Campus and Community Planning Engagement Charter

2018 Annual Review

MARCH 2019

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

UBC's two main campuses are located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the xwməθ–kwəyˇəm (Musqueam) and Syilx (Okanagan) peoples. Other UBC activities take place on Indigenous lands throughout British Columbia and beyond. UBC's relationship with Indigenous people and communities is central to the University. The University's Strategic Plan, "Shaping UBC's Next Century", calls for a deepening of engagement with our Indigenous partners. The University's draft Indigenous Strategic Plan provides a framework to pursue this deepened engagement, with collaboration and equality as guiding principles. This deeper engagement is now underway and works alongside the implementation and refinement of Campus and Community Planning's Engagement Charter.

C+CP conducts an annual review to reinforce transparency and accountability on the Board of Governors adopted Engagement Charter, which identifies core principles and guiding practices for consultation on C+CP-led plans and development projects. Previous annual reviews have broadly focused on the department's engagement practices. The scope of this year's review focused on engagement practices specific to development permitting and construction on campus. This provided an opportunity for an in-depth review of the standard engagement practices used in the development approval process through to project implementation. The review was based on consultation with key stakeholders who are regularly involved with/or impacted by development permitting and construction on campus. It summarizes 2018 engagement activities; analyzes stakeholder feedback – highlighting areas of strength and possible improvements; and identifies enhanced engagement commitments for 2019.

ENHANCED ENGAGEMENT COMMITMENTS FOR 2019

C+ CP has identified commitments to enhance engagement practices for development permitting, based on the outcomes of the 2018 Annual Review. These will be monitored and reported on in future annual reviews. They are listed below, according to the Engagement Charter's three phases: 1. Defining, 2. Designing and Implementing, and 3. Concluding the Process:

Defining the Process
1. Review and refine approaches to notification and outreach, including a) identifying ways to reach newcomers and ESL community members; and b) strengthening the ability of UBC departments and partner organizations to engage their membership in development planning on campus.
2. Clearly define and communicate to stakeholders and community members the parameters for each engagement, including the project purpose, engagement objectives, type/level of involvement, and how input will be used.

Designing and Implementing the Process:
3. Identify opportunities to gather feedback on projects in advance of the development permit application stage, as appropriate.
4. Provide more information on the context for a development proposal, such as the project rationale and benefits; policy and planning context; and siting and design principles used, as appropriate to the project.

Concluding the Process
5. Develop a systematic approach to assess and summarize how feedback informed the project proposal.
6. Establish consistent methods for sharing outcomes, including how input informed the final project design and next steps, e.g., construction and traffic management plans.
7. Ensure timely notifications and information updates (e.g. construction, detours, and tree removals) during the project and provide contact information, for any issues that arise.

ANALYSIS OF STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK – SUMMARY

Analysis of stakeholder feedback suggested the following strengths and possible improvements, both general and for each of the three Charter phases.

General Strengths:
Almost all review participants agreed that C+CP does a "good" or "excellent" job overall with engagement in development permitting, and offered their suggestions only as refinements. The Charter is seen as an increasingly valuable engagement planning and accountability tool, and is becoming better known by stakeholders and other departments.

C+CP staff are seen as demonstrating their commitment to the Charter through ongoing improvement to their consultation and engagement processes. Communication and collaboration with the administration and other departments, including project applicants, has improved. Relationships between community stakeholders and development staff are generally good. Stakeholders appreciate the C+CP's annual charter reviews, with some support for annual reporting on how results are being addressed.

General Suggestions:
C+CP should continue to reinforce – with applicants and stakeholders – the message that engagement brings benefits in both generating ideas to improve projects and strengthening the university community. Two-way communications, listening and responding, even if not all input can be addressed, builds trust which supports future engagement processes, and strengthens relationships.

A. DEFINING THE PROCESS

1. **Identification of and outreach to stakeholders impacted by or interested in development proposals**

Strengths: C+CP generally reaches the right stakeholders for development projects; outreach continues to improve. Notifying and working with stakeholders through university associations and organizations is an effective channel. Notifications have improved, people are receiving information from a variety of sources.

Possible improvements:
- Consult earlier with the UBC academic community on projects, leveraging relevant UBC committees to identify opportunities, constraints and risks before proposals are fully developed.
- Use pre-consultation to tailor outreach methods, especially for participants who may be unlikely to hear about, or participate in routine methods, such as an open house or survey.
- Continue to work with campus and partner organizations, but consider also (1) supporting them to strengthen their engagement with members, and (2) reaching out directly to their

members using other engagement methods.

- Consult with neighbourhood and multicultural organizations and community leaders on how to broaden newcomer and ESL community engagement.

2. **Communicating the objectives and scope of each engagement process and how input will be used**

Applicants and stakeholders are often unclear about the objectives and scope of engagement on development permitting. Participant expectations for influence often exceed what is possible from a policy, planning and regulatory perspective.

Possible improvements:
- Define and communicate to applicants and stakeholders the parameters for each engagement, as appropriate to the project. Topics might include the project purpose, engagement objectives and levels of participation; and how input will be recorded, used and reported.
- To ensure transparency and manage expectations, be frank and direct. Knowing the parameters helps stakeholders manage their time and effort and provides greater process certainty for applicants.

B. **DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING THE PROCESS:**

3. **Providing the right type and amount of information, and at the right time, for effective engagement**

Strengths: Stakeholders said they generally get the right amount and type of information, and can access additional information, if needed.

Possible improvements:
- Consider inserting new or strengthened consultation opportunities at an earlier stage in the development planning process, before the permit application is submitted, for key projects. This is already done to a degree through C+CP's precinct planning, which includes consultation on an area before specific projects are proposed.
- Ensure that the type and level of information provided matches the engagement parameters, i.e., what do people most need to know? Consider providing more information as part of initial notifications to allow more people to respond.
- Continue to improve communication materials and methods, including simplifying the language; favouring user-friendly design and "low-text" content (infographics, videos, photos); and using site visits and models. This will also aid ESL participants. Continue to expand digital information; much is still print and text-based.

4. **Use of on-line and hard copy feedback forms at open houses; other methods?**

C+CP's current methods are generally seen as appropriate for engagement on permitting; "pop-up" events and visits to organizations help reach people who may not otherwise participate.

Possible improvements:
- Broaden outreach to the uninvolved, using multiple techniques, e.g., expand and vary the types and locations of pop-up events to reach community members "where they are". Further improve the C+CP website, which is seen as a useful but underutilized reference.

5. **Should additional information be provided, and if so, in what formats?**

UBC's complex governance (i.e., "Who is UBC?") results in uncertainty for many stakeholders (especially newcomers and/or ESL community members and neighbours) as to who owns, controls and regulates land parcels, buildings and roads; how campus development processes work; and who to contact with concerns. This lack of knowledge often limits their ability to engage in development and planning.

Possible improvements:
- Develop user-friendly materials – maps, "road maps", flow charts, graphics and videos – to explain campus and off-campus governance and decision-making. Outline development processes, including jurisdictions, functions, responsibilities and contacts, and C+CP's role in development, e.g., "Quick Facts about C+CP".
- Communicate to stakeholders a clear rationale for the project, including its purpose, benefits for the university, and siting and design principles used. Provide information on the context, including UBC's strategic directions; policies, plans and Technical Guidelines; and how technical analysis has shaped project design (as appropriate to the project scale and scope).

C. CONCLUDING THE PROCESS:

6. **Sharing the outcomes of the development permit process**

Those familiar with the process suggested that overall, stakeholder input is generally well summarized and communicated to applicants, and to decision-makers up to the Board of Governors level. Yet virtually all stakeholders said this stage could be improved, as they rarely hear back about the results of the process. "Closing the loop" provides closure, demonstrates transparency and accountability, and builds relationships and trust for future engagement processes, even when the scope of influence is limited.

Possible improvements:
- Develop a clear approach and criteria for assessing and responding to input, including explaining what can and can't be changed, and why, e.g., policy goals and financial and technical opportunities and constraints. Specify how input is balanced across strong and divergent views, and considered alongside technical analysis.
- Ensure that engagement summaries are useful to the project team by making them concise and timely, and by analyzing concerns raised, and how widely and strongly they are felt.
- Ensure more systematic application of the Charter principles on "sharing outcomes" (pg. 7). Inform participants directly about results of the process, with thanks. As appropriate to the project, include information on final project siting and design; alignment with university priorities, polices, plans and guidelines; public input and influence; next steps (e.g., construction and transportation schedules); and contact information, should issues arise. Include affected stakeholders who didn't participate in notification and updates.
- Solicit ongoing feedback from stakeholders on how engagement in development could be improved (follow up on Enhanced Commitments in Section 4), e.g., Add a question to the standard feedback form and annual Charter Review. Evaluate a sample of projects at intervals, using an on-line survey and/or interviews.

7. **Ongoing project communications, once a project is underway (notifications, updates, contacts and channels for feedback on issues during construction)**

Notification channels around construction and transportation have improved, but could be more effective in both timeliness and reach. Due to the UBC's complex governance, some residents are unsure whom to contact with concerns and complaints.

Possible improvements:

- Ensure timely electronic and signage notifications related to construction and transportation (e.g., three weeks). Stakeholders accept that projects will have impacts but need time to plan around them. Additional consultation may be needed to identity and mitigate impacts.
- Strengthen approach for communicating updates on project changes, delays and disruptions, and publicize contact information for community members to report emerging concerns.

1.   Purpose and Process

UBC's two main campuses are located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the xwməθ–kwəy̓əm (Musqueam) and Syilx (Okanagan) peoples. Other UBC activities take place on Indigenous lands throughout British Columbia and beyond. UBC's relationship with Indigenous people and communities is central to the University. The University's Strategic Plan, "Shaping UBC's Next Century", calls for a deepening of engagement with our Indigenous partners. The University's draft Indigenous Strategic Plan provides a framework to pursue this deepened engagement, with collaboration and equality as guiding principles. This deeper engagement is now underway and works alongside the implementation and refinement of Campus and Community Planning's Engagement Charter.

Engagement is central to the University's academic mission, administration, planning and community relationships. The UBC Board of Governors adopted C+CP's [Engagement Charter](#) in September 2014, after consultation with stakeholders and partners. The Charter sets out C+CP's promise to the community on engagement by identifying core principles and guiding practices for consultation on planning and development projects.

C+CP conducts an annual review to reinforce transparency and accountability on Charter commitments to its stakeholders and to the Board of Governors. Previous annual reviews have broadly focused on the department's engagement practices. The scope of this year's review focused on engagement practices specific to development permitting and construction on campus which was based on a commitment made by C+CP, as part of the 2017 Annual Review. This provided an opportunity for an in-depth review of the standard engagement practices used in the development approval process through to project implementation. The purpose of the 2018 review, conducted in February 2019, was to:

- summarize C+CP's 2018 engagement activities;
- gather stakeholder views on C+CP engagement practices for development permitting and construction activity; and
- identify enhanced engagement commitments for 2019, based on stakeholder and staff input.

C+CP engaged a consultant to co-design the review process; conduct semi- structured interviews and a focus group involving 16 people in total, along with a meeting presentation and feedback session; summarize results; and provide strategic advice on engagement. Stakeholders who participated are regularly involved with/or impacted by development permitting and construction on campus, including permit applicants; campus residents and neighbours; and their representatives; and student and UBC leadership. Appendix A lists participants and Appendix B lists the review questions.

2. 2018 Engagement Activities

During 2018, C+CP designed and delivered the following engagement initiatives, based on the Charter principles and practices, and on stakeholder/partner suggestions from previous annual charter reviews.

a) Area, Building and Landscape Planning Processes

Development Permit Open Houses

A public meeting may be held at the discretion of the Director of Planning for major Institutional/Public Realm/Neighbourhood development permit applications or minor projects that generate significant public interest. In 2018, seven Public Open Houses were held, including four Institutional and three Neighbourhood projects.

Institutional/Public Realm Open Houses

1. DP10001-6 Bioenergy Research Demonstration Facility (BRDF) Expansion
2. DP18013T AMS Sustainability Mobile
3. DP18045 MacInnes Field and Public Realm Upgrades
4. DP18048 TRIUMF Institute of Advanced medical Isotopes (IAMI)

Neighbourhood Open Houses

5. DP18001 Wesbrook Place Lot 8 (Ivy on the Park)
6. DP18011T Temporary Beach Volleyball Courts – Wesbrook Place
7. DP18028 Wesbrook Place Lot 4 (Mundell House)

Stadium Neighbourhood

UBC builds neighbourhoods to support its academic mission. This includes providing affordable housing for faculty, staff and students. UBC's Stadium Neighbourhood planning process is shaping the University's next neighbourhood. It began in fall 2017 with the establishment of nine neighbourhood planning principles. There has been extensive community engagement and consultation involving students, faculty, staff, residents and partners. Methods included: open houses; resident forums; a public workshop; "roadshow" presentations to faculty, students and staff; online feedback; and additional stakeholder discussions. Details on engagement activities during each phase of consultation are available here.

University Boulevard Area

The U Boulevard area has seen significant changes over the past five years. Over the next few years, UBC plans to add more services, amenities and student housing in support of the Board approved vision for the area.

In Spring 2018, C+CP consulted stakeholders on several projects aimed at increasing student housing and academic opportunities in the U Boulevard area. Follow-up engagement in Fall 2018 included a planning update on the U Boulevard area and opportunities for the public to provide input on shaping the design vision of the Bosque, a key public space in the centre of campus. Methods included open houses, pop-up events, online feedback and stakeholder discussions. Details on activities at each of phase of consultation are available here.

b) **Community Programming**

Ongoing

- UTown@UBC Community Grants includes stewardship of a volunteer grant selection committee with UBC community members and Musqueam partnership
- Grant expansion with Community of Caring and Fast Track Funds through UBC Wellbeing partnership (students)
- UTown@UBC Youth Leadership Program
- UTown@UBC Community Bike Clinics
- Utown@UBC Kids Fit
- UTown@UBC Baby Senior Sing Along
- Walk n' Roll & Car Free Morning
- Project 529 anti-bike theft registration
- Funding Acadia Park Family Resource Fair
- Kids Takeover UBC (youth engagement)

One-time / Special

- Acadia Park Needs Assessment (community consultation)
- Community Programming Evaluation Framework Development (partner consultation)
- Pride Installation (LGBTQ advisory committee and community consultation)
- Beautify My Bike Cage Mural contest

c) **Ongoing Public and Stakeholder Engagement**
- UBC - UNA, jointly hosted events
  - Land Use 101: a public forum, with UBC and UBC Properties Trust speakers
- Regular meetings with AMS leadership (ongoing – monthly)
- Meetings throughout the year with other key organizations (ongoing)

3. Analysis of Stakeholder Feedback

This section summarizes the analysis of stakeholder feedback on engagement related to development permitting. Outcomes are presented under the sub-headings of "general" and the three Charter phases: 1. Defining, 2. Designing and Implementing, and 3. Concluding the Engagement Process. Sub-sections for each include Strengths, Issues and Possible Improvements. Sample quotes *in italic font* illustrate key points.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Strengths:
Almost all review participants agreed that C+CP does a "good" or "excellent" job overall with engagement in development permitting, and said they offered their suggestions only as refinements. Specific strengths mentioned include:

- (As noted in 2016) The Charter is seen as an increasingly valuable engagement planning and accountability tool, and is becoming better known by stakeholders and other departments. There is potential to continue to expand its use in engagement across the university. *The Charter has clearly articulated goals and clear process in how you go about engagement.*

- C+CP staff are seen as demonstrating their commitment to Charter principles through ongoing improvement to their consultation and engagement processes, especially in identifying the right stakeholders and offering broad and diverse notification channels. Relationships between stakeholders and development staff are generally good. *They [staff] reach out to ask for input at many opportunities – I appreciate that – it seems genuine and feels as if [those] we engage with are truly committed to improving these processes. They are easy to reach and responsive. They will talk about anything.*

- Communication and collaboration with UBC's central administration and other departments on proposed developments has improved. Applicants are generally satisfied with project outcomes and were complimentary about improved communication and working relationships with C+CP staff. *There is a true sense that they are trying to have greater connection with university entities and colleagues.*

- Stakeholders appreciate C+CP's annual charter reviews and hope to be notified when the report is available, with some support for annual reporting on how results are being addressed. *It shows good accountability to publicly post the review and notify participants, so we can follow up on the recommendations.*

General suggestions:
- Some stakeholders noted that engagement on planning seems to follow the Charter more consistently than for development. It was suggested that good practices for the former could be adapted for the latter, even though they require different types of engagement. These include better definition of engagement objectives and scope of influence and more consistent reporting back/closing the loop.

- C+CP should continue to reinforce – with applicants and stakeholders – the message that engagement is not just "checking a box", but rather brings benefits, both in generating ideas to improve projects and in strengthening the outcomes. For example, in presenting the Charter Review to the Board of Governors and other departments, use case studies that show how a project was changed through public input.

- A key factor in gaining the trust of stakeholders is ensuring effective two-way communications –

listening and responding – even if not all input can be addressed. This trust nourishes productive relationships and facilitates future consultation on planning and development.

A. **DEFINING THE PROCESS: reach the right stakeholders (be inclusive); identify engagement goals; outline the scope of stakeholder influence (be transparent)**

1. *Identification of and outreach to stakeholders impacted by or interested in development proposals*

Strengths:
- C+CP generally reaches the right stakeholders for development projects; outreach continues to improve. Notifying and working with stakeholders through university associations and organizations is an effective channel: *They are very good at bringing the right people to the table. They are thorough, communicate well, and provide lots of opportunities for students, residents and neighbours to learn about and provide feedback on projects.*
- Development notifications have improved. People are receiving information from a variety of sources, e.g., site signage, bulletin boards, website, email blasts. *Notification and update channels are great; full marks. I'm amazed at what they do. People are learning where to look. They email to a long list of people and put ads in the Ubyssey, etc.*

Issues:
- There is room for more substantive engagement with the UBC academic community (administration, executive and faculties) earlier in the development process, before the permitting stage.
- The shifting UBC demographics and community composition and growing community present new challenges in engaging the campus community and neighbours in the development permitting process, including:
  - increasing numbers of buildings, resident and non-resident owners and tenants (e.g., UBC neighbourhoods includes close to 70 stratas in five neighbourhoods);
  - differing interests, perspectives, backgrounds and expectations vis-à-vis planning and development;
  - differing levels of awareness and knowledge about UBC governance entities, roles and responsibilities; and about university planning and development;
  - constraints to participation, such as time, family responsibilities, language, timing of events; and
  - the large numbers of transient community members (faculty, students, staff, etc.).

These factors mean that:

- many possibly affected community members don't receive, don't understand and/or may not respond to general outreach re: open house and survey opportunities; and
- it's challenging to build community understanding of development processes and address their diverse interests. This applies even when working with campus and partner organizations, who encompass diverse and often fragmented perspectives.

Possible improvements:
- Consult earlier with the UBC academic community on projects, leveraging relevant UBC committees to identify opportunities, constraints and risks before proposals are fully developed.
- Use pre-consultation to identify individuals and groups who might be affected, but may be unlikely to participate in an open house or survey, and tailor outreach methods to them (see below). *Seek*

out those that might not come forward – it's often the ones who haven't been involved before that express anger and concern later in the process.

- Continue to share information and work with campus and partner organizations, but consider also (1) supporting these groups to strengthen their engagement with members (e.g., e-communications (Intranets, list serves, newsletters and social media, UNA information forums), and (2) using other methods to directly reach their members, e.g., strata councils, rental managers, residents, tenants, students, faculty, etc. (there are mixed views of how effectively various umbrella organizations represent and communicate with their membership).

- Consult with neighbourhood and multicultural organizations and community leaders on how to broaden newcomer and ESL community engagement in development proposals, and use key contacts, as needed, to help navigate the process (e.g., Chinese community leaders who helped with St. John's Hospice).

2. ***Communicating the objectives and scope of each engagement process and how input will be used***

Issues:
Both applicants and stakeholders are often unclear about the objectives and scope of engagement on development permitting. Participant expectations for influence often exceed what is possible from a policy, planning and regulatory perspective. (This was contrasted with C+CP planning engagements, for which the goals and scope are seen as relatively well-communicated).

Possible improvements:
- Clearly define and communicate to both applicants and stakeholders the parameters for each engagement, tailoring the approach to the project scale, scope and likely level of public interest. This may include outlining:
  - the project purpose;
  - engagement objectives, including the type/level of participation (using the Spectrum of Public Participation or similar); and scope of influence (what's "on the table" for discussion and what isn't); and
  - how input will be recorded, used in decisions and reported.

- To ensure transparency and manage expectations, be frank and direct. Most stakeholders understand, or will learn that there are different types of consultation. Knowing the parameters helps them manage their time and effort. *Make it clear at what stages intensive effort and detailed feedback could be useful and at what stages it's primarily an approval process. People from our organization put a lot of effort into evaluating designs, but they don't see any changes and they're not sure what happened; we shouldn't put in that effort if it won't have an effect.*

- Defining the engagement parameters will also provide greater process certainty and consistency for applicants. They would like more clarity on the interaction of the technical review and engagement process; the relative roles of development, technical and engagement staff; how stakeholder input will be analyzed, weighed and responded to (especially if there are strong and divergent viewpoints); and how it will be balanced with technical input. *Sometimes it's not clear who is signing off on this decision. We need a more defined process – to know up front what the goal posts are.*

B. **DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING THE PROCESS: engage diverse stakeholders; address their needs and concerns; ensure two-way information; choose appropriate methods; identify schedule and resources**

3. *Providing the right type and amount of information, and at the right time, for effective engagement*

Strengths:
- Stakeholders said they generally get the right amount and type of information, and can access additional information, as needed. They appreciate information that focuses on their interests. *Hone in on what students care about most, such as getting more space on campus. There are lots of opportunities to be involved; diverse times and locations. Information sites are numerous and informative; that's improved. Poster boards at events are well done and resource persons are helpful. If we ask for more information, they are always happy to provide it.*

Possible improvements:
- See Box A. Consider engaging at an earlier stage in project development, as appropriate to the project scale and scope. Where there has been precinct-level planning and consultation before proceeding to development, communicate the outcomes of this process to community members.

BOX A.

Issue: Consultation Occurs Too Late in the Development Process

Several review participants, both applicants and stakeholders, suggested that some of the issues (and occasional frustration) of project teams, applicants, staff and stakeholders with engagement on development permitting is because consultation occurs so late in development planning process. At that point, most of the design work, and the policy and technical reviews are done, leaving little scope for change, and thus for input. As a result, participants often perceive their time and effort to be fruitless. At the same time, applicants have concerns about the time and effort spent soliciting input at this stage, and are unsure how to assess and respond to concerns this late in the process. Sample comments:

With permitting, there's a sequence you work with, it's not open-ended planning; people get frustrated because they don't understand the process; it's complex. On the level of a building, from my experience, the opportunity for input comes too late. Engagement may trigger stakeholder expectations that can't be met. We are told that that feedback will be considered but it seems that it's in fact too late. They aren't very flexible – I don't see a lot of room to adjust or modify it. They went with a design that had nothing to do with the presentation.

Possible Improvement: Provide Consultation Opportunities Earlier in the Process for Key Projects

Some participants see potential value in providing new or strengthened opportunities for consultation at an earlier stage in the development planning process, before the development permit application stage. Any major change to the existing process would likely have to be considered at a higher level of UBC, yet might be worth considering as stakeholder interest in development proposals is growing. In the meantime, consider options within the current process for earlier consultation. Sample comments:

Seems that there's high-level planning, then a near-complete proposal, with time/space in between where we're not consulted. By then, it seems almost like a done deal. We don't hear how the designs meet those high level goals.

There is confusion about the stages; it seems like there's (1) location/siting, (2) refining location and design (e.g., shading), then (3) permitting, but often the proposal at stage 3 doesn't look like what was discussed at 1 and 2, yet it seems there's no additional scope for change. Maybe there needs to be another consultation between (2) and (3) to address substantive issues?

- Ensure that the type and level of information provided matches the engagement parameters, e.g., What do people most need to know? Is the objective primarily "informing"? *Don't drown people in too much information; it's ultimately about impacts. People often want more information, especially technical reports, but they end up going down the rabbit hole – it's not productive.*
- Consider providing more information on the proposal (or links to it) as part of initial notifications. While good detailed information is available at the open house, providing it with the notification may enable more stakeholders to provide feedback.
- Continue to improve communication materials and methods. Suggestions include:
  - Simplify the language, using "plain language" principles: *Content for development projects is often overly technical, bureaucratic and/or jargon-laden.*
  - Use (or require that applicants use) user-friendly design and "low-text" content (infographics, videos, photos); and site visits and models.
  - The above guidelines, coupled with providing capsule information on the project in multiple languages, may help reach ESL residents, where appropriate.
  - Continue to expand digital information; most materials are still print and text-based (consistent message from 2015 and 2016). *We're not using tech as well as we could – we're still pushing out mostly static information, but not truly engaging people and having a dialogue.*

4. *Use of on-line and hard copy feedback forms at open houses to collect input, and consideration of other methods*

Strengths:
- C+CP's current methods are generally seen as appropriate for engagement on permitting (see suggested refinements below). Stakeholder especially appreciate the "pop-up" events in high walking traffic areas in the Alumni Centre and UBC Life building, where C+CP can reach students, staff and faculty. *C+CP is better than other [UBC processes] at getting in-person engagement – people engage as they walk by. They do a good job at keeping on-line feedback simple and keeping questions simple – asking the core questions that need to be answered.*

Possible improvements:
- Expand and vary pop-up events to reach stakeholders "where they are", e.g., set up a booth in the AMS Nest. *They often engage with neighbourhood residents at their community centre to reach residents – this could be done more with faculty, staff and students.*
- Refine engagement methods to broaden outreach to the uninvolved, using multiple techniques, since people interact in different ways. Consider lunch sessions, podcasts, webinars, on-line blogs and forums on UBC development issues, and adding social media to open houses. *Open houses and boards are the old ways of connecting for development permitting and planning, but these are very static. The world won't come out to those any more – people are busy; making them show up at a set time will only reach a small percentage of people.*
- Further improve the C+CP website, which is seen as a useful but underutilized reference (as in 2015 and 2016): *The website is very static; there's almost too much info, it's overwhelming - chunk it out. Think about information accessibility, packaging and design features to help people understand.*
- As students are inundated with social media, social media is useful but should be used strategically, e.g., for notifications and project follow-up for those directly affected. There is likely more potential for increased use of e-communications with resident groups and individuals.

5. *Should additional information be provided, and if so, in what formats?*

Issues:
- UBC's complex governance (*"Who is UBC?"*) results in uncertainty for many stakeholders (especially newcomers and/or ESL community members and neighbours) as to who owns, controls and regulates land parcels, buildings and roads; how campus development processes work; and who to contact with concerns. Many people are unclear about the relative roles of strata councils, the UNA, property managers, C+CP, the Board of Governors and Metro Vancouver (e.g., Parks) in planning, permitting, development, operations, parks and transportation. This lack of knowledge often limits their ability to engage effectively in development and planning.

Possible improvements:
- Develop user-friendly materials – maps, "road maps", flow charts, graphics and videos – to explain campus and off-campus governance and decision-making. Outline development processes, including jurisdictions, functions, responsibilities and contacts. Clarify C+CP's role in development, e.g., "Quick Facts about C+CP" (See sample [UNA video](#)). This background info is especially important for newcomers and transient community members. It can be disseminated through C+CPs communication channels and used to provide context at open houses and other public events (e.g., UNA information forums).
- Communicate to community members and Development Review bodies a clear rationale for the project, including its purpose, benefits for the university, and siting and design principles used. Provide more information on the project context, including UBC's strategic directions; how it responds to university policies and plans and technical guidelines; and how the project team and C+CP technical analysis has shaped project design. *We have the chance to tell a fabulous story. It would be helpful to see concrete statements about how the project meets these broader planning and design goals. At the front end, we/they need have a conversation about the key principles for the project, e.g., affordability, density, and/or financial sustainability principles. Address not just financial feasibility, but liveability goals.*

C. **CONCLUDING THE PROCESS: share outcomes and how input was used; evaluate the process; do follow-up communications; integrate results with on-going communication, relationship-building and research**

6. *Sharing the outcomes of the development permit process*

Strengths:
- Those familiar with the process suggested that overall, stakeholder input is generally well summarized and communicated to applicants, and to decision-makers up to the Board of Governors level.

Issues:
- Virtually all stakeholders said this stage could be improved, as they rarely hear back about the process. *We provided input, but we didn't hear back, yet we know decisions were shaped by that feedback. Discussion is good but closure isn't as good as it could be. Need to share the outcome and show how project is moving forward. There is better feedback after planning processes, with summaries on how the plan was changed, but I haven't seen that at the building level. Would be lovely if [reporting back] was improved at all levels, from planning to permitting.*
- Greater attention to "closing the loop" provides closure, demonstrates transparency and accountability, and builds relationships and trust for future engagement processes, even when the scope of influence is limited. *It's an "I hear you" step – even if we don't use all the input or make certain*

changes, it shows good leadership. This is always the most critical part of engagement process; the more you emphasize this, the better off everyone will be. Sharing feedback is important … make sure people understand how information was received and its impact the project … because people appreciate the consistency of the development process.

Possible Improvements:

- Develop a clear approach and criteria for assessing and responding to input, including explaining what can and can't be changed, and why, e.g., policy goals, and financial and technical opportunities and constraints. *We sometimes overreact to feedback. We are reactive, not proactive on context; our approach needs to be principles-based re: project purpose, criteria, etc., so that we have a clear project rationale.*

- Specify early in the process how input will be balanced across strong and divergent views, and how it will be considered alongside technical analysis.

- As appropriate to the project, make engagement summaries more useful to the project team by making them more concise and timely, and by providing more analysis of community input, highlighting key concerns and indicating the strength, composition and breadth of concern or support.

- Ensure more systematic and consistent application of the Charter principles on reporting back ("Share the Outcomes" and "Post-Engagement Notification Process", pg. 7), including reporting to participants before the project begins.

  - Contact everyone who was involved and/or signed up for updates, with thanks and links to project reports. Select reporting techniques appropriate to the project, e.g., written or graphic summary, PPT, video, web post, closure meeting, site visit, opening ceremony or celebration. If appropriate, send a brief description that can be cut and pasted into a website or newsletter.

  - As noted under "1. defining the scope", be direct about the nature and scope of public influence, even if limited. *Let them know "We hear you", and there are nuggets we can use and times when we can't.*

  - Send project information to others who weren't involved but could be impacted by construction, using existing channels, both organizations and individuals.

- As appropriate to the project, sharing outcomes should "close the loop" by referencing the project context and history, and could include reporting on:

  - final project siting and design;

  - how the project addresses university priorities, policies, plans, guidelines and core project principles;

  - how the project evolved during the design, review and permitting process;

  - summary of public concerns and how they did or didn't influence the project; (stakeholders find it useful to learn about others' views and what kind of input "works".)

  - next steps, including opening ceremonies (if any), expected transportation and construction schedules and impacts on traffic, facilities and activities; and

  - contact information, should issues arise.

- Solicit ongoing feedback from stakeholders on how development engagement could be improved (follow up on priorities in section 4). This could include inserting a question in the standard feedback form and in the annual Charter review, and evaluating a sample of development engagement processes at intervals, using an on-line survey and/or interviews.

7. *Ongoing project communications, once a project is underway (notifications, updates, contacts and channels for feedback on issues during construction)*

Issues:

- Notification channels around construction and transportation management have improved, but could be more effective in both timeliness and reach. *They did a good job of signage and information around the University Blvd. student areas and bus loop, with good notice. C+CP was getting ahead on notifications re: closures to pathways, roads, etc., but timelines have slipped in the last year; notice often happens late in the process. We get more warning about bike races than road closures. There was considerable public uncertainty around the University Blvd. work.*

- Due to the complex UBC governance, some stakeholders are confused about who is responsible for project implementation, and who to contact with complaints. While students are relatively adept at finding information, it can be more challenging for new residents and ESL community members.

Possible improvements:

- Ensure timely electronic and signage notifications related to construction and transportation. Community members accept that project will have impacts, but want time to plan around them. These include departments who need to provide advance notice to students, faculty, staff and other users about changes to building access, and residents who need to deal with detours, noise, dust or other impacts.
  - It was suggested that notifications showing locations, dates and times be posted at least three weeks before a construction activity or traffic change, to allow for effective dissemination and planning responses.
  - Even after a permit is approved, some projects may need additional consultation with affected campus and off-campus entities to discuss specific construction concerns and how to address them.

- Strengthen approach for communicating updates on project changes, delays and disruptions, e.g., *Keep "projects under construction" pages current – some projects haven't been updated since 2017.*

- Publicize opportunities for community feedback during project implementation, including contact information for stakeholders to report emerging concerns (use regular channels, e.g., contact lists/list serves, email blasts, website, visits to organizations, and conversations with neighbourhood residents).

4. Enhanced Engagement Commitments for 2019

C+ CP has identified commitments to enhance engagement practices for development permitting, based on the outcomes of the 2018 Annual Review. They are listed below, under the Engagement Charter's three phases: 1. Defining, 2. Designing and Implementing, and 3. Concluding the Process. These will be monitored and reported on in future annual reviews.

Defining the Process
1. Review and refine approaches to notification and outreach, including a) identifying ways to reach newcomers and ESL community members; and b) strengthening the ability of UBC departments and partner organizations to engage their membership in development planning on campus.
2. Clearly define and communicate to applicants and stakeholders and community members the parameters for each engagement, including the project purpose, engagement objectives, type/level of involvement, and how input will be used.

Designing and Implementing the Process:
3. Identify opportunities to gather feedback on projects in advance of the development permit application stage, as appropriate.
4. Provide more information on the context for a development proposal, such as the project rationale and benefits; policy and planning context; and siting and design principles used, as appropriate to the project.

Concluding the Process
5. Develop a systematic approach to assess and summarize how feedback informed the project proposal.
6. Establish consistent methods for sharing outcomes with stakeholders, including how input informed the final project design and next steps, e.g., construction and traffic management plans
7. Ensure timely notifications and information updates (e.g. construction, detours, and tree removals) during the project and provide contact information, for any issues that arise.

Appendices

APPENDIX A. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPANT LIST

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	Name
1. Alma Mater Society	Max Holmes, VP Academic Cristina Ilnitchi, VP External Affairs
2. UBC Athletics and Recreation	Kavie Toor, Senior Director, Facilities, Recreation and Sport Partnerships
3. UBC Student Housing and Hospitality Services (SHHS)	Andrew Parr, Acting VP and Managing Director
4. University Faculty and Staff Tenants Association (UFASTA)	Tara Ivanochko, Chair
5. University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA)	Johanne Blenkin, Executive Director
6. University Endowment Lands – Community Advisory Council reps	Mojan Nozari, Council Member, Area D rep
7. UBC Properties Trust	Paul Young, Director, Planning & Design Megan Pohanka, Director of Market Development
8. UBC Property and Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC)	Committee Meeting
9. UNA Strata Reps (Focus Group)	Jacky Connie - East Campus Les Dukowski - Chancellor Richard Watson – Hawthorn David Hahn – Wesbrook; Chris Finch - Hampton Place; Doug Chivers - Hampton Place Alex Volkoff – Hawthorn (via written responses)

APPENDIX B. ANNUAL REVIEW QUESTIONS

Opening Question: What are 1 or 2 of C+CP's greatest strengths in informing and gathering feedback from the campus community on development permits and construction, including transportation management and construction notification?

A. **DEFINING THE PROCESS: reach the right stakeholders (be inclusive); identify engagement goals; outline the scope of stakeholder influence (be transparent)**

   1. How effectively does C+CP identify and reach out to stakeholders most impacted by or interested in development proposals? (Suggested improvements?)

   2. How well does C+CP communicate the goals and scope of each engagement process and how input will be used? (Suggested improvements?)

B. **DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING THE PROCESS: engage diverse stakeholders; address their needs and concerns; ensure two-way communication/information; choose appropriate methods; identify schedule and resource**

   3. Are you (and other stakeholders) getting the right type and amount of information, and at the right time, to participate effectively in development reviews? (Suggested improvements?)

   4. C+CP uses primarily on-line and hard copy feedback forms at open houses to collect input. How effective do you think these are? What other methods should be considered, if any?

   5. Is there any additional information you would like to see? If so, in what formats (e.g., boards, webpage, fact sheets, other)?

C. **CONCLUDING THE PROCESS: share outcomes and how input was used; evaluate the process; do follow-up communications; integrate results with on-going communication, relationship-building and research**

   6. How effectively does C+CP share the outcomes of the development permit process? (Suggested Improvements?)

   7. Once an approved project is underway, how satisfied are you with ongoing project communications, including notifications; updates and contacts and channels to provide feedback on issues and concerns during construction? (Suggested improvements?)