clear walkway.

4. Protect for the creation of the new east/west Mobility Corridor multi-use pathway along the southern edge of Maggie’s Field (see the Section 5.4.5).

5. Potential site for the First People’s Gathering House is being considered adjacent to Maggie’s Field.

Maggie’s Field can provide an opportunity for passive recreation and community gathering.

Tiered seating that navigate the field’s natural grade could create an amphitheater type setting for formal events and programming, as well as day to use.
The Fields: West Residential Field (U4-3)

Just as Maggie’s Field is envisioned as an eastern gateway into the broader Fields landscape, the West Residential Field presents a western gateway that should serve and respond to the needs of the growing west campus residential community.

As development of new residential buildings proceeds down the slope at the west end of the campus, this space presents an opportunity to create a central open space around which to build community. It should accommodate programming that serves the various aspects of day-to-day life and diverse needs of the community, which may include spaces for children and pets alongside student oriented passive recreation.

Creating the east/west connection that extends up from the east/west Mobility Corridor and wraps around the West Residential Field extending along the northern edge of The Fields will be integral to positioning this space as a gateway into The Fields and connection into the campus to the east.

Provide a landscaped setting and amenities to anchor the residential community.
The Fields: Existing Sport Fields (U4-2)

At the heart of The Fields, a series of existing athletics fields primarily serve formal and varsity athletics, while also supporting a degree of community and informal student use. Current initiatives such as the Stadium Enhancement Project and donor-initiated investment in an enhanced soccer facility present opportunities to advance broader objectives for The Fields, such as providing renewed and improved facilities for spectators and athletes. With the introduction of the east/west Mobility Corridor, longer term renewal and resurfacing of athletic fields may provide synergistic opportunities to incorporate one level of below-grade parking beneath the fields in a cost-effective manner.

Concurrent with any investment in athletic facilities and fields, it is critical that the envisioned east/west and north/south connections through The Fields are created, along with related wayfinding and new services and amenities to serve both athletes and spectators. Each of the north/south connections shown is strategically positioned to connect between existing fields into existing or future connections to the north and south.

The new Mobility Corridor and Residence Lane each provide east/west connections, working with the north/south connections to create a porous grid across the entire west campus.

Figure 5-58. Rendered view of the sports fields and enhanced connections

Providing integrated spaces for movement and gathering with flexible seating and adjacent amenities and services can create a more active environment that builds community around athletic activities.

Sports fields will be integrated into placemaking and larger movement patterns.
The Fields: Field 5 (U4-4)

Positioned on the southern side of the new east/west Mobility Corridor, the area sometimes referred to as “Field 5” presents one of the only remaining opportunities for a full-size athletic field on the SFU Burnaby Campus. It is also an excellent location for a potential field house, supporting year round athletic activities.

In addition to a new athletic field and/or field house, the Campus Master Plan considers a number of potential uses that could be incorporated on this site both in the interim and long term, such as interim surface parking to unlock development elsewhere or large new institutional buildings. Each of these alternative uses are illustrated to the right.

However, due to the inherent challenge of introducing large flat athletic fields on a mountaintop, and this site’s proximity to other athletic facilities, it is strongly recommended that SFU Athletics consider whether or not additional fields are required on the mountaintop, and if so, this site should likely be protected for this specific use.

When this site is developed, it will be integral to protect for north/south connections, along with related wayfinding and complimentary landscape and public realm design features to integrate this site into the broader Fields landscape.
5.4.5 EAST/WEST MOBILITY CORRIDOR (U5)

Expanding cross-campus connectivity for all types of movements

The Mobility Corridor enhances east/west connectivity across the campus for a range of travel modes, including pedestrians, cycling, transit and potentially vehicles. As a counterpoint to the Central Axis, the Corridor provides an experience that is integrated within rather than imposed upon the landscape, providing new clues for how to organize future development and open spaces along the Corridor.

As a relatively flat route, the Corridor enhances accessibility and multi-modal connections across the campus. It also creates access and address for future development, parking and open spaces, becoming a significant place that contributes to the arrival experience and overall identity of the campus. The Corridor will be created incrementally over time in conjunction with new development, which should activate the Corridor and contribute to its function as a vibrant public space.

Figure 5-63. Site Plan of East/West Mobility Corridor
Mobility Corridor: Zone 1 - West Campus (U5-1)

This portion of the Mobility Corridor creates a new east/west connection through an area of the campus that is currently forested. As a new connection between University Dr W and Gaglardi Way/South Campus Rd, in any scenario the Zone 1 portion of the Mobility Corridor should be completed in its entirety to complete this important connection. The following scenarios illustrate how this portion of the Mobility Corridor can be realized over time, protecting the right of way for a future complete street in the long-term.

**Near Term**
In the near term, the zone 1 portion of the Mobility Corridor can be realized as a multi-use pathway, including bi-directional lanes for bikes, scooters, skateboards and other micro-mobility devices, as well as a dedicated sidewalk for pedestrians (See Figure 5-64). The Mobility Corridor could extend west of University Drive to create an active transportation link into the Trans Canada Trail system and Burnaby Mountain Park.

**Long-Term: Type A**
In the fullness of time, vehicular access may be required to service potential new development to the south. As such, this portion of the Mobility Corridor should consider and protect for a wider 22 m right of way (see Figure 5-65). This protects for a future scenario where the Mobility Corridor is integrated as part of a complete street that supports full vehicular movement to unlock development potential in this area of the campus.

**Long-Term: Type B**
This alternative long-term configuration of a future complete street also envisions a 22 m right of way that incorporates the new Mobility Corridor along its northern edge, with a vehicular street to the south. This configuration illustrates a 3.5 m landscape zone, as an alternative to the pick-up and drop-off areas depicted on the long-term section (See Figure 5-66).

The Mobility Corridor will incorporate a complete streets principles to support the needs of all types of movement, as well as reinforcing building entrances and arrival.
Figure 5-64. Proposed near-term street section of zone 1

Figure 5-65. Proposed long-term (type A) street section of zone 1

Figure 5-66. Proposed long-term (type B) street section of zone 1
**Mobility Corridor: Gaglardi Way / Mobility Corridor Intersection (U5-2)**

Due to the irregular intersection between South Campus Rd, Gaglardi Way and the future Mobility Corridor, the following intersection configurations were explored to ensure the feasibility of the Mobility Corridor.

Configuration #1 (left) normalizes the intersection, realigning Gaglardi Way to intersect South Campus Rd and the Mobility Corridor at a right angle. This creates a 4-way intersection with stop signs, calming vehicular traffic, improving visibility, and allowing for a traditional crossing of Gaglardi way for the Mobility Corridor.

Configuration #2 (right) maintains Gaglardi Way and resolves the intersection with a roundabout. Both options demonstrate feasible solutions to address this intersection. Further detailed study is required to select a preferred approach and resolve the detailed design of the Mobility Corridor’s crossing of this intersection.

**ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION CONFIGURATION #1**

![Figure 5-67. Alternative Intersection Configuration #1 of Gaglardi Way and Mobility Corridor](image)

**ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION CONFIGURATION #2**

![Figure 5-68. Alternative Intersection Configuration #2 of Gaglardi Way and Mobility Corridor](image)
**Mobility Corridor: Zone 2 - Central Campus (U5-3)**

**EXISTING CONDITION**

In zone 2, in the central area of the campus, the Mobility Corridor is envisioned as a multi-use pathway to be located along the northern edge of the existing South Campus Rd.

The sections to the right illustrate typical existing conditions along South Campus Rd, which includes two vehicular lanes, a 1.5 m bike lane along the southern edge, 1.5 m and sidewalks along the northern edge. In some areas a lane for pick up and drop off functions is also located along the northern edge of the vehicular roadway; in other areas larger green setbacks are provided.

Conceptual sections on the following page illustrate how the Mobility Corridor can be integrated within this existing roadway.

![Figure 5-69. Street Section of Existing Zone 2 Portion](image-url)
PROPOSED CONDITION

To respond to various existing conditions along South Campus Rd, three typologies are illustrated in the following conceptual sections to demonstrate how the Mobility Corridor can be integrated within different areas of the existing roadway. In all three typologies the Mobility Corridor is integrated as a 5 m multi-use pathway that runs along the northern edge of the road, including a 3 m bi-directional lane for bikes and other faster wheeled mobility devices, and a 2m sidewalk for pedestrians. In all typologies, the current location of the centre line of the road is also maintained in its current location to avoid the need for costly regrading or road alterations.

Typology A

Typology A illustrates more generous landscape zones separating vehicles from the Mobility Corridor and southern sidewalk.

Figure 5-70. Proposed Type A Street Section of Zone 2 Portion
Typology B

Typology B illustrates opportunities to integrate pedestrian crossings and street furnishings in areas where north/south pedestrian pathways intersect the Mobility Corridor, interrupting the landscape zone shown in Typology A.

Figure 5-71. Proposed Type B Street Section of Zone 2 Portion

Typology C

Typology C illustrates opportunities to integrate more extensive pick-up and drop-off activity where the Mobility Corridor is located adjacent to main entrances into busier campus buildings or landscapes. Pick-up and drop-off functions replace or interrupt the landscape zones shown in Typology A.

Figure 5-72. Proposed Type C Street Section of Zone 2 Portion
**Mobility Corridor: Zone 3 - East Campus (U5-4)**

**PROPOSED CONDITION**

In zone 3, the Mobility Corridor separates from South Campus Road to maintain a relatively flat grade, continuing northwards to intersect with Science Road just west of Tower Road. It extends along the southern frontage of the TASC 1 building, and is to be integrated within the proposed development in the Innovation Precinct, directing pedestrians, cyclists and other active transportation users into the heart of this future development and further to UniverCity.

![Figure 5-73. Proposed Street Section of Zone 3 Portion](image)

The character of Mobility Corridor can change depending on its context, for example where it may intersect plazas, squares or other special areas of the campus.
5.4.6 EAST GREEN (U6)

A new place of arrival, providing north/south connections from the Gondola

The East Green is a major north/south linear space extending across the full campus, providing opportunities for movement and amenity extending to the north and south of the anticipated future Gondola landing. It will provide a new place of arrival into the campus, and will organize and provide a setting for new communities and buildings as the campus grows. Located where the UniverCity and SFU communities intersect, it is also provides a place of amenity for all in tying these two communities together. The East Green will contain a variety of landscape types and experiences, ranging from more formal and urbanc to more natural as one moves down the mountain. It will create long views to and from the campus, and will support important environmental functions such as stormwater management.

Figure 5-74. Site plan of East Green
**East Green: Discovery Commons (U6-4)**

Discovery Commons is located at the southern extent of the East Green, between South Campus Rd and University Dr. This portion of the East Green provides a central organizing element for new development along the southern slopes, creating a central commons for north/south movement and day-to-day amenity for new buildings on either side, as well as the existing Discovery 2 and FIC buildings located in this area of the campus.

Buildings along the eastern edge of the Commons should integrate a primary north/south interior pedestrian walkway along the edge of the Commons, contributing to the extension of this primary north/south corridor into the campus. This corridor may integrate a continuous series of escalators within each building along the eastern edge of the Green, creating a "people-mover" that speeds north/south movement along the East Green and assists with the significant changes in grade.

The character and landscape design of Discovery Commons should support a transition from more urban areas of the campus to the north, with significant soft landscaping, tree planting and water/stormwater features connecting back to the forest to the south. It should also contain more urban hardscape plazas where greater pedestrian activity, outdoor seating, and/or pick up and drop off activity is anticipated, particularly where major buildings and roadways interface with this landscape.

*Figure 5-75. Rendered view of Discovery Commons, looking north.*

Landscaping can incorporate stormwater management features, native species and wildlife habitat, and other environmental features and functions.
**East Green: North Gateway (U6-1)**

The North Gateway is a generous open space located between the final phases of the UniverCity development and a future academic development parcel north of Saywell and Blusson Halls. As the northern-most portion of the East Green, the North Gateway is envisioned as a transitional open space bridging from more hardscape and urban plaza spaces to the south into the forest to the north. As such this landscape should include generous plantings and water features that invite nature back into the campus in this area, as well as creating a place of natural beauty for passive use and enjoyment by both the UniverCity and SFU communities. A clear connection into the Trans Canada and Cardiac Hill Trail systems should be included, inviting the communities on the mountain to enjoy the surrounding Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area. Clear wayfinding both into the trail system, and into the campus should also be included to assist all users of the space in finding their way to nearby amenities and key destinations, allowing the space to function as a secondary green gateway into the campus from the north.

![Figure 5-76. Rendered view of North Gateway, looking west](image)
**East Green: Strand Commons and Town Square (U6-2)**

Strand Commons is envisioned as a new green open space located on the areas of surface parking to the east of Strand Hall. This area is a particularly important and central location for a central green commons where the UniverCity and SFU community can come together, building on the existing success of Town Square. These places will respond to their location within the overall structure of the campus, functioning as a complement to the Academic Quad; similar in size, but a place of vibrant activity and cultural iconography. The new Commons enhances the setting for the administrative heart of SFU, and has a relationship with the existing Town Square, allowing for urban mainstreet functions to spill into this space as a ‘central park’ to both the SFU and UniverCity communities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The majority of Strand Commons is envisioned as a primarily green, soft landscape for passive recreation.

2. Strand Commons should transition to a more hardscape urban plaza where it interfaces with the reconfigured bus loop to the east and the existing Town Square to the southeast.

3. A large and prominent development site is situated south of the Commons and west of the Square. This site is currently under consideration as a potential location for the First People’s Gathering House. The design and function of Strand Commons and Town Square must respond to their role as the setting for any future development on this site.

4. The future Gondola landing is located at the southwest corner of Town Square. The Square will need to respond to its new role as a primary connection between the Gondola, the central axis, and the UniverCity main street, including clear wayfinding and pathways to support a legible and welcoming arrival experience.

![Figure 5-77. Rendered view and recommendations for Strand Commons and Town Square](image-url)
5. The existing central east/west outdoor pedestrian corridor is maintained and integrated along the southern edge of Strand Commons, connecting and extending the central axis to the UniverCity High Street.

4. Major east/west interior pedestrian walkways compliment the Central Axis, located along the northern edge of Strand Commons and at the southern edge of Town Square. The northern Saywell/Blusson Hall corridor is highly successful, providing clues for the creation and improvement of the southern corridor over time: these pedestrian networks should be oriented to the outside, providing clear wayfinding, natural light and opportunities for indoor and outdoor pedestrian movement.

7. With the southern corridor located opposite the planned future Gondola landing, this corridor is positioned to become a primary point of access and gateway into the campus. The new Applied Sciences building entrance should be relocated north to create direct, clear access from the Gondola landing across the southern edge of Town Square, supporting connections all the way to the west end of campus.

Plazas highlight places of arrival and building entrances, providing places for gathering that allow activities within buildings to spill into the public realm.

Figure 5-78. Rendered view and recommendations for Strand Commons and Town Square
East Green: Innovation Plaza (U6-3)

Innovation Plaza extends south from Town Square down to South Campus Road, creating a new central open space between the existing Sciences Complex and new development on the east parking lot, currently conceived of as an Innovation District. It incorporates the landing for the planned Gondola, positioning this area as a new primary gateway into the campus. Innovation Plaza should respond to this important opportunity to by ensuring the Gondola landing building is clearly visible and accessible as a central feature within the Plaza, with hardscape areas accommodating significant pedestrian traffic to and from the Gondola.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Gondola landing building and other new buildings fronting the space should incorporate active uses at grade, including welcoming functions closest to the Gondola, food and beverage uses, and other day to day services and amenities, with the plaza designed to allow these uses to spill out and activate the surrounding public realm.

2. The successful Town Square landscape can be extended into Innovation Plaza, including tiered seating and water features to navigate the grade changes and accommodate day to day use. This space is a focal point that anchors a very important social hub at the most eastern point of the Central Axis (see Section 5.1.3). As such, it should be designed to accommodate programming, special events and gatherings that can bring the SFU, UniverCity, and broader communities beyond the mountain together.

3. A new entrance lobby into the applied sciences building and primary pedestrian corridor to the west should be positioned opposite the Gondola landing, connected with a clear hardscape pathway and wayfinding (see Strand Commons for more details on this pedestrian pathway).

4. The existing stand of mature trees in front of the Applied Sciences building should be protected and maintained, providing a juxtaposition to the hardscape plaza areas to the east.

5. More extensive tree plantings and potential stormwater management can be extended further south as well, contributing to the notion of the East Green as a ‘Green Finger’ that invites nature and natural functions from the forest back into the heart of the campus.

Figure 5-79. Rendered view and recommendations for Innovation Plaza, looking north
In the fullness of time, the existing facilities building (currently located in the middle of Innovation Plaza, should be relocated, with new development shifted to the west to accommodate the creation of the East Green as a continuous north/south corridor. (See section 5.3.5 for more details)

Where Innovation Plaza meets South Campus Rd, a hardscape area should be introduced, signifying pedestrian priority and creating a generous crossing to the Discovery Commons to the south. This area can also accommodate pick up and drop off activity, connecting users into the campus.

New buildings along the eastern edge of the Plaza should be oriented with primary active frontages facing the Plaza. This should include a primary north/south pedestrian corridor that extends from the Discovery Commons up to the Gondola. This interior corridor should be oriented to the outside, providing clear wayfinding, natural light and opportunities for indoor and outdoor pedestrian movement. This corridor may integrate a continuous series of escalators within each building along the eastern edge of the green, creating a ‘people-mover’ that speeds north/south movement along the East Green and assists with the significant changes in grade.
This Chapter provides a series of general guidelines for distinct areas of the campus, building on the recommendations in Chapter 5 and complimenting the detailed directions in the following Chapter 7 Precinct Plans.

The research and analysis work at the start of the campus planning process set the stage for the strategies, recommendations and guidelines of the Campus Master Plan going forward for the next 50 years. The original concepts that informed the Erickson/Massey campus plan were studied and analyzed to determine how these seminal concepts continued to shape subsequent campus plans as well as decisions about the siting and design of individual projects over the last 50 years.

These inspired campus structuring concepts in the original plan are at the core of the framework that grounds the 2065 Campus Master Plan and its area-wide guidelines. They have been used to organize the area-wide guidelines into four general areas informing strategies for heritage conservation, indigenization and sustainability. These four general areas are:

- Erickson/Massey Core
- Expanded Central Axis
- Central Campus
- South Campus

This chapter includes:

6.1 ORGANIZING THE GUIDELINES
This section describes the four distinct areas of the campus that are used to organize the guidelines in the following sections.

6.2 HERITAGE CONSERVATION GUIDELINES
This section outlines a strategy and guidelines to conserve heritage buildings and spaces.

6.3 GENERAL BUILDING DESIGN GUIDELINES
This section provides guidelines to inform the design of new buildings, speaking to materiality and integration with existing buildings and spaces.

6.4 ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE GUIDELINES
This section provides guidelines for advancing sustainability best practices, including how to balance these with other priorities.

6.5 INDIGENIZATION GUIDELINES
This section acknowledges SFU’s truth and reconciliation initiatives, and provides guidelines to advance the indigenization of the campus.

6.6 GENERAL PUBLIC REALM AND LANDSCAPE GUIDELINES
This section provides general guidelines and a recommendation to complete more comprehensive public realm planning.

6.7 ACCESSIBILITY GUIDELINES
This section provides guidelines to ensure the campus is accessible for everyone to allow full participation in the university community.

6.8 PANORAMIC VIEWS AND VIEW CORRIDOR GUIDELINES
This section identifies key views and provides guidance on protecting and enhancing them.
6.1 ORGANIZING THE GUIDELINES

ERICKSON/MASSEY CORE AND AXIS

The Erickson/Massey competition-winning concept established a framework for the initial round of campus development and for its subsequent expansion. A Central Axis linked a series of spaces intended to be experienced as a processional route defined by open spaces and buildings in a formal, rectilinear pattern of openings and pinch points.

The Axis is aligned with the ridge of Burnaby Mountain and toward important view opportunities to the west and east. The Axis and its rectilinear pattern has been used over time to structure the expansion of the campus to include the student residences and to interface with UniverCity at its High Street.

EXPANDED ERICKSON/MASSEY AXIS

The Central Axis as it extends to the west and east is a key driver of the Erickson/Massey plan. It is covered by design guidelines that reflect the design intentions for expanding the Axis over time including respecting its axial symmetry and rectilinearity, the patterning of spaces, the ceremonial progression of moving through spaces, especially for convocation and other campus-wide events, and other original design intentions.

Areas along the central spine are covered by guidelines that respect the rectilinearity of the core and the primacy of the Axis in step with the way the Erickson/Massey concept has been built out in the central campus and future growth has been anticipated in earlier campus plans, including the 2010 Endall Elliot Burnaby Mountain Campus Development Plan.

The geometry of building footprints, paths and corridors, courtyards and open spaces should be rectilinear on the alignment of the Central Axis and reference the design principles of the Erickson/Massey plan.

CENTRAL CAMPUS DESIGN STRATEGY

Areas in proximity to the campus core but not directly on the Axis should continue to have a geometry that parallels the rectilinear grid of the core, especially for building footprints that terrace downslope to the north and south.

Open spaces should be expressed in courtyard forms but the landscape itself should be more informal, varied and designed to meet anticipated uses and programming in response to the occupants of adjacent buildings.

The Central Campus guidelines focus on advancing strong urban design principles, including responding to planning concepts and design principles of the original Erickson/Massey plan.

Figure 6-1. Original Erickson/Massey concept

Figure 6-2. Expanded Erickson/Massey Axis

Figure 6-3. Formal Erickson/Massey architectural order of the Central Campus
SOUTH CAMPUS DESIGN STRATEGY

The South Campus presents an opportunity to break from, contrast with, and therefore highlight the rectilinear composition of the central campus. The new East/West Mobility Corridor is part of this break with tradition. As it follows a contour across the mountainside it facilitates mobility and fits with the land.

The intent for the South Campus guidelines is to encourage a contemporary design approach and to be responsive to the natural conditions of the site: slope, aspect, surface watercourses, mature tree stands, and ecological function. These values are also reflective of the comments received on Indigenization of the campus through design that is respectful of nature and the land.

Guidelines address such topics as visible, functional stormwater management features, bridges and culverts that protect watercourses as wildlife corridors, trail connections to the adjacent Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area, tree management for views, and streetscape planting concepts that use a variety of species in informal groupings rather than regularly spaced standard trees. Sustainable best practices for both buildings and landscapes have particular application in the South Campus.

Green Fingers reaching into the Central Campus should provide a contrast to the rectilinear layout of buildings and courtyards with an informal and naturalized landscape character.

The northern edges of The Fields and other active spaces south of the Transportation Centre are within the Central Campus and should express a rectilinear grid and should transition to softer, informal design expression on their southern edges.

Figure 6-4. Informal South Campus Architectural Order
Simon Fraser University was sited on Burnaby Mountain in 1963 by Dr. Gordon Shrum, appointed by the BC Legislature to lead the creation of a new university. These lands fall within the traditional territories of the Squamish, Musqueam, Tsleil-Waututh, and Kwikwetlem First Nations who used these lands for a variety of purposes over centuries. The understanding of the campus’s heritage encompasses both the First Nations’ history of use and the evolution of the new university. More on the traditional territories on which the campus is situated can be found in Section 2.1, and guidelines specific to supporting the Indigenization of campus are provided in Section 6.5.

The Central Axis and ensemble of iconic spaces and buildings along it are foundational, organizing elements of the existing campus. The 1963 Development Plan helped launched Arthur Erickson’s career, and in many ways represents the best of both the architect’s body of work and this style of architecture in general. The resulting historic campus core tells a remarkable story about the origins of the SFU Burnaby campus, and these spaces are central both to SFU Burnaby’s image and to the experience of the campus. They are also recognized and appreciated beyond the campus, having made prominent appearances in various film and television productions, as well as Canadian architectural archives. For all of these reasons, the importance of celebrating and conserving these heritage buildings and spaces as an important part of the campus of the future cannot be understated.

Today, the SFU Burnaby Campus is listed on the City of Burnaby’s heritage inventory. However, specific buildings and landscapes that contribute to the campus’s heritage value have not been identified to date. A comprehensive strategy to identify and preserve specific heritage resources is required to evaluate new development and design interventions.

The 2065 Campus Master Plan process has put the design evolution and the built heritage of the campus into the core of its strategic approach to shaping future planning and design decisions, recognizing SFU’s important role as the stewards of the SFU Burnaby campus and its architectural legacy.

**Recommended heritage conservation process**

1. Undertake Cultural Heritage Landscape study or similar evaluation to identify heritage assets
2. Prepare Statements of Significance for all identified heritage buildings and landscapes
3. Refine Campus Core boundaries based on the Statements of Significance
4. Review updated heritage inventory with key stakeholders
5. All projects on the heritage inventory involve a heritage professional and a heritage review process

*Oblique view of the campus in its early stages of development*
Integrated Heritage and Design Guideline Strategy

ERICKSON/MASSEY CORE

The Campus Master Plan identifies the original core buildings of the Erickson/Massey competition-winning concept as requiring a heritage strategy that will include heritage conservation guidelines, referencing the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada and related heritage guidelines. The intent is to conserve and restore the historic fabric and ensure that any new interventions are limited, analyzed by standards for best heritage practices, and clearly identifiable through differentiated materials and design.

The focus of the core heritage strategy, shown in orange on the diagram on the following page, is the original Erickson/Massey framework. The Academic Quadrangle and Convocation Mall should receive the most conservation-oriented guidelines for buildings and as a cultural landscape with some tapering towards the west and east. The ceremonial role of the procession through these spaces should also be embedded in the conservation approach. The axial alignment of the spine is also a significant part of the historic core that should be given a high level of protection.

The Transportation Centre design directions should be presented as stepping back toward the Erickson/Massey intentions, and consider the removal of later additions and modifications that were made over the years that further compromised the already constrained spatial/movement sequence within this key area of the historic core.

The Campus Master Plan recommends that a Cultural Heritage Landscape Study or similar study be undertaken to confirm this area, and to identify any historically significant buildings and landscapes across the campus. Comprehensive Statements of Significance for identified buildings and landscapes should then be prepared. Projects undertaken in relation to identified heritage assets should have a qualified heritage professional on the planning and design team, who can engage with and respond to the relevant Statements of Significance.

Statements of Significance should articulate the specific attributes to be celebrated and conserved, as well as providing direction on the potential for renewal and reprogramming of existing resources and/or sensitive new development that interfaces with or incorporates the identified heritage resources.

The Statements should consider the individual heritage value of specific resources and the interplay among buildings and landscapes that has been at the core of the Erickson/Massey Plan, and subsequent plans, as an ensemble.

The Statements of Significance should be undertaken as the next step and form the basis for refinement of the buildings and landscapes that should constitute the core that is addressed by heritage conservation methods and standards. The core area, once refined, would clarify and define the Heritage Inventory and related heritage review processes.

EXPANDED ERICKSON/MASSEY AXIS

As the Central Axis extends to the west and east, the relevant design guidelines focus on the design intentions embedded in the Erickson/Massey Plan for expanding the Axis over time, including respecting axial symmetry and rectilinearity, with more focus on urban design drivers and less use of heritage conservation standards.

Beyond the campus core and along the Central Axis, several buildings have heritage values and significance. The future of these structures should be determined through the recommended Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and/or similar evaluation to identify their significance and determine if Statements of Significance should be prepared to articulate specific attributes and conservation strategies.
CENTRAL CAMPUS DESIGN STRATEGY

In the Central Campus, the guidelines focus on advancing strong urban design principles, including responding to planning concepts and design principles of the original Erickson/Massey plan. While the buildings and landscapes are not formally planned and designed using heritage conservation approaches, the guidelines support the heritage core with buildings and open spaces that respond to the hierarchy of heritage importance of the core and terrace along the ridge in forms that are inspired by the Erickson/Massey architectural order.

SOUTH CAMPUS DESIGN STRATEGY

The South Campus breaks from and contrasts with the formality and rectilinearity of the Erickson/Massey inspired core and central campus. Although development is proposed within these areas that the original plan envisioned as the forest setting of the campus, the guidelines intend to highlight land and forest and an organic fit of development to site.

BUILDINGS AND LANDSCAPES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR STATEMENTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following list of buildings and landscapes are located within the Erickson/Massey Core and may be considered when SFU engages in the process of preparing Statements of Significance to update the Heritage Inventory. Other buildings outside the Erickson/Massey Core may also be considered for statements of significance. Given the 50 year span of this plan, additional buildings across the campus will need to be considered over time as well.
The guidelines in this section are general to the design of buildings in the three areas of the campus: Campus Core, Central Campus and South Campus. Guidelines that pertain to the design of buildings for specific sites in order to achieve the urban design objectives of the Campus Plan are located in the Precinct Plans in Chapter 7 to ensure that the designs of individual buildings respond to the hierarchies and roles of adjacent movement routes, commons and Green Fingers with their composition of facades, entries and internal corridors.

**CAMPUS CORE**

Buildings in the Campus Core are subject to the heritage strategy, methods and standards that reference Canadian best practices.

Guidelines for the Campus Core include:

1. New buildings or additions to buildings should be clearly distinguishable from the core heritage buildings and not compete for visual primacy with the original Erickson/Massey ensemble.

2. Concrete should be a dominant building material with wood details, large areas of glazing and modest areas of colour in art and decorative accents. Sustainability considerations related to passive design and energy efficiency should also inform consideration of building materiality.

3. Building massing should express the horizontality, rectilinear geometry and repetitive patterning of the Erickson/Massey core buildings.

4. Where possible internal corridors and external walkways should be extensions of the existing grid and should be located to enhance wayfinding and with a high degree of transparency between them.

5. Stairs should be located along or adjacent to the major corridor network, be generous in dimensions and have access to natural light.

6. External walkways should be provided with weather protection along building facades with entries accentuated by larger and more prominent weather protection elements.

**CENTRAL CAMPUS**

Buildings in the Central Campus are largely outside the area that is subject to heritage methodologies with the exception of a few buildings that may be identified as heritage and included on the Heritage Register after Statements of Significance are prepared and reviewed with the City of Burnaby.

Guidelines for the Central Campus include:

1. New buildings or additions to buildings should not compete for visual primacy with the original Erickson/Massey ensemble while being compatible with the overall character of the campus core.

2. Concrete should be a key building material with an expanded palette of additional materials including wood, large areas of glazing, and hardboard panels of cement or fibreglass. Bright colours should be used modestly in art and decorative accents, with the potential exceptions of small pavilions in open spaces and buildings with Indigenous design and programming. Sustainability considerations should also inform consideration of building materiality.

3. Building massing should express the horizontality, rectilinear geometry and repetitive patterning of the Erickson/Massey core buildings in a contemporary design expression.
The South Campus is intended to be a contrast to the Erickson/Massey character of the Core and Central Campus with inspiration from land and nature and contemporary design.

Areas at the transition from Central to South Campus such as The Fields and along the new Mobility Corridor should be designed to mediate this transition in their designs with more formal and rectilinear north facades and massing that reveals the contours of the land on which they are sited.

Guidelines for the South Campus include:
1. New buildings or additions to buildings should not compete for visual primacy with the original Erickson/Massey ensemble while being compatible with the overall character intended for the South Campus.
2. Building materials should be selected from a palette that may include concrete, wood, glazing systems in aluminum or zinc, metal panels, hardboard panels of cement or fibreglass, natural stone, and mosaic tiles, among other materials, but not brick, glazed brick or stucco. Sustainability considerations related to passive design and energy efficiency should also inform consideration of building materiality.
3. Building massing should express the topography of the site and relationships to natural features such as watercourses, retained forest stands, and trails, among others.
4. Buildings should provide external weather protection and with major entries along the facade indicated in the precinct concepts.
5. Building designs should express their internal uses and contribute interest and animation to the public realm.
6. Transparency that permits views into interior spaces that are adjacent to external movement routes should be provided by extensive areas of glazing.
7. Finished floor elevations on sloping sites should support accessibility and the indoor-outdoor relationships to external walkways and open spaces.
ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY, AND RESILIENCE GUIDELINES

The guidelines in this section are general to the full Burnaby Mountain campus, recognizing that opportunities in the Campus Core, and to a lesser extent in the Central Campus, should be balanced with heritage objectives while the South Campus will have new buildings and landscapes with more scope to address environment, sustainability, and resilience guidelines.

Attention in future projects to environment, sustainability, and resilience objectives supports the advice received during the planning process regarding Indigenous values to respect nature and the land.

SFU subscribes to two green building certification systems: Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design (LEED) and the Building Owners and Managers Association’s Building Environmental Standards (BOMA BEST).

SFU has also advanced a number of its own sustainability planning initiatives, including the 20-Year Sustainability Vision and Goals, which the Campus Master Plan works to advance. Key goals include, but are not limited to:

> Positioning campus infrastructure and operations to be living environments for interdisciplinary learning, applied research and practical work to advance sustainability and resiliency.
> Providing the SFU community with opportunities for engagement and involvement in long-term planning and prioritization.
> Placing value on community health and well-being.
> Establishing and maintaining abundant public green spaces and protecting local biodiversity.

GENERAL CAMPUS GUIDELINES

Overall guidelines for the environment, sustainability and resilience of the campus include:

Environmental Sustainability

1. Landscape design and plant selection should consider drought resistance, use of native species and likelihood of warmer temperatures in the future. SFU has a policy to use native plant species in all new planting programs, especially when the area is near or adjacent to natural areas such as forest edges, swales and creeks.
2. Water features should be designed to utilize rainwater and not depend on potable water sources.
3. Stormwater management should adhere to the adopted Stormwater Management Strategy and, where possible, stormwater function should be visible to and understood by the campus community.
4. Potential for impacts to stands of forest should be considered and mitigated in the siting of new buildings or additions.
5. Forest stands across the campus should be managed to support ecological functions.

Sustainable Building Design

1. Passive building design strategies and building orientation should be considered as part of the integrated design process for all buildings.
2. Building massing should consider energy performance implications and strive for compact forms.
3. Space programming should locate internal building functions in locations that match their thermal and natural light access requirements.
4. Location, size, orientation and views from windows should be carefully considered in relation to thermal comfort and energy use.
5. Potential for passive natural ventilation should be considered in the design and siting of buildings.
6. Durability and potential for eventual recycling should be considered in the selection of building materials.
7. Buildings should be designed to minimize the requirements for potable water consumption.

Social Sustainability

1. All buildings and landscapes should be designed to optimize universal accessibility.
2. The social sustainability of the campus should be enhanced by considering the roles of open spaces, interior spaces and movement routes and designing buildings and landscapes to bring students, staff, faculty and members of the larger community into social contact and promote cultural, recreational and leisure activities.
3. Sustainable best practices should be visible and interpreted, and where possible, encourage the involvement of members of the campus community.
4. Ensure that buildings and open spaces incorporate opportunities to support health and wellness, and opportunities for interdisciplinary learning to advance other sustainability and resilience initiatives.
Simon Fraser University has taken steps towards Reconciliation and the Indigenization of the campus on Burnaby Mountain (refer to Section 2.1). These steps take a number of forms including:

- Protocols for involving First Nations in decision making about the campus and its lands
- Programs and departments with a focus on Indigenous studies and support for Indigenous students, faculty and staff
- Projects and built work that express Indigenous art and culture, including the Welcome Pole recently created and installed at the south entry to the campus, as well as a wide range of Indigenous art across campus and two Indigenous gardens featuring plants valued by the First Nations on whose unceded territories the campus is located.

The design guidelines build on the Guiding Principles which speak to supporting Indigenization of the campus (see Section 4.1), by incorporating key ideas that reflect Indigenous values including:

- Considerations for welcoming visitors to the campus at entry points and, especially, at the arrival of Gaglardi Way to the view across The Fields to the campus core
- Bringing nature into the campus with Green Fingers and strengthening connections between the built campus and the natural spaces in the South Campus and Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area
- Establishing the alignment of the proposed new Mobility Corridor along a contour line of the mountainside to provide ease of access and movement, to limit disturbance to the topography, and to respect natural features and mature trees
- Encouraging new buildings in the South Campus to sit within the landscape with minimized disruptions of topography and natural systems
- Environmental sustainability and resilience guidelines that stress natural functions, watercourse enhancement, surface stormwater features, biodiversity and native species
- Encouraging open spaces that are designed for a wide variety of programming including Indigenous ceremonies of welcoming and cultural purposes
- Emphasizing indoor/outdoor relationships with views from both internal circulation routes and outdoor walkways into landscaped courtyards, stands of trees, and natural areas.

The ‘Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre’ at UBC integrates with the surrounding landscape, drawing on Indigenous culture to inform its design without making specific reference to any one community in order to create a space for all.
CAMPUS CORE

There are many opportunities for Indigenization initiatives within the Campus Core with its heritage buildings and landscapes to introduce design layers and to reference Indigenous history and culture. The processes for involving First Nations in campus planning and design should ensure that new projects are informed by First Nations values and advice and that wayfinding, place naming, landscape and planting choices, and art express Indigenous culture.

CENTRAL CAMPUS

Guidelines for the Central Campus support urban design directions that express the formal symmetry and rectilinearity of the Erickson/Massey Plan. While it is expected that these guidelines will apply generally to new buildings in the Central Campus, buildings and landscapes for Indigenization projects including the planned First Nations Gathering House and Indigenous gardens will likely explore organic, non-linear forms that will be a counterpoint to the overall formal structure and should ensure that these new design elements will contrast and be highlighted against the overall rectilinear pattern. Like the Campus Core, processes for involving First Nations in campus planning and design should ensure that new projects are informed by First Nations values and advice and that wayfinding, place naming, landscape and planting choices, and art express Indigenous culture.

SOUTH CAMPUS

Guidelines for the South Campus move away from the formal grid of the Central Campus and present opportunities for building design and siting and landscape to express relationships to landform and contour of the land, forest, cultural landscape and traditional land use. Within the South Campus, Indigenization should inform an intention to fit to the land through:

1. Aligning new roads and paths to the contours of the mountainside.
2. Assessing the viability of mature tree stands for retention and including forest patches within the landscape, including understory plants that are native to the Burnaby Mountain forest ecology.
3. Restoring the ecology of surface watercourses and featuring surface stormwater management with native vegetation to transport rainwater to the mountain’s watercourse network.
4. Involving First Nations experts in the design of new buildings and places, and the selection of plant materials for naturalized areas and restoration of ecological function.
5. Seeking opportunities for Indigenous place names, cultural landscape interpretation, ceremony and programming, and First Nations art.
The guidelines in this section are, in most cases, general to the full Burnaby Mountain campus. It is recommended that a Public Realm Plan be prepared to provide detailed guidelines for specific areas, specifying materials and furnishings for a variety of campus applications that are beyond the scope of the Master Plan.

**GENERAL CAMPUS GUIDELINES**

Overall guidelines for the public realm and landscape include:

**Weather Protection**

1. Weather protection should be provided along all major pedestrian routes except where interrupted by streets or service lanes.
2. Weather protection elements should be integrated into building facades where possible and continued by free-standing elements where buildings are not located.

**Paving**

1. Paving patterns and materials should be used strategically and systematically across the campus as a key wayfinding strategy.
2. Paving should clearly differentiate between pedestrian and vehicular routes with vehicular routes generally paved in asphalt and pedestrian crossings using the paving materials and patterns of adjacent pedestrian routes to signal pedestrian priority over vehicles.
3. Pedestrian realm areas should be designed to accommodate campus service and security vehicle use.
4. Universal accessibility should be fully available in all paved areas.
5. Paving in the Campus Core should work to create a consistent sense of place, referencing the pattern established by the recent Plaza Renewal initiative.
6. Paving in the Central Campus should be inspired by the Erickson/Massey materials and rectilinear patterning with a contemporary design interpretation.
7. Individual courtyards should be paved to express the surrounding architecture and to suit the intended programming of the space.
8. Paving in the South Campus should continue the materials and wayfinding elements of the Central Campus although forms may be more curvilinear.
9. Paving should continue to differentiate the boundary of campus and UniverCity where interlocking pavers have been used in the design of Town Square and High Street.

**Lighting**

1. A coordinated lighting strategy should be completed for the safety of the campus community at night, and to take advantage of the opportunities that strategic and consistent application of lighting can provide for wayfinding, placemaking, comfort and beauty.
2. Lighting should reinforce the hierarchy of routes and spaces on campus and assist in marking building entries.
3. Lighting should follow sustainable best practices that limit light pollution, address durability, life cycle costs and ease of maintenance and are adaptable to future technological improvements.

**Site Furnishings**

1. A Public Realm Plan should provide detailed direction on the choices and applications of a range of site furnishings that could include: seating, tables, bike racks, drinking fountains, garbage and recycling containers, newspaper boxes, flag and banner poles, screening and fencing, tree and drainage grates, bollards, transit shelters, and information kiosks, among others.
2. Until a Public Realm Plan is undertaken, the recent renovations for the Academic Quadrangle and Convocation Mall should be referenced for site furnishing selection.

**Signage**

1. Campus signage should be designed and placed in keeping with the university-wide Signage Strategy.
2. Opportunities to use First Nations place names should be sought both for places on the campus and when referencing places within the surrounding lands including mountains visible from campus.

**Public Art**

1. Public art is a well established tradition on the SFU campus, ranging from free standing sculpture to two dimensional art works along public corridors, that should be continued as new buildings and landscapes are designed and implemented.
2. Indigenous art is featured at a number of places on campus and should continue to be a key means to make Indigenous culture a part of campus life.
Landscape
1. Landscape should generally be low maintenance, require low levels of watering and feature native and drought / climate change tolerant species.
2. Courtyards may include a wider range of species than the general campus in order to achieve specific objectives including Indigenous gardens, placemaking and seasonal colour accents.
3. Surface stormwater features should be planted to distinguish them from their context and to express their function.
4. Landscape should have an educational component where possible including interpretation of Indigenous and ethnobotanical plants and biodiversity.
5. A Public Realm Plan should provide detailed direction on topics that are beyond the scope of the Master Plan including: tree protection and replacement and tree, forest and view management, recommended tree and plant species for specific applications including to define area character and placemaking.

Open Space Programming
1. Open spaces should be designed to be flexible and accommodate a wide range of programming.
2. Central open spaces should adapt to and provide support for Indigenous ceremonies including ones for welcoming people to campus and involving regalia, dancing, drumming and other cultural activities.
3. Supportive infrastructure should be provided in open spaces intended for events and other programming such as electrical outlets, water, access for delivery and set-up of event elements like tents, stages and support trucks.
4. Open spaces should consider a role as teaching spaces that provide information on the academic explorations of campus departments in surrounding buildings and on Indigenous culture and history.
The Campus Master Plan supports accessibility in a number of ways through the Guiding Principles, Big Moves, elements of the Campus Plan systems, and through specific University Projects. The Master Plan provides high level ideas on how to create a more accessible campus for everyone to allow full participation in the university community. This will be achieved by removing barriers, improving wayfinding, identifying relatively flat routes across the campus, and ensuring universal accessibility in both new projects, and renovation and maintenance of built areas of the campus. Whereas the Campus Master Plan provides a high-level framework to guide the overall evolution of the campus over time, individual projects should respond to more detailed accessibility guidelines, criteria and requirements that will need to be considered through the detailed design of those projects.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

The Guiding Principles [4.1] are the foundational element of the plan which any new projects on the campus should align with. One of the Guiding Principles is to Enhance Connectivity and Movement. This principle supports accessibility in a number of ways. One of the components of this principle is to eliminate physical barriers to ensure universal accessibility across the campus and minimize barrier impacts of the natural terrain. The principle also says that campus projects should ensure a unified and connected campus setting, promote and facilitate connectivity and transit access across the campus, and improve wayfinding and legibility.

**THE BIG MOVES**

The Big Moves [4.2] also support accessibility across the campus. One of the Big Moves is to preserve, repair, and enhance the ceremonial axis and ensemble of iconic spaces and buildings, providing opportunities to remove barriers, avoid grade changes where possible, improve wayfinding, and prioritize primary levels for east/west movement across the campus. Another one of the Big Moves is the extend a new east/west Mobility Corridor across the campus to enhance connectivity and serve future development. The Mobility Corridor intentionally follows a relatively even grade across the campus to support all modes of transportation and universal accessibility.

**THE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

The Development Framework [5.1] provides the overall structure for the campus, illustrating the integration of buildings, open spaces, and movement corridors. It captures one of the foundational recommendations of the Campus Master Plan, which involves more clearly defining and extending primary pedestrian circulation routes to improve wayfinding and legibility. These routes should be maintained at a primary level to avoid confusing grade changes whenever possible, which also supports accessibility. Where grade changes are required, and at key intersections where these primary circulation routes meet buildings and open spaces, clear ‘thresholds’ are recommended to provide intuitive and accessible vertical circulation.

**THE OPEN SPACE SYSTEM**

The Open System [5.2] considers accessibility as it relates to the Central Axis and Green Streets. The Central Axis is a key defining open space element of the campus. Recommendations to reinforce, extend and repair this axis will enhance connectivity and accessibility across the campus. This can be achieved by minimizing grade changes to the greatest extend possible, and prioritizing the 300 level as the primary level across the west end of the campus, while providing key locations for vertical circulation at clearly defined thresholds. Recommendations for Green Streets speak to providing space for all forms of mobility, considering traffic calming to enhance safety, and introducing signage and wayfinding to enhance legibility, all of which will support universal accessibility.

**THE MOVEMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEM**

The Movement and Infrastructure system [5.3] considers accessibility as it relates to the street and transit network and the pedestrian network. Recommendations for the Pedestrian Network addresses improvements to universal accessibility and challenges due to the mountaintop location. Universal accessibility is supported by the Mobility Corridor, improvements to the Central Axis and Transportation Centre, establishing even grades for primary pedestrian pathways with clear points of accessible vertical circulation at key nodes within the system. These thresholds will accommodate clear, legible transitions between indoor and outdoor pedestrian pathways, and facilitate seamless and accessible vertical movement between campus facilities on all levels.

**THE UNIVERSITY PROJECTS**

The University Projects [5.4] are large-scale initiations that build upon and implement key elements of the Big Moves and Campus Plan Systems. As such, these projects build on the higher-level directions outlined above, helping to illustrate how they can be achieved in specific areas of the campus over time.

Project 5.4.1 Transportation Centre includes recommendations to establish a series of new, more prominent elevators to enhance vertical circulation and universal accessibility.

Project 5.4.2 The West Axis helps to illustrate how universal accessibility can be improved by establishing a primary route at the 300 level across west campus.
Project 5.4.4 The Fields works to enhance connections and remove barriers through the athletics and recreation precinct, improving connectivity and accessible access.

Project 5.4.5 Mobility Corridor establishes a new universally accessible east/west route across the campus, providing an alternative to the central axis.

Project 5.4.3 The West Green and 5.4.6 The East Green establish primary north/south routes across the campus, extending accessible connections between the central axis, mobility corridor and the broader system of primary routes across the campus.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ACCESSIBILITY

The following guidelines are intended to provide high-level direction to enhance universal accessibility across the campus. Individual projects should respond to more detailed provincial guidelines and best practices through their detailed design, and should be reviewed in coordination with SFU’s office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion for alignment with specific SFU initiatives.

1. All pedestrian routes should be safe, easy to use, easily identifiable, clearly separated from vehicular routes, well maintained and free of obstacles.

2. Curb ramps should be provided at all street corners, wherever pedestrian crosswalks are provided and wherever there is a level difference between the sidewalk, or pedestrian pathway, and the road surface.

3. Public spaces should be designed to be accessible by all users and to provide opportunities for rest, shade, socializing and weather protection.

4. Visual and tactile cues should be included in the design of the built environment for safe navigation.

5. Continuous handrails should be provided on both side of all ramps and stairs.

6. Exterior lighting should be provided along all pedestrian routes to ensure safe access at sidewalks, bus stops, or parking areas leading to campus facilities or amenities.

7. Wherever stops for special transit vehicles are provided, a lay-by area free of other vehicular traffic should be provided.

8. Designated accessible parking spaces should be provided within 30 m of accessible entrances.

9. Recreational facilities should be accessible to persons with varying abilities.

10. All amenities and services available to the campus community should be readily accessible and useable by everyone, regardless of age or ability.
6.8 PANORAMIC VIEWS AND VIEW CORRIDOR DESIGN GUIDELINES

The Erickson/Massey Plan was strongly shaped by views and future view opportunities. The 1963 Plan document is richly illustrated by Erickson’s sketches of the views from the site in different directions.

The Plan sought to feature and protect significant views both north and south from the Transportation Centre and east and west from the ends of the central spine. Buildings were envisioned as terracing down the slopes from the Academic Quadrangle to preserve outward views and buildings along the spine were encouraged to capture view opportunities.

Specific views of significance in the Erickson/Massey Plan include views westward to Vancouver and Burrard Inlet, northward to Indian Arm, and eastward to Mount Baker. Many of these views feature mountains and water bodies that are recognized in the cultures of the four First Nations whose territories encompass them. The elements of the land featured in these views have Indigenous names and stories that could be highlighted on campus, including through interpretation strategies that highlight these views.

As the trees on campus and within the Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area have matured over the intervening 50 years, many of the views that existed in 1963 have been blocked from ground level and lower floor vantage points, but some are available from upper floors or can be glimpsed from specific places.

The Burnaby Mountain Conservation Management Plan of the City of Burnaby anticipates that trees within its boundaries would be impeding views from Simon Fraser University to the panoramic vistas beyond.

One of the Key Principles of the Conservation Area Plan states that:

“View corridor management will be assessed and implemented relative to the protection of significant environmental features. Scenic views and viewing opportunities will be maintained through vegetation management such as the selective thinning or removal of trees or tree branches to retain view corridors, or planting a different mix of species at important viewpoints to limit re-growth.”

A coordinated investigation by SFU and the City of Burnaby of the potential for opening key views in balance with the environmental values of the Plan is recommended.

VIEW CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The guidelines recommend the management of buildings and landscapes within key view corridors. Buildings should be generally excluded from these view corridors and if required should be limited to small structures with heights that do not impede views.

A dramatic view prospect should be available from a new public open space at the west terminus of the Central Axis. The elevation of the place of prospect should be designed to assist in obtaining open views towards the city and should preferably be a continuation of the elevation of the Central Axis within the Student Residence area.

A view corridor should be created from the expanded Dining Hall over the proposed central open space for the Student Residences and extending over the West Green.

The Erickson/Massey concept featured an area on the south side of the Transportation Centre that was open to create views both toward the buildings, as a key entry and arrival sequence for the campus, and outward to enhance the experience of moving along the Axis.

This area should be retained as an open space as illustrated across the Plan.

The Erickson/Massey concept envisioned panoramic views northward from the Transportation Centre and the Diamond Alumni Centre to Indian Arm. Views in this corridor should be protected and enhanced through forest management.

Views are currently available from the northwest corner of the Academic Quadrangle within a view corridor that overlaps with view #4, and should be protected and enhanced in coordination for both corridors.

The East Green is intended to both create a Green Finger and view corridor; refer to the University Project in Chapter 5.

The Central Axis provides a view corridor connection along High Street to UniverCity with a forest backdrop, and a potential view to Mt. Baker further east along UniverCity High Street.

The historic Gaglardi Way entrance view of the Welcome Poles and Academic Quad.
Figure 6-7. Key view corridors
7.1 PRECINCT PLANS

The Precinct Plans provide a convenient set of tools in which to plan, evaluate and coordinate campus projects. They describe the potential role, use and form of specific places on campus at a scale in which more detailed recommendations can be best illustrated and understood, as well as providing guidance on the long-term coordinated implementation of the large scale University Projects described in Chapter 5.

This chapter includes:

7.1 PRECINCT PLANS
This section provides an introduction to the chapter, including the approach and intentions of the Precinct Plans as a key implementation tool.

7.2 PRECINCT PLAN ELEMENTS
This section describes the various elements that are shown on the various Precinct Plan drawings.

7.3 INTEGRATION WITH UNIVERSITY PROJECTS
This section outlines the relationship between Precinct Plans as a key tool for ensuring the long-term realization of the University Projects (Section 5.4).

7.4 PRECINCT A: ACADEMIC CORE PRECINCT
This section provides site-by-site directions for the Academic Core area of the campus.

7.5 PRECINCT B: WEST PRECINCT
This section provides site-by-site directions for the western area of the campus.

7.6 PRECINCT C: EAST PRECINCT
This section provides site-by-site directions for the eastern area of the campus.

7.7 PRECINCT D: SOUTH PRECINCT
This section provides site-by-site directions for the southern area of the campus.
The campus has been divided into four precincts, responding broadly to the existing and proposed land use and development patterns. They are the Academic Core, East, West and South Precincts.

Each Precinct Plan includes:

- A brief overview;
- An illustration of existing conditions and the Long-term Demonstration Plan;
- A Precinct Plan diagram; and
- A Development Matrix that includes development parameters and other criteria for each development site, as well as enabling and coordinated projects.

**IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

Where large parcels are to be developed in phases or with multiple buildings, a phasing and development plan should be created for the entire parcel in conjunction with detailed site planning for the proposed development. This will ensure coordination of pedestrian and vehicular circulation and address impacts to the larger open space and movement networks. Phasing plans should also be considered where development sites are adjacent or share important infrastructure such as service areas. Phasing plans are identified as enabling projects for the large development parcels, but must be undertaken in all situations where a project is not developing the entire site.

Proposals that depart significantly from the Precinct Plans should be subject to a review process where they demonstrate they achieve the principles, objectives and general intent of the Campus Master Plan.
Figure 7-2. Precinct Plan Map for the entire campus
7.2 PRECINCT PLAN ELEMENTS

The following elements are illustrated in the framework maps and listed in the supporting legend for each precinct area.

UNIVERSITY PROJECTS

These are large-scale initiatives that will play a central role informing the character of future development. Due to their scale and complexity, they will require implementation by the University administration, likely in a phased manner. For more detail, see Section 5.4.

University Projects - Open Space
There are four major open space University Projects, each of which is made up of a series of smaller open spaces that can be realized over time.

University Projects - Mobility
The mobility corridor is a major university project, divided into four sections that can be implemented together or incrementally.

University Projects - Development
The university projects include major improvements to the Transportation Building and surrounding landscape.

DEVELOPMENT PARCELS

Development parcels are areas where new development or redevelopment should occur. The development parcels do not necessarily indicate the total development footprint. They may also include landscaping, courtyards, walkways, service/loading areas or other features that extend beyond the walls of the building. Within each precinct, each development parcel has been assigned a code for cross-reference with the precinct Development Matrix. The Development Matrix indicates the specific parameters for parcel coverage.

Key Building Frontage
Building facades should generally be aligned with the frontage line to create consistent open space enclosure. Primary entrances and active uses should be located along building frontages and loading areas should avoid building frontages.

Potential Landmark Locations
These prominent locations serve as focal points and support wayfinding and identity. They are appropriate locations for public art or landscape-forms.

Development Parcels
Redevelopment Parcels
These are development sites that are currently occupied by buildings or are closely aligned with existing buildings and infrastructure.

Infill / Near-Term Expansion Parcels
These development sites are either undeveloped or exist as surface parking.

Future Expansion Parcels
These sites are assumed to be developed in the longer-term, although they may be used for interim development, such as surface parking.

Existing / Approved Buildings

Existing Parking / Loading Entrances

Potential Parking / Loading Entrances

Existing Parkade

Potential Underground Parking

Potential Underfield Parking

Existing and potential structured parking entrances and loading areas should be located away from primary pedestrian routes and building entrances. This will minimize conflict with pedestrians and support the creation of high functioning service routes and loading areas.
MOBILITY

New Streets
These locations should be reserved for future rights-of-way to ensure connectivity and access as the campus evolves over time.

Gondola
This is the assumed Gondola alignment at the time of writing. The design of adjacent open spaces and development should not compromise the function or experience of the Gondola.

Transit Loop and Potential Stops
A bi-directional transit loop will support local movement across the campus and integrate with city transit, parking and land use patterns. Transit stops are recommended at frequent intervals and should be located where primary pedestrian and building entrances are anticipated.

Major Transit Stations
Major transit stations are key points of arrival and departure from the city transit network, including buses, the Gondola and potentially future modes of movement. Space should be reserved to support transit function while also creating a safe, attractive and comfortable pedestrian experience.

Primary Building Entrance Locations
Recommended locations for primary building entrances are intended to ensure entrances are highly visible, are aligned appropriately with the pedestrian network and contribute to an active public realm. In addition to the primary entrances, multiple secondary entrances are encouraged along active frontages.

Interior/Covered Pedestrian Network
Interior and covered pedestrian routes function as internal pedestrian streets, providing circulation, building address, wayfinding, and structuring the overall campus. These routes should be intuitive and direct. Views to the outside and the use of natural light is encouraged. They should also align with connections to the exterior pedestrian and vehicular movement network. The extension of these networks should anticipate future growth and connect to future development.

Enhanced Pedestrian Crossings
These are key pedestrian crossings, located within the broader framework of the pedestrian network. These places should receive additional design attention to prioritize pedestrian priority and safety, in anticipation of a high volume of pedestrian activity.

Campus Gateways
These are higher order thresholds within the campus that signify key moments of arrival. These places should receive addition design attention and are appropriate locations for art, signage and other artifacts indicating your arrival at SFU.

Thresholds
Thresholds are points of entry or intersection within the interior /covered pedestrian network. Their design should support wayfinding and orientation in a direct and intuitive manner. Visual connections to the outside is encouraged. These are also good locations for vertical circulation.

Existing Cycling Routes
Cycling routes are on-street cycling facilities, including bike lanes and sharrows.

Proposed Cycling Routes
Proposed Cycling Routes

Existing Multi-use Path
Multi-use Paths are dedicated routes for bicycles and pedestrians.

Proposed Multi-use Path

Trans Canada Trails

Proposed Multi-use Path

Proposed Multi-use Path
## 7.3 INTEGRATION WITH UNIVERSITY PROJECTS

The Precinct Plans provide further context for the University Projects described in Section 5.4 of this document, supporting their implementation. These projects play a direct role in improving the larger campus environment and achieving the vision for the Plan. Due to their scale and complexity, implementation of these projects will largely be the responsibility of the University administration and be achieved through incremental development and coordination with other initiatives. This will require a coordinated approach, and long-term oversight and commitment to the vision for these projects. The University Projects are referenced as Enabling and Coordinated Projects within the Development Matrix.

### TRANSPORTATION CENTRE
- **U1**
  - U1-1 Transportation Centre

### WEST AXIS
- **U2**
  - U2-1 West Mall
  - U2-2 West Commons
  - U2-3 Residential Quad
  - U2-4 West Prospect

### WEST GREEN
- **U3**
  - U3-1 West Commons
  - U3-2 Athletic Central Commons
  - U3-3 West Green Gateway

### THE FIELDS
- **U4**
  - U4-1 Maggie’s Field
  - U4-2 Existing Sport Fields
  - U4-3 West Residential Field
  - U4-4 Field 5

### MOBILITY CORRIDOR
- **U5**
  - U5-1 West Campus
  - U5-2 Gaglardi/Mobility Corridor Gateway
  - U5-3 Central Campus
  - U5-4 East Campus

### EAST GREEN
- **U6**
  - U6-1 North Gateway
  - U6-2 Strand Commons and Town Square
  - U6-3 Innovation Plaza
  - U6-4 Discovery Commons
Figure 7-3. Integration with University Projects
The Academic Core represents the heart of the historic campus and is where the majority of the teaching, research, student life, athletic and administration facilities are located. Development here will largely be characterized as renewal and infill with the renovation of the Transportation Centre and reconstruction of portions of the academic facilities south of the Academic Quadrangle. The most significant new development site is located south of Strand Commons and east of the Trottier Observatory, where an iconic building is anticipated, in keeping with the profile of this last significant site at the heart of the campus. At the eastern edge of the precinct, the new East Green Open Space project will be the setting for the new Gondola landing and support the transition from this precinct to UniverCity and the emerging innovation district to the south.

Figure 7-4. Academic Core Existing Conditions
Figure 7-6. Academic Core Precinct Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Development Site</th>
<th>Development Parameters</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Other Development Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-1</td>
<td>Infill development of existing visitor parking lot VN</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>80 100 4 6 7,360 13,800</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Academic; Administrative Partnership; Student Services/Amenity; Demolition of existing building on site; Removal of parking on site; Multi-use path north of University Drive East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-2</td>
<td>W.A.C Bennet Library renewal and expansion</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>80 100 2 3 4,160 7,800</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Academic; Student Services/Amenity; Relocate Library uses to Schrum Biology Building during renovation; Renovation of W.A.C Bennet Library; Transportation Centre Public Realm (U1); Relocation of Bus Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-3</td>
<td>New cultural development</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>80 100 1 2 920 2,300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Cultural; Relocate existing service road to allocated space at new Student Union Building; Maggie's Field (U4-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-4</td>
<td>Infill development</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>80 100 - 4 18,400 23,000</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Academic; Relocate uses to a new building to serve as a replacement for the Schrum Biology building; Demolish Schrum Science Centre - Biology &amp; Physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7-7. Academic Core Development Matrix
The West Precinct serves a range of athletic and residential uses, with athletic facilities and fields, student dormitories and other student related residential development and amenities. Development is aligned along the western portion of the Central Axis framing a renewed West Mall, Residential Quad and West Prospect, all with an axial view west towards the Lion’s Gate Bridge. The new West Commons, a "campus recreation room", provides a setting for the new dining hall and future amenities. The West Commons also supports north/south movement and connections to the Mobility Corridor and Gaglardi Way.

At the heart of this precinct will be The Fields, a landscape that forms a transition from the forest to the south and the formal setting of the campus to the north. The Fields will accommodate both active and passive recreation and athletics, including Maggie’s Field. Knitting the precinct together will be a new Mobility Corridor that provides both a setting for new development and an east/west connection across campus for active mobility and potentially other modes of movement.

Figure 7-8. West Precinct Existing Conditions
Figure 7-9. West Precinct Demonstration Plan
Figure 7-10. West Precinct Plan

Development Parcels
- Infill / Near-Term Expansion Parcels
- Key Building Frontage
- Potential Landmark Locations

University Projects
- Open Space
- Mobility

University Projects - Open Space
- University Projects - Mobility

Pedestrian Connectivity
- Primary Building Entrance Locations
- Interior/Covered Pedestrian Network
- Enhanced Pedestrian Crossings
- Campus Gateways
- Thresholds

Parking/ Servicing
- Existing Parking / Loading Entrances
- Potential Parking / Loading Entrances
- Potential Underground Parking
- Potential Underfield Parking

Buildings
- Existing / Approved Buildings

Mobility
- New Streets
- Transit Loop and Potential Stops

Cycling / Trails
- Existing Cycling Routes
- Proposed Cycling Routes
- Existing Multi-use Path
- Proposed Multi-use Path
- Trans Canada Trail

Existing / Approved Buildings

Potential Underground Parking

Potential Underfield Parking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Site</th>
<th>Development Parameters</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Enabling Projects</th>
<th>Other Development Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP-1 Infill Development</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>50 70 8 12</td>
<td>10,400 24,960</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-2 Infill Development</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>50 70 8 12</td>
<td>12,400 26,040</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-3 Building Renewal and Expansion</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>50 70 8 12</td>
<td>16,800 35,280</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-4 New Development</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>50 70 4 6</td>
<td>6,400 12,000</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-5 New Development</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>50 70 7 8</td>
<td>6,545 10,472</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-6 New Development</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>50 70 7 8</td>
<td>6,738 10,780</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-7 New Development</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>50 70 7 8</td>
<td>7,840 12,544</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-8 Redevelopment</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>50 70 4 16</td>
<td>44,800 250,880</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-9 Redevelopment</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>50 70 8 16</td>
<td>21,400 59,920</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-10 Redevelopment</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>50 70 4 10</td>
<td>17,300 60,550</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field 5 (Identified for sport fields with potential for development or parking)</td>
<td>19,250</td>
<td>50 70 2 4</td>
<td>19,250 53,900</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-11 New Development</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>80 100 2 4</td>
<td>12,640 31,600</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-12 New Development</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>80 100 2 4</td>
<td>1,840 4,600</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7-11. West Precinct Development Matrix
The East Precinct is emerging as a mixed-use district with academic, cultural, innovation and amenity uses at the intersection of the Academic Core to the west, UniverCity to the east, and an Innovation District to the south. At the heart of this precinct will be the East Green – a new open space that ties together the Town Square, Strand Commons and more natural landscapes to the north and south. Long views from the Gondola will be visible along East Green and it will become the key north/south movement spine for pedestrians. An interior movement corridor, which may be lined with a string of escalators (the 'people-mover'), is located along the western face of new development on Lot 24.
Figure 7-13. East Precinct Demonstration Plan
### Development Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Site Area (Sq.m)</th>
<th>Min./Max. Coverage</th>
<th>Min./Max. Height (Floors)</th>
<th>Min./Max. Gross Floor Area (Sq.m)</th>
<th>Identified for Underground Parking</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Enabling Projects</th>
<th>Potential Co-ordinated Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP-1</td>
<td>New development</td>
<td>17,330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>41,592</td>
<td>83,184</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>North Gateway (U6-1); Bike lane on Arts Road; Multi-use path north of University Drive East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-2</td>
<td>New Development (Site partially owned by UniverCity)</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>20,061</td>
<td>33,435</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Strand Commons and Town Square (U6-2); Bus layover, pick-up and drop-off area; Coordinate with UniverCity due to partial ownership of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-3</td>
<td>Infill Development</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Strand Commons and Town Square (U6-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-4</td>
<td>Building Renewal and Expansion</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Renewal of Applied Science Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-5</td>
<td>New Development</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>136,800</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Innovation Plaza (U6-3); New building entrance should be aligned with Gondola landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-6</td>
<td>New Development</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>16,080</td>
<td>26,800</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Innovation Plaza (U6-3); Integrate Gondola landing; Coordinate building edge with Gondola alignment; Incorporate interior pedestrian walkway (or ‘people-mover’/escalators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-7</td>
<td>New Development</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>49,560</td>
<td>84,960</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Innovation Plaza (U6-3); Mobility Corridor East Campus (US-4); New courtyard integrated with Mobility Corridor; Incorporate interior pedestrian walkway (or ‘people-mover’/escalators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-8</td>
<td>New Development</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>16,520</td>
<td>21,240</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Innovation Plaza (U6-3); Mobility Corridor East Campus (US-4); New courtyard; Incorporate interior pedestrian walkway (or ‘people-mover’/escalators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Development Considerations

- Enhance and extend Residence Lane and add bike lanes; Enhance existing pedestrian friendly route north of the site
- Relocate parking to an interim parking lot

**Figure 7-15. East Precinct Development Matrix**
The South Precinct is assumed to be realized over the long-term, if needed. As such, the development assumptions and parameters are more broadly defined here. Nevertheless, it is important to begin to make some assumptions to provide context for development to the north, provide an estimate regarding long-term capacity of the overall campus, and ensure the quality of the setting and the environmental function of these lands are not compromised. Also, although infrastructure may be built incrementally, given the topography and other constraints there are relatively few options for the locations of roads and the utility network. Comprehensive planning for these networks should occur before building development is initiated.
Figure 7-17. South Precinct Demonstration Plan
Figure 7-18. South Precinct Plan
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Site Area (Sq.m)</th>
<th>Min./Max. Coverage</th>
<th>Min./Max. Height (Floors)</th>
<th>Min./Max.Gross Floor Area (Sq.m)</th>
<th>Identified for Underground Parking</th>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Enabling Projects</th>
<th>Potential Co-ordinated Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP-1</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>7/320</td>
<td>28/200</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Commons (U6-4); Enhance Nelson Way and add bike lanes; Coordinate building edge with Gondola alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-2</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>33/920</td>
<td>127/200</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Commons (U6-4); preserve existing creek west of the site; Add bike lanes on the new road; This site was identified as a potential location for future childcare facility in the SFU Long-Term Strategic Plan For Childcare Services Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-3</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>43/520</td>
<td>163/200</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve existing creek east and west of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-4</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>25/600</td>
<td>96/000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary (Orange hatched area east of the site is subject to further study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-5</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>22/400</td>
<td>84/000</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Commons (U6-4); Enhance Nelson Way and add bike lanes; Coordinate building edge with Gondola alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-6</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>26/480</td>
<td>59/580</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Commons (U6-4); Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-7</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>18/240</td>
<td>41/040</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Corridor Central Campus (U5-3); Preserve existing creeks east and west of the site; Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-8</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>4/416</td>
<td>9/936</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve existing creek west of the site; Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-9</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>2/080</td>
<td>6/240</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve existing creeks east and west of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-10</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>12/160</td>
<td>36/480</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Commons (U6-4); Add bike lanes on new roads; Preserve existing creek west of the site; This site was identified as a potential location for future childcare facility in the SFU Long-Term Strategic Plan For Childcare Services Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-11</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>23/200</td>
<td>69/600</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve existing creeks east and west of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-12</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>16/960</td>
<td>50/880</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Green Gateway (U3-3); Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary; Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-13</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>15/560</td>
<td>46/680</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary; Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-14</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>4/000</td>
<td>12/000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Green Gateway (U3-3); Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary (Orange hatched area east of the site is subject to further study); Add bike lanes on the new road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-15</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>10/360</td>
<td>31/080</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-16</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>8/800</td>
<td>26/400</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed environmental study to determine the exact site boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7-19. South Precinct Development Matrix
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