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In 2010 we engaged two firms of exceptionally thoughtful and talented architects, Peter Rose Architects and Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates to work with us in developing a Campus Master Plan for Bishop's University.

A great campus master plan should articulate an enduring and sustainable vision while at the same time being a living document which can evolve as circumstances change and opportunities arise. The 2012 Rose/Van Valkenburgh Plan meets that test.

We are deeply indebted to Peter Rose, Paul Puciata, Laura Solano, and Neil Budzinski, who helped us appreciate the outstanding qualities of our campus and developed a plan that will allow us to preserve and enhance the best of our unique natural and built environments.

One of the critical insights that the architects brought to this process is that over the last 70 years we have allowed the automobile to take precedence over the pedestrian. Almost half of the buildings on our campus were constructed between 1950 and 1975. This was the era when the car was king, and the automobile was given pride of place on our campus during that period.

In her song “Big Yellow Taxi,” Joni Mitchell wrote that “they paved paradise to put up a parking lot…” She may not have been writing about Bishop’s, but she could have been. Our bucolic campus now includes the equivalent of 21 football fields of pavement. The architects’ proposal to restrict cars to the periphery of the campus was a simple but transformative idea that we have begun to implement and will positively affect the development of our campus for decades to come.

One of the central themes of the Rose/Van Valkenburgh Plan was the need to create greater transparency both inside our buildings and to the campus around them. The renovation and expansion of the John H. Price Sports Centre in 2015 and the renovation of the Library Learning Commons in 2018 were guided by that idea.

This year, as we began the process of deciding on a site for a new student residence, we engaged the firm of Lemay to help us choose a location for the new building. Under the direction of Michel Dufresne and with the collaboration of his talented colleagues, Éric Pelletier, Marie-Ève Parent, Sophie Lacoste, Valérie Gravel, Amélie Turgeon and David Dumoulín, they updated the Rose/Van Valkenburgh Plan. They have proposed a site for the new residence and have developed more specific proposals with respect to the walkways, roadways and vegetation for the campus. They have also developed a plan for the main entrance to the campus which is dignified and pedestrian friendly.

There are many profound insights and compelling ideas in this Master Plan which is the result of extensive thought and discussion within the Bishop’s community. It provides clear guidelines for the development and stewardship of our campus. Most importantly, it sets out how we can provide concrete expression to the fundamental values of our institution.

Bishop’s University’s goal is to provide the foremost undergraduate education in Canada. The Master Plan challenges us to ensure that our campus is a worthy manifestation of that ambition. It encourages us to aspire to excellence. I am confident that we will rise to the challenge and that this Plan will guide us well into our third century.

Michael Goldbloom
Principal and Vice-Chancellor - Bishop’s University
July 2018
Today, our primary focus remains the liberal education of undergraduate students.

We aspire to be the institution of choice for outstanding young people seeking academic excellence and a comprehensive undergraduate experience in a community that instils confidence, courage and a sense of responsibility in its students.

At the heart of the Bishop’s experience is close interaction between professors and students, within the classroom and elsewhere, in research, scholarship and creative activity.

We seek to engage our students in their own intellectual and social development by offering programs of study and extracurricular activities that foster intellectual curiosity and a life-long commitment to learning.

As a learning community, we are engaged in the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. We encourage both breadth and depth in our students’ academic programs, to equip them to explore and solve complex problems.

We are committed to maintaining our intimate size and residential nature in order to foster the social development of our students, encourage the creation of lasting friendships and engender a true sense of community.

We invite our students, who come from Quebec, elsewhere in Canada, and around the world, to practice the respectful and informed dialogue that sustains democracy, to exercise the rights and responsibilities of good citizenship and to realize their potential for leadership.

We encourage our students to engage with individuals from different social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds and to take advantage of opportunities to open themselves to the world.

Values

Excellence
We value outstanding teaching, research and creative expression, and the pursuit of excellence in all that we undertake.

We aim to instil the aspiration and determination to excel in our students and in all other members of our community.

Community-focused
We are a diverse, vibrant, inclusive and collaborative intellectual community of people dedicated to excellence and sustainability.

With students from every Canadian province and territory and more than 60 countries, the world meets on our campus. Our small size, attractive natural and built environment in a bilingual community in Quebec provide opportunities for a high degree of engagement and close relationships among faculty, students, staff, alumni and the local community.

We adhere to the highest standards of moral and ethical conduct in all activities and relationships.

Student-centred
Bishop’s highest priority is to support each of its students in achieving their full potential. As a small, residential, predominantly undergraduate, academically rigorous liberal arts institution supported by engaged alumni, Bishop’s is able to provide its students the best possible student experience.

Our academic excellence, cross-disciplinary learning environment, rich co-curricular and extracurricular offerings and outstanding student support services equip Bishop’s to provide a rare and exceptional experience for its students.

Sustainability
We value the natural beauty of our surroundings and the exceptional architectural quality of our built environment.

Bishop’s University is located on the traditional territory of the Abenaki people, the original stewards of the land. We are committed to protecting our natural and built environment so that subsequent generations of Bishop’s students and the wider community of the Eastern Townships will be able to enjoy them.

We promote sustainability as an overarching principle for all our activities and strategic priorities. Our holistic approach includes a concern for our environment, and a commitment to sustaining our institution through viable financial, cultural and social practices. We seek to integrate principles of sustainability into our academic programs and our individual and institutional activities.

In 1843, the founders of Bishop’s University declared their intention “to offer to the country at large the blessing of a sound and liberal education.”
We are pleased to present the Bishop's University Master Plan, developed in 2012 by the firms of Peter Rose Architecte | ARCOP and Michael Van Valkenburg Associates, and updated by Lemay in 2018. In developing the Rose | Van Valkenberg Master Plan, the University consulted extensively with campus stakeholders and community groups, including faculty, students, staff, alumni, administrators and the greater Lennoxville and Sherbrooke communities, as well as with Champlain Regional College.

The Master Plan is a detailed study of campus life, its built and natural environment and as an ongoing dialogue among students, faculty, staff and administration. This interaction and open dialogue have been critical to the development of this plan, and will continue to be central to its successful implementation. The Plan’s 2018 revision was an opportunity to renew this dialogue, with particular attention paid to the landscape components connecting the campus’s natural and built framework, while enhancing the overall campus experience.
The University would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following members of the University community, whose participation in the Campus Forum process was essential to identifying the central themes of the Master Plan and its development.
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1. Introduction
1.1 Why a Master Plan

The Catalyst

While various basic plans and studies of Bishop’s University had been conducted over the years – including a plan drawn by Henderson Architecte in 1990, as well as a campus study by the McGill University School of Urban Planning, in 1992 – a full-scale Master Plan for the campus was developed for the first time in 2012.

The catalyst for this first Master Plan was the renovation and expansion of the John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre, the largest project in Bishop’s history. The magnitude of the Sports Centre project, and its potential impact on Bishop’s campus, suggested to decision-makers at the time that both the project and the campus itself would benefit enormously from carefully considering the campus as a whole.

Today, like its surroundings, the campus is flourishing such that an updated Master Plan is justified. A revised version would promote the integration of completed and ongoing projects since its last review, but would also enable the University to reassess its priorities regarding campus development, traffic, connectivity, and enhancing its natural and built heritage. It would also help the University to align with community projects such as Lennoville’s Special Planning Program for the downtown core, the enhancement of the Saint-François River, and the extension of Highway 410. Additionally, while the 2012 Master Plan was strongly oriented towards the development of campus real estate, the context in 2018 is quite different. The University is facing both development and financing constraints, and the ratio between number of students and academic space does not justify building new pavilions, or even expanding existing ones. Only student support infrastructures, such as residences, cafeterias, and sports and extracurricular facilities, may be targeted for construction projects when required.

The 2018 Master Plan therefore proposes a new orientation toward consolidating and efficiently managing the campus existing elements. Its cornerstone is enhancement of the user experience through quality redevelopment.

The Professional Team

Directed by Peter Rose and Paul Pusciata of Peter Rose Architecte / ARCOP, the 2012 Master Plan was the work of highly qualified professionals. Key collaborators and partners throughout the process included landscape architecture firm Michael Van Valkenburg Associates (represented by Principal Laura Solano, assisted by Neil Budzinskie) and sustainability consultants Transsolar Climate Engineers (represented by Principal Matthias Schuler). This professional team worked in close collaboration on the Master Plan over more than two years.

The Master Plan review was entrusted to Lemay, which put together a diverse team of professionals in architecture and landscape architecture, urban planning and urban design. This multidisciplinary team, coordinated by Lemay Associate and Project Manager Michel Dufresne, in turn worked closely with the Bishop’s community throughout the review process.

A Holistic Approach

Lemay presents this Master Plan Revision as a living document that will help Bishop’s University address various issues within a coherent framework. The Lemay team looked back in time at the history of the campus, to understand how it became what it is today; it then used those insights to look forward, to understand how decisions can be made for maximum benefit to the Bishop’s University campus in the future.

A good Master Plan maximizes the impact of capital investments while providing a structure for prioritizing improvements, based on well-defined and strategic criteria. The goal of this holistic approach is for the “whole” of the campus to vastly exceed the sum of its parts.

Stewardship of a Living Document

Unlike the product of pure research, which may be summarized in a static report, a Master Plan is a living document that requires constant stewardship. The original 2012 version was intended to be a working tool, adapting to changing contexts to guide the University in its decision-making process. This new version remains true to the original Rose | Van Valkenberg Plan while advancing some ideas and adjusting others in response to new conditions: the new version remains a living document which itself will eventually need to be revisited.

The endeavours proposed here will require an excellent team, consisting of members of the Bishop’s community as well as expert outside consultants. This team will further develop individual aspects of the Master Plan, and engage in negotiations with a range of relevant local authorities, before implementing any measures. On a regular basis, this team will supervise the Plan’s updating and revision – a required procedure for any evolving, working Master Plan.

An Operating System for the Future

University operations involve thousands of people and an incalculable number of decisions on a daily basis. Over time, the campus – the “stage” on which university life plays out – grows and is constructed, sometimes incrementally, sometimes in great leaps, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. For a Master Plan to be effective, it must guide the construction of all aspects of the physical campus over time. It is the best tool for avoiding short-sighted decisions and ensuring the massive cumulative effect of making good tactical and strategic decisions over time.
1.2 A Master Planning Process

The Five Phases of the Master Plan Process

Lemay’s review of the Campus Master Plan followed the same stages as the original document:

Observation Phase:
Based on the work of the firms Peter Rose Architecte / ARCOP and Michael Van Valkenburg Associates, this phase allowed a new team of professionals to exchange with University representatives, leading to a solid understanding of the issues involved and the expectations of this updated version of the Master Plan. Some new data collection was necessary to account for campus work conducted since then. “On the ground” observations of the Bishop’s campus rounded out the University profile. This stage allowed the team to familiarize itself with the subject and assume a co-creator role from which to shape its proposals.

Concept Development:
In the Concept Development phase, Lemay took a broad, macro-scale look at the campus. This followed validation of the development principles established by the 2012 Master Plan. Key objectives were articulated as a series of guiding principles.

Precinct Studies:
A development approach by landscape unit was developed, aiding in the production of guidelines for the campus as a whole, as well as objectives specific to campus sectors with existing identities.

Focusing on specific areas of the campus deemed important for the overall Master Plan, this phase studied traffic options and gave precedence to pedestrians while reducing the presence of automobiles. A new landscape concept also allowed for a strong campus signature.

Design Guidelines:
In this phase, broad recommendations were established to direct the development of future projects. These included issues relating to site planning (including traffic and street patterns), landscaping, building massing, signage and sustainability.

Final Plan:
Refining the ideas generated in the previous four phases, the Final Plan phase includes proposals for a new cafeteria and student residences; open spaces and landscapes; parking, traffic and street patterns; and infrastructure improvements.

Organization of this Document

The five phases outlined above are reflected in the organization of this document:

The first chapter, Introduction, outlines the project context, stages, methods and objectives.

The second chapter, “Campus in Context,” profiles Bishop’s University within its social and natural setting, geographically and historically, demonstrating how the campus has evolved over the past century and a half.

This detailed look at Bishop’s growth over the years allows us to see how the physical form of the campus has been sporadically shaped by external forces far beyond the campus itself. Understanding Bishop’s context and history provides invaluable clues for how to set in motion coherent growth in the future.

The third chapter, “The Campus Today: Seven Observations,” reviews the six elements presented in the original Master Plan, advances a seventh, and proposes response elements. This chapter also summarizes key results of the previous two chapters. These observations form the core of the principles that have guided the development of the Master Plan.

The fourth chapter, “Development Strategy,” establishes general orientations and a detailed vision for campus development as a whole, accompanied by specific orientations for the nine “precincts.”

The fifth chapter, “Built Environment Development Components,” presents all plans, drawings and images relating to development of the natural and built environment.

The sixth chapter, “Landscape Development Components,” presents all plans, drawings and images relating to the landscape development components.

In the seventh chapter, “Implementation Strategy,” there is an overview of phasing and procedures that will allow the University to implement the plan.

Chapter 8 concludes with a summary of key elements and strategic proposals.
1.3 Main Goals

A Walking Campus

Bishop’s should be a walking campus – an all-weather, all-season, pedestrian-friendly campus. Pedestrian paths should be everywhere, forming a network of outdoor spaces, all deliberately defined by landscape. Pedestrian paths should not pass through parking lots, or other spaces dedicated to cars.

Buildings and landscapes, both within the University and in the region beyond, should be connected in multiple ways. This multiplicity of connections will offer a rich range of choices when navigating the campus, especially important on a campus with as varied a climate as at Bishop’s University. Fast and slow, in the sun or in shade: the campus should be beautiful and a pleasure to use in all seasons.

Bike and walking paths should be developed around the campus perimeter, along both rivers, into the woods and through the fields. Connected to existing hiking and biking networks beyond Bishop’s University, these paths could better connect the campus to the region, for the mutual benefit of both. Paths between Lennoxville and the campus should be improved, and a new pedestrian bridge should be considered.

Managing the Automobile

Cars should be relocated to the perimeter of the campus. This new perimeter for vehicular circulation should be separate from the pedestrian network, and cars should not be in conflict with the pedestrian network.

Cars will be, for the foreseeable future, the primary means of travel to and from the campus. These cars should be parked on the campus in conveniently located lots. To the greatest degree possible, these conveniently located parking lots should be hidden, heavily screened by landscape and not visible from the network of outdoor spaces and buildings. The use of cars to move around the campus should be discouraged.

The main entrance to the campus should introduce the campus in an appropriately dignified fashion, and strategically reveal the essential character of the campus. The Highway 410 Bypass project provides an opportunity to both improve the University’s connection to the river, and establish a more harmonious integration between the University and the landscape.
Integrating Landscape and Campus

Strengthening Bishop’s connections to the glorious surrounding landscape is one of the critical goals of the Master Plan. One of the most beautiful spaces on the campus, which also happens to be at the geographic centre of Bishop’s, is the hill surrounded by a series of mostly two-storey faculty bungalows. Connected to the spaces in front of the Student Centre and the Theatre, this hill has the potential to be a truly iconic campus centre. The Quad, St. Mark’s Chapel, McGreer Hall’s Tomlinson Hall, and Bandeen Hall have all been identified as important heritage buildings on campus. Improving, developing and preserving these key campus assets, and programming them with appropriate activities, will tie these important places to Bishop’s history and assure their continued relevance to campus identity in the future.

Buildings and landscapes should each be considered as integral parts of a larger whole.

Connections and Gathering Spaces

Most of the activity on the campus is hidden behind opaque walls and doors. Much of this activity can and should be revealed, helping to establish further connections. Views into buildings, and from circulation spaces into classroom spaces, should be emphasized and enhanced. A more visible and transparent campus will improve the social and pedagogical life of the University.

Gathering spaces of all scales should serve as points of connection throughout the campus and landscape. The revered Quad is one of the only enclosed exterior spaces on the campus. This is an example of one type of informal gathering space, but these should be everywhere.

Two-thirds of Bishop’s students now live and eat off-campus. The possibility of healthy, affordable food available for all students, in multiple locations, will encourage the development of a lively 24-hour campus.

Working with Existing Conditions

The above guiding principles have all directed the development of the Master Plan, and are the result of research undertaken by the Master Planning Team to determine the University’s key existing assets.

Improving, developing and preserving these campus assets, and programming them with appropriate activities, will allow the University to respond to site-specific conditions to maximum effect. Working with existing conditions allows for a Master Plan that is both sustainable and that can be executed within an economy of means.

By carefully studying the history of the campus, as well as its current structure, we propose a Master Plan that makes the most of existing conditions, and as such, consists of a feasible and realistic guide for the future of Bishop’s University.
2. Campus in Context
Regional plan showing Bishop's University property and the central campus context.
Regional Context

Bishop’s 550-acre campus is situated in the Eastern Townships of Quebec, approximately 150 km (a two-hour drive) east of Montreal, and 250 km (a three-hour drive) southwest of Quebec City. The campus is located in the bilingual community of Lennoxville, a borough of Sherbrooke, the 6th largest city in the Province of Quebec.
One of the most important attributes of Bishop's University's campus is its physical setting among rivers, forests, farms, meadows, rolling hills, and mountains, which provide vistas and atmospheres of rare beauty.

Regional Overview

Bishop's University is located in the southern Appalachian highlands of Quebec's Eastern Townships, between the Green Mountains (including Mount Orford) to the west, and the prolongation of the White Mountains (including Mount Megantic) to the east. The region's landscape is marked by three major rivers: the St. Francis River, and two of its tributaries, the Massawippi and Coaticook. Bishop's University is located on the traditional Abenaki territory.

The University's rural location, along with the unique natural setting at the junction of the St. Francis and Massawippi Rivers, plays an important part in defining the landscape experience of the campus. Today, the architectural core of the University occupies a relatively small percentage of its overall land holdings, leaving the remainder available for use as recreational space.
Geomorphology

The effect of the advance and retreat of glaciers over the past 1.8 million years has helped form the river systems and soil deposits currently found within the Bishop's University region. This movement has resulted in the creation of distinctive landforms that are evident on the campus today. The prevailing soil type is lacustrine and clay loam. This clay loam supports multiple plant communities, including both farmland ecology and native forest plant communities. As part of the Appalachian Orogen geologic domain, the geomorphology of Bishop's University's campus also consists of highly vulnerable limestone, quartzite, quartz and pyroclastite.
Topography and Solar Orientation
Topography and Solar Orientation

The physical orientation and siting of the campus has an important effect on the way the buildings and landscapes are used. For instance, solar exposure, as well as the steepness of slopes, affects the walkability of the campus.

Slopes

Steep 20:1 topography characterizes the southwestern edge of campus as it slopes down to the river, as well as portions of the campus Centre. This topography creates diverse landscape experiences, such as prospects and enclosures, but also underlies accessibility challenges on the campus.

Northern Exposure

Although walking distances across the campus are relatively short, the extreme winter climate makes the areas of northern exposure less accommodating for passage during the colder seasons.

Southern Exposure

South-facing slopes and southern solar exposure combine to create microclimates in a large, continuous section of the campus. South-facing building walls also create local warm areas that can mitigate winter cold. These areas of southern exposure have great potential for social use throughout the year.

Flood Zones

Given its proximity to two rivers, the possibility of flooding is an ever-present reality for the University. For the most part, the main social areas on campus are raised above the effects of flooding, although the low-lying areas are subject to frequent inundation.

Peter Curry Marsh

In 1990, Ducks Unlimited Canada, in cooperation with Bishop’s University, constructed the Peter Curry Marsh Area on campus in recognition of Mr. Peter D. Curry’s ’34 generous support of the University and wetland conservation programs. Recently Dr. Michael Richardson, Chair of the Biology Department, received another grant from Ducks Unlimited Canada to enhance the viewing area, beautify the terrain that surrounds the marshland, and enrich our pedestrian friendly green campus.
2.3 Historical Overview

**Founding of the University**

Bishop’s University was founded as Bishop’s College in 1843. The University owes its creation to the Second Bishop Mountain, and its establishment in Lennoxville to the Reverend Lucius Doolittle. Through a petition presented to Lord Metcalfe, Bishop’s College was established by an Act of the Canadian Parliament in 1843. In 1846, the College was moved to its present 40-acre campus, on land donated by Colonel William Morris. By 1853, with the recognition of its official Royal Charter, Bishop’s College gained the right to confer degrees, and has since been known as Bishop’s University.

Ever since its founding, Bishop’s University has continued to support a well-rounded education in the liberal arts and sciences. For the first 50 years of its existence, Bishop’s University was a small Gothic Revival campus in a beautiful rural setting. Although Bishop’s University doubled in size from its founding in 1846 up until the early 20th century, the campus remained small.

**The Early 20th Century**

During the first half of the 20th century, very little changed at the University. This stasis was mostly due to external circumstances. Like many institutions, the University was caught up in global economic and political circumstances far beyond its campus. Two World Wars, and a worldwide economic depression, meant that Bishop’s had neither the pressure nor the means to grow.

**The Automobile Years**

In stark contrast to the lean war years, the post-World War II years were by and large a period of prosperity and rapid growth throughout North America. Bishop’s University became a publicly funded institution in 1948. A quarter-century stretching from the 1950s to the early 1980s was a time of significant expansion at Bishop’s. This period was coincident with the very ambitious expansion, especially in North America, of road networks and automobile use. This was a time when funding for highways was readily available, and the increase in use of the automobile was explosive. An infatuation with all things car – suburban developments, shopping malls, and dedicated infrastructure – proceeded unbridled.

This period saw enormous growth of the Bishop’s campus. The Quiet Revolution in the Quebec of the 1960s brought significant public investment in education, including universities. Money was available for new programs and infrastructure, and the growth of the student population followed, bolstered by additional funding for soldiers and women. Seventy-four percent of Bishop’s campus was built during this period. Mirroring communities across North America, the Bishop’s campus was radically transformed from a green and pedestrian-friendly landscape to one that was physically and visually dominated by the car. Bishop’s became a driving campus.
The Legacy of Automobile Growth

For the most part, the cultural influences that shaped Bishop’s in the third quarter of the 20th century have continued at a slower pace but in the same vein as today. Landscape and dedicated pedestrian paths continue to diminish, as spaces for the automobile continue to grow.

A consequence of this growth pattern is that today there is a great deal of conflict between service vehicles, automobiles and pedestrians. This conflict is often hazardous to pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, the visual result is that the presence of pavement is quite dominant. It seems as if there are service vehicles, cars and pavement everywhere. Finally, the campus is not particularly coherent. The road network and pedestrian path network are both visually and organizationally chaotic, while the parking is inefficient.

In formal and organizational terms, the Bishop’s University that we see today was essentially built during this era of the automobile.

The Campus Today

Today, the University’s campus is characterized by a blend of modern and historical buildings. Along with the academic buildings, the inner campus comprises several sports fields, a sports complex and an indoor rink, a theatre, an art gallery and a music auditorium, all of which are open to the student body and the community at large.
2.4 Building Chronology

The Bishop’s University campus saw major expansion over the years. Previously concentrated around McGreer Hall, its buildings came to occupy a much greater surface area with a significant footprint.

1846-1899: The Beginning

Bishop’s University began as a small, Gothic Revival campus in a lush landscape. Although several buildings were built in these early years, the character of the campus remained small and compact. Six buildings were constructed on the Bishop’s campus before 1900. These buildings total 11,241 square metres, or 14% of the total current campus building space.

1900-1924: Early 20th century

During the first quarter of the 20th century, only two buildings were constructed, both in the area of today’s historic quad. The campus remained small and compact. These buildings total 614 square metres, less than 1% of the total current campus building space.

1925-1949: Depression and War

The scarce years of the Great Depression and Second World War saw no physical growth of the Bishop’s campus. No buildings were constructed on the campus between 1925 and 1949.

1950-1974: Automobile Boom

Bishop’s University saw unprecedented physical growth with the post-war financial boom and era of the automobile. Reaching beyond the historic quad, it came of age with the construction of 21 campus buildings between 1950 and 1974. These buildings total 60,172 square metres, 74% of the total current campus building space.

1975-1999: End of the 20th Century

Physical growth of the campus slowed during the last half of the 20th century, with three buildings constructed on the campus between 1975 and 1999. These buildings total 9,925 square metres, 12% of the total current campus building space.

2000-2018: Early 21st Century

Since the beginning of the 21st century, a new building, Paterson Hall Residence, has been built and another building, the John J. Price Sports & Recreation Centre, has undergone major renovations and expansion that was completed in 2015. The university library is currently undergoing a major renovation that will transform the existing building into a Learning Commons. The space will be adapted to new teaching and information-sharing requirements, reflecting a more collaborative and dynamic vision of higher learning. Work will conclude in time for the 2018 autumn semester.

—“Old Ams” Building, 1891. Originally housing the Lennoxville Classical School. The principal’s house is seen on the right.

—McGee Hall, 1909

—Memorial Hall, 1950

—John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre, 1975

—Paterson Hall, 2004

—Library and Learning Commons, 2018
1.4 Building Chronology

1846-1899
- 1846: McGeen Hall
- 1857: St. Mark’s Chapel
- 1861: Old Arts

1900-1924
- 1909: Principal’s House
- 1910: Older Library
- 1911: Keuhner Hall

1925-1949
- 1918: Bishop’s College School
- 1919: Old Library
- 1920: Old Arts

1950-1954
- 1950-1954: McGeen Hall

1955-1959
- 1955-1959: Champlain Regional College

1960-1964
- 1960-1964: John H. Price Sports Centre

1965-1969
- 1965-1969: Johnson Science Building

1970-1974
- 1970-1974: Library Expansion

1975-1999
- 1975: Bishop’s University Master Plan
- 1977: John H. Price Sports Centre

21st Century
- 2004: Paterson Hall
- 2017: John H. Price Sports Centre
2.5 Campus Users

Bishop's Community

Academic Structure
Offering over 100 majors in five academic divisions, Bishop's University maintains an average class size of 25 and a student-to-faculty ratio of 16:1. The University is structured around the following faculties:

• The William School of Business
• The School of Education
• The Faculty of Arts and Science
  — Humanities
  — Social Sciences
  — Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Enrolment
Bishop's University's total undergraduate enrolment for the 2017-2018 academic year is 2,790: 2,296 full-time undergraduate students, 269 part-time undergraduate and special interest students, 119 exchange students and 106 graduate students. The student body is 56% female and 44% male, with 48% from the Province of Quebec, 30% from the rest of Canada, and 22% International.

Faculty
The Bishop's Faculty is comprised of 110 full-time faculty members and 100 temporary full-time, part-time and tutor members.

Staff and Administrative Population
In addition to the student and faculty population, the University community includes a staff and administration population of around 250 people directly employed by Food Services, the Follett Campus Bookstore, the Dobson-Lagasse Entrepreneurship Centre and other student services. In total, some 1,200 people work on-campus.

Champlain College
Bishop's University share its campus with the Champlain-Lennoxville Regional College, a CEGEP with approximately 1,200 students.

Student Services
Performance/exhibit halls
• Foreman Art Gallery
• Centennial Theatre (650 seats)
  — Centennial Theatre Lobby (20-150 seats, depending on configuration)
  — Bandeen Hall (130 seats)
  — Turner Studio (120 seats)

Sports facilities (membership open to students and non-students, variable opening hours depending on facility)
• Coulter Field, a multipurpose outdoor stadium
• Old Lennoxville Golf Club
• John H. Price Sports & Recreation Centre
  — 800-seat Jane and Eric Molson Ice Hockey Arena
  — Double gymnasium with mezzanine
  — 4,000-sq.-ft. fitness centre
  — Indoor pool
  — Indoor jogging track
  — 2 weight rooms
  — Squash courts
  — Dance studio
  — Sports medicine clinic
• Outdoor pool
• 3 multipurpose practice fields
• Panda Daycare
  — Capacity of 140 children, including 20 infants
The Ministère des Transports du Québec (MTQ) foresees beginning work on Phase 2 of the extension of Highway 410, to route 108, in summer 2018. This work involves construction of a bridge over the Massawippi River, two overpasses (over the railroad and Glenday Road) and a traffic circle at the intersection with route 108, which will also be reconfigured.

A consequence of this extension will be the segregation of approximately 140 acres of Bishop’s land from its campus. However, Quebec’s transportation department will implement mitigation measures to limit harm to the campus caused by the highway extension. These measures aim to reduce noise and visual pollution using vegetated barriers or walls.

The department also committed to maintaining vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle access to the Mitchell Farm underneath Highway 410, to revitalizing wetland belonging to the University and to ensuring connections among pedestrian and cycling networks next to the highway.

---

The construction of the proposed Highway 410 will isolate the main campus from approximately 140 acres, or more than 40% of the University’s property.
3. The Campus Today: Seven Observations
3.1 A Compact Walking Campus

Historically, Bishop’s University was described as a pedestrian-oriented campus in a lush rural landscape. The small physical size of the campus – from end-to-end, the campus is about 900 metres long – means that it is possible to walk from one end to the other in about eight minutes.

Since the 1960s, as new facilities have been built and enrolment has increased, the campus has seen its visual and physical landscape altered and diminished by a steady influx of roads, parking lots and cars. Given the small and compact nature of the campus, a return to a landscape-centric and pedestrian-friendly campus should be an overarching goal.
Bishop’s University’s campus is dominated by vehicles. It is nearly impossible to navigate the campus as a pedestrian without encountering vehicles, including cars, buses, and service trucks. A full 30% of the central campus is paved for vehicles – in motion and at rest. Parking lots and the road network represent over 73,000 m² of the campus’s surface area, with no less than 1,236 parking spaces. These parking spaces are in lots of varying sizes and spread across the campus, engendering a strong unwanted vehicle presence at its centre. Without a hierarchy of traffic lanes, through-traffic is endemic, and pedestrians and cyclists are at a disadvantage. There is one notable exception: a short stretch in the centre where pedestrians dominate and traffic is limited to maintenance vehicles.

The pedestrian network is also incomplete, making campus navigation impossible without walking on roadways. With mismatched materials, pathways lack a ranking system to establish priority, and the pedestrian experience is not maximized. The campus ground surfaces, for pedestrians as well as for vehicles, are mainly asphalt. These surfaces are in a serious state of disrepair. Apart from asphalt, there are surfaces in prefabricated and stamped concrete as well as stone dust. Not only do they fail to elevate the campus’s image, they prevent an accurate reading of pedestrian versus vehicle traffic.
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### 3.2 Vehicles Everywhere

The pedestrian network is also incomplete, making campus navigation impossible without walking on roadways. With mismatched materials, pathways lack a ranking system to establish priority, and the pedestrian experience is not maximized.

The campus ground surfaces, for pedestrians as well as for vehicles, are mainly asphalt. These surfaces are in a serious state of disrepair. Apart from asphalt, there are surfaces in prefabricated and stamped concrete as well as stone dust. Not only do they fail to elevate the campus’s image, they prevent an accurate reading of pedestrian versus vehicle traffic.

**Campus Roadways and Service Network**
- 6,174 m (3.84 miles) linear length
- 46,304 m² (11 acres) total area of paved vehicular roads

**Campus Parking**
- 24 parking lots
- 1,236 parking spaces
- 27,043 m² (7 acres) total area

**Vehicular Network**
- 73,347 m² (18 acres) total area
- 30% of central campus
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Stamped asphalt
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Asphalt pathway
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Stamped asphalt
3.3 A Winter Campus

Winter should be celebrated as a wonderful feature of the Bishop’s campus, rather than an uncomfortable condition to be endured.

Bishop’s University is a four-season campus. However, due to regional climate conditions and timing of the academic calendar, much of the students’ campus experience is a winter one. But winter is not fun here: the cold weather is merely endured rather than celebrated. The dictates of driving through snow and ice mean that salt, sand and snow accumulate from clearing large paved surfaces. A consequence of this is that unattractive piles of road debris dominate one’s experience of the campus, detracting from the beauty of a winter landscape.

This is why this Master Plan proposes various measures to maximize the campus outdoor spaces year-round. Shared streets that limit vehicle encroachment will improve the pedestrian experience across campus during winter. Development of the Quads should incorporate social spaces with wind protection and all-season programming. Particular attention should be paid to the urban furniture, which must be usable year-round, and the lighting, which must be sufficient and also create a pleasant ambience. Finally, winter should be a time to leverage Bishop’s exceptional natural landscapes.
Bishop’s University’s campus is loosely organized by program type. Academic functions – classrooms, library and faculty offices – are generally located around the historic Quad. Residential functions – dorms and dining facilities – are generally located in the newer buildings in the southeast portion of the campus. Student services, athletic centres and other facilities are scattered throughout.

The following table presents the distribution of activities in key campus buildings. The percentages below do not include surfaces considered “neutral” or technical, such as hallways, mechanical rooms, etc.
Bishop's University occupies 150 acres in the vast and glorious setting of Quebec's Eastern Townships. The campus landscape is a valuable resource, the perceived boundaries of which extend to the horizons.

One of the most important but underappreciated attributes of the Bishop's campus is the full extent of its landholdings: riverfronts, forest, farms, rolling meadows and mountains. Within easy reach of many developed campus areas, the campus community can enjoy vistas and atmospheres of rare beauty, which are already part of Bishop's University. Within the Bishop's Master Planning mandate, opportunities can be created to allow the Bishop's University community to capitalize better on these extraordinary resources.

In some instances, it is the artful blending between natural elements and a cultivated landscape that provides the best setting for recreational use. The gradual unfolding of enclosed spaces, combined with the distant views as one walks through the campus, provides both landscape range as well as an important sense of security. This is a concept that could be used to great advantage when considering possibilities for a new pedestrian approach onto campus, exploring ways to better incorporate the adjacent woodlands into the sense of arrival.

The rural landscape can also be incorporated into a network of recreational trails on campus. Even a brief foray into a wide-open space can provide a sense of psychological expansion, regardless of the season. Stronger links between the central campus and these types of distinctive landscape moments will create a sense of choice and will encourage greater engagement from the campus community with the landscape.

Another environmental aspect of the campus that could be strengthened relates to the changing of the seasons. Greater access to the larger concept of the campus landscape, through the seasons, will make it easier for students to encounter these exciting changes as part of daily life.

Given the exceptionally beautiful natural setting of the campus, it is easy to imagine that an even larger scale of landscape could be incorporated into campus life, the moment of arrival onto campus and the experience of departure from campus. In part, the current lack of connection to nearby landscape features like the St. Francis riverfront is related to the presence of Route 108. The Highway 410 extension project, which will commence in 2018, will also separate university property into two parts. Measures have been planned to maintain nearby pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle networks.

Known and appreciated for its pastoral aspect, the Bishop's campus is mainly made up of sweeping lawns interspersed with trees, chiefly deciduous, and a few small clusters of conifers. The northern portion of Centennial Theatre offers a grouping of pines with a unique and high-quality ambiance, while the central space of the historic quad is an open lawn free of trees. Areas for sports practice are also grassy. The presence of sizeable wooded sectors in the southwestern portion of the campus contributes to this pastoral character.

Less pastoral, the absence of vegetation on the many parking lots creates heat islands. Heat islands are also an issue with Coulter Field, which is covered with synthetic turf.

Outdoor meeting spaces take up a small proportion of campus resources, and are concentrated at the centre of student life: the residences, the Student Union Building, Dewhurst Dining Hall (“Dewey’s”) and various sports facilities. Assembly areas are diverse; however, their choice of materials and state of disrepair discourage a sense of ownership by the student body.

3.5 An Underused Landscape
— Artificial turf

— Practice field

— Grassy area

— Trees on grassy area

— Trees

— Perennials

— Annuals
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3.6 A Campus Tenuously Connected to Beautiful Landscapes Beyond its Boundaries

While the landscape surrounding the Bishop’s campus has undeniable beauty, the campus itself remains tenuously connected to landscapes beyond its boundaries.

The bridge into Lennoxville, designed principally for heavy traffic, with pedestrians seemingly accommodated as an afterthought, is the only connection between the town and the campus, and pedestrians are forced to share the bridge with vehicles. This situation could nonetheless change following the Highway 410 extension, as much of its traffic will be rerouted. For the students, faculty and staff who use it daily, there is a slight connection with the riverfront landscape below, but not a strong one.

Route 108 (College Street) forms an uninviting boundary between the campus and the river. While Bishop’s University technically owns waterfront property, this barrier prohibits easy access to the river. The waterfront does not feel like it is a part of the campus.
3.7 Campus Signature

The campus’s urban furniture, lighting and signage do not reflect the quality and prestige of the University, or contribute to its signature, in contrast with its spectacular landscape and emblematic historic buildings. Maclean’s, the Globe & Mail, the Huffington Post, the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) and others, all rank Bishop’s University as providing one of the best overall student experiences in Canada and having some of the most satisfied students in North America. The campus signature should reflect this prestigious standing.

There is no consistency to the many types of furniture in use, and no campus signature established. The placement and location of benches and picnic tables is haphazard and rarely aligned with pedestrian traffic. Waste management depends on large waste containers, negatively impacting the quality of the campus landscape, and the number and location of bike racks in the academic sector is negligible in proportion to the number of students.

A variety of lighting types also conflicts with the creation of a campus signature, and there are at least six types of pedestrian lamp posts, unequally distributed across campus. The lamp posts in parking areas and near sports fields are not uniform and represent different eras. At the same time, quads, residence sectors and certain pedestrian routes are unlit, and there is minimal ambient lighting for user comfort and well-being.

Both graphic coherence and hierarchy are lacking in the design of different types of signage; this does not support a campus signature. Some itineraries are faulty, which can hinder proper orientation on the campus.
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4. Development Strategy
4.1 Development Vision

Our goal is to offer Canada's foremost undergraduate education and experience. To develop a university campus grounded in the quality of life of its users; to showcase a lush landscape; and to promote a “Live, learn and play” approach.
4.2 General Orientations

The Master Plan orientations establish the vital components to be preserved or reinforced, and identify campus enhancement opportunities. The approach proposes defining orientations according to a global, campus-wide vision, to be followed by general considerations for each landscape unit.

1 Campus Life
   - To improve the site’s entrance and offer an immersive campus experience;
   - To reinforce the campus strong identity (built heritage and natural landscape context) while developing a signature across various components of its outdoor spaces;
   - To connect the University with its urban and landscape contexts;
   - To create a vibrant and lively university environment year-round;
   - To prioritize on-campus pedestrian travel and access by directing vehicle traffic outside the centre of campus.

2 Mind and Body
   - To design welcoming, safe and comfortable spaces;
   - To offer meeting spaces for activities and social interaction;
   - To provide peaceful spaces that encourage reflection and concentration;
   - To supply community and sporting facilities meeting the highest standards;
   - To implement functional lighting that ensures user safety as well as ambient lighting that promotes overall well-being.

3 Sustainability and Accessibility
   - To adopt exemplary practices, chiefly in facilitating sustainable mobility, green power sources, energy-efficient buildings and optimized waste management;
   - To maintain and highlight mature trees, thereby ensuring their permanence;
   - To make the campus universally accessible.

4 Quality and Excellence
   - Maintaining the beauty of campus surroundings and the exceptional architectural quality of the built environment;
   - Designing high-quality amenities worthy of campus buildings’ prestige;
   - Promoting attractive facilities for outstanding young people striving for academic excellence.
Proposed Plan
Bishop's University
Precincts
When our athletic teams get ready for action each season, #BleedPurple means school spirit. Our teams are highly competitive, and they have the fans to match. Our fans are known to be some of the most passionate on the Canadian University sports scene without exception. The cheers from #GaiterNation fans fill our student athletes with energy and pride every time they don their purple jerseys.

Our newly renovated John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre is an outstanding facility for our students, as well as our campus and local community who all benefit from high-quality services, equipment, facilities and programming. At a project budget of $32 million, the sports centre is the largest investment in our university's history.

We #BleedPurple on the field, on the pitch, on the court, and in the gym.

– WOMEN’S & MEN’S –  
– MEN’S ONLY –  
– WOMEN’S ONLY –
Historic Frontage Objectives

- Showcase historic buildings;
- Preserve grass lawns showcasing historic buildings;
- Move vehicle roads away from building façades;
- Minimize the presence of vehicles by eliminating their passage and the number of parking spots (with adequate signage);
- Create a new pedestrian entrance on campus with a walkway over the Massawippi River;
- Insert walkways that open up views of the campus and its environment's key elements;
- Showcase the architecture of the historic buildings with lighting (down lighting);
- Review Divinity House programming in order to preserve the building and enhance its connection to the Massawippi River.
Riverfront Objectives

- Develop a safe and comfortable waterfront boardwalk/trail integrated with the landscape, offering rest areas and points of contact with the water;
- Designate a location for creating a safe passageway over Route 108 toward the riverfront promenade, and install adequate signage;
- Promote the use of wood and materials sensitive to the natural river context;
- Improve and feature spaces dedicated to pedestrians and cyclists on route 108;
- Encourage a sense of ownership of the sector through the addition of furniture (benches, waste containers, picnic tables and bicycle racks);
- Install interpretive panels at appropriate locations for information purposes.
Objectives for the Heart of the Campus

- Enhance the tree canopy, offering shade and privacy;
- Reinforce the vocabulary of the classic, prestigious quads through the creation of diagonal and parallel pathways, in relation to the buildings;
- Establish routes that open up impressive views of the campus and its surroundings;
- Encourage buildings' transparency and permeability, making them more pedestrian-friendly;
- Encourage social interactions through pedestrian routes (crossings) and through the development of new gathering spaces;
- Minimize vehicle presence by eliminating constant vehicle transit and ubiquitous parking lots (with adequate signage);
- Offer academic buildings that are healthy, comfortable and encouraging of studies and social lives while accommodating expected growth;
- Showcase the architecture of the buildings with lighting (down light);
- Encourage a sense of ownership of the sector through the addition of furniture (benches, waste baskets, picnic tables and bicycle racks).
Main Entrance Objectives

- Designate the main entrance as the key vehicle threshold of the campus (with adequate signage);
- Improve plant cover to minimize the visual presence of vehicle traffic and parking;
- Offer a safe and comfortable pedestrian network.
Residential District Objectives

- Simplify vehicle and pedestrian routes;
- Preserve the existing residential character, effecting minimal changes;
- Connect residents vehicle routes to the St. Francis Street entrance.

— Existing condition, Mackinnon Drive
— Existing condition, Champlain College
— Existing condition, Mackinnon Drive
Student Residence and Cafeteria Objectives

- Encourage social interactions via pedestrian routes (crossings);
- Plan programmable zones for student and sporting activities (skating rink, half football field, etc.);
- Offer healthy, comfortable residential buildings that encourage studying and socializing while adapting to future growth;
- Encourage building transparency and permeability, making pedestrian travels and indoor environments more pleasant.
Sports Facilities and Golf Course Objectives

- Increase plant and tree cover to minimize views of roadways and parking;
- Connect the sports and recreation centre to the forested area's recreational trails;
- Plan for a soccer field;
- Preserve Hugh Scott Forest;
- Develop wooded areas composed of tree groves, grasslands and bio-retentive wetlands;
- Develop a trail in the new wooded area;
- Protect and enhance Peter Curry Marsh:
  - Addition of a 20-m protection strip to the existing buffer zone;
  - Planting of trees 20-m wide between the protective strip and the potential development site (whose marsh must be protected at all costs, both during construction and when deciding on the site's vocation);
  - Locate the pedestrian path to one side of the marsh so as not to disturb wildlife.
Backyard Objectives

- Consolidate “Buildings and Grounds” facilities;
- Demolition of W.B. Scott Arena
- Lay out short-term parking spaces on the periphery;
- De-emphasize vehicle parking and traffic by boosting plant cover.
Champlain College Objectives

- Maintain the pedestrian link with the campus core;
- Improve the interface with Route 108;
- Plan for layouts that feature the central work of art, to prevent vehicles from parking on the perimeter;
- Convert parking lot on west side to communal greenspace.
Wooded Area Objectives

- Maintain the forest cover and highlight it, to ensure its longevity;
- Make better use of this existing resource through the establishment of trails and clear wayfinding markers;
- Operate with sensitivity and minimal impact on flora and fauna;
- Create four-season recreational paths (cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, etc.);
- Build rest areas along those paths;
- Connect pathways with the river’s edge and create waterfront rest stops;
- Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians on the path from two campus to users from the golf course and Champlain College student residences (lighting and security system);
- Ensure attractive passage under the Highway 410
5. Built Environment Development Components
Introduction

The integration of architecture and landscape supports the larger campus experience, creating moments of intimacy, openness, threshold, shelter and community. Even on a relatively compact campus like Bishop’s, a sense of neighbourhood and identity within campus precincts is important. To this end, place-making may be used to support the campus’s cohesiveness, ensure a diversity of experiences and facilitate orientation within the larger landscape.

Campus buildings at Bishop’s are generally arranged by program use. For instance, most academic buildings are clustered in the northwest corner of the campus, while residential buildings form a more sprawling arrangement in its southeastern sector. Athletic uses are located east side of housing facilities, while student life occupies a small, but central, position on campus.

The Master Plan is based on this existing arrangement, and reinforces it while maximizing the possibilities created through consolidation of pedestrian and vehicle networks. An expansion of the Learning Commons would broaden the reach of the academic core throughout the Quad. Potential expansion and new construction alongside the Nicolls Building and the Student Centre could introduce additional structure. Student life spreads out through the centre of campus, while new residences would increase the number of beds offered on-campus and form their own residential Quad. Sports fields would be located at the eastern extremity of the central campus, where flat playing fields converse more easily with the greater landscape, and where the John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre can more readily support outdoor recreational activities.

---

**LEGEND**
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While the Master Plan is being updated, the John Bassett Memorial Library is undergoing a complete redevelopment and program redefinition to "provide improved support for teaching and research, offer access to technologically advanced facilities, integrated academic support services and programs, and innovative study and meeting rooms" – creating, in the University’s own words, a Learning Commons.

The Master Plan identifies a strategy for further expanding the Learning Commons that would support the Library’s new program and create a stronger spatial connection between the reconfigured Learning Commons, the Quad and the existing Academic and Arts Precincts.

The Library and Learning Commons will bring together new and existing services under one roof to better serve students, faculty and staff. The new facility will include the Library, the Writing Centre, the Student Success Centre, the Teaching and Learning Centre, the ITS Helpdesk, and a café.
One of the most important principles of the Master Plan is the need to create, reinforce, and at times simply reveal connections among people, the spaces they inhabit, and the spaces they move through, or view at a distance. Where patterns of use are already strongly developed, like they are inside the Quad, this need is addressed by strengthening those patterns with new spatial relationships within the campus landscape, or amongst its buildings.

The proposed Arts Café program accomplishes just that. Located within the pine dell adjacent to the Molson Fine Arts Building, Centennial Theatre and the Buildings & Grounds building, which would be redeveloped as a Student Life building, this new social space would provide an informal setting for students working into the evening at the Learning Commons or arts studios, those attending pre- or post-event gatherings at the theatre, gallery or art studios, or those simply looking for quick refreshment throughout their day. Constructed amongst the trees, the Arts Café would be designed as an activated space seamlessly woven into the fabric of campus life, blurring the boundaries between building and landscape.
Considering the pressing need for new residences, the site in front of the current cafeteria, across the shared path, has been identified as a prime location for building new residences (Phase 1). The construction of new residences facing the cafeteria would complete the residential Quad and make the cafeteria the new heart of residential life on campus.

The new residence would have 98 beds over three storeys. It would need ground-level common spaces opening onto the outdoors, towards the street as much as towards the woods: quality spaces breathing life into the residential sector. The new residences would need to respect the sector’s majestic vegetation and also use it to enhance the quality of the spaces.

In a second phase, the site west of the Phase 1 residences, parallel to the multifunctional path, is suitable for the construction of a new residence. This building would have at least 64 beds over three levels and would need to be designed and built in continuity with the spirit of the Phase 1 residences. Visual openings between the two residences should be preserved. The ground floor should open onto the shared pathway and enliven the street with indoor and outdoor spaces. Considering its greater proximity to the centre of campus and the site’s topography, spaces to the west and at the top of the hill should contribute to student life with meeting and relaxing spaces for everyone.

The expansion of Paterson Hall to the south is a promising solution, given the building’s current configuration; the south wall appears to have been built with a future expansion in mind. The addition of +/- 48 beds over four floors is a possibility. It should be noted that Paterson Hall’s residence type and current clientele do not represent the campus’s most-needed types of room; however, this expansion may allow for the building’s existing equipment and common spaces to be shared.

A final potential site has been identified for the construction of a new residence, northeast of Paterson Hall. The woods next to this site make it a poorer fit than the others. The building would have the potential for 72 beds over four floors and be built to preserve as much vegetation as possible while minimizing its own surface area.

The master plan aims to streamline traffic throughout the academic sector, by creating stronger relationships with the landscape and creating larger social spaces for planned and impromptu meetings. Expansions and new construction next to the Nicolls Building and Memorial House would further reinforce the Quad structure. A first step would be to move existing and proposed pedestrian traffic to a shared pathway at the centre of those buildings, which chiefly face south and southwest, forming an all-season enclosure. This new route would lay the framework for informal meetings year-round.

---

**LEGEND**

- Privileged site for Residences
- Secondary site option for Residences
- Privileged site for Common Areas

- Phase 1: Construction of a new residence facing Dewhurst Cafeteria, parallel to the shared pathway. Three storeys, common spaces on ground floor. Potential for 98 beds.
- Phase 2: Demolition of MacKinnon Hall. Construction of a new residence west of the Phase 1 residence, parallel to the multifunctional pathway. Three storeys, common spaces on the ground floor. Potential for 64 beds.
5.4 Academic Sector

With the potential demolition of the Dewhurst building, the residential cafeteria should be relocated to the heart of the campus, in the common space between academic areas and the sports centre. This would encourage the use of meeting spaces and accommodate the cafeteria’s various users while preserving easy access for its primary clientele, student residents. The construction of a new cafeteria facing the wooded area and shared lane is also an opportunity to offer different types of spaces for academic, sports and event requirements. The introduction of an outdoor meeting space would greatly contribute to students’ on-campus quality of life.
5.5 Cafeteria

Net surface areas:
- The cafeteria remains in the current building, the net surface area would be around 1,536 m².
- This represents a net surface area increase of some 318 m² (26%) over the current building.
- Considering new circulation areas (elevator and exits) and remaining mechanical space, the overall net surface area necessary would be 2,267 m².
- This represents a gross surface area increase of 450 m² (25%) over the current building.

Development principles for the extension of the existing cafeteria would be as follows:
- Provide a balance of programmed and programmable spaces that can adapt and accommodate varying functions over time.
- Include the following programs:
  - hall
  - donors wall
  - courtyard
  - conference room
  - production kitchen
  - dishwasher
  - fridge and freezer
  - storage
  - loading dock

For reference purposes, the following summary outlines the types of programs:

1. Food Services:
   As noted in Bishop’s 2009 Survey of Dining Services and Facilities, the variety and quality of dining options increasingly reflect the diversity of student preferences. Though the industry trend of providing many small dining services inside academic buildings and libraries continues to grow (thus decreasing demand for cafeteria services), food service space still makes up almost 37% of student centres total assignable square footage on campuses with fewer than 8,000 students. Back-of-house space dedicated to food services has also decreased, as food preparation increasingly takes place in front of customers.

2. Ballroom Facilities:
   Many campuses include a hall that doubles as a lecture or multi-purpose space. Twelve square feet per seat is the standard applied to most new ballrooms. These spaces are flexible and often include a pre-event area and adjacent food service / catering kitchen, as well as sophisticated audio-visual capabilities.

3. Conference / Meeting Rooms:
   A key early programming decision is whether the University should incorporate conference facilities as part of the new cafeteria. These spaces are intended to complement a larger meeting hall, and act as a breakout space during conferences. Flexibility in layout should also facilitate their use as seminar rooms and classrooms. Ideally, these would provide visual and acoustic separation from noisy, high-use areas.
6. Landscape Development Components
6.1 Vehicle Traffic and Parking

Component Characteristics

- Segregation of two road networks: the high-flow main network, and a low-flow network on shared streets (used by maintenance and delivery vehicles, short-term and disability parking) which prioritizes pedestrian traffic;
- Consolidation of parking spaces on the campus perimeter;
- Greening of parking lots;
- Strong main entrance;
- Two-way main access;
- One-way secondary access.

The option of introducing a traffic circle was not adopted for the main entrance onto campus, chiefly because of safety concerns for pedestrians wishing to reach the waterfront. With the extension of Highway 410 and the relocation of a significant amount of traffic away from campus, the installation of traffic lights should be planned for the long term, as part of discussions with the City of Sherbrooke. In the short term, installing mandatory stop signs should be a priority.
Shared Street
Proposed Streetscape

- Shared roadway at the same level as adjacent land;
- Cohabitation of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles;
- Distinctive ground covering to send a signal to occasional vehicles to slow down;
- Urban furniture to offer users a rest stop along the route.

---
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— Proposed streetscape for shared streets

— Shared street, Brighton, UK

— Shared street
Proposed Streetscape

- Standard two-way roadway;
- Planted areas on both sides of the roadway, with a setback to allow for sidewalks;
- Double planting of trees to mitigate the presence of mineral surfaces and identify the main entrance with a formal character;
- Development of bioswales.

Proposed Streetscape Examples:

- McGill University, Montreal
- Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC
- MUHC, Montreal, QC
Proposed Parking

- Creation of structured parking lots;
- Introduction of islands planted with perennials, shrubs and trees requiring minimal maintenance, in support of bio-retention and combating heat islands.

The proposed parking development concept intends for it to be located where the W.B. Scott Arena now stands, although this arena will eventually be demolished, and this would allow the many on-campus parking lots to be consolidated.
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6.2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic

Component Characteristics

• Separation of pedestrian and vehicle traffic;
• Ranking of pathways;
• Maximizing the pedestrian experience: creation of crossroads for social interaction and showcasing campus’s strong points (historic buildings, woods, cluster of pine trees, golf course, cross-country ski trails, etc.);
• Creation of trails to avoid grass surfaces being trampled;
• Improve bicycle facilities by providing more covered parking space near the library and the John H. Price Sports Centre;
• Creation of a pedestrian bridge over the Massawippi River, linking the campus and Lennoxville;
• Extend the trails south and east of golf course;
• Creation of a nature trail (Sentier HOPPS Trail) near the Peter Curry Marsh.

The development of a network of pathways separate from vehicle traffic enables the pedestrian and cyclist experience to be maximized while improving on-campus safety. This network facilitates access to all buildings, parking areas and places of interest through active modes of transport.
The Massawippi River, which forms the western edge of campus, offers stunning natural scenery in a comparatively calm and quiet environment. The construction of a new campus entry via a pedestrian bridge across the river will draw this landscape into the shared experience of the campus, providing a unique threshold into the campus that registers the change of the seasons and the annual cycles of regional flooding.

A new pedestrian entry across the Massawippi will branch off from the current pedestrian approach along a sidewalk across the vehicular bridge. Following the landmark of McGreer through a loose canopy of trees, the new bridge will cross at an elevation high enough to bypass the steep slopes on the eastern banks of the river.
Proposed Layout
Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic

The routes for emergency vehicles are not shown. In places where they drive, pedestrian paths must be widened to 6 metres. The 1.5-metre concrete pedestrian alley will also need to be preserved and enlarged to this standard, using a more permeable material than granite dust.
6.3 Vegetation and Water Management

Component Characteristics

- Tree-planting in the quads, creating private, shaded places;
- Double planting of trees along the main access route;
- Greening of former parking spaces to create bio-retention zones and reduce heat islands;
- Diversified range of plants increasing biodiversity;
- Development of wooded areas composed of tree groves, grasslands and bio-retention wetlands;
- Conservation and improvement of the Boise SCOTT Woods;
- New indigenous plantings that complement existing species;
- Exclusion of invasive species and ash trees.

Existing Deciduous Trees

- Common buckthorn
- Silver maple
- Red maple
- Sugar maple
- Norway maple
- Manitoba maple
- Crabapple royalty
- Toba hawthorn
- European birch
- Yellow birch
- White birch
- Cottonwood
- White willow
- American linden
- European linden
- Red ash
- Black ash
- Mountain ash
- Pin oak
- Bar oak
- Red oak
- Black cherry
- American beech
- Catalpa
- American elm
- Butternut
- Mulberry
- Trembling aspen
- Kentucky coffeetree
- Honey locust
- Black walnut
- Lilac
- Northern hackberry

Existing Coniferous Trees

- Austrian pine
- White pine
- Red pine
- Scots pine
- Canada yew
- Tamarack
- Balsam fir
- White spruce
- Colorado spruce
- Northern white-cedar
- Eastern hemlock
The campus’s close proximity to the junction of two rivers, as well as its location at a major bend in the St. Francis River, increases the likelihood of flooding, particularly in low-lying areas at the edges of the campus.

This proximity to riparian ecosystems also increases the need to provide an effective stormwater management plan that slows water accumulation during peak storm events, and reduces or eliminates the transfer of surface pollutants from roadways into local water systems.

The campus location suggests that the University has a role in the stewardship of the natural resources that lend it beauty. In response, multiple bioretention areas will be created on the campus to collect runoff from parking areas and vernal pools to safeguard against flooding in the main areas of campus. Filtering pollutants through plants and settlement of sediment, the floodplains will be working landscapes that bring additional benefits through increased ecological diversity and habitat creation.

Locations are based on map data of flood-prone zones produced by the City of Sherbrooke.
6.4 Peter Curry Marsh

On account of the following observations:

- The campus disposes of a series of unaffected land areas which partly lies in the floodplain of the St. Francis River;
- The necessity of a better surface water management;
- The importance of conserving the Peter Curry Marsh;
- The low level of ecological diversity in the vicinity of the marsh;
- The absence of a green corridor enabling land animal transit.

Statement

The University recognizes the importance of the Peter Curry Marsh and will ensure that any campus development will respect the integrity of this ecosystem.

Bishop’s University will seek to maintain and renew its stewardship agreement with Ducks Unlimited Canada, thereby promising its collaboration with a Canadian leader in wetland habitat conservation. In so doing, will also seek to maintain its commitment to donors who have contributed to the wellbeing of the marsh.
Component Characteristics

Upgrading the Peter Curry Marsh in a long term perspective

- Creating a protected area within the designated breeding areas for birds, amphibians and turtles;
- Increasing the insulosity index (small islands) in the main pond to provide shelter and breeding grounds for waterfowl and other aquatic birds and introducing turtle nesting sites;
- Implementing a survey program initiated by the courses academic requirements;
- Building a nature trail (Sentier HOPPS Trail) to the benefit of nature lovers within restricted limits;
- Controlling the quality of water inputs by eliminating potential sources of contamination.

Enhancing the specific biodiversity

- Initiating a long term program of tree planting mostly on sterile grounds;
- Establishing a control station at Glenday Marsh (south of the train track) to provide a state of reference as to compare the local biodiversity index;
- Introducing indigenous plant and animal species compatible with their natural range and favouring species at risk within the protected areas;
- Eliminating exotic and invasive species;
- Monitoring and improving fish habitat for spawning and migration;
- Enforcing the shrub strata to provide more efficient shelter and feeding grounds to birds and small animal.

Developing a green corridor along the eastern limit of the main campus

- Interconnecting the marsh with the St. Francis River through a series of ponds within the floodplain area;
- Creating a bike path (east-west) and a hiking trail (north-south) in a more secure and inspiring environment;
- Managing the water runoff from the campus;
- Improving the stream bed by reducing the bank slope and by improving the creek bed.
6.5 Meeting Spaces

Component Characteristics

- Increased sense of ownership and comfort in quad sectors (tree-planting, lighting and furniture);
- Addition of new, comfortable, safe and welcoming gathering spaces;
- Extension of the Student Center outward with the development of terraces and welcoming tiers;
- Enhancement of indoor/outdoor permeability;
- Development of a meeting space on the roof of the Student Center (long-term opportunity);
- Open spaces that can accommodate various events, including up to 600 people under a canopy;
- Places for downtime along the river's edge and by the trees.
6.6 Winter activities

Component Characteristics

- Addition of patio heaters to allow for winter use of outdoor terraces (on the ground and on roofs);
- Installation of two ice rinks (without protective strips) on the practice fields;
- Development of an ice corridor in the forest on the Sentier HOPPS Trail;
- Inclusion of a cross-country ski trail;
- Delimitation of two areas conducive to the holding of one-time winter events;
- Adding removable campfire facilities on campus.
LEGEND

- Outdoor Heated Terrace
- Rooftop Heated Terrace
- Ice Rink
- Cross-Country Ski Path
- Ice Skating Trail on the Sender HOPPS Trail
- Outdoor Winter Event

Proposed Layout
Winter activities
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6.7 Ground Surfaces

Component Characteristics

- Vehicle lanes: asphalt roadway with granite borders;
- Shared lanes:
  - Option 1: Cobblestone-type granite paving stone roadway with granite borders;
  - Option 2: Poured in-situ concrete with pattern;
  - Option 3: Concrete pavers casted into asphalt or stamped asphalt with granite borders;
- Pedestrian pathways: poured in-situ concrete sidewalk with light sandblasted finish;
- Riverside trails: elevated wooden boardwalk;
- Forest pathways: hard-packed dirt trail;
- Forest pathways leading to student residences (Champlain College): stone dust trail;
- Terraces and gathering spaces: poured in-situ concrete surfaces.

— Pedestrian pathways: Concrete sidewalk with lights and blasted finish

— Asphalt surface with granite curbs

— Shared lanes:

Option 1: Cobblestone-type granite paving
Option 2: Poured in-situ concrete with pattern
Option 3: Concrete pavers casted into asphalt or stamped asphalt
LEGEND
- Asphalt surface with granite borders
- Option 1: Cobblestone-type granite paving stone
- Option 2: Poured-in-situ concrete with pattern
- Option 3: Concrete pavers casted into asphalt or stamped asphalt
- Poured in-situ concrete
- Concrete sidewalk
- Stone dust surface
- Wooden boardwalk
- Dirt trail

Proposed Layout
Ground Surfaces
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Component Characteristics

- Creation of an identifying range of furniture to strengthen the campus brand image;
- Furniture with classic and contemporary lines;
- Different applications to promote interaction;
- Hardwood coverings for user comfort and aluminium for durability and low maintenance;
- Installation of waste and recycling containers at the pedestrian level;
- Installation of furniture on mineral surfaces to preserve lawns;
- Unique signature for the McGreer Quad, with noble materials;
- Donor plaques may be affixed to the furniture, or names engraved onto natural stone.


— Granite or limestone benches, with or without wooden foundations. Located along trails and near doors of historic buildings, or in the McGreer Quad.

— Unattached, wooden Adirondack chairs painted Bishop’s University’s distinctive purple. Located in areas suitable for gatherings (Academic Quad, McGreer Quad, around the Student Centre).

— Contemporary furniture with classic workmanship, made of wood and aluminium. Located throughout campus at strategic locations. Reference: Benches, picnic tables, waste and recycling receptacles - Collection Dimanche by Equiparc (materials: steel and wood) Bicycle rack EP 5990 by Equiparc (material: steel)
Component Characteristics

- Creation of an identifying range of lighting apparatus to strengthen the campus brand image;
- Lighting apparatus with classic and contemporary lines;
- Installation of lighting apparatus on the same scale as its context of insertion;
- Vehicle lanes: double-headed lamp post (pedestrian and roadway types);
- Pedestrian paths: pedestrian-type lamp post;
- Parking spaces: roadway lamp post;
- Grey-coloured (RAL 7043, Traffic Grey B) apparatus to integrate with pale aspect of architectural details;
- No light pollution (uplighting) to preserve the starry sky experience of the Mont-Mégantic International Dark Sky Reserve (MMIDSR).

---

For reference purposes, the range presented is Sylage by Schréder (material: aluminum).
Proposed Plan

Lighting

- Double-headed lamp post
- Roadway lamp post
- Pedestrian type lamp post
- Sports lighting
Exterior Campus Lighting Recommendations

Exterior lighting can strengthen and unify campus architecture, landscape, circulation and use. The University should work towards unifying lamp types used on campus, so as to create a clear, campus-wide family of fixtures and fittings, and unify right "colour" areas. The objective is to provide uniform light colour across similar use areas, identify major corridors, and provide appropriate warm or cool colours through fixtures which enhance sense of place.

Furthermore, campus lighting solutions should seek to reduce light pollution and energy consumption while minimizing the problems created by improperly designed and installed fixtures. Excessive glare can be troublesome and may cause safety problems. Light trespass reduces privacy, and higher energy use results in increased costs, besides impacting the environment directly and indirectly. A comprehensive Campus Lighting Plan would advance the safety and welfare of the Bishop's community, and contribute to the identity of the campus as a whole.

Principles of Campus Lighting

1. Minimize Light Trespass and Glare.

Special care should be taken to prevent light pollution and direct glare. Extra light bouncing into the atmosphere interferes with the work of astronomers and can disrupt neighbouring buildings. Ground-based flood lighting of building facades should be phased out and wherever possible replaced with wall-mounted, dark-sky friendly (full cutoff or fully shielded) fixtures.

2. Avoid Overly Bright Lighting.

The intent of lighting building entries and circulation areas is to enhance the best qualities of the environment, not to become a “beacon” on campus. The brightest is not necessarily the best. Maintain a maximum average illuminance level of 0.5 to 2 foot candles on horizontal surfaces.

3. Design with Lamp Colour in Mind.

Specify lamps with a high colour rendering index (CRI) and a uniform colour temperature. Bishop's should target a standard correlated colour temperature (CCT) of 4000K. A colour rendering index (CRI) value of 70 or greater is the minimum recommendation for light sources on campus. Any LED products used in exteriors should adhere to these standards (refer to appendices regarding LED fixtures and standards).

4. Use “White” Light Sources - Avoid “Yellow” Light Sources.

As white light has all colours present in the spectrum, it is more effective in defining peripheral and night vision. The most commonly available sources are metal halide and fluorescent. LED lighting is swiftly growing as a viable technology, though care should be given to specifying minimum performance and warranty criteria. High Pressure Sodium (HPS) has often been selected because of its high efficiency and longevity; however, HPS lamps produce an orange-coloured light and the colour rendering index (CRI) does not provide a lighting quality which is appropriate for the campus. The use of Low Pressure Sodium (LPS) or Mercury Vapor (MV) light sources should be avoided due to the poor colour rendering values and visibility issues, as well as poor energy efficiency (in case of MV).

5. Design with Maintenance in Mind.

Mount light fixtures in accessible locations so that the lighting can be maintained regularly. Specify fixtures that have simple mechanisms for lamp changing and captive hardware, where parts will not fall out of the fixture upon re-lamping. Use long-life lamps wherever possible and avoid the use of incandescent light sources. Specify tamper-resistant and captive screws in any area that may be accessible to the public.

6. Connect Lighting to a Control System.

Due to the difference between summer and winter daylight hours, lighting should be connected to a photocell to turn fixtures on at a time clock to turn them off. The use of a dimming system or building automation system is not required, but encouraged where appropriate.

7. Design with Efficiency in Mind.

Use the smallest wattage lamp source available in any given application to meet the desired light levels specified to minimize energy consumption. Do not, however, compromise desired light levels as outlined to achieve higher efficiency.

8. Design with Safety In Mind.

It is important to understand the role of lighting in safety and security in an exterior environment. A well-designed and well-commissioned lighting system will help with detection and assessment of any threat by enabling recognition of facial expression and body language of oncoming people, and could facilitate a timely defensive or evasive action. Beyond this, however, safety and security depend on the actual infrastructure on campus to deal with crime. At locations with CCTV cameras, special attention must be paid to the illumination levels, distribution, and specific optical characteristics, because a camera perceives its surrounding very differently from the human visual system. The CCTV manufacturer and security consultant should be consulted for vertical and horizontal illuminance requirements, as well as uniformity requirements for the system.

To be noted

+ When lighting equipment is due to be replaced, the lighting plan must be considered as a whole and a photometric study must be conducted, either by a supplier or a lighting engineer, to ensure the safety of the premises.
6.10 Works of Art and Monuments

Component Characteristics

- Works of art can be an invaluable tool in customizing outdoor spaces and routes. Their integration on campus is therefore recommended;
- Works of art, monuments, commemorative objects and sculptures across campus must be maintained and showcased;
- Spatial arrangements surrounding works of art and monuments must enable their contemplation (open areas, pedestals, illumination, strategic locations);
- Reserving space for outdoor exhibit areas near the (Molson) Fine Arts Building and Foreman Art Gallery is recommended.
Wayfinding systems can be broken down into three basic categories of signs, intended for both exterior and interior contexts: identification, directional/orientation and regulatory. A comprehensive wayfinding system creates a unified approach to each of these categories, organizing them into a consistent family of symbols, images, and words. In the context of the Master Plan, we have focused on the development of exterior wayfinding.

**Identification**
- Campus Identification
- Site Entry
- Building Identification
- Entrance Identification
- Parking Area Identification
- Accessible Parking Identification

**Directional Communication**
- Off-Site trail Markers
- On-Site Vehicular Directional Markers
- Pedestrian Directional Markers

**Regulatory**
- Parking/Traffic Regulations
- Public Transportation Information
- Entrance/Exit Information
Proposed Vehicular and Pedestrian Wayfinding
Identification

Campus Identification and Site Entry
A consistent campus identification sign standard should announce the presence of the University at key perimeter locations and entries. Serving to mark thresholds to the campus, these signs (Types A, F, and J) should express the University’s personality, character, and perhaps historic context in a way suitable to its landscape, reinforcing a sense of arrival and place within the campus environment.

Building and Entrance Identification
Building identification is currently limited to graphics mounted directly to building facades, usually in typefaces consistent with design of the individual building. It is recommended that this system be carried forward bearing in mind recommended graphic scales and illumination. Also recommended is the addition of free-standing building identification (Type I) signage for significant destinations often accessed by visitors (Sports Centre, Theatre, McGreer, etc.).

Parking Area and Accessible Parking Identification
Maintaining a consistent graphic language as other elements of the sign family, these signs (Types G and H) should identify parking locations and type in an appropriately scaled graphic which is legible while driving. These may also include real-time digital display of current capacity.

Directional Communication
A hierarchy of sign types is recommended which addresses separate visual communication needs for motorists within a uniform “family” of sign components.

On-Site Vehicular Directional
Directional signs (Types A and B) are the principal guiding tool for vehicular wayfinding, helping users better navigate through campus. This signage group should address parking and service access, campus precincts, and major destination venues only. The ability of the motorist to interpret sign messages while driving is limited to three to four messages. Therefore, it is imperative that the information on these signs be direct, brief and appropriately scaled. Pedestrian wayfinding signs will help guide users to their ultimate destinations.

Pedestrian Wayfinding
A uniform set of signs (Type C) to help pedestrians navigate the precincts of the campus and the network of walkways within will be a critical element of any proposed sign system. Since pedestrian movement is at a slow pace, more detailed information about specific destinations can be accommodated. However the extent of the detail should be limited so that directional and identification signs do not become cluttered with extraneous information.

Pedestrian Directional Communication
A standard for directing pedestrians to major destinations within the campuses (Types D and E) should be placed at the perimeter of visitor parking areas and at primary walkway intersections. Information should be limited to abbreviated building names (i.e., “Bassett Library,” rather than “John Bassett Memorial Library”), except in particular instances where significant visitor traffic is evident (i.e., the Office of Admissions).

Pedestrian Information Centres
Free-standing directory maps (Type E) oriented to the direction the viewer is facing, with a “you are here” designation, complement the pedestrian directional signs. If the implementation budget allows, maps could be wired with two-way intercoms which would allow for contact with Campus Security or campus tour guides. Separately placed bulletin board kiosks will provide areas for posting of student events and activities and reduce clutter on maps and site furnishings.

Wayfinding for Events
Event signs (Type D) should provide a uniform presentation of temporary information to the general public. Places of recurring events could utilize removable sign boards printed on standard sized panels by University facilities, which would be located at key decision points. A graphic template should be designed and enforced to ensure consistency of visual communication.

Street names
To facilitate wayfinding, a campus-wide naming system for vehicle and shared lanes is suggested.
6.12 Campus Sustainability

- Discourage sprawl in order to minimize the loss of open space, and the amount of fuel wasted in moving people and goods.
- Improve the energy efficiency of existing and future buildings - in the building envelope, the operational systems, the monitoring, and controls.
- Advocate for construction that maximizes the use of locally produced materials.
- Consider campus and building utilities in terms of their impacts on conservation, energy efficiency, and global warming.
- Changes to the campus landscape design should enhance plant and animal habitat, emphasize local species, minimize the amount of fuel used in maintenance, reduce the use of fertilizer and pesticides, and address water quality and runoff issues.
- Minimize driving through the use of parking management, incentives, rideshare programs, improved bicycle facilities, and by increasing the College's provision of affordable faculty and staff housing close to campus.
- Improve the pedestrian experience by strengthening the spatial cohesion of the campus, the path system, and the vehicular street system.
Recommendations

**General**

1. Establish a process by which decisions affecting the sustainability of the campus are made (and to resolve conflicts involving sustainability).
2. Consider the impact of decisions about facilities and operations on Carbon Neutrality and other aspects of sustainability, and assess costs and benefits over the long term.

**Buildings**

1. Adopt the LEED MC-Plus guidelines system for all renovation and new construction projects.
2. Design new buildings to be as energy-efficient as possible.
3. Improve the energy performance of existing campus buildings through improvements to their envelopes and building systems.
4. Assign priorities for improvements based on the energy audit of buildings on campus and on academic program and availability.
5. Encourage behavioural changes for students, faculty and staff, including adjustments to indoor temperatures and use of air-conditioning.
6. Meter all buildings for water, power, and steam.
7. Minimize the use and need of air-conditioning in campus buildings by using shading, natural ventilation and mechanically assisted ventilation.
8. Strategically plant deciduous shade trees on the south side of buildings to help reduce daytime solar heat gain during summer months.
9. Where appropriate, utilize energy-efficient means of cooling, such as geothermal, shading, natural and mechanical ventilation, etc.
10. Utilize refrigeration gases in air-conditioning and refrigeration systems that are as benign as possible, both in terms of their global warming potential and their ozone depletion potential.
11. Consider energy-efficient alternative systems for specialized functions in individual buildings, such as:
   - A purified water system for the new ice sheet, which will reduce the energy required to create the ice.
   - Heat exchangers for the recapture of waste heat (e.g., between the ice refrigeration system and swimming pool heating).
   - Heat exchangers for the recapture of waste heat in food service areas.
12. Investigate the feasibility of solar heating for domestic hot water.
13. Develop a life-cycle assessment for construction materials, considering cost, longevity, environmental damage caused by production, embodied energy, potential for recycling, disposal, hazards, etc.
14. Adaptive reuse of buildings should be considered before removal.
15. Building deconstruction should:
   - Minimize the quantity of materials entering the waste stream by employing deconstruction rather than demolition.
   - Materials salvaged from deconstruction should be considered for future use in anticipated building projects.
   - New construction projects should incorporate salvaged or recycled material where possible.

**Utilities**

1. Improve the efficiency of utility systems by upgrading steam and natural gas distribution as necessary.
2. Introduce monitoring and metering devices so that leaks and losses can be readily identified and excessive usage can be curtailed.
3. Develop a reporting log for comparing end-use measurements over time and verifying that the systems are performing as designed.

**Energy Sources**

1. Conduct an alternative energy assessment of the campus to understand better what forms of alternate energy are feasible and how best to employ them. Of particular interest is exploring the feasibility of utilizing river water for thermal exchange.
2. Reforest a portion of Bishop’s agricultural land to sequester carbon.
3. Increase Bishop’s on-campus generation of electricity from alternative renewable sources: wind power, photovoltaic panels, exercise machines.
4. **Vehicular Travel and Commuting**

1. Follow Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to reduce private vehicle use by faculty, staff and students.
   - Establish a target for a reduced levels of carbon emissions due to regular commuting.
   - Provide incentives for faculty and staff who would typically commute to campus via private car to utilize instead public transportation, walk, or bike.
   - Provide incentives for using shuttle services such as passes or financial compensation.
   - Provide financial incentives for car pooling.
   - Provide vehicles for emergency use by faculty and staff who use public transit or car pooling for their daily commutes.
   - Provide the majority of parking spaces in peripheral campus lots to reduce car use during the day.
   - Eliminate parking in the Central Campus (with the exception of accessibility / short term visitors / barrier-free requirements).
   - Relocate all student parking to the Patterson lot to discourage students from using their cars for short trips during the school year.
2. Prioritize local meetings and conferences or utilize teleconferences to minimize air travel.
3. Begin shifting campus fleet vehicles where appropriate, from gasoline or diesel fuels to electric power or hybrid fuel.
4. Encourage outside vendors to use alternative fuel or hybrid vehicles, for instance private bussing companies.
5. Develop a non-riding policy for campus deliveries, outside vendors, athletics buses, etc.
6. Initiate an hourly/daily car rental program available to students, faculty, and staff.
7. Increase on-campus housing capacity and alternatives.

**Bicycle Transportation Recommendations**

1. Develop a comprehensive bicycle program, for both the regular academic year and the summer, that includes access, maintenance, information, and safety.
2. Make the campus more bicycle friendly by:
   - Providing sufficient parking for bicycles, with attention to number, location and type of bike racks.
   - Widening pathways to accommodate bicycle use along major corridors.
   - Constructing curb cuts at all locations where pathways intersect roads.
   - Replacing all storm sewer drain covers that are not bicycle-friendly.
   - Providing showers in more locations for bicycle commuters.
   - Providing secure covered storage locations for bicycle commuters.
3. Develop an incentive program to promote bicycle commuting by employees.
4. Integrate the University’s bicycle transportation initiatives with efforts by the Borough of Lennoxville and City of Sherbrooke to promote bicycle transportation.
5. Expand the bicycle loan program.

**Landscape and Open Space**

1. All new construction at Bishop’s should be planned within the existing developed area of the campus.
2. New buildings and hardscape should not be built in green areas remote from the core campus.
3. Plant materials should be local species, if possible.
4. Reduce the amount of lawn by converting it to greenwod, meadows, trees with groundcover, and forest as appropriate in different areas of campus.
5. Increase the amount of habitat suitable for indigenous plants and animals.
6. Increase the inter-connectedness of plant and animal habitat by linking currently isolated areas.
7. Continue to reduce the amount of herbicides and pesticides used.
8. Improve soils and drainage, particularly in heavily used areas of campus.
9. Protect sensitive or critical areas by establishing a Green Reserve.
10. Provide summer shade for building facades with trees and shrubs.
11. Design the campus landscape to encourage social interactions and a variety of uses:
   - Orient plazas and terraces outside of academic and residential buildings to maximize daylight and solar heat gain.
   - Provide seating in protected areas and in locations best suited to capture the views of near and distant landscape types.
Supply Chain Management
1. Initiate a purchasing plan that prioritizes sustainable materials and supplies, and prioritizes purchases from companies invested in maintaining their own sustainability standards.
2. Strive to use suppliers located within 500 kilometres of the campus.
3. Encourage suppliers to use recyclable and returnable packaging as shipping materials.
4. Ensure that Bishop’s does not engage in unfair trade or limit growth opportunities in the region.
5. Support and serve as a catalyst for sustainable Quebec businesses.

University Finances
1. Make every effort to invest in environmentally friendly, socially responsible areas.

Reporting, Record-Keeping, and Guidelines
1. Institute a formalized record-keeping and reporting system for issues of sustainability, such as that developed by the Global Reporting Initiative.
2. Develop formal guidelines, including performance benchmarks, for capital projects, maintenance, deconstruction and operational activities.
3. Utilize the reporting and record-keeping system to monitor successes, areas for improvement, costs and benefits, and to more accurately attribute costs and benefits to actions taken.
4. Report performance against guidelines and principles through an annual report.
5. Develop maintenance guidelines and schedules to meet the recommendations for improving energy efficiency and thermal comfort by upgrading the envelopes of existing buildings.
6. Revise the energy accounting system to equitably allocate the greenhouse gases associated with the production of steam and co-generated electricity.
7. Work with suppliers and encourage them to conduct their own greenhouse gas inventory and life cycle assessments. Estimate the full greenhouse gas emissions associated with materials and energy purchased and produced, including the embodied energy of supplies and construction materials, and the energy consumed in the production, refinement, processing, shipping and combustion of energy sources.

Water Management
1. Implement a rainwater collection system for water from the athletic buildings, and use it to supply water for irrigation of fields where needed.
2. Create bioswales, appropriately located, to reduce stormwater runoff and to improve water quality.

Campus Operations Recommendations
Off-Campus
1. Chart travel emissions for off-campus activities and include them in carbon reports.
2. Strive to reduce carbon emissions due to travel.

On-Campus
1. Establish maintenance and operations schedules for campus grounds and buildings, including building envelope upgrades.
2. Install dining services storage capacities relative to the locations of dining operations and delivery schedules.
3. Reduce energy use by building equipment on-site.
4. Develop parking policies and processes for transportation management.
1. Develop a Carbon Offset purchase and management program to compensate for irreducible greenhouse gas emissions.
6.13 Accessibility

Introduction

Since the mid-1970s, the Quebec government has taken measures to promote inclusive education, work and social environments. These measures have included the enactment, in 1976, of the first building code to set standards for accessibility for wheelchair users, and the adoption in 1978 of the Act to Secure the Rights of the Disabled. This Act provided for regulations to be brought forth which pertained to buildings constructed prior to 1976, so as to promote accessibility for people with disabilities.

Currently in Quebec, no regulation specifically targets existing buildings built before 1976, unless they are subject to alterations. However, amendments to the Act, introduced in 2004, include a specific obligation for government departments and agencies as well as municipalities to produce an “action plan” for accessibility, including accessibility to public buildings. Bishop’s University, as a public higher education institution, and increasingly a community resource, should move towards the development of its own “action plan” and begin a formal process of identifying and removing barriers that are considered “readily-achievable.”

Although this process is not mandated by the current Quebec legislation, it is recommended that the University initiate a comprehensive accessibility audit in anticipation of shifts in Quebec law. Varied and sporadic barrier removals have taken place on campus, mostly as a reactive response to a problem, rather than as part of a systematic, Campus-wide plan to increase accessibility. While the one-on-one response to a

---

LEGEND

- Accessible Building
- Partially Accessible Building
- Inaccessible Building
- Accessible Route
- Accessible Entrance
- Parking for people with disabilities

---

Existing building and route accessibility
student’s request is well-intentioned, and is in fact consistent with Quebec legislation, a person with a disability should not have to request that structural modifications be made to common areas of the campus. Such requests constitute a burden that affects students with disabilities alone, and is therefore inconsistent with the premise of equal accessibility. While a few upgrades have been achieved, a number of campus buildings remain inaccessible. Student housing stock has some accessible rooms, but additional fully accessible rooms are needed. Legal settlements with academic institutions in the United States typically stipulate that a minimum of 3% of available beds be made accessible. Further, residence hall study lounges are not accessible, preventing students with physical disabilities from full participation in student and campus life, as well as inclusion in “Learning Communities.”

An accessible campus is one that accommodates the widest range of potential users, including people with mobility, visual or auditory impairments or other special needs. It includes not only accessible buildings but also accessible landscapes, transit, communication and information systems.

The current Code de construction du Québec (CCQ) as administered by the Régie du bâtiment du Québec (RBQ) establishes a baseline set of building standards targeting barrier-free access for individuals with disabilities. While accessibility compliance is required for all new construction, it is recommended that Bishop’s set forth a plan for readily achievable barrier removal within the existing facilities and throughout the campus landscape.

The Exterior Environment

Improvements to the exterior campus environment shown in the Master Plan will be transformational, both aesthetically and in terms of accessibility. Throughout the Master Plan, landscaping projects address major accessibility concerns on the campus through the planning of accessible routes. As existing buildings are renovated or new facilities are built, not only the building but also the immediate site must be made as barrier-free as possible in accordance with Quebec guidelines. In order to make a more accessible and inviting campus, the entire campus should also be brought into a state of compliance where feasible. An overall goal is to create a network of accessible routes so that every building that is at least partially accessible is connected to all other at least partially accessible facilities along an accessible route. The following exterior improvements are examples of readily achievable barrier removal:

- Installing compliant ramps
- Making curb cuts in sidewalks and entrances
- Widening doors
- Installing offset hinges to widen doorways
- Installing accessible door hardware
- Creating designated accessible parking spaces

The Interior Environment

Setting Priorities

Some buildings whose accessibility is of high priority to the University have already been renovated, or are on their way to being fully accessible. Other buildings are lacking in many of the major criteria that make a building not only welcoming and equitable for a person with a disability, but that also reflect favourably upon the University. Each facility’s use, location and prominence in campus life should factor into the equation when prioritizing accessibility improvements. Priority should be placed on buildings with the highest use by students, faculty, staff, and visitors. Of these, the highest priority buildings for achieving barrier removal are those with highly public functions, particularly those one-of-a-kind structures which serve functions that cannot readily be moved to another venue. Examples include the Theatre, Sports Centre, Stadium, Library and Student Centre. Highly used academic buildings including Johnson, Hamilton and Nicolls should also be a top priority. Next priority should be given to student life issues, such as eating and drinking establishments, sport and fitness facilities. Select residential halls should be made barrier-free so that individuals with disabilities are able to live in a variety of environments over their years at the University. When substantial barrier removal will not be conducted on a particular facility, the reasons for the University’s decision should be clearly documented. For example, if the program in that facility will be moved to another location, or if that building will be replaced within several years according to the Master Plan, it may be reasonable for the University to postpone substantial barrier removal until the renovation. Documentation of the University’s decisions should be placed in the University’s accessibility compliance files.
Readily Achievable Barrier Removal

A “readily achievable” barrier removal refers to one that is easily accomplished without much difficulty or expense. Issues which may affect whether or not barrier removal is readily achievable include the cost of the action in relation to the institution's financial resources, its number of employees, and the number and type of the institution’s other facilities. As the University’s resources are not limitless, priorities must also be set in terms of which barriers are eliminated first. The top priority is getting all individuals through the door, utilizing physical means that are efficient and that respect the dignity of individuals with disabilities. The next priority is providing access to public goods and services, followed by providing access to restrooms and other public facilities.

First Priority:
• Installing ramps
• Widening doors
• Installing offset hinges to widen doorways
• Eliminating a turnstile or providing an alternative accessible path
• Installing accessible door hardware
• Installing flashing alarm lights

Second Priority:
• Removing high-pile, low-density carpeting
• Rearranging tables, chairs, vending machines, display racks and other furniture

Third Priority:
• Installing grab bars in toilet stalls
• Rearranging toilet partitions to increase maneuvering space
• Insulating lavatory pipes under sinks to prevent burns
• Installing a raised toilet seat
• Installing a full-length bathroom mirror

Fourth Priority:
• Repositioning shelves
• Repositioning telephones
• Adding raised markings on elevator controls
• Installing an accessible paper cup dispenser at existing inaccessible water fountains

The University should take steps not only to create accessibility for individuals with mobility issues that require the use of a wheelchair, but also to eliminate barriers to individuals with other disabilities. For example, door and faucet hardware should be corrected, to benefit individuals with limited hand dexterity; Braille and raised character signage should be installed for those who have vision loss; and visual strobe alarms should be installed for hearing-impaired or deaf individuals.

Alternatives to Barrier Removal

When the University cannot provide physical access to certain spaces, it should train employees and institute methods for making its services accessible. Alternative methods to providing individuals with disabilities access to public goods, services and accommodations at Bishop’s must be instituted if doing so is readily achievable. For example, the University is responsible for providing accessible courses and examinations, but not all classroom and examination facilities must be accessible. Alternatives must be provided that make the experience equal and comparable to the experience provided to others, and the individual should not be required to bear the cost of any modifications or auxiliary aids.

System-wide Improvements

For new construction and major renovation projects, it is recommended that the University:
• Conduct accessibility design reviews of all architectural design documents for new construction/renovation projects so that errors can be identified and corrected on paper in advance of construction.
• Establish an annual budget for readily-achievable barrier removal throughout the campus. The budget should be sufficient to reach readily-achievable accessibility within five years.
• Establish normally scheduled routines for the Buildings & Grounds Department to ensure that accessible features are operational and usable. Though mechanical failures of elevators and automatic doors will occur occasionally, persistent failures, inadequate maintenance or defunct equipment impede meeting the requirement for providing access to a public accommodation.
• Create and post evacuation route maps for all buildings illustrating the fastest route out of buildings — for persons with mobility as well as persons with disabilities. In lieu of accessible routes, the locations of Areas of Rescue Assistance for persons with disabilities should be posted.
• Implement effective communication systems, such as accessible website design, public and emergency telephones that provide TDD/TTY (telecommunication device for the deaf/text-telephone device, respectively) service, and assisted listening devices should be provided. Key to this is the availability of such devices. Finally, the University should ensure that strobe alarms are installed in all common public areas.
Establish an awareness campaign geared toward accessibility. This campaign could include initiatives like focus group sessions, the publication of accessibility policies, the publication and distribution of accessibility information and a map detailing the location of accessible parking, exterior routes, shuttle stops, entrances, rest rooms, etc.

- Accessibility information should be readily available before individuals arrive on campus. It is strongly recommended that the University restructure its website and add to the accessibility features.
- The job description for the Disability Student Advisor position should be revised to reflect these initiatives.
- A proactive approach to both barrier removal and ensuring that all renovations and new construction fully comply with accessibility requirements is strongly recommended.
7. Implementation Strategy
7.1 Process and Procedures

Implementation

The phased implementation of any Master Plan is an inherently complex and an ever-changing process. While some of these initiatives are discretionary (such as wayfinding), others may be imperative (such as utilities infrastructure or accessibility upgrades). Some may be achieved at relatively low cost while carrying out maintenance-related improvements, while others may bring higher costs. Some of these projects may be paid for by planned capital campaigns, while others are the result of unpredictable funding opportunities.

The 2018 Master Plan, in accordance with the previous version, has been conceived as a living document, establishing a framework for future decision-making. While some of the initiatives proposed are quite specific, and developed with precision, others are put forth as intentionally flexible, requiring further inquiry, analysis, technical development and design study. While spatial relationships between future buildings and amongst landscapes are identified and prescribed, specific building and landscape programs, their dimensions, and detailed technical resolution are intentionally left open for future development. This future project development, the management of the campus interim phases, and the ongoing critique and revision of the Master Plan require that the University establish an oversight structure and regular review process for decision-making going forward.

Master Plan Oversight and Governance

Historically, oversight of campus development initiatives at Bishop’s has been shared between the University’s Buildings & Grounds Department and the Sustainable Development Committee, each reporting independently to the Board of Governors. Both committees are made up of members of administration, staff, faculty, students and external representatives, with some members appointed to both committees.

Oversight of the 2012 Campus Master Plan was carried out by a separate body, the Master Plan Consultative Group, which has called on subcommittees in specialized areas of study (i.e., parking, accessibility, sustainability, residential life, etc.) for input. For the Master Plan updating process, several members of the 2012 Consultative Group, as well as new members, participated in the exercise.

Several 2012 recommendations regarding planning oversight still need to be implement:

1. An independent group of professionals has been appointed to assist the Oversight Committee. Its professionals in Architecture, Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture participate on request and offer broad experience in campus and campus landscape planning.
2. A Campus Planning Oversight Committee to report directly to the Board of Governors. The Committee will be in charge of the ongoing review and development of the Campus Master Plan, and the review of specific projects’ compliance with the Plan’s intent and principles. This Committee should meet on a bi-annual basis to review the status of ongoing campus initiatives. In the interest of maintaining continuity and an ongoing historical knowledge of these initiatives, the term of appointment to this Committee should span a minimum of two academic years. Appointment terms within the Committee should also staggered to reinforce this continuity.
The Master Plan articulates a long-term view of the potential spatial development of the Bishop’s campus — the relationships between and amongst buildings, landscape, vehicles, pedestrians and spaces beyond its limits. Each project the University undertakes has the potential to activate and contribute to this longer-range vision. To achieve it, individual projects must follow a three-tiered planning process towards execution.

Campus Plan Review

The Master Plan does not anticipate building programs or detailed technical challenges of specific projects. As new projects are considered, each should first be reviewed and tested in the context of the Master Plan. In certain instances, alternative project sites and program mixes should be considered with an eye to the impact the project will have on the campus as a whole.

District Plans

Bridging the Master Plan and specific project site plans are District Plans. The latter should guide the development of every new site, examining specific impacts on landscape, pedestrian circulation and building context. In turn, every District Plan needs to respect the overall orientations developed for each landscape unit (Section 4.2 General Orientations). Landscape units are buildings and open spaces that share urban, architectural and landscape characteristics (Historic Frontage, Riverfront, Main Entrance, etc.).

Site Plans

These plans test with greater specificity the technical, environmental and fiscal feasibility of a proposed project, eventually leading to its design development and the production of construction documentation.
### A – Pedestrian Experience, Vehicle Traffic and Parking

**Primary Projects**
1. Replan Main Entrance and installation of traffic lights *
2. Build new parking lot *
3. Provide a grassy expanse (half the size of a soccer field) for free sport and games*
4. Clear access to river **
5. Build new services building **

**Supporting Projects**
6. Landscape of new and existing parking lots **
7. Relocate existing storage facility *
8. Reforest around the new parking lot *
9. Implement new pedestrian pathway **
10. Plant trees, install lighting and urban furniture **

### B – Campus Entrance – West

**Primary Projects**
1. Move vehicle roads away from building façades *
2. Eliminate parking spots *
3. Create a pedestrian bridge over Massawippi River ***

**Supporting Projects**
4. Showcase architecture of historic buildings through illumination **
5. Make chapel landscape improvements **
6. Restore sedge meadow in flood zone **

### C – Old Quad

**Primary Projects**
1. Open a passage through between Pollack and Bandeen Hall **

**Supporting Projects**
2. Realign paths in Old Quad *
3. Plant trees, install lighting and urban furniture *

### D – Academic Quad

**Primary Projects**
1. Remove parking and build a shared lane *
2. Expand Nichols Building ***
3. Expand Marjorie Donald House (Student Centre) ***
4. Build new Academic building ***
5. Create interior connection from Nichols Building to the Student Centre ***

**Supporting Projects**
6. Plant new woodland **
7. Plant trees, install lighting and urban furniture **

### E – Student Center and Arts Court

**Primary Projects**
1. Remove parking pavement *
2. Build amphitheatre **
3. Move Buildings & Grounds department in the new service building **
4. Reforest existing plaza at Centennial Theatre **
5. Arts Café: renovate building, build extension ***

**Supporting Projects**
6. Plant trees **
7. Steel lawn **
8. Landscape footpaths **

### F – Student Centre and residences

**Primary Projects**
1. Build a 100 beds residences in front of Dewhurst *
2. Expand Paterson Hall if needed to compensate the lost of beds during the demolition of Mackinon Hall *
3. Reforest the existing cafeteria *
4. Demolish Mackinon Hall *
5. Build a 100 beds residence in Mackinon’s current location *
6. Option: If a residence larger than 100 beds is needed, it’s possible to construct a 4 stories residence beside Paterson Hall. *

**Supporting Projects**
7. Plant trees, integrate pedestrian paths, install urban furniture, remove paved surfaces for cars within residential zone *

### G – Sports Facilities

**Primary Projects**
1. Create a sports field**
2. Expand John H. Sport and Recreation Centre **
3. Upgrading the Peter Curry Marsh* 
4. Enhancing the specific biodiversity around the Peter Curry Marsh* 
5. Introduction of a forested protective buffer zone for Peter Curry Marsh* 

**Supporting Projects**
6. Development of wooded areas composed of tree groves, grasslands and bio-retention wetlands*** 
7. Creation of the Sentier HOPPS Trail within new wooded area***

### 7.3 Phasing

* Short term (0-5 years)
** Mid-term (5-10 years)
*** Long term (10-20 years)

Three significant groups of initiatives may be broadly identified, within which a number of projects may be executed as new opportunities arise. These initiatives and their projects are identified in diagrams on the following pages.

### Pedestrian Bridge:

A new pedestrian bridge, aligned with the axis of the former covered bridge abutment, will link Bishop’s across the Massawippi River to College Street (Route 108), providing a dignified pedestrian threshold to the campus. An alternative to the harried and at unpleasent experience of the existing crossing along the College Street Bridge, the new-bridge will provide a continuous pedestrian transition between campus and town, visually engaging the Massawippi as an identifying element of the Bishop’s campus.

### Near Term

**Capital Improvements / Establishment of Perimeter Road**

Several projects have been realized in compliance with the 2012 Master Plan since it was adopted. The expansion of the John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre and the development of sports facilities have endowed the University with equipment of national calibre. These projects have rendered obsolete the W.B. Scott Arena, whose demolition forms part of the Master Plan, to make way for a new aboveground parking lot and reforestation. This recent project prompted the redevelopment of the main entranceway to the complex as well as projected parking areas in the campus’s peripheral areas.

**Campus Entry – Pedestrian and Vehicular**

Ceremonial Entrance: This entryway is currently configured as an off-ramp for eastbound traffic on Route 108, and for many drivers acts as their principal entrance to campus. This configuration, originally established to mitigate the hazard of cued vehicles being invisible to eastbound traffic, encourages entrance onto campus at high speed for all types of vehicles. This creates a danger, particularly for pedestrians approaching the campus from Lennoxville, and diminishes the presence of the University’s most valued historic landmarks.

In complement to the transformation of John Bassett Memorial Library and the creation of a new pedestrian bridge over the Massawippi River, facilitating access to the historic heart of campus, the Master Plan proposes the realignment of pedestrian paths inside the Old Quad and the establishment of a new landscape development through tree-planting and installation of lighting that embellishes the buildings.
8. Conclusion
Team - 2012

The original Master Plan was the result of almost two years of effort by the professional team, working in close collaboration with members of the Bishop's University community, as well as with representatives of Champlain College and the Town of Lennoxville. The professional team was directed by Peter Rose and Paul Puciata of Peter Rose Architecte / ARCOP, along with Principal Laura Solano and Neil Budzinski of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Landscape Architects, and Principal Matthias Schuler of Transsolar Climate Engineers, who was responsible for energy strategies and sustainability. The process began with several days of meetings, interviews and workshops with more than 100 members of the Bishop's, Champlain and Lennoxville communities, resulting in the document “Proceedings of the Centre Multisports et de Santé et Campus Development Forum” that outlined basic objectives and goals to guide the master planning work.

Team - 2018

This update to the Master Plan is the product of close collaboration between Lemay’s professional team and members of the Bishop’s University community. Under the direction of Michel Dufresne, an urban planning associate with Lemay and the project’s director, a team of urban planners, urban designers, architects and landscape architects was able to resume the important work done by the team of Peter Rose Architecte / ARCOP and Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates and take it to the next level, reflecting the University’s current aspirations and vision for the future. Inspired by its own great number of workshops, research and a long process of reflection on the development vision to shape this unique campus, this newest edition lays the foundation for a future Bishop’s University campus in continuity with the original Master Plan of 2012.

Methodology - 2012

The methodology of the team began with extensive research into the 166-year history of the University, which led to a series of analyses of this history, as well as a detailed analysis of the present condition of the Bishop’s University campus. Via an ongoing series of workshops and studies, the professional team developed a broad range of proposals for the future of the Bishop’s University Campus, the result of which is the 2012 Master Plan.

2018

Starting from the same basics as the work delivered in 2012 by the team of Peter Rose Architecte / ARCOP and Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, the Lemay team initially aimed to measure the impact of measures identified in the preceding Master Plan, as well as the state of projects already executed. Thanks to numerous workshops with Bishop’s community representatives, the Lemay team was also able to develop its own reflection on the development of the campus while paying particular attention to its landscape development components. This marriage of the original proposals and the results of the current exercise make this Master Plan a true living document, evolving to respond to the development needs of Bishop’s University for years to come.
One of the major goals of the Master Plan is to make the campus more walkable. Although pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles all need to be accommodated on campus, it is the organization of pedestrian circulation that should be given precedence in the central spaces of campus. The strategic rearrangement of parking and vehicle traffic on campus will allow true pedestrian sovereignty to be feasible.

Located on unceded traditional Abenaki territory, at the junction of St. Francis and Massawippi rivers, Bishop’s University’s existence was due, in part, to the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, which saw the City of Sherbrooke develop as a prosperous manufacturing and business centre – harnessing enormous amounts of hydroelectric power from its rivers, connecting to the rest of North America with its steam-powered railway system. In many ways, the Bishop’s of today was also shaped by another revolution, this time of the 20th century: the emergence of the automobile as the primary means of transportation. Necessitating the construction of countless highways and parking lots, especially between 1950 and 1975, the height of this “revolution” coincided with the construction of the vast majority of Bishop’s buildings – some 74% of its existing campus.

The University is pursuing its second master planning exercise at another opportune moment in history – as the world is in the throes of yet another powerful, consequential agent of change. In the context of the present Master Plan, and for the University driving it, the Digital Revolution offers improved access to more and better data of all forms, and especially better data analysis tools. The latter support us in giving data a meaningful shape, and empower us to map, model, simulate and precisely evaluate strategies for the future.

Simply put, planning tools have never been more powerful. Judiciously deployed, they offer the possibility of better and more strategically effective master plans than ever before.

8.3 An Opportune Moment