

A faint, light blue line-art map of a city street grid serves as the background. The map shows a network of streets, with some streets highlighted in a slightly darker blue. The overall layout is a grid, with some streets curving or branching off. The map is centered on the page, and the text is overlaid on it.

# **University Boulevard Precinct Planning**

## **Phase 2 Public Consultation Summary Report**

May 12, 2015

**campus + community** planning

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Summary of Consultation Feedback .....	2
<b>2. Public Consultation Process Overview .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Stakeholder and Public Notification .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Stakeholder Notification .....	3
Public Notification .....	3
<b>4. Public Consultation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Open House .....	4
Online Consultation .....	4
<b>5. Detailed Feedback from Public Consultation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Open House and Online Consultation .....	5
Stakeholder Submissions .....	9
<b>6. Participant Demographics .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7. Next Steps .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8. Appendices .....</b>	<b>14</b>

# 1. Executive Summary

This report presents a summary of feedback received during Phase 2 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct, which ran from April 7 - 19 online, with a public open house on April 8.

UBC Campus + Community Planning (C+CP) provided notification of the public consultation through advertising, email, online, and outreach to stakeholders. Notification was sent to **1,077 campus stakeholders** representing student government and societies, faculties and departments, faculty, UBC administration and staff, campus residents, and neighbours. As a result of these outreach activities:

- Over **165** people attended the Public Open House
- **634** unique page views to the University Boulevard Precinct Planning project pages on the C+CP website.

Written feedback received were as follows:

- **38** people submitted feedback; **15** forms were completed at the Public Open House and **23** online submissions
- **2** stakeholder letters submitted by email

The consultation report from Phase 1 is available [online](#).

## Summary of Consultation Feedback

Overall, there was a broad level of support for the proposed concepts. Comments received from the public consultation (public and stakeholders) were largely focused on:

- Concern about bringing rental housing to the precinct; preferring the area serve only academic and social purposes.
- Concern that accommodating faculty and staff housing on land zoned Academic serves as a precedent that could be applied to other academic areas of campus, particularly by applying the permitted academic land use of Campus as a Living Lab to the D.H. Copp site.
- Assurance that events in the area will not be compromised by noise complaints from future residents on University Boulevard.
- The need to mitigate environmental impacts (noise, vibrations and emissions), particularly as part of the design of the Gage South student residences but also for the adjacent residents in the UEL.
- The need for generous amounts of green spaces, gathering places and adequate weather protection along with high amenity public realm including street furniture, trees, wayfinding, public art, etc.
- The importance of having small-retail in the area, informal study/social spaces and more academic uses in the area
- The importance of a high level of pedestrian and cycling connectivity and comfort throughout the precinct
- The need for strong and cohesive architecture, particularly at the “gateway” corner of University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall.
- Clarification on how future resident interests would be represented.

## 2. Public Consultation Process Overview

Phase 2 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct was held in April 2015. In February 2015, we gathered feedback from the University community on how to complete the precinct vision. The purpose of the second phase of consultation was to present and gather feedback on the proposed planning and design concepts in the precinct. The feedback received during the public consultation informed the final plans for the precinct being presented to the UBC Board of Governors for approval in June 2015.

On-campus and online public consultation activities included:

- A **public open house** on Wednesday, April 8, 2015 11:00am – 2:00pm at Main Concourse, Student Union Building (Sub), 6138 Student Union Boulevard;
- **Online consultation** which ran from April 7 - 19.

## 3. Stakeholder and Public Notification

### Stakeholder Notification

Notification for the Phase 2 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct Planning was sent to **1,077 campus stakeholders**. This included **125 stakeholders** from student government and societies, faculties and departments, UBC administration, campus residents, and neighbours. A 'heads up' email was also circulated to **952** faculty and staff.

The stakeholder email included a copy of the newspaper ad, sample tweets, and a link to the Campus and Community Planning (C+CP) website to direct people to more information. Stakeholders were encouraged to share the information with their networks.

### Public Notification

C+CP provided notification between March 19 – April 19 through advertising, email and stakeholder outreach. Notification was provided through the following print advertisements and online channels (circulation numbers are shown in brackets):

- Vancouver Courier, published on March 27 and April 3 (circ 51,850 x2 = 103,700)
- The Ubyyssey, published on March 26 and March 30 (circ 12,000 x 2 = 24,000)
- The Campus Resident (circ 9,500)
- UNA e-newsletter (circ 2,475)
- The C+CP event calendar (78 unique pages views)
- The C+CP e-newsletter (circ 2,060)
- Campus digital signage (3,000/day X 19 = 57,000)
- C+CP website - project webpage (634 unique page views)
- Posts to C+CP Twitter accounts between April 7 – 19 (1,613 followers)
- UBC Events web page on April 8 (exact reach unknown)

## 4. Public Consultation

Public consultation included online consultation from April 7 – 19 and a public open house held on April 8. During this phase:

- **38** people submitted feedback; **15** forms were completed at the Public Open House and **23** online submissions
- **2** stakeholder letters submitted by email

Copies of the Open House display boards/online materials and questionnaire are provided in Appendix II & III respectively.

### Open House

The open house was **attended by over 165 people**.

A series of sixteen (16) display boards were setup and provided an overview of the vision for the precinct along with the proposed planning and design concepts for GSAB and D.H. Copp, UBC Bus Exchange and Gage South Student Housing, Wesbrook Mall and urban design for the precinct as a whole. Participants were encouraged to fill out a feedback form to share their comments on the proposed planning and design concepts for:

- Creating a vibrant academic and social hub
- Contributing to UBC's complete community as a mixed use core
- Expressing the academic identity and values of the university at the university gateway
- Wesbrook Mall redesign

Planning staff from UBC were on hand to answer questions.

### Online Consultation

As part of the online consultation, the C+CP website provided the same information as was available at the Public Open Houses on April 8. The web content was posted to the C+CP website on April 7, and the link to the online questionnaire was also posted to the project page on the same day, which included the same set of questions as those asked at the Public Open House. The online consultation ran from April 7 – 19.

## 5. Detailed Feedback from Public Consultation

The following summarizes the key themes from the feedback received during Phase 2. A full transcript of questionnaire feedback received and stakeholder letters are included in Appendix IV below.

Overall, there was a broad level of support for the proposed concepts. Comments received from the public consultation (public and stakeholders) were largely focused on:

- Concern about bringing rental housing to the precinct; preferring the area serve only academic and social purposes.

- Concern that accommodating faculty and staff housing on land zoned Academic serves as a precedent that could be applied to other academic areas of campus, particularly by applying the permitted academic land use of Campus as a Living Lab to the D.H. Copp site.
- Assurance that events in the area will not be compromised by noise complaints from future residents on University Boulevard.
- The need to mitigate environmental impacts (noise, vibrations and emissions), particularly as part of the design of the Gage South student residences but also for the adjacent residents in the UEL.
- The need for generous amounts of green spaces, gathering places and adequate weather protection along with high amenity public realm including street furniture, trees, wayfinding, public art, etc.
- The importance of having small-retail in the area, informal study/social spaces and more academic uses in the area
- The importance of a high level of pedestrian and cycling connectivity and comfort throughout the precinct
- The need for strong and cohesive architecture, particularly at the “gateway” corner of University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall.
- Clarification on how future resident interests would be represented.

## Open House and Online Consultation

Below is the detailed feedback received from the five questions posed in the questionnaire. Comments with occurrences over 5% (received 2 or more times) are represented in the tables below. All data presented below is calculated out of a total of 38 responses received. The questions as they appeared in the questionnaire, along with the feedback and how this feedback is addressed in the precinct plans, are as follows:

### Vibrancy

Q1. Share your comments on the proposed planning and design concepts for creating a **vibrant academic and social hub**. Do you support these concepts? What else do you think should be considered? What can be improved and how?

	#	%
Comments made that support the proposed concepts	16	42%
Comments made that do not support housing in precinct	3	8%

Comment	#	%	Outcome
<b>Theme: Environmental impacts</b>			
Concerned about noise and emissions impact on students living in Gage South Student Housing Need to implement good ventilation and noise barriers	2	5%	Preliminary acoustical analysis indicates that design measures can be used to mitigate noise for students living in Gage South, including when windows are open. When the Gage South student residence moves into the design phase we will identify the specific design measures to address noise, vibrations, fumes, etc. based on best practice for mixed-use developments with vehicle parking on the ground floor. Similar recommendations are also included in Section 5.7 of the design guidelines.
<b>Theme: Public realm features</b>			
Need good rain shelter throughout precinct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accessible year-round outdoor space</li> <li>• for outdoor fitness</li> <li>• with interesting design</li> <li>• with seating</li> </ul>	4	11%	Section 4.3 of the design guidelines outlines the approach to weather protection. Weather protection will be incorporated into all new buildings coinciding with areas of high use, as well as bus arrival and departure areas and the eastern edge of MacInnes Field, along Athlete's Way. There will also be weather protection in the Student Union Plaza.
Need more green space throughout precinct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less commercial activity</li> <li>• design more large open space for gatherings</li> <li>• more trees &amp; permeable surfaces</li> <li>• multi-functional spaces available all year around</li> </ul>	6	16%	Sections 3.6 and 3.7 of the design guidelines outlines the approach to open spaces in the precinct. There are a variety of green spaces, large open areas and tree lined areas planned for the area including: The Green, The Bosque, University Square, a pocket park in front of D.H. Copp, trees along U. Blvd, Student Union Blvd and Athlete's Way. MacInnes Field will serve as the key public green space.
<b>Theme: Street level uses</b>			
Need more indoor gathering spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• studying and informal social spaces</li> </ul>	3	8%	Section 7.0 of the design guidelines outlines the approach to street-level uses. This includes recommendations for small grocer, food market and cafes along with informal study spaces as well as a generous streetscape to allow space for patios.
Need a grocery store in the precinct	2	5%	
Need more restaurants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• patio</li> <li>• seek out independent businesses or student run</li> </ul>	4	11%	

## Complete Community

Q2. Share your comments on the proposed planning and design concepts for **contributing to UBC's complete community as a mixed use core**. Do you support these concepts? What else do you think should be considered? What can be improved and how?

	#	%
Comments made that support the proposed concepts	8	21%
Comments made that do not support housing in precinct	6	16%

Comment	#	%	Outcome
<b>Theme: Bike facilities</b>			
Need for separated bike lanes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>buffered bike lanes not safe enough</li> </ul>	3	8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wesbrook Mall will have a buffered bike lane along the corridor. If budget allows, complete separation will be implemented.</li> <li>There will also be shared bike/pedestrian routes throughout the precinct as well as improvements to Student Union Boulevard which will include a multi-use pathway on either side as well as marked shared lanes.</li> <li>Improvements on University Boulevard will include better signage and route definition for cyclists along the corridor and at the entrance to East Mall. Once the entrances at Wesbrook Mall and East Mall are complete, this cyclist corridor will be monitored to determine if additional measures and changes are required.</li> </ul>
<b>Theme: Public realm features</b>			
Need good rain shelter throughout precinct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>covered walkways</li> </ul>	2	5%	See vibrancy section above

## Academic Identity + Values

Q3. Share your comments on the proposed planning and design concepts for **expressing the academic identity and values of the university at the university gateway**. Do you support these concepts? What else do you think should be considered? What can be improved and how?

	#	%
Comments made that support the proposed concepts	7	18%
Comments made that do not support housing in precinct	4	11%



Comment	#	%	Outcome
<b>Theme: Architecture and building design</b>			
Design GSAB to be more iconic/distinctive	2	5%	Section 5.5 of the design guidelines recommends that this corner site offers a key opportunity to help announce an academic gateway experience and to express UBC's identity and values. Ground floor academic and retail uses will contribute to an animated and vibrant public realm along all edges.
<b>Theme: Public realm features</b>			
Improve landscaping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less sculptures</li> <li>• more trees and green spaces</li> </ul>	3	8%	See above vibrancy section on green spaces
Wants rain shelter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above the gateway</li> <li>• Awnings where people actually stand to board the bus</li> </ul>	2	5%	See above vibrancy section on rain shelter

### Wesbrook Mall

Q4. Share your comments on the proposed design concept for **Wesbrook Mall** redesign. Do you support these concepts? What else do you think should be considered? What can be improved and how?

	#	%
Comments made that support the proposed concepts	6	16%

Comment	#	%	Outcome
<b>Theme: Pedestrian routes</b>			
Supports improving pedestrian crossings @ University Blvd & Wesbrook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifically the south-east to south-west corner</li> </ul>	4	11%	Section 3.8 of the design guidelines provides some suggestions on how to improve the intersection including: corner bulges to shorten crossing distances, a special hardscape treatment at the intersection as well as a scramble style signal for pedestrians.
<b>Theme: Bike facilities</b>			
Supports buffered/separated bike lanes	5	13%	See above complete community section on bike facilities
Need separated bike lanes	2	5%	

Theme: Environmental impacts			
Concerned about impact on students living in Gage South Student Housing	2	5%	See above vibrancy section on environmental impacts
Theme: Public realm features			
Supports more green space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• add trees along the middle median</li> <li>• trees and planters</li> </ul>	4	11%	See above vibrancy section on green spaces

## General

### Q5. Other Comments

Comment	#	%	Outcome
Theme: Architecture and building design			
Cohesive design	2	5%	Section 5.3 of the design guidelines outlines the approach to architecture for new buildings in the precinct. These guidelines include principles on collective and individual identity to ensure new projects work together harmoniously while maintaining their identity. There is also a principle of continuity of campus fabric to ensure materials and colour for new buildings are based on characteristics of buildings that area successful fit into the campus fabric.
Theme: Housing			
Does not support housing in precinct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit to academic and social uses only</li> <li>• More student housing, less rental housing</li> <li>• Move site B and D to other parts of the precinct</li> </ul>	4	11%	The vision for the area is to have diverse uses and services – including student housing and year-round non-market rental housing. The consultation throughout this planning process has received strong support for this principle of a complete mixed use community.
Future housing needs to be affordable for students	3	8%	There will be a variety of housing options available to students, including Gage South student housing and rental housing on University Boulevard. Student housing fees will be based on the standard 12-year contracts and rental housing will be set according to market rates.

## Stakeholder Submissions

Two (2) letter/email submissions were received by stakeholders during the public consultation period. The comments received are summarized below.

## UEL Community Advisory Council

Comment	Outcome
<p><b>Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that noise in the precinct will affect UEL residents, based on the modeled noise levels in the 2012 Gage South and Environs Noise Impact Analysis.</li> <li>Requesting details on noise abatement procedures and a full noise analysis of the final development plan prior to construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2012 UBC Noise Impact Analysis predicts that day-to-day noise levels in Gage South and the first two rows of houses in the UEL will be between 59-62 dB Leq, which is considered compliant within international standards (ANSI). For comparison, these predicted levels are within the City of Vancouver's Bylaw for intermediate zones, which include corridors such as Arbutus, Yew, West 10th and many other central areas in Vancouver that are similar to this part of the campus. In our view, these are acceptable standards to follow. However, based on the study outcomes and interest from the community, we are exploring additional noise reduction strategies for the Gage South student housing as described in the Public Consultation section above on environmental impacts.</li> <li>The details of the mitigation measures can be shared, once complete.</li> </ul>

## AMS and GSS (Combined)

Comment	Outcome
<p>(As outlined in the AMS Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>MacInnes Field</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the 2 major student events in the design of the field</li> <li>Future U. Blvd residents should be made aware of these events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.7.4 of the design guidelines explains that the design should accommodate annual campus wide events.</li> <li>Residents in the area will be notified of the events and potentially, included as part of lease agreements.</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the AMS Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>Bus Exchange</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate light and signage must be installed for safe crossings</li> <li>Design should address the congestion caused by people lining up for buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.7.1 of the design guidelines outlines the recommendations for the design of the Bus Exchange which includes specific recommendations to provide high quality lighting design and to work with TransLink to develop a wayfinding plan for the transit system and the campus</li> <li>Passenger loading and unloading areas will be designed to manage specific queuing and circulation needs, particularly at locations with high volumes of pedestrians.</li> </ul>

Comment	Outcome
<p>(As outlined in the GSS Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>Increase core academic uses in precinct</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the concentration of residential and retail uses planned for U.Blvd.</li> <li>Suggest including additional uses related to the university's core activities to enhance the academic character of the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the mixed-use core of the campus, the vision for the area is to have diverse uses and services, including academic uses. The exact amount of academic use is not yet set.</li> <li>As outlined in Section 7.0 of the design guidelines, the university will be exploring a variety of academic uses on the ground floor of buildings.</li> <li>The amount of academic use on the GSAB site is also not yet set.</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the GSS Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>Apply mix use to other residential areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see the mixed-use approach applied to other residential areas on campus not just U.Blvd – as this would better contribute to building a complete campus community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mixed-use approach has already been applied to Wesbrook Place and as outlined in Section 4.1.6.2 of the Land Use Plan, mixed-use neighbourhood centres may also be considered in other neighbourhoods on campus subject to identification of location, areas and design guidelines during the Neighbourhood Plan process for that local area.</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the GSS Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>Concerned about the process:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board 2 approval of the Teaching Labs granted de facto approval of these projects</li> <li>Holding consultation on projects which seem to have received implicit approval is not consistent with the Engagement Principles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board 2 approval of the Undergraduate Teaching Labs did not grant approval of the faculty and staff housing projects on GSAB and Copp, rather it provided approval to use the revenue from the Wesbrook Place market housing built in place of faculty-staff rental housing to finance a loan to upgrade the Undergraduate Life Science Teaching Labs.</li> <li>These projects have yet to be approved. A purpose of precinct planning process was to test the rationale for bringing the faculty/staff housing to the precinct, which includes consultation.</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the Residence Hall Association Phase 1 submission)</p> <p><b>Concerned about the impacts of non-market rental housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Having non-students and families in the area will cause conflict with student activities</li> <li>Adding new buildings to the area, particularly adding density and removing open space</li> <li>Want to make sure that the priority is affordable student housing not high rental rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main concern heard throughout the process around potential conflict between non-student residents and student activities was related to noise. The intention for the area is to attract residents who are interested in living closer to campus and transit, and by extension, understand that there will be more activity in the area, similar to other urban areas. The University plans to notify and remind residents in the precinct to expect noise levels to be similar to an urban area, which includes annual outdoor events.</li> <li>There is an extensive public realm plan for the area (See Sections 3.6 and 3.7 of the design guidelines) that will result in no net loss in open space, and the addition of more usable outdoor space.</li> <li>The precinct will include both student housing and university housing. The former will be priced the</li> </ul>

Comment	Outcome
	same as other year-round student housing. The latter will be based on market rental rates.
<p>(As outlined in the GSS Phase 1 + AMS/GSS phase 2 submissions)</p> <p><b>Gage South Student Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that any health and safety issues (i.e. noise, exhaust, vibrations, lighting, accessibility) related to the integration of student housing and the bus storage will be properly mitigated.</li> <li>• Commitment to engaging constructively in resolving the unique design challenged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Public Consultation section above on environmental impacts</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the GSS Phase 1 + AMS/GSS phase 2 submissions)</p> <p><b>Do not support faculty and staff housing on GSAB and Copp sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of compliance with Land Use Plan, and development controls in the Development Handbook</li> <li>• Non-institutional housing should be kept in areas designated as Neighbourhood or Village Centre Academic land uses</li> <li>• How will residents be represented?</li> <li>• Concerned that these projects will create a precedent that could allow for further non-institutional development on academic lands, e.g. The academic lands in Acadia Park will have non-institutional uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With Campus as a Living Lab as an approvable Academic land use, the D.H. Copp redevelopment is considered in compliance with Land Use Plan (LUP) designations since the residential component is tied to academic programming. However, to accommodate the rental housing on the GSAB site, a LUP amendment may be necessary.</li> <li>• The Development Handbook is only applicable to neighbourhood housing areas and not academic areas. If a LUP amendment were to proceed, all other plans and policies would need to be not inconsistent.</li> <li>• Residents in these buildings will be represented by the UNA, similar to other UBC neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• The Land Use Plan currently permits residential housing on academic lands, if it is tied to academic programming. The University acknowledges the point raised by the AMS and GSS that these projects are setting precedence, particularly in how definitions in the LUP of permitted academic uses associated with Campus as a Living Lab projects are being interpreted. It is recommended that this point be revisited during the next comprehensive Land Use Plan Review.</li> </ul>
<p>(As outlined in the AMS/GSS phase 2 submissions)</p> <p><b>Recommend a single land use designation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the university address the multiple land use designations on GSAB and Copp? i.e which land uses will apply? Will there be different governance structures?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is no change to the LUP, both land uses will apply. This will not create any conflicts in governance. Properties Trust will manage the interior of the buildings and the exterior will be managed by the University. This mixed approach is not new, and already exists with the Technology Enterprise Buildings (i.e. TEFF 1, 2 and 3)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Skeptical of the quality of research of academic</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of the project with Campus as a Living</li> </ul>

Comment	Outcome
<p><b>program that would qualify D.H. Copp as a Campus as a Living Lab project.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends the University reconsider their support for this project</li> </ul>	<p>research responds to a demand from UBC researchers to study the sustainable design and performance of a medium density residential development based on a typical development budget and that is ultimately replicable. A research brief is being developed by a joint academic-operations committee.</p>

## 6. Participant Demographics

A total of 165 people signed in at the Open House, and 38 people submitted feedback online or in person.

	Open House		Online/In person feedback	
What is your primary affiliation with UBC?	Count	%	Count	%
Student	90	55	11	29
Faculty	11	6.7	6	16
Staff	30	18	11	29
UBC Resident	13	8	3	8
Alumni	0	0	4	11
Other	13	8	1	3
N/A	8	5	2	5

Notes: 1) Several people have multiple affiliations with the University. To avoid double counting and simplify reporting, those who indicated they were student, faculty or staff in addition to other affiliations were counted as the former. If they indicated they were a UBC resident and alumni, they were counted as a resident. 2) The total numbers under % do not add up to 100 due to rounding.

## 7. Next Steps

Many of the recurring comments received are addressed in the design guidelines, including:

- provisions for mitigating the environmental impacts before Gage South student residences are built
- designing outdoor spaces in the precinct to include generous amounts of green spaces, gathering places and adequate weather protection
- recommendations to include small-scale retail and informal study/social spaces
- providing designated bikes route throughout the precinct, including a buffered bike lane on Wesbrook Mall (with the possibility of complete separation), as well as improvements to the bike facilities on University Boulevard and Student Union Boulevard.

- clarification that the future residents living in developments along University Boulevard will be represented by the University Neighbourhoods Association. This was arrived at through consultation with key stakeholders and the UNA Board of Directors has indicated support for this in principle. A formal UNA Board motion of support is anticipated at the upcoming UNA Board meeting on May 12.

Concerns around Land Use Plan (LUP) compliance were also raised around the redevelopment of the GSAB and D.H. Copp sites. With Campus as a Living Lab as an approvable Academic land use, the D.H. Copp redevelopment could proceed vis-a-vis the LUP designations. However, to accommodate the rental housing on the GSAB site, a LUP amendment may be necessary.

A summary of both Phase 1 and 2 of the public consultation will be presented to the UBC Board of Governors in June 2015 as part of the presentation to approve the design recommendations.

Following Board approval, project plans will be further refined and subject to Board capital approval and the development permit process, as applicable. Updates to University plans and policies for the area may be required from time to time. Before the Board considers the development application for each building project, the public will have the opportunity to review and provide comment, as part of the development permit process.

## 8. Appendices

### Appendix I: Stakeholder Notification list

1.	Access & Diversity
2.	Alumni UBC
3.	AMS
4.	Arts Undergraduate Society
5.	Bookstore
6.	Campus + Community Planning
7.	Centre for Student Involvement
8.	City of Vancouver
9.	College for Interdisciplinary Studies
10.	College of Health Disciplines
11.	Commerce Undergraduate Society
12.	Committee of Faculty Business Administrators (CFBA)
13.	CUPE 116
14.	CUPE 2278: UBC Teaching Assistants, Markers, Tutors, Instructors and English Language Inst.
15.	CUPE 2950: Canadian Union of Public Employees
16.	Dentistry Undergraduate Society
17.	Development & Alumni Engagement
18.	Dunbar Vision Implementation Committee
19.	Durante Kreuk
20.	Education Students Association
21.	Engineering Undergraduate Society
22.	Enrolment Services
23.	Faculty Association
24.	Faculty of Dentistry
25.	Faculty of Education
26.	Faculty of Forestry
27.	Faculty of Land and Food Systems

28.	Faculty of Law
29.	Faculty of Medicine
30.	Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
31.	First Nations House of Learning
32.	Forestry Undergraduate Society
33.	Fraternities (Beta Theta Pi )
34.	Government Relations
35.	Green College
36.	GSS
37.	Housing Relocation Services
38.	HUB (cycling)
39.	Interfraternity Council
40.	International House
41.	International Student Association
42.	Kinesiology Undergraduate Society
43.	Land and Food Systems Undergraduate Society
44.	Law Students Association
45.	Medical Undergraduate Society
46.	Metro Vancouver
47.	Metro Vancouver (elected)
48.	Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
49.	Music Undergraduate Society
50.	Musqueam First Nation
51.	Norma Rose Point Elementary School
52.	Office of the Vice-President Academic
53.	Office of the Vice-President Research & International
54.	PAC - Norma Rose Point Elementary School
55.	PAC - U Hill Elementary Parent Advisory Council
56.	PACCE (President's Advisory Committee on Campus Enhancement)
57.	Pacific Spirit Park Society
58.	Panhellenic Council
59.	Pharmacy Undergraduate Society
60.	Planning Students Association
61.	Point Grey Village Business Association
62.	Professors Emeriti
63.	Public Affairs
64.	RCMP
65.	Regent College
66.	Residence Hall Association
67.	SALA
68.	Sauder School of Business
69.	School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
70.	School of Audiology and Speech Sciences
71.	School of Community & Regional Planning
72.	School of Continuing Studies
73.	School of Journalism
74.	School of Kinesiology
75.	School of Library, Archival and Information Systems
76.	School of Music
77.	School of Nursing
78.	School of Population and Public Health
79.	School of Social Work



80.	Science Undergraduate Society
81.	Senior Advisor to the President on Student Housing
82.	South West Marine Drive Rate Payers Association
83.	St. Marks
84.	Staff Finders/ OGPR
85.	Student Communication Services
86.	Student Development and Services
87.	Student Housing & Hospitality Services
88.	The Dunbar Village Business Association
89.	The Vancouver School of Theology
90.	TransLink
91.	TRIUMF
92.	UBC Alumni
93.	UBC Association of Professors Emeriti
94.	UBC Athletics and Recreation
95.	UBC Bike Co-op
96.	UBC Botanical Garden
97.	UBC Building Operations
98.	UBC Common Energy
99.	UBC Community Partnership Unit
100.	UBC Energy and Water Services
101.	UBC Faculty of Applied Science
102.	UBC Faculty of Arts
103.	UBC Faculty of Graduate Studies
104.	UBC Faculty of Science
105.	UBC Infrastructure and Development
106.	UBC Properties Trust
107.	UBC Theatre Department
108.	UBC/UEL Alliance for Biking and Walking
109.	UFASTA
110.	University Community Services
111.	University Endowment Lands (Administration)
112.	University Endowment Lands (Community Advisory Committee)
113.	University Hill Elementary School
114.	University Hill Secondary School
115.	University Neighbourhoods Association
116.	USI (University Sustainability Initiative)
117.	Vancouver Fire and Rescue Service
118.	Vancouver School Board
119.	Vancouver School of Theology
120.	Village Gate Homes
121.	VP Students Office
122.	Wesbrook Village
123.	West Point Grey Residents Association
124.	West Point Grey Vision Implementation Committee
125.	Wreck Beach Preservation Society

**Appendix II: Public Open House Display Boards****Appendix III: Questionnaire****Appendix IV: All Questionnaire Feedback Received and Stakeholder Letters**