



University Boulevard Precinct Planning

Phase 1 Public Consultation Summary Report

April 7, 2015

campus + community planning

Table of Contents

- 1. Executive Summary 2
 - Summary of Consultation Feedback 2
- 2. Public Consultation Process Overview 2
- 3. Stakeholder and Public Notification 3
 - Stakeholder Notification 3
 - Public Notification 3
- 4. Public Consultation 4
 - Open House 4
 - Workshop 4
 - Online Consultation 5
 - Stakeholder Engagement 5
- 5. Detailed Feedback from Public Consultation 5
 - Open House and Online Consultation 6
 - Workshop 9
- 6. Stakeholder Submissions 13
- 7. Participant Demographics 16
- 8. Next Steps 17
- 9. Appendices 17

1. Executive Summary

This report presents a summary of feedback received during Phase 1 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct, which ran from February 10 – 23 online, with a public open house on February 10 and a public workshop on February 12.

UBC Campus + Community Planning (C+CP) provided notification of the public consultation through advertising, email, online, and outreach to stakeholders. Notification was sent to **1,067 campus stakeholders, faculty and staff**, 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 **100** people attended the Public Open House
- **30** people participated at the Public Workshop
- **700** unique page views to the University Boulevard Precinct Planning project pages on the C+CP website.

Written feedback received were as follows:

- **52** people submitted ideas at the Public Open House
- **30** completed online and **2** in person questionnaires were received
- **5** stakeholder letters were received

Summary of Consultation Feedback

During the first phase of public consultation we introduced proposed new development opportunities in the precinct and gathered ideas and feedback on what else is needed to contribute to the precinct's vision. Over 475 ideas and comments were submitted through the public consultation on ways to complete the precinct vision, which can be summarized through the following themes:

- Ensure a high level of pedestrian and cycling connectivity and comfort throughout the precinct
- Design buildings with supportive services and create a high quality, high amenity public realm (including street furniture, trees, wayfinding, public art, etc.)
- Create a more welcoming arrival experience
- Clarify the land use planning justification for residential uses on academic land

2. Public Consultation Process Overview

Phase 1 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct was held in February 2015. The purpose of this consultation was to present the vision for the precinct and hear the needs, interests and ideas for how to complete the precinct vision. During the public consultation, we introduced proposed new development opportunities in the precinct and gathered ideas and feedback on what else is needed to contribute to the precinct's vision. The feedback received during the public consultation, in combination with further design analysis was used to develop draft planning and design concepts for the precinct.

On-campus and online public consultation activities included:

- A **public open house** on Tuesday, February 10, 2015 11:00am – 2:00pm at 2nd Floor Foyer, The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre, 1961 East Mall;
- A **public workshop** on Thursday, February 12, 2015 3:30pm – 6:30pm at 2nd floor, Hillel House, 6145 Student Union Blvd;
- **Online consultation** which ran from February 10 – 23.

In addition to the public consultation, the planning team met with a variety of campus stakeholders and committees to present and discuss the precinct planning underway.

3. Stakeholder and Public Notification

Stakeholder Notification

Notification for the Phase 1 Public Consultation on the University Boulevard Precinct Planning was sent to **1,067 campus stakeholders, faculty and staff**. This included **115 stakeholders** from student government and societies, faculties and departments, UBC administration, campus residents, and neighbours. A 'heads up' email also was 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 February 10 – February 20 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 January 30 and February 6 (circ 51,850 x2 = 103700)
- The Ubyyssey, published on January 29 and February 6 (circ 12,000 x 2 = 24000)
- UNA e-newsletter (circ 2,475)
- The C+CP event calendar (27 unique pages views)
- The C+CP e-newsletter (circ 2,060)
- Campus digital signage (3,000/day X 19 = 57000)
- C+CP website - project webpage (700 unique page views)
- Posts to C+CP Twitter accounts between February 5 to February 23 (over 1,564 followers)
- UBC Events web page on February 10 and 12 (exact reach unknown)
- Flyers were dropped off at 29 UEL households located between Western Parkway, Campus Rd, Wesbrook Crescent and Allison Rd. 2 posters were also dropped off at UHill Community Space and University Village's rental office.

Notification was also provided through a face-to-face flyer handout (400 handouts) on January 26, January 28 and February 6 in front of Save on Foods at Wesbrook Village, at the UBC diesel bus loop, and in front of UBC Hospital at 2211 Wesbrook Mall.

4. Public Consultation

Public consultation included online consultation from February 10 – 23, a public open house held on February 10 and a public workshop on February 12. During this phase:

- **52** people submitted ideas at the Public Open House
- **30** online feedback forms submitted
- **2** in person feedback form submitted
- **5** stakeholder letters submitted

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

Open House

The open house was **attended by over 100 people** with ideas and feedback submitted from over 50 people, including students, faculty, staff, alumni and campus neighbours.

A series of fifteen (15) display boards were setup with an overview of the vision for the precinct along with proposed new development opportunities in the precinct. Participants were invited to post ideas on display boards or submit ideas through the feedback form in person or online on the following topics:

- **Vibrant Spaces:** What kinds of street-level uses (shops, services, recreation, storefront academic) and design features would help contribute to the vibrancy and success in the precinct?
- **Pedestrian and Bike Connections:** What should we be thinking about to achieve successful pedestrian and bike connections in the precinct?
- **Identity and Values:** How can buildings, streets and open spaces be designed to express a sense of arrival to the university?
- **Other comments**

Planning staff from UBC were on hand to answer questions.

Workshop

30 people participated in the workshop, including students, faculty, staff, alumni and campus neighbours.

During the workshop participants learned about the vision for the area and participated in discussions on how to complete the vision for the precinct. After a brief introduction, participants were divided into groups with a facilitator and notetaker at each table. There were five breakout groups and each group reported back on the outcomes of their discussion at the end of the session. Each table group discussed one or two of the following topics:

1. **Vibrant Spaces:** What kind of street-level uses (i.e. shops, services, recreation, storefront academic) and design features would help contribute to the vibrancy and success in the precinct?
2. **Pedestrian and Bike Connections:** What should we be thinking about to achieve successful pedestrian and bike connections?

- Precinct-wide
 - Wesbrook Mall-specific
3. **Academic Identity + Values:** How can buildings, streets and open spaces be designed to express a sense of arrival to the academic centre of the university?

Notes from the workshop are provided in Appendix III.

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 February 10. The web content was posted to the C+CP website on February 10, 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 February 10 to 23.

Stakeholder Engagement

The planning staff also met with campus stakeholders during January and February 2015. This included:

- A workshop with academic leadership and faculty on the academic uses and programming opportunities in the precinct in January.
- Presentations to and discussions with:
 - o Deans
 - o Property and Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC)
 - o Presidents Advisory Committee on Campus Enhancement (PACCE)
 - o AMS Council
 - o Alumni UBC
 - o University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Committee (UEL CAC)
 - o GSS Council
 - o Senate's Academic Building Needs Committee
 - o UNA Operations and Sustainability Standing Committee

5. Detailed Feedback from Public Consultation

Over 475 ideas and comments were submitted through the public consultation on ways to complete the precinct vision, which can be summarized through the following themes:

- Ensure a high level of pedestrian and cycling connectivity and comfort throughout the precinct
- Design buildings with supportive services and create a high quality, high amenity public realm (including street furniture, trees, wayfinding, public art, etc.)
- Create a more welcoming arrival experience
- Clarify the land use planning justification for residential uses on academic land

Feedback from stakeholders was received through written submissions and at presentations. The following summarizes the key themes from their feedback:

- Student government (both AMS and GSS) had a mixed response to additional housing in the precinct. Both questioned the justification for and validity of having faculty and staff housing on academic land, and identified the risk that this could be repeated on future academic lands, such as Acadia Park. The AMS were in general support with the caveat that the Land Use Plan is amended. The GSS preferred more academic uses in the area and strongly encouraged that without exception, all new non-institutional housing be built within neighbourhood or Village Centre Academic land
- UEL residents expressed concerns about the heights, noise and shadows from the proposed Gage South Student Residences
- Student response to the integrated bus terminal/student residence has been positive with some questions about how noise, light and emissions will be addressed
- Alumni UBC and student government are seeking assurance that events in the area will not be compromised by noise complaints from future residents on University Boulevard
- UNA and others requested clarification on how future resident interests would be represented
- Student Residence Hall Association expressed concern about the impacts of adding non-market rental housing to the area.

Open House and Online Consultation

Below is the detailed feedback received from the four questions posed in the questionnaire. Comments with occurrences over 5% (received 4 or more times) are represented in the tables below. All data presented below is calculated out of a total of 84 responses received (52 open house participants and 32 online and in-person respondents). The questions as they appeared in the questionnaire, along with their results, are as follows:

Vibrancy

Q1. Vibrant Spaces: What kind of street-level uses (i.e. shops, services, recreation, storefront academic) and design features would help contribute to the vibrancy and success of the precinct?

Idea	Specific Suggestions	Relevant Locations	#	%
Theme: Bike Facilities & Pedestrian Routes				
Bike lanes	Dedicated, separated and good design	Athlete's Way (2); University Boulevard (7)	9	11%
Safe pedestrian routes	In all directions from Bus Exchange; wide sidewalks; pedestrian bridge	Bus Exchange (5); Athlete's Way (2); MacInnes Field (2); Precinct/Other (1); University Boulevard (2)	12	14%
Theme: Public Realm Features				
Seating / benches	Seating with shelter	University Boulevard (4); Gage South Student	10	12%

Idea	Specific Suggestions	Relevant Locations	#	%
		Housing Courtyard (3); Bus Exchange (2); MacInnes Field (1)		
Rain shelter	Permanent umbrellas; sheltered waiting areas; trees	Bus Exchange (6); Gage South Student Housing Courtyard (1); Athlete's Way (1); University Boulevard (1)	9	11%
Interactive public realm features	Infobooth, workout circuit, swings, UBC history panels, parkour	Athlete's Way (1); Bus Exchange (1); University Boulevard (2);	4	5%
Public art	Commissioned by alumni and students	Athlete's Way (2); Bus Exchange (2);	4	5%
Good lighting	Compatible with winter rain	Bus Exchange (3); MacInnes Field (2)	5	6%
Outdoor power outlets	Close to seating areas and grass	Gage South Courtyard Student Housing (2); MacInnes Field (2); University Boulevard (1)	5	6%
Wide sidewalks	Able to accommodate large crowds during peak hour	Precinct/Other (1); University Boulevard (2); Athlete's Way (2);	5	6%
Digital signage	Real time bus schedules, faculty displays, UBC events	Bus exchange (4)	4	5%
Theme: Street-level Uses				
Food outlets	Deli, diverse and affordable	Bus exchange (1); Gage South Student Housing Courtyard (1); MacInnes Field (2); University Boulevard (4)	8	10%
Lounge/study/club spaces	Open late, both in door and outdoor for diverse activities	Gage South Student Housing Courtyard (3); University Boulevard (3)	6	7%
Cafe with seating	Good design, covered seating	Gage South Student Housing Courtyard (2); University Boulevard (3)	5	6%
Grocery store	n/a	Precinct/Other (4)	4	5%

Pedestrians and Biking

Q2. Pedestrian and Bike Connections: What should we be thinking about to achieve successful pedestrian and bike connections?

Idea	Specific Suggestions	Relevant Locations	#	%
Theme: Bike Facilities				
Requested bike lanes	Clear connections, connect to neighbourhoods, schools, shopping, with connection to the car free areas	Along U.Blvd (14); Along Student Union Blvd (21);	35	42%
Separated lanes*	Separated access to Gage Towers	Along U.Blvd (10); Along Student Union Blvd (8)	18	21%
Dedicated lanes*	n/a	Along Student Union Blvd. (8)	8	10%
Bike parking	Secure parking with cover, on the periphery to avoid being in the way	Bus Exchange (3), Along University Boulevard (2), Along Student Union Blvd. (1)	6	7%
Theme: Pedestrian Routes				
Requesting good pedestrian routes	Around MacInnes Field to avoid conflicts, consider bus line up congestion, get rid of angled crosswalks, more crosswalks (maybe signalized), Wesbrook Mall path is currently too narrow, manage pedestrian flows, requires good lighting and signage, to Gage residences	Along U.Blvd (1); Along Student Union Blvd (3); Wesbrook (2); Bus Exchange (5); Precinct/Other (1)	12	14%
All walk signals	Scramble crossing for pedestrians	Wesbrook Mall @ UBLVD (4); Bus Exchange (1)	5	6%
Wide sidewalks	No-texting lane for faster walkers	Bus Exchange (2); Along U.Blvd (1); Wesbrook (3); Precinct/Other (1)	7	8%
Theme: Public Realm Feature				
Good lighting	Increased lighting at crosswalks	Bus Exchange (3); Along University Boulevard (1)	4	5%
Theme: Traffic Management				
Ban vehicles	Ban private motor vehicles	Precinct/Other (6); Wesbrook@UBlvd (1)	7	8%
Reduce speed limits	to 30 km/h between Chancellor Rd and Student Union Blvd and throughout campus	Along Wesbrook Mall (4)	4	5%

Note: * These are subthemes that are also counted under requested bike lanes.

Identity and Values

Q3. Academic Identity + Values: How can buildings, streets and open spaces be designed to express a sense of arrival to the academic centre of the university?

Idea	Specific Suggestions	#	%
Theme: Architecture and Building Design			
Need more uniformity / cohesion	Not just glass	5	6%
Theme: Public Realm Feature			
Public art	Arches or sculpture; statues of war champions, poets, scientists...	5	6%
Theme: Bus Facilities			
Bus arrival should be more prominent: instead of between two buildings	n/a	4	5%

General

Q4. Other comments

Comment	Specific Suggestions	#	%
Respect LU designations	Concerned about private development; Concerned about the precedent this is setting that future academic lands will be converted (e.g. Acadia Park); Suggestion to re-open LUP incl. Acadia; Reserve academic land for student housing, not private development	7	8%

Workshop

A summary of the key ideas that emerged from the workshop discussions are summarized below.

Vibrant Spaces

Q. What kind of street-level uses (i.e. shops, services, recreation, storefront academic) and design features would help contribute to the vibrancy and success of the precinct?

Athlete's Way

Public realm features: Explore opportunities for design features that will encourage interactions, such as functional spaces and seating areas.

Bus Exchange

Architecture and building design:

- Design visually appealing storefronts
- Make bus storage visually appealing by adding visual treatment such as public art

Public realm features

- Good lighting
- Infobooth that is bookable and can be used by student clubs, consultation, exhibits, etc...
- Interactive features: academic achievement displays and impermanent features
- Rain shelter
- Transit piazza: designed to have more a piazza feel to it

Street-level uses

- Affordable shops, food carts, and services
- No need here for shops and services, not much lingering
- Affordable food outlets
- Lounge / study/ club spaces

Bike facilities

- Bike valet service
- Bike share: plan for bixi program

University Boulevard

Architecture and Building design: allow sun to penetrate the street (sun traps)

Pedestrian routes: Relocate pedestrian crosswalks to align with pedestrian corridors (e.g. between War Memorial and GSAB)

Public realm features

- Accommodate a variety of activities
- Re-evaluate the medium strip, is there a better use?
- Food carts

Street-level uses

- Add street-level uses to north-south pedestrian corridor between War Memorial Gym and GSAB sites
- Grocery store
- Social services (i.e. community services, medical, etc...)
- Shoppers Drug Mart does not contribute to vibrancy, replace with a use that has more pedestrian flow, e.g. bookstore with café.
- Lounge/study/club spaces:
 - Can be storefronts
 - Free, open late, open to all, wifi and multipurpose
 - These spaces will create vibrancy and will help make other retail successful

Precinct wide

Architecture and building design: Includes posters and art installation wrappings

Street-level uses:

- Clothing store
- Collaborative space
- Farmer's market
- Hardware store
- Potential for 2nd floor retail
- Storefront info centre
- Wesbrook Mall does not need amenities

Pedestrian and Bike Connections

Q. What should we be thinking about to achieve successful pedestrian and bike connections?

University Boulevard

Bike facilities and pedestrian routes: Need for safe bike and pedestrian routes to avoid vehicle conflicts, particular concern with new developments

Along Wesbrook Mall

Bike facilities and pedestrian routes:

- Preference for a separated bike lane – dutch model
- Wesbrook Crescent can be used as a bike path between Walter Gage Road to Chancellor Place
- Have flexibility in cycling facilities to accommodate different skill levels – some on roads, some on paths
- Make pedestrian paths more prominent
- Create connection and interaction with neighbourhoods

Public Realm Features and Road Design:

- Improve lighting along the mall for pedestrian, bikes and @ bus stops
- Need strategies to animate the roadway: athletics, plazas, more creative bus shelters
- Green streets e.g. woonerf @ Granville Island and bioswales
- Wayfinding that identifies bike parking locations

Street-level uses: commercial uses @ ground level of parkades, retail, plazas with cafes

Precinct Wide

Bike facilities:

- Make UBC a bike friendly place: better bike integration; design bike lanes that are accessible for all ages and ability; slow down cyclists turning into East Mall from University Boulevard
- Bike lanes

- Separation is ideal to encourage more users and make people feel safe
- Connect bike lanes to neighbourhoods, schools, and shopping
- Use pavement, flush to curb to distinguish dedicated area
- Bike parking
 - Accessible, intuitive, connected to bike routes
 - Create covered bike parking, as part of the building design
 - Address security issues by keeping visitors separate
 - Increase parking security for visitors
 - Install bike racks near Car2Go

Pedestrian routes

- Focus routes on the flows and where people want to go
- Better crosswalks = less jaywalking
- Build a pedestrian passage through the new Copp building
- Need wide sidewalks to make space for transit lineups

Wesbrook Mall @ University Boulevard

- Public art: Paint intersection or sidewalk
- Public realm features:
 - Encourage interactive activities
 - Different pavement treatment
 - Create visual connection with light projections and colour pedestrian path/sidewalk; innovating with lighting to mimic plaza
 - Fun interactive features such as climbing wall, overhanging chandelier, or piano on University Boulevard
 - Plaza that will draw people to each separate Faculty area
- Transit
 - Prefer 99 bus stop @ U.Blvd then at Bus Exchange

Academic Identity + Values

Q. How can buildings, streets and open spaces be designed to express a sense of arrival to the academic centre of the university?

Academic uses

- Need more academic uses @ the gateway

Alternatives to War Memorial Gym

- Flex space to promote innovation and exchange as an interdisciplinary centre
- Grocery store
- Multipurpose event hall / conference centre
- Ground floor should be more porous and serve Bus Exchange
- Showcase sustainability

- Should serve more than just athletes; make it more accessible to the general public

Architecture & building design:

- Need more uniformity / cohesion
- Bring Bus Exchange into campus identity
- Express education aspect in architecture/landscape
- No gateposts
- Relate to Strangway
- Bus facilities: Aquatic Centre edge should be revisited to consider Bus exchange

Public realm feature

- Copp trees should be kept
- Design to incorporate natural beauty (e.g. Piper Palza, Flag Pole plaza)
- Different pavement treatment @ UBlvd / Wesbrook intersection
- Interactive features: bike tours, signage about buildings, research, and welcoming messages
- Less branding
- Public art
 - More grass roots/ bottom-up
 - More whimsy but related to the university's identity
 - Murals
 - Need more art to reinforce campus identity

Values

- Landscape: Trees and variety of plantings
- Sustainability, rooted in the history of the land, a community unto itself
- Tradition and ceremony: E' on main is a good example
- Opportunities to express values on: U. Blvd, Bus Exchange and MacInnes Field

6. Stakeholder Submissions

Five (5) letter/email submissions were received by stakeholders during the public consultation period. The comments received are summarized below.

AMS

MacInnes Field

- Consider the 2 major student events (Storm the Wall and year-end Block Party) in the design process for the field
- Future U. Blvd residents should be made aware of these events

Bus Exchange

- Adequate light and signage must be installed for safe crossings

- Design to address the congestion caused by people lining up for buses

GSAB and Copp

- Concerned that these type of projects, if planned in neighbourhood lands, would not be allowed under the Development Handbook, as they exceed the maximum allowable site coverage of 55% and a maximum FSR of 2.8
- 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.
- Concerned that future residents will not have adequate representation

The AMS recommends that the LUP is amended to allow for these plans to move forward and ensure that they are applicable only to the U.Blvd precinct.

AMS Bike Co-op

- Excited and support for the potential benefits for the cycling infrastructure during the redesign and restructuring of the precinct.
- Concerned about lack of continuity between the bike routes on University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall (from Agronomy road southwards).
- Concerned that bike lanes are lacking transitions that do not spit riders out into open traffic
- Recommendations:
 - Design segregated bike lanes, such as the ones on Dunsmuir Street.
 - Improving intersection
 - Minimizing traffic-cyclist route crossovers and unclear sidewalk/bike lane delimitation.
 - Establish bike routes that are safe and accessible to cyclists of all ages and abilities. Well-established lanes will encourage the use of bicycles for travel to campus and on campus by residents and visitors alike.

GSS

Vibrant Academic and Social Hub

- The Nest, Alumni Centre, athletics facilities, open spaces and buildings that support gatherings will ensure the precinct is vibrant
- Concerned about the extent to which the precinct will be a vibrant academic area since it is largely composed of ancillary uses and these services are not central to teaching, learning and research, like classrooms, libraries and labs are.
- Suggest including additional uses related to the university's core activities to enhance the academic character of the area

Complete Community

- 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.

University Gateway

- Concerned about the concentration of residential and retail uses planned for U.Bld.
- Instead, increase core academic uses in this precinct to ensure UBC's stature as a world-class university

Faculty/Staff Housing projects

- Concerned that the project are not in compliance with LUP, since they are non-institutional projects and are not convinced that the explanations given to date are satisfactory
- Concerned that the projects would not be subject to the development controls for non-institutional projects
- Concerned about the representation of future residents or if these people will be considered residents of campus
- Concerned about the process:
 - The Board 2 approval of the Teaching Labs granted de facto approval of these projects
 - Holding consultation on projects which seem to have received implicit approval is not consistent with the Engagement Principles

The GSS Strongly encourages that without exception, all new non-institutional housing will be built within the neighbourhood or village centre academic land.

- Concerned that the future Acadia Park student family housing will be under threat and displaced in favour of more lucrative non-institutional housing projects

Bus Exchange

- 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.
- If they cannot be addressed, the university should consider alternatives, including separation of the projects or pursuing other uses that are better suited to co-location (e.g. athletics facilities)

Residence Hall Association

Concerned about the impacts of non-market rental housing on UBLvd. Specific concerns include:

- Having non-students and families in the area will cause conflict with student activities
- Adding new buildings to the area, particularly adding density and removing open space
- Want to make sure that the priority is affordable student housing not high rental rates

University Endowment Land Community Advisory Council

- Concerned about the noise that will be generated by the Gage and Environs Development as it is completed.

- The UBC Gage South and Environs Noise Impact Analysis¹ states that UEL residents in the vicinity of Wesbrook will be impacted. As stated in the report, the noise impacts arise from:
 - Music noise generated in the new MacInnes Field.
 - Pit patron speech noise generated between the SUB and Gage Towers.
 - Bus noise generated in the future diesel bus loop.
 - Road traffic noise on Wesbrook Mall.
 - Mechanical equipment noise from nearby buildings such as the new Aquatic Centre.
- Based on the report, the UEL residents adjacent to Wesbrook will fall into the "Compatible" and "Marginally Compatible" categories. That means the sound levels will range between less than 60 dBA (Compatible Use) and 65 dBA (marginally Compatible Use).
 - Concerned that these noise levels are well above levels used by various municipalities in setting maximum noise levels during the day and night.
 - If the noise levels generated by the "Gage and Environs" development meet or exceed the noise levels given by the report predictions, UEL residents in Wesbrook area will experience a considerable increase in the noise level in their area.
- Based on the recommendation of World Health Organization, the night-time noise levels measured 1 meter from the facades of living spaces is 45 dB LAeq. This 45 dBA level is well below the levels given in the UBC report.

7. Participant Demographics

A total of 96 people signed in at the Open House, 32 people submitted feedback forms and 30 people attended the workshop.

	Open House		Online/In person feedback		Workshop	
What is your primary affiliation with UBC?	Count	% ***	Count	%	Count	% ***
Student*	39	41	14	44	16	53
Faculty	9	9	2	6	1	3
Staff**	26	27	9	28	9	30
UBC Resident	6	6	1	3	0	0
Alumni	5	5	4	13	1	3
Other	7	7	0	0	3	10
N/A	4	4	2	6	0	0

*Six of the online feedback respondents identified their primary affiliation as students also identified themselves as residents of Acadia Park. **One workshop participant identified his primary affiliation as staff also identified himself as alumni. ***The total numbers under % do not add up to 100 due to rounding.

¹ UBC Gage South & Environs Noise Impact Analysis. Prepared for: University of British Columbia Campus & Community Planning, February 27, 2012 by BKL Consultants.

8. Next Steps

The results of the public consultation will inform recommendations to the Board of Governors regarding updates to the University Boulevard Precinct Design Guidelines, the University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan, as well as the Board of Governor approvals for capital projects in the precinct, including planning concepts for GSAB and D.H. Copp, concepts for the UBC Bus Exchange and Gage South Student Housing, and Undergraduate Life Science Teaching Labs.

A summary of Phase 1 Public Consultation will be presented to the UBC Board of Governors in April 2015. Phase 2 public consultation will run online from April 7 – 19 with an open house on April 8. The summary report of the public consultation from Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be presented to the UBC Board of Governors in June 2015, along with the approval of the design recommendations.

Following Board approval, project plans will be further refined and subject to the development permit process, as applicable. This may include updates to University plans and policies for the area. 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.

9. Appendices

Appendix I: Stakeholder Notification list

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

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

79.	South West Marine Drive Rate Payers Association
80.	St. Marks
81.	Student Association of the UBC School of Social Work
82.	Student Communications Services
83.	Student Development Committee
84.	Student Housing & Hospitality Services
85.	The Dunbar Village Business Association
86.	The Vancouver School of Theology
87.	TRIUMF
88.	UBC Association of Professors Emeriti
89.	UBC Athletics & Recreation
90.	UBC Bike Co-op
91.	UBC Botanical Garden
92.	UBC Botanical Garden
93.	UBC Community Partnership Unit
94.	UBC Faculty of Applied Science
95.	UBC Faculty of Arts
96.	UBC Faculty of Arts
97.	UBC Faculty of Graduate Studies
98.	UBC Faculty of Science
99.	UBC Properties Trust
100.	UBC Theatre Department
101.	UBC/UEL Alliance for Biking and Walking
102.	University Community Services
103.	University Endowment Lands (Administration)
104.	University Endowment Lands (Community Advisory Committee)
105.	University Hill Elementary School
106.	University Hill Secondary School
107.	University Neighbourhoods Association
108.	USI (University Sustainability Initiative)
109.	Vancouver School of Theology
110.	Village Gate Homes
111.	VP Students Office
112.	Wesbrook Village
113.	West Point Grey Residents Association
114.	West Point Grey Vision Implementation Committee
115.	Wreck Beach Preservation Society

Appendix II: Public Open House Display Boards (Attachment)

Appendix III: Notes from Workshop (Attachment)

Appendix IV: Questionnaire (Attachment)

Appendix V: Raw Feedback Received and Stakeholder Letters (Attachment)