

Feedback from survey

Comment	6
Glad Option 3 was dropped	1
Impacts on residents	1
Need more rec space	1
Preserving history happens through stories and inspiration	1
Rec clubs need more space	1
Too soon, irresponsible, no UBC strategic plan yet	1
Concern	10
Consultation process / options	2
Decision to close pool basement gym without replacement	1
Development next to hospice and Promontory	1
Impacts on residents	2
Lack of fitness centre space	1
Lack of transparency with consultation process / options	3
Opposed	1
renting athletic space to professional teams	1
Question	1
How do WMG options impact existing rec space	1
Suggestion	5
Build more rec space, biggest impact on overall wellbeing	1
Create affordable market housing for faculty	1
ensure environmental standards in project development	1
Green walls for Stadium Road residents to grown own food	1
Varsity spending should benefit the priorities of the university	1
Support	1
having student workout space	1

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

Table 1	<p>(Page 1) Thunderbird Stadium Options</p> <p>Flip:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where do people park? Displaced <u>existing</u>*surface parking street parking • Sequencing of build • Noise? Pro for the Centre of Excellence to buffer noise => trade-off is more traffic • Where is the housing locating in the flip? <p>[All] How do these facilities <u>benefit</u> residents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be clear about this
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p>[All]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the density or urban at N of Stadium road ← (concern of no input) ← Height ↓ Lack of trust & need for certainty of what will be developed • Shifting density around is a desired input • Noise – How can this be improved? Desire for an improved condition over <u>existing</u>
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <p>1B – Residential around STD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for pot buyers <p>(1B + 5 – COE at bubble is better for adjacent users)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less traffic/noise if COE is moved <p>Flip or not flip stadium less of a concern than above</p> <p>2+ 5 – Concern for noise in Hampton (orientation)</p>
	<p>(Page 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late night student noise <u>Flip</u> may reduce this? Shift traffic to E. or W. Mall? • <u>♥UBC</u> Long term res -> students/faculty/[res]] • (Not about divide and conquer between neighbourhood)

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

Table 2	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p>Importance of Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Want to see strong outcomes• Learn about transportation plans/impacts• Understanding of options/COE• Concerns around development around stadium/GA roans <p>WMG/COE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option E allows phasing (keep WMG in place through construction)• Option E loses future opportunities for gateway north site• Taller building is more efficient use of land parcel• Prefer COE near WMG due to expected traffic impacts in Thunderbird park area<ul style="list-style-type: none">- co-location with SRC/Nest/Aquatics/bus loop is appealing• Suggestion to build COE/rec program in Doug Mitchell to mitigate cost, construction impacts & proximity to parking• Recreating opportunities on Osborne site should be explored when building is renewed
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p>Stadium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acoustics are good for residents currently due to sunken field and stadium orientation• Future neighbourhood planning process should accommodate additional parking for athletic uses<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Need for accommodating faculty/staff housing that meets needs (families)• Option 2 & 5 allow better views for new neighbourhood• Structural integrity of west stadium berm is important for botanical gardens<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Storm water management is important for botanical gardens- Shade impacts of potential neighbourhood need to be considered• Transportation circulation is important• Loss of forest a concern• Tiered parking should be considered near 16th• General preferences for co-locating neighbourhoods and sport facilities

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

<p>Table 3</p>	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p>Centre of Excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worry • Placement • Why moving to near War Memorial attractive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Functionality - Rec and spectator consolidated - Close to transit <p style="margin-left: 400px;">} Option E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why worry about near Hawthorne <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demolished of functional buildings -> UBC has poor standards of resources -> Construction disruption • Impact on neighbourhoods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of hedge - Recreation of nature - Noise – views - Traffic increases
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functional if of Rec & Athletic • Consolidation • Agreement on near War Memorial but as separate building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More accessible when near transit • Worries about flip <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction on impacts - Property values - Noise - Traffic impact <p style="margin-left: 300px;">} Closer housing around new promontory the greater those concerns are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New stadium has been requested • Gardens may fit better with residential than stadium • Preference from St. John’s Hospice to leave stadium in current location

Table 3	<p>(Page 3)</p> <p>Best options with Planning considerations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The stadium may be orphaned - Allows for bridge • Centre of Excellence • Lack of clarity on what the neighbourhood will look like <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More details wanted • Benefit of Option 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Away from busy street - Connection to promontory • Why one time revenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revenue is generated into endowment fund
	<p>(Page 4)</p> <p>Option 1B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated • Noise issues – noise problem in neighbourhood • People walking through neighbourhood causes disruption <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easily connect • Easier to sell when built up due to less noise • Benefit – opportunity to increase connections to other neighbourhoods • The people who bought in to • Until the layout is shown, it is too uncertain to see what option is best • Some retail? • How to access the neighbourhood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic concerns -> road rebuilt?
	<p>(Page 5)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Centre of Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Place either near War Memorial as separate building or near Stadium 2) More information is needed on the look and density in order to make decision on stadium location 3) Concerns about additional density can it be achieved elsewhere 4) Option 1B too much interaction between spectators and residents -> noise and traffic <p>(Page 5 continued)</p>

	5) Potential for small retail
--	-------------------------------

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

Table 4	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p>War Memorial Gym</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Centre of Excellence – Option D & E removes Osborne and brings student activity - Stadium Neighbourhood and U Boulevard relationship: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed use of U Boulevard - Should War Memorial be renovated and be site of COE? Or should we continue to think about relocating South? - More details wanted on COE and what it entails - More details wanted on how many stories high the building will be - Why was this idea [COE] not thought of earlier? - Raises up questions about housing density -> relevant to residents to inquire the extent of density <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Need to flag this as a concern: what are the transfer impacts?
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p>Impacts from putting COE relocated in North Gateway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why the name “Centre of Excellence?” Entire university can also be “Centre of Excellence” • Loss of open green space in field • Why not build COE at old SUB location? It has heritage value like Thunderbird Stadium and War Memorial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Old SUB also clashes with contemporary design of area • COE should be where the students are (North Gateway) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More details on why varsity teams needing it to be at this location • Hampton residents are concerned with more buildings and affecting ecology of area *
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centre of Excellence – should not be called this. Too ambiguous • Hampton – traffic would be also be too severe • Preference for central transit • Parking concern <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WM Field needs to take this into particular events, especially for entertainment & events -> disrupts community. Need to articulate parking strategy • Hope to keep green space in/near WM Field. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at broader transportation issue; put stadium near where the students are

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

Table 5	(Page 4) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern for non-UBC folks to find the area challenging to get around• Athletics downloading costs on residents – haven't presented full costs<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Athletics need to consider business model before talking about neighbourhood planning• If stadium has 5000 seats, it should have 5000 parking spots, otherwise it would burden residents• Heritage aspect not too prominent in stadium because it's not too old – keeping it is more for function and utilitarian reasons
	(Page 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doesn't want stadium to be moved to WM Filed as it affects nearby residents

Jan. 21, 2017 – Wesbrook Workshop

Table 6	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p>Hawthorn and Chancellor Place Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Likes to have stadium close by• Having stadium at Hawthorn creates buffer (+ VE) – not as dense• Stadium @ Hawthorn (+ VE) an amenity• Wants more green space near/around neighbourhoods• Concerns:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Too much traffic:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➢ 16th avenue/Wesbrook – traffic congestion and safety concerns➢ Density increase will contribute to traffic and safety concerns- Not ideal but option B is preferred because more traffic directed to Marine Drive instead of inner roads. Option B remains more green space• Option 5<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Too dense- Green space taken out- Stadium has heritage significance
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1B preferred *• Option 1B: should be rated higher for “<u>enhanced access to facilities</u>” because Centre of Excellence is same as Option 5<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Also have enhanced access to Marine Drive- Will affect overall rating for Option 1B- What is rational when rating “accessibility” and “building school spirit”- Desire to have more info on revenue opportunities between options<ul style="list-style-type: none">➢ Need info to make an informed decision

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 1	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>Thunderbird</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoE close to Osborne makes sense, academics close to high performance (1b) • Bus top close to T-bird, inaccessible now – location for all venues makes things easier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Would also reduce confusion for people coming from off campus • (2;5) make sense for not splitting neighbourhood w/ stadium in between higher density potential • Lots of challenges with getting people out to stadium community, new infrastructure would incentivize people to come out • Accessibility a key consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Also has to be inclusive of people arriving on foot • Noise can also be inclusive; welcoming, promoting community participation • New stadium maybe a draw for potential students/community • Have to weight in central location w/ varsity needs for CoE
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p><u>Thunderbird Con't</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage isn't as important as having people at the game <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Good atmosphere more important for students • Relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 1b – better short term vs. 2 & 5 better long term ➤ 1b limiting in terms of upgrades possible ➤ 1b efficiency of CoE, tennis may balance inefficiency and split stadium ➤ 2 & 5 one site potentially move straightforward a construction site ➤ Option 2 most cost efficient – cost/density. \$5 million for new bubble (option 5) shouldn't value break this option ➤ Sponsorship potential? Partnering/joining a league (NCAD) ➤ Birdcoop is ridiculous – needs more rec space -> willing to come out of Recs
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <p><u>Rec</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convenient to have facilities located together

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize rec in central campus, max varsity in south campus • Reno isn't as nice as new facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Not worth the difference in costs -> rebuild • Long term option is best for War construction • Add student housing into options. Is adding housing in any of the options possible? High volume in housing so feel strongly it should be considered? • Student housing = student participation and facility utilization • Time of day impacts participation for off-campus students • Heritage more important for War <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Keeping certain features and home important
Table 1	<p>(Page 4) <u>Rec (Con't)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • War move symbolic – a heritage asset • Funding: easier to fund as user base is very large, high usage

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 2	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>Rec Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option D: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ More efficient land use ➤ Housing, sky train • We need rec space • It's better in the heart of campus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No one ever goes south <p><u>Proximity</u></p>
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p><u>Varsity Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate space is good because it's a destination... BUT Blended on U Boulevard with rec space can draw bodies, spectators, build spirit <p><u>Stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flip is preferred • Housing would be in high demand
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <p><u>Rec</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stacking is more efficient land use • Better engagement from proximity with rec/varsity • What happens with WMG users during construction? • WE NEED FITNESS SPACE <p><u>Varsity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity for athletics athletes from options BUT Better community engagement in D/E *
	<p>(Page 4)</p> <p>(Con't)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Important to keep membership costs down, even with shiny new buildings• Aquatic Centre is free• Lost the old Aquatic Centre gym, it was free <p><u>Stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Benefits to 2 & 5• But not clearly communicated or understood
Table 2	<p>(Page 5)</p> <p><u>Fitness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consolidated is a benefit• Will there be space for growth?• Will my tuition go up to pay for this?

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 3	<p>(Page 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about clearing forest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ropes course has made the trees unhealthy • Waste of money to tear down tennis bubble just to build something new • Noise concerns with Stadium Neighbourhood? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ People will be aware before move in ➤ Student housing - loses us the ability to sell market housing ➤ Construction vs. stadium noise ➤ Vanier and community housing flip - would be extension of Chancellor
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seating facing other way is good for noise direction and for avoiding getting sun in your eyes during events • Option 2 & 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Will the stadium stands be sunk down or at grade? • Option 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Better to have Centre of Excellence close to stadium • Option 1b & 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Better synergy with Kinesiology? ➤ Strengthen connection of Main Mall from Thunderbird Boulevard to Stadium ➤ Make this stretch more a part of nice walk ➤ Stadium move could strengthen East Mall as pedestrian route ➤ Parking considerations?
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate additional parking into Neighbourhood Plan (developments) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reserved for residents + event lower down • Consider more parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ One big parkade for future housing and spectators <p><u>War Memorial Gym Options:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option E is to remove some housing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Having academic on first floor will isolate students from faculties ➤ More value as businesses, Rec and housing ➤ Making mark is best as sports building ➤ Nice new building ➤ If upgrading War Memorial, build residence (private) ➤ If demolishing, have some way memorialize building
Table 3	<p>(Page 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have plaque or name building War Memorial Gym again • There needs to be some way to make it more than just a name • Very visible monument may serve purpose – make it more visible on Wesbrook Mall • Would be nice to have natural light in the gym • Plaques along the walls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Importance of fitness ➤ People don't notice them • South side not very aesthetically pleasing • You could restore but you will have to come back in another 50 years • Sun exposure/shade for AMS Nest?
	<p>(Page 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we separate the loud activities and market housing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe put student there instead <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Matter of marketing? Let people know there will be noise • Disappointment that stadium track flip was removed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Greek village was excited by possible synergy with stadium closer • Incorporate track on MacInnes Field Site and Stadium on track site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Track would get more use as recreation site ➤ In War Memorial -> indoor running track

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 4	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>WMG Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Move CoE to fields precinct<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Centralize varsity program• Stack is more efficient use of land *• CoE in centre of campus is closer to student density and transit *<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Parking in this area is a concern• Should acknowledge history of WMG but retention is not important; should be renewed to conform with recent development in the area• Access to recreation facilities in the short term is important• Benefit to co-location CoE in proximity to parking (tennis bubble) or transit (WMG)• No support for CoE/stadium co-location due to parking impacts
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p><u>Stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing site – proximity of housing to stadium would be an issue• Flip<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Allows ability to deal with lighting, noise and traffic more effectively➤ East facing stadium would be preferable for spectator experience• Colocation of use is preferred<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ better to have housing be in a continuous neighbourhood and stadium next to the fields• New housing – revenue should be used to fund stadium• Option 5 – CoE good location for parking but necessitates more construction• Colocation of spectator facilities (stadium/CoE) is appealing• Proximity parking is important (particularly if CoE is on Matthew's)

Table 4	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>Stadium Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separating CoE from stadium could be better for traffic + P • Noise impacts from CoE on tennis bubble • Residential more desirable away from athletics fields • CoE + rec better combined near centre of campus • Keep what's important without compromising functionality
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p>*support the idea of “indoor precinct” and “outdoor precinct”</p>

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 5	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rec facilities affect the most people so should be prioritized • Facilities shouldn't be <u>exclusive</u> to varsity • Consider <u>long-term</u> needs (20+ years) • Consider faculty and staff needs as well • Explore Olympic combat sports/martial arts facility (eg. fencing, wrestling, judo, boxing, TKD)
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p><u>War Memorial Gym</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whatever option generates the most NEW SPACE should be preferred • Retaining heritage/memorial value important, even if rebuilt • Combining rec/athletics provides greater flexibility (ie. Options D + E) • Ensure space programming enables flexible management/allocation for non-varsity use • What happens to current users during construction? • Don't compromise varsity needs as they bring in \$ and reputation • Supportive of investment but where is money coming from? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development charges/community amenity continues? • Supportive of moving Centre of Excellence here -> closer to heart of campus and other facilities
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <p><u>Stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider potential impact on attendance at stadium events • Concerned about influx of new residential buildings (parking, noise, traffic, use of facilities/shopping, population) • Preserve quiet neighbourhood feel and academic focus • Stadium is only 50 years old and has heritage value <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retrofit is sufficient • Options 2 & 5 provide greater flexibility for Neighbourhood Plan -> Option 5 moves closer to Centre of Excellence closer to centre of campus

Table 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider Kinesiology program needs• Option 2 & 5 could deliver new community amenities (parks, trees, etc)• Opportunity to create more space for students to live on campus• Layout and design of new community is key
---------	---

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 6	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>War Gym/Rec Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LEED Gold ➤ Wood construction ➤ Embodied energy • Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rec near transit ➤ Co-located ➤ Community student events <p><u>Local Centre of Excellence at WMG area vs stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centre of Excellence + new Aquatic facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Foster school spirit as close to student population • Better transit access • Easy access for big events <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gym option B + C are not preferred as best to have varsity in the new WMG area • For D + E, allow varsity facilities to be used for REC when not in use
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <p><u>Option 2 – stacked</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More challenging to manage when high use of both facilities (crowds, etc) <p><u>Option E</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If keeping WMG make sure it is refreshed inside to outside so it matches its surrounding • Lots of openness and connection between fitness and other areas • Having both sites seems to allow more space and flexibility to spread out the fitness and programming
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to not compromise high performance by the rec or UBC varsity and both are externally

	<p>usable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E allows both uses to have their own identity • Option E is general most preferred <p><u>Additional Sticky Notes</u> (Page 1) <u>Centre of Excellence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to spectators + parking (tennis centre) • CoE near on Matthews would be isolated (far from resources, parking and transit) • CoE @ WMG is a problem due to parking
Table 6	<p>(Page 2) <u>WMG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No connection to historical significance of WMG <p><u>Stadium</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolation of existing site is appealing since it makes it feel special • Existing site would be a concern due to traffic impacts <p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of stadium is of greater value than WMF • Approach to stadium through Hawthorn is a great feature <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working out in basement is unappealing

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 7	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>War Memorial Gym</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option E<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Would there be substitute space?➤ How can we get more people to come out?➤ Any space for TSC sports?➤ Building varsity in WMG area?• Option D<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Facility too high?• Option C<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Would be fun to have new building with parking and transit options• Would there be shuttles to these facilities?• Focus on expanding Centre• Residents concern regarding noise too much of an impact on decisions?• Awkward to have massive buildings isolated from other buildings
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option E makes most sense for varsity and rec<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Most feasible➤ Good location, accessible options for different fitness needs➤ Good to have varsity gyms at Gateway➤ Building should be all glass for aesthetics *• Why keep the old SUB? Too dingy for renovated gym• Would you pay \$25 per year to support facilities?<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Some yes, but expect some push back from other students➤ Need to appeal to as many people as possible. What will benefit them?• Pumping more money into varsity will eventually fund itself -> free promo for UBC

Table 7	<p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option C – pushback from varsity• Need to make varsity accessible for revenue• Option E and 5 makes the most sense together• Options depend on needs for varsity space• Consider accessibility for wheel chairs too• Build an inclusive, fun atmosphere – no one wants to go to games alones• How long does Option E last for?
---------	--

Jan. 31, 2017: Hillel house Workshop

Table 8	<p>(Page 1)</p> <p><u>War Memorial Gym</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorial wall – better to have its purpose for respect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Finding a way to enhance legacy • Option D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rec facilities be close to bus loop where most students activity is ➤ Not sure if structure might be too big? Safety issues to consider as well, eg. fire during events • Keep spectator sports south of campus
	<p>(Page 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does varsity think of having the Centre close to TBird park? • Mix feelings towards rec facilities in student areas but also getting people to attend varsity games? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Right now, varsity games too far from main campus • Shuttle bus between 2 hubs to increase commute • What would make come out to sports events? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Events held on Friday nights
	<p>(Page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current impressions of rec facilities – too crowded, busy • Making facilities more attractive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Advertisements ➤ Frequency of programs ➤ Multi-purpose court ➤ Outdoor amenities ➤ Modern building (but need to consider heritage) Transparency with glass or more enclosed? Transparency for design but still some space for privacy ➤ Natural sunlight (the kind that doesn't blind you)
	<p>(Page 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 and 5 good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Option 2 seems most accessible with transit options

Table 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Creating better spec atmosphere• More housing and funding around the stadium• Ensuring there's transit options near stadium• On campus residents – important to consider safety and comfort when people walk between events• Would you pay a little more for these facilities?<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Depends if it's beneficial and accessible
---------	---

Appendix XI- Phase II Workshop Notes and Verbatim Survey Feedback

Do you have any comments about the shortlisted War Memorial Gym options? |

#	Response
1.	Full rebuild and tie in with new GSAB building
2.	renovation better than new build
3.	Without combining the War Memorial Gym with a Football Stadium and Centre of Excellence we are continuing to divide our resources across the campus. A close look at almost ALL varsity programs and stadiums across Canada and the US will show that these stadiums are in close proximity and therefore allow for the sharing of many common spaces (S & C, Physio clinics, research, etc.) By dividing them at this stage, and with such a great distance between them, we are committing ourselves to a mediocre setup at best for the next 40-50 years.
4.	No. I refuse to choose from an arbitrary, artificially constrained "shortlist".
5.	I like the full renovation as opposed to a full replacement. (Option B)This will preserve the historic outline of the building and yet provide needed services. It also should be cheaper. I agree that a new build will give the opportunity to architecturally blend the complex into the designs of the SUB and the Alumni Centre but I put greater weight in the history of the gym. Neither design will take away the relocation of green space in this area. (I hope)
6.	Bigger gym needed, better hours, bigger locker rooms, and FREE day-use lockers (unlike the awful new pool locker options).
7.	I believe option C is the better one, the current building is old and the new building will bring top facilities for the UBC community and more importantly to the UBC basketball team.
8.	NO
9.	How would this affect the Bird Coop at the SRC?
10.	I strongly believe that the best option for both the community and athletic department is to proceed with the full renovation of War Memorial Gym. There is great historical value in the current gym and proceeding with the renovation option would provide the opportunity to maintain this aspect of the building.
11.	I think the scale of investment warrants demolition and building a more modern and efficient structure that would better meet university priorities The current building is very run down.
12.	The war memorial gym should be fully rebuilt like on Option C, however with implementation of small retail stores and or coffee shops students and faculty could stop by before heading onto the bus. I believe Option C is better because of the natural lighting the recreation center participants will receive throughout the day.
13.	I would like to better understand the environmental impacts of the options - how long would a renovated facility last? When would it need to be replaced? How will final building efficiency, construction waste, longevity compare in each of the options? Either way, the school desperately needs to invest more in recreation space for the university community -

and spend less on athletics facilities that are so far removed from the lives of most people who live, work, and study at the campus (vs. recreation space, which will have a huge impact on a large number of people!).

14. Please consider Doug Mitchell as alternative option.

15. All of these development options are presented in a way that ignores cumulative impact of ongoing development and the implications of cumulative effects upon residents and members of the UBC community. The motivating idea is one that argues for need of such space without contextualizing other needs more centrally linked to the university's core mission.

16. pleased about the possibility for complete rebuild, and having all the services in the same location. Should maximize recreational space, and not have areas that go unused because they're "varsity only."

Design should engage along its border with McInnes Field.

Don't overbuild the stands - maybe 150 percent capacity of the average crowd so there's room for growth, but not wasted space/expenditure. For large/feature games to build school spirit, use Mitchell arena with sport court, as that fits 5000 already and those stands are underused as well.

17. The project with the earliest completion date should be preferred. Sport facilities are extremely limited and many students will appreciate being able to use the new gym as soon as possible.

18. The division into a "spectator hub" and a "recreation hub" makes no sense. Almost all athletics facilities are used for both competition (i.e. with spectators) and recreation. The division is bizarre and seems unnecessary.

19. Option C/ Option D

I would like the demolition of the current War Memorial Gym it is currently wearing down and the facility is very worn down. The rebuilding of WMG would allow for more opportunities for the student body and better accessibility for all

20. Prefer Option B

21. There is already a lot of varsity space and there NEEDS to be space for TSC sport clubs space as well (gym ->both gyms and workout space,office space, storage space)

22. I think keeping the current athletic excellence component within the War Memorial site is important.

However, it would be ideal to reconstruct the building to offer a more optimized space with the same foot print as well as to help fit the aesthetic of the new development in the area of UBC central. priority to option D.

Do you have any comments about the shortlisted Thunderbird Stadium options? |

Response

1.	Support for Option 2
2.	<p>keep the noise and residential separate</p> <p>do not build very high - it impacts the light to the world class botanical garden</p> <p>people get married near the best north American alpine garden, so put a buffer zone or schedule any events with this in mind</p>
3.	No. Again, I refuse to choose from an arbitrary, artificially constrained "shortlist".
4.	<p>I prefer to see the Academic Excellence Centre be part of the Stadium relocation closer to East Mall. (Option 2). I would guess that it would provide some cost effectiveness. The Stadium Neighbourhood development could be aimed at those faculty, staff and students with interests in athletics development and individual fitness through a combination of market housing, rental and co-development. I do realize the location the Centre to the current Bubble site gives greater access to the rest of the Campus but I would not support relocating the bubble. It is a very functional facility even though it needs to address washroom needs. It also lends itself to maintenance and renovation. Currently despite some brutal weather, it is practically dry most days, (I am a user).</p> <p>At the end of the day it is the citizens of this province who pay for higher education and I believe these plans should be reflecting that contribution. I fully realize there will likely be great fund raising efforts but the tax deductions still take the project to a tax-supported model.</p>
5.	No
6.	Option 1b is the best given that the current location of that stadium is perfect and it just needs improved seating and roofing, the field is in optimal conditions.
7.	IN FAVOUR OF RETAINING STADIUM WHERE IT IS
8.	<p>In my opinion, option 1 for Thunderbird stadium (full renovation and athletic centre in current location) would be of best interest for the athletes as well as for the potential for residential development. The current location of the stadium does not need to be changed, and incorporating the athletic centre in that location as well would be great for both the varsity athletic community (providing a central location that many teams already make use of) and would also be a cost effective solution (not having to relocate the current tennis bubble). In regards to the Whit Matthews field, in it's current state, it would not require much work to start the building of the new residential buildings. If the stadium were to be relocated to the Whit Matthews field, and residential buildings be build on the current stadium location, there would be much greater costs associated with preparing the land to be suitable for building residential condos. Option 1 is feasible in regards to keeping the great current location of Thunderbird stadium and adding the benefit of athletic centre, and in regards to finances would also be the best option for the land that is currently available. Option 1 would allow for minimal disturbance of the current tennis bubble or having to displace the football, soccer, and many other teams that make use of the current stadium to tear it up and then attempt the build residential on that site. The Whit Matthews field is the most easily accessible location to start building for residential as it currently sits, and would create the best and fastest opportunity for income, while still maintaining the Thunderbird stadium until funds exists to redo the facility.</p>
9.	I would like to see the Thunderbird structural supports preserved and reused in some way

<p>if the stadium is built on Whit Mathews field.</p>
<p>10. The stadium is located too far for students to walk to, which discourages students to watch games on a weekly or casual basis. Other than the changing room and seatings that are outdated, the building is fine.</p>
<p>11. I think that the focus should be shifted from Varsity-centric (which benefits fewer members of the community) to more focus on recreation. I.e. spend less money on the spectator hub and spend more money on the recreation hub. I think that a realistic approach should be taken when considering how sport spectatorship will change over the next decades - will it actually increase dramatically enough to warrant all these new facilities?</p>
<p>12. You want to build housing next to a stadium. Residents already complain about noise. This will only make that worse. Be sensible and do not build housing. Unless you want to destroy any soul that UBC has left.</p>
<p>13. The stadium options present very little in way of actual 'options.' Furthermore the general plan to designate revenue from house to the rebuild of the stadium (whether it is flipped or not) is done in isolation from other capital project needs that are more closely tied to the university's core mission.</p>
<p>14. Shortlisted options reflect caring more about neighbourhood wants than varsity and student desires, and place too low a value on access (transit/walking/parking). Of the shortlist, the flipped option on whit matthews field is best, and placing the stadium along the road will build visibility.</p> <p>Locating the centre of excellence closer to research facilities such as the life sciences building (ie placing it near the tennis building) makes sense.</p>
<p>15. The option 1b is preferable from the standpoint of existing Hawthorn Place campus residents as it seems to offer the least amount of disruption, noise, increased traffic and general congestion.</p>
<p>16. Every option presented for Thunderbird Stadium includes a new "Stadium Road Neighbourhood" that will be MARKET HOUSING -- NOT STUDENT HOUSING. Why? Presumably this is to offset the costs, but using something that has not been approved to offset costs doesn't seem financially responsible. So, it can't really be about offsetting costs can it? Is it therefore about lining the pockets of developers?</p> <p>Also, the stadium is used for concerts. There are already conflicts with the residents in south campus regarding noise. How is it possibly a good idea to have a non-student neighbourhood right next to the stadium?</p>
<p>17. relocate thunderbird stadium-> allow for new housing to be built</p>
<p>18. Prefer option 2</p> <p>because new Athletic Centre of Excellence would shield Hawthorne Place from concert/sport noise</p>
<p>19. -Strong preference for option 2</p> <p>-If option 1 or 5 were to be considered Please do not remove existing tennis bubble- Place athletic centre of excellence @WMG (your options E or D) Thank you!</p>

20. Moving the stadium and putting up residences is a good move
21. I believe that it would be best for conformity to move and invest the stadium to be closer to east mall and have housing/ residence be developed behind the stadium further down stadium road

Priority to Option 5 but leaving the ACE functionality at War Memorial

Do you have any general comments? |

#	Response
1.	<p>sports are a hobby and extra to university studies</p> <p>having a space for students to work out is great</p> <p>I don't like renting our space out to professional teams</p>
2.	<p>In the initial public consult that was performed it was not clear that the Athletics Centre of Excellence would include the court sports of volleyball and basketball and I believe that this had a significant impact on the resulting feedback and feeling towards the Centre of Excellence. There is clearly a strong push and support for the football stadium but that same support is clearly not there for War Memorial. I feel this has more to do with the lack of clear communication than with the plan itself.</p>
3.	<p>This process is flawed and opaque. It appears to be "window dressing" intended to allow UBC to pretend that the community was meaningfully consulted. If you were seriously interested in community opinion, you would:</p> <p>(1) Release a summary of the October survey. If there was, in fact, "little support for a basic renovation of War Memorial Gym", you need to quantify that level of support. As it stands, it is logical to infer that the "little" support was substantial enough that revealing it would demonstrate the illegitimacy of the Board's "shortlist".</p> <p>(2) Present the full set of options, including: (a) doing nothing whatsoever, (b) only doing seismic upgrades. It would be nice if (a) were nonsensical because all other campus buildings were seismically sound, but we know perfectly well that's not the case.</p>
4.	<p>I am happy to see that the plans to move the Stadium to the Dhillon track or the Osborne Centre have been scrapped and common sense has prevailed. I see the Osborne Centre is getting needed repairs and renovations. It is also a functional area. The Dhillon Track gets lots of use by public and private schools as well as the varsity clubs. The contributions by the White Caps are making this corner at Wesbrook and 16th attractive and accessible.</p> <p>I remain a bit concerned that the "truth" about the land development plans around the Stadium were not more transparent. I felt this issue was a sleeping elephant. The complete removal of the Stadium from its current site, I saw as an attempt to add the existing Stadium property (which is huge) to the Neighbourhood plan. However, with Option 2, UBC will still have a substantial building site as the Rope Course will be taken over. As above, this is an opportunity for Planning to look at some imaginative development on this site.</p>

<p>There will be interesting days ahead.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to contribute some comments.</p> <p>Best of luck!</p>
<p>5. Don't skimp on the lockers.</p>
<p>6. New fitness centre space is urgently needed. Things are now even worse with the closure of the aquatic centre gym. I know numerous people who simply don't work out or work out less due to lack of available fitness centre space on campus.</p>
<p>7. IN NONE OF THE OPTIONS PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED AT THE VARIOUS WORKSHOPS IN 2016, AND UP TO THE JANUARY 21 WORKSHOP AT WESBROOK, WAS THE "REVISED" OPTION 1(B) BEING CONSIDERED. THUS, THOSE PEOPLE WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE EARLIER WORKSHOPS WERE NOT AWARE OF THE "REVISION", AND EVEN AT THE WESBROOK WORKSHOP DID THE C+CP PEOPLE GO OUT OF THEIR WAY TO HIGHLIGHT THE CHANGES. OBVIOUSLY THE MOST AFFECTED PARTY HERE ARE THE FOLKS AT THE HOSPICE, WHO NOW FACE A MAJOR REAL ESTATE PROJECT ON THE LOT ADJACENT TO THEIR PARKING LOT, (WHICH WAS NOT INCLUDED ORIGINALLY) NOT TO MENTION THE PROPOSALS BEING CONSIDERED FOR THE STADIUM SITE. THEY DON'T SEEM TO HAVE A VOICE HERE. ALSO AFFECTED BY THIS CHANGE ARE THE OWNERS IN THE PROMONTORY CONDOMINIUM, ALSO UNAWARE OF THE REVISION. THIS PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THEIR PRIVACY AND VIEWS.</p>
<p>8. How would changes to the War Memorial Gym affect the Bird Coop at the SRC?</p>
<p>9. Noise mitigation and traffic patterns/parking/ recognition of historical significance/ sensitivity to nearby residence concerns, especially any negative environmental impacts on UEL.</p>
<p>10. I think that more money should be spent on recreation, and the money spent on varsity athletics should be redistributed to suit the priorities of the university. Generally, I believe that there should be more focus put into athletics and recreation, as it directly affects the lives of everyone on campus. Through investment in these facilities, and equally importantly in the programs offered, individual well-being and school spirit will flourish. I think that UBC has a strong foundation, and with the right direction can become even more of a leader in how athletics and recreation can succeed and be a major part of the culture and experience of the university.</p>
<p>11. Could the proposed develop have provisions for 100 square feet per resident to grow food for themselves. Severe shortage of community garden plots in Westbrook. Consider vertical gardening technology, green wall and green roofs for the Stadium road development.</p>
<p>12. This plan has been put together with such a high degree of PR-advertising value, it feel's like it has been fast tracked through the processes, and it is taking place with the semblance of ignoring cumulative community impacts and other pressing capital needs more closely linked to the university's core mission.</p>
<p>13. preserving history is about ensuring the stories that make history are retold. Preserving a building doesn't do this, but having a building that inspires the sharing does.</p>
<p>14. Please ensure high environmental standards are implemented in the design.</p>
<p>15. It would have been nice to see the impact on livability on existing campus residents as one of the guiding principles. Those of us who have already purchased condos on campus have</p>

invested significantly in order to live here and we would like to protect our investment as well as continue to enjoy the surroundings. It seems to me that the area is almost at capacity with traffic and noise and increasing density will only detract further from the experience.

16. 1. First and foremost, UBC itself DOES NOT yet have a strategic plan. The new president is still working on it. The first thing it says in the guiding principles is that this athletics plan should be consistent with UBC's strategic priorities. But how can it be when these are not yet ready? It seems to be too early to be thinking about this.
2. Many new athletics facilities have been added to campus recently WITHOUT a strategic plan in place, including a \$40 million aquatic centre that isn't appropriate for UBC (see the backlash on Twitter and Reddit as well as the negative press that has been received). Why is Campus and Community Planning only now considering a proper strategic plan for athletics facilities on campus? This does not seem like responsible planning. Why has the Board of Governors not previously demanded a strategic plan? And why are we allowing the unit that let us get to be one of the worst performing universities in terms of athletics space to lead future development?
3. It is disgusting that some of the promotional materials for this consultation included the phrasing "It's getting crowded in here". But, it was Campus and Community Planning together with UBC Athletics that CLOSED the basement gym in the old aquatic centre before the new one in the basement of the SUB is open. In fact, it is going to be at least a FULL year before the new gym is ready, despite knowing that the old gym would disappear at least four years ago and despite the old SUB sitting empty for close to two years. Campus planning has acknowledged that there isn't enough space, but they closed the one place that was relieving some of that pressure? How can this unit possibly expect the community to trust them with providing the athletics facilities that the campus needs?
4. Furthermore, how is it efficient to create a new location with a gym instead of putting it together with the aquatic centre? Separating them means additional change rooms, additional showers, additional staff for working at registration desks, etc.. Again, this seems like poor long-term planning.

17. ANY approved plan MUST create affordable purchase housing for UBC Faculty members. The lack of affordable homes near UBC is hurting recruitment + retention. The Gameplan is an opportunity to finally come up with a workable housing plan that will benefit multiple generations of faculty, improving UBC academics in tandem with UBC athletics

18. Why have caveat at all? Incompatible with residential

19. TSC Sport Clubs is home to 600+ athletics in its second year. We will continue to grow and need space to excel in our 13 sports!

20. The Gameplan is ambitious and accounts for all potential stakeholders!

The necessity for more recreational space is in high demand at UBC.

Great to help people know that we are UBC... "The University of Building Construction."