



CITY SPACES

585 - 1111 West Hastings Street
Vancouver BC V6E 2J3
604 687 2281

5th Floor 844 Courtney Street
Victoria BC V8W 1C4
250 383 0304

208 - 811 Manning Road NE
Calgary AB T2E 7L4
403 4542468

www.cityspaces.ca

UEL BLOCK F

OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS SUMMARY

August 5, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- INTRODUCTION 2**
 - OPEN HOUSE 2**
 - NOTIFICATION 3**
 - OUTCOMES 3**
- COMMENT FORMS 4**
 - ANALYSIS 4**
- SUMMARY 12**
- APPENDIX ONE 14**
- APPENDIX TWO 16**



INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the outcomes from the recent public review of the rezoning proposal for Block F, submitted by the Musqueam Capital Corp.

OPEN HOUSE

The UEL Administration hosted an open house to make publicly available the most recent rezoning plans and proposal information submitted for Block F from the Musqueam Capital Corp on June 17th, 2015 at Norma Rose Point Elementary School. The school is located directly across from the Block F subject property, along its southeastern edge. The open house was structured as an informal drop-in between the hours of 4:00 – 8:00pm.

A total of 25 of boards were presented from the applicant to inform the public of the proposed development and design. An additional 6 boards were prepared by UEL staff to explain the rezoning process and criteria being utilized. Applicant representatives, UEL staff, and planning consultants were all present to engage with the public and answer any questions that arose from the material presented.

It was also noted that members of the UEL Community Advisory Council and/or its Block F Working Group were positioned outside the open house and sought to provide attendees with a handout entitled “A Message from the UEL Community Advisory Council” which provided positive comments as well as listing of 12 issue areas.



NOTIFICATION

Prior to the open house a notification postcard was sent through the mail to each household in the UEL community. A total of 2,130 households were issued notifications: approximately 1,604 postcards to residents of the UEL and 526 to residents of Acadia Park, located outside the UEL boundaries.

Specifically, within the UEL, the number of postcards delivered was as follows:

- 214 single family homes in Area A
- 108 single family homes in Area B
- 123 single family homes in Area C; and
- 1,159 individual units in the multi-family Area D.

Additionally, 83 cards were sent to businesses within the UEL and 10 to agencies and stakeholders.

All together, this notification effort represents a total of approximately 2,223 postcards distributed.

Members of the Community Advisory Council and Advisory Design Panel were informed in person, and two advertisements ran in the Vancouver Courier on June 3rd and June 10th. Further, an advertisement for the open house was also made available on the UEL web site.

Additionally, three on-site notification signs were set up by the applicant: two along University Boulevard and one along Acadia Road.

OUTCOMES

A total of approximately 150 people attended the open house over the four-hour period. In addition to in-person conversations, participants attending the open house were encouraged to provide feedback on the Block F proposal through a one-page, double sided comment form consisting of 14 questions. Available in hard copy or online via the UEL web site, the comment form was made publicly available from the date of the open house until June 30th, at which point the online opportunity for comment was closed and paper copies were no longer accepted for submission.

The majority of the comment forms (57) were received in conjunction with the open house. An additional 6 submissions were subsequently dropped off at the UEL Administration Office. Another 26 comment forms were completed through the online engagement tool prior to the June 30th close of the online comment period. Altogether, by the end of the comment period, 89 comment forms were collected.

The following sections provide a summary of the responses provided through the comment forms, as well as an overview of the open ended written comments offered. An appendix is also provided to set out verbatim the comments received through this stage of the process.

Note: The below summary, given the percentage of responses received from within the UEL, should not be considered a statistically valid representation of the community's viewpoints. Further, while the number of responses received for each question have been outlined through this report, it is not possible to determine if the individuals completing the forms at the open house also completed a follow up response on-line, or if multiple on-line responses were submitted by the same individual.



COMMENT FORMS

ANALYSIS

The comment forms used a series of questions with a standard range of responses comprising of Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Strongly Disagree, Somewhat Disagree and No Opinion check box system. This technique offered those completing the comment form a range of choices relative to key elements of the plan. This system also allows a quantitative evaluation of responses. Two opportunities were also provided for open-ended comments. Specifically, for question 10, in addition to checking off which facilities respondents said they would use, respondents were asked to “Please indicate the types of facilities and programs you would use”. Under question 14 at the end of the comment forms, respondents were also encouraged to “Please provide any additional comments and feedback you have about the proposed plan”.

Some respondents also chose to write comments in the margins in regards to specific questions. These comments have been included in the brief discussion following each table. In the instances in which this occurs, these comments have been referred to as “direct comments”.

The below analysis has been conducted on a question-by-question basis and cross-tabulated by the location of the resident – within or outside UEL.

QUESTION 1:

I live:									
In UEL					Outside UEL				
Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Unspecified	Acadia Park Residence	Another UBC Residential Development	West Point Grey	Other	Total (%/#)
55%					40%				
7%	16%	3%	11%	18%	13%	12%	6%	9%	95%
6	14	3	10	16	12	11	5	8	85

The remaining 5% of respondents (4 respondents) did not specify where they live; in all calculations this group has been included within “Outside UEL”.



Of the comment forms completed, just over half were from residents of the UEL. This is a total of 49 responses from the 1,604 notified households, equating to a 3% participation rate by UEL households. Twelve residents of Acadia Park provided feedback, representing just over 2% of the 526 households notified. A quarter of respondents were from residents living elsewhere within UBC. The remaining quarter live off-campus, in neither UEL nor UBC.

QUESTION 2:

I am interested in the Block F Project because:					
I live nearby.	I own a business in the area.	I am a student and/or work in the area.	I frequently visit the surrounding amenities.	I am interested in living in this development.	Other
82%	2%	7%	35%	7%	12%
75	2	6	32	6	11

Approximately 4 out of 5 respondents indicated they live nearby; this was by far the strongest reason for interest in the proposed rezoning. Surrounding amenities, including Pacific Spirit Park and the University Golf Club, was the second most common reason for interest at 35%. Turnout by students was low, as was feedback from owners of nearby businesses. A few members of St. Anselm’s Anglican Church stated the church as being a main reason for interest in the proposal, in addition to living nearby.

QUESTION 3:

The proposed plan includes a mix of residential, commercial, a UEL park, open spaces, trails, a community amenity building, and other features. I believe the arrangement of these uses on the site is an acceptable one.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	6%	12%	12%	21%	3%	55%	49
Outside UEL	7%	15%	7%	13%	3%	45%	40
Overall	12%	27%	19%	35%	7%	100%	89

Less than half (40%) of respondents agreed with the arrangement of uses on the site, with a 54% disagreeing.



QUESTION 4:

The proposed plan includes a blend of housing types (ranging from townhomes to low-rise apartments and high-rise apartments), creating a community that will accommodate a range of household types, including families and singles. I believe this is an acceptable proposal.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	7%	7%	15%	21%	6%	56%	47
Outside UEL	8%	8%	8%	17%	3%	44%	39
Overall	15%	15%	23%	40%	7%	100%	86

The proposed blend of housing types received a response of about one-third in agreement and two-thirds in disagreement. A direct comment made by a respondent in relation to this question was “high rise too high, not enough family housing”. A number of respondents echoed similar sentiments in their closing comments later in the comment form, with two dozen in opposition either to the proposed height, or the inclusion of the high-rises.

QUESTION 5:

Workforce Housing, providing affordable housing for moderate-income households, is the appropriate target for the affordable housing requirement, being 20% of any increase in density, as outlined in the Official Community Plan.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	8%	10%	11%	19%	7%	55%	49
Outside UEL	8%	10%	5%	11%	11%	45%	40
Overall	16%	20%	16%	30%	18%	100%	89

For question 5, regarding the provision of workforce housing, just over one third expressed agreement with almost half expressing disagreement. 18% had no opinion or comment. One response asked why only 20% of the density was workforce, suggesting that 30% would be a better number.



Several are concerned that housing for students and seniors was not addressed at all, while others felt that affordable housing should be addressed more thoroughly, i.e. ensure that it is kept affordable. Conversely, it was also suggested that if the development were to not provide workforce housing, the high-rises could be reduced in height to 9 storeys.

QUESTION 6:

The proposed community amenity contribution (community amenity building, UEL park improvements, affordable housing, and other improvements) meets community needs.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	7%	13%	13%	13%	8%	55%	49
Outside UEL	3%	16%	6%	13%	8%	45%	40
Overall	10%	29%	19%	26%	16%	100%	89

For question 6 regarding the proposed community amenity contribution: 39% respondents agreed that the proposed contribution meets community needs, while 45% disagreed. 16% had no opinion or comment.

QUESTION 7:

The inclusion of high-rises in the plan allows for both an increase in open space and more townhomes in the proposed community than would be possible under the current zoning (MF-1), which only allows up to four-storey apartments. This is a good "trade off".	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	8%	4.5%	6%	31%	6%	55%	49
Outside UEL	10%	4.5%	4%	23%	3%	45%	40
Overall	18%	9%	10%	54%	9%	100%	89



The assertion made in question 7 that “the inclusion of high-rises in the plan... is a good trade-off” received low levels of support. Over half of respondents strongly disagreed, with another 10% somewhat disagreeing. Direct comments included “8 to 10 stories would be tolerable if this must go forward”, “bad fengshui to have towers overshadowing townhouses”, and “towers too high”.

QUESTION 8:

Eighteen-storey high-rise apartments, which are generally consistent in height with a number of mature trees that will be retained on site, are acceptable to me.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/ Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	6%	3%	4%	39%	2%	55%	49
Outside UEL	6%	6%	7%	25%	2%	45%	40
Overall	12%	9%	11%	64%	4%	100%	89

Question 8 directly addressed the issue of height of the high-rises. 75% of respondents disagreed with the statement. The lack of support indicated through this question reflects the comments shared throughout the feedback, especially those offered in question 14; through which it was conveyed that eighteen storeys is too high for the context, and respondents would prefer something lower - twelve storeys or less were suggested by a few individuals.

QUESTION 9:

The proposed commercial space and plaza will be an asset to the community.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/ Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	9%	20%	8%	13%	4.5%	55%	49
Outside UEL	13%	11%	3%	13%	4.5%	45%	40
Overall	22%	31%	11%	26%	9%	100%	89

Over half of respondents agree that the proposed commercial space and plaza would be an asset to the community. Residents of the UEL showed slightly higher levels of support, likely due to their proximity to these proposed amenities.



QUESTION 10:

The proposed community amenity-building concept includes a gym, fitness centre, meeting rooms, indoor and outdoor gathering space, and a coffee bar kitchen. These are spaces I would use.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/ Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	9%	20%	9%	9%	8%	55%	49
Outside UEL	10%	9%	8%	9%	9%	45%	40
Overall	19%	29%	17%	18%	17%	100%	89

Similar levels of support were shown for the community amenity-building itself; again, with higher levels of support provided from UEL residents.

The below table indicates that of the possible facilities that are proposed to comprise the community amenity building, the gym and fitness centre were seen as the facilities most likely to be used.

The proposed community amenity-building concept includes a gym, fitness centre, meeting rooms, indoor and outdoor gathering space, and a coffee bar kitchen. These are spaces I would use.	Gym		Fitness Centre		Meeting Rooms		Indoor and Outdoor Gathering Spaces		Coffee Bar Kitchen	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
In UEL	12%	11	9%	8	7%	6	4%	4	6%	5
Outside UEL	6%	5	4%	4	1%	1	3%	3	6%	5
Overall	18%	16	13%	12	8%	7	8%	7	11%	10



QUESTION 11:

The network of open space, trails, and outdoor facilities (e.g., playground, hard court) will be an asset to the community.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	14%	17%	8%	8%	8%	55%	49
Outside UEL	17%	8%	4%	8%	8%	45%	40
Overall	31%	25%	12%	16%	16%	100%	89

Respondents were supportive of ‘the network of open space, trails, and outdoor facilities...(being) an asset to the community’, which is reflective of the respondents’ earlier expressed reasons for interest in the proposed project aside from living nearby (see question 2).

QUESTION 12:

The concept for the dedicated UEL public park contains the right balance of tree retention, open space and active recreation.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	12%	11%	7%	13%	11%	55%	49
Outside UEL	7%	16%	6%	9%	8%	45%	40
Overall	19%	27%	13%	22%	19%	100%	89

While the dedicated UEL public park received slightly less support than the network of open space, trails and outdoor facilities, it was still fairly well received by respondents. Roughly half are in support, slightly less are in disagreement, and the remaining one-fifth chose not to comment.



QUESTION 13:

The proposed landscaping concept along University Boulevard creates a unique and positive identity for the development.	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion/ Comment	Total Responses	
						%	#
In UEL	7%	16%	6%	17%	10%	55%	49
Outside UEL	6%	13%	3%	10%	12%	45%	40
Overall	13%	29%	9%	27%	22%	100%	89

The proposed landscaping concept along University was neutrally received. Of all questions asked it had the lowest response rate; just over one-fifth of respondents declined to share their opinion or comment. Overall, it received slightly higher support from UEL residents.

QUESTION 14:

The final question was open ended, simply providing space in which respondents could provide additional comments and feedback; these verbatim comments can be found in Appendix Two. As reflected above, the majority of comments made were against high-rises. Comments were either regarding height (twenty believe eighteen storeys to be too high) or their inclusion altogether (five stated that they do not want to see any form of high-rise).

The second most frequent topic was parking; fifteen felt that not enough parking has been provided, and five would like to see underground parking included in the proposal. Trees were also a key topic for fourteen respondents; some comments were in regards to retaining more trees/greenery or preservation of the forest, and one suggested that trees should be better used to screen development from University Boulevard so as not to alter the entrance into UBC.

SUMMARY

Overall, of the 89 comment forms submitted there is a clear indication that the respondents are not in favour of many of the proposed features of Block F that were the focus of the comment form. While there are elements receiving over 50% of respondent support (commercial space and trails) these elements seem to be viewed in isolation and not considered as viable trade offs to enable the rest of the proposed rezoning. Most notably, the issue of building height appears to be a key focus of those submitting a comment form response, with 75% of respondents specifically identifying the proposed eighteen-storey height limit as unacceptable.

As an alternative, 12 storeys was suggested by three respondents as a more acceptable alternate maximum height. Another common, although less frequent, request was for townhouses only, with a maximum height of 4 storeys. Twice people requested that the 6 storey buildings currently proposed to neighbour St. Anselm's Church be reduced to 4 storeys, so as not to block sunshine from the churchyard and playground; one suggested that the two simply switch places.

Related to height is the proposed increase in project density. Nine felt the proposed density increase is too high, with another twelve raising concerns about increases in traffic, as some doubt that the existing infrastructure has the capacity for another 2,500 residents. Key points addressed traffic flow of cars and pedestrians, parking, and the noise created by increased traffic. Increased traffic along Acadia Road specifically is a concern, as the road is shared by residents, cyclists, and students from Norma Rose Point School. Provision of safe routes for cyclists along Acadia Road and through Block F was suggested by one, two more expressed concerns about cycling routes in general, and fifteen respondents would like to see more parking to meet the increased demand. Of these, five implicitly prefer underground parking. Two more simply requested that parking be discreet. A more detailed traffic and transit plan was requested by a few respondents.

This lack of support appears to be consistent within the UEL as well as outside the UEL. As its most adjacent neighbour, the residents of Acadia Park whom submitted comment forms also disagreed that the proposed rezoning includes an adequate enough blend of housing types to create an acceptable proposal (85% disagreement vs. 60% of total).

Aside from the issues related to height, density, and the overall form of development, the loss of the forest that currently exists on the site is also a concern. Eight respondents who live in the area indicate that it is a cherished part of their neighbourhood. An additional four stated that they are firmly opposed to any development, but did not implicitly state that this was due to the forest; and another five expressed concerns about greenspaces, parkland, or wetlands.



More support was given to Community Amenities and the commercial space / plaza, and respondents were particularly fond of the network of open space, trails, and outdoor facilities (53% agreement for commercial space / plaza; 56% for open space, trails and outdoor facilities; and 48% for community amenities (gym)). Within the proposed community amenities building, people indicated a preference towards the gym (18%), fitness centre (13%) and coffee bar (11%), and plan to use the outdoor gathering space. While the question was asked as 'indoor and outdoor gathering space', people either circled 'outdoor' or wrote outdoor in the comments (seven total). Two inquired as to whether a small library branch could be part of the building, and the same number mentioned childcare and play spaces.

For the outdoor spaces, respondents indicated they would like to see as many trees retained as possible; it was identified that walking through the existing forest is a treasured part of the existing community. Four analogous comments were made in regards to the wetlands, with one positing a concern that during the summer months the wetland would actually be dry, and two raised questions about the effect this change would have on the ecosystem in this area. For the more developed aspects of outdoor space, specific requests were made for a playground, sandbox, and a hard-surface tennis court. An individual pointed out that while UBC does have some tennis courts, there are very few publicly accessible courts nearby, and they would greatly appreciate a court as part of this development.

Three requested a model of the project: two would like a physical scale model, while another requested a 3D computer rendering.



APPENDIX ONE

Below is a verbatim provision of the comments received for question #10. To ensure respondent privacy, effort has been made to remove information that might otherwise identify the respondent.

QUESTION 10: PLEASE INDICATE THE TYPES OF FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS YOU WOULD USE

- by choosing to live here residents have chosen other priorities over 'big box' generic suburban offerings. All of these 'amenities' are already within 5-10 minutes
- gym, stores
- fitness center, gathering places, yoga, dance, art
- fitness, coffee bar, kitchen
- coffee bar
- gym. Open (shared) office spaces. Public library. Small businesses - gift shop. Butcher shop
- tennis courts - no such facility (outdoor) in UEL community - only UBC, and those are sparse and uncared for.
- gym, fitness centre, meeting rooms, coffee bar
- place for arts and crafts classes, place for community gardens
- no parking!!!
- gym, meeting rooms
- exercise, childcare, play spaces, community events, classes
- the usual recreation centre options
- most facilities - what about a public library? Check marks on gym, fitness centre, outdoor gathering space, coffee bar kitchen



- community centre of no personal interest. Questionable how much use by the existing community could it cope with demand from residents of the development and "outsiders"? Presumably development residents would have priority.
- Community center, gym, meeting rooms
- The existing forest trails
- meeting rooms
- Fitness centre (velodrome)
- I would use more green spaces, like the whole ecosystem this project is about to destroy, without really thinking in the consequences
- All of the above
- outdoor gathering space, meeting rooms, gym
- Fitness centre. I hope the plan is to incorporate seniors programs in the community centre - keep all generations interacting together
- "community building" why calling it community amenity building?
- Gym, gathering space, coffee bar
- Playground, sandboxes
- outdoor gathering space, coffee shop
- I live in UNA and have access to UNA centres but agree UEL needs a community centre
- gym, fitness centre, coffee bar kitchen
- Gym, fitness centre
- Gym, food amenities
- coffee, meeting spaces
- fitness centre, outdoor gathering space
- Pool, gymnasium, theatre
- Forest space, playgrounds
- Fitness centre, Wine store, local pub



APPENDIX TWO

Below is a verbatim provision of the comments received for question #14. To ensure respondent privacy, effort has been made to remove information that might otherwise identify the respondent.

QUESTION 14: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND FEEDBACK

- I will provide input at another time and in a different format as I feel these questions are structured in a manner where adequate discussion or input cannot be provided. It appears that UEL administration is in favour of this development plan as this form of Open House does NOT provide the opportunity for genuine discussion.
- The wording of this questionnaire is itself, an affront to an and objective request for input
- 18 storeys not necessary!! 12 storeys more than sufficient still allowing for community amenities and open spaces. Not enough parking for residents.
- My husband is always busy and that's the only close place that my kid and I can go to explore nature. That's so sad we will miss all the forest smell, all the blossoms beauty, all the great views... :(
- It's an ambitious plan. It's happening everywhere. However, we need to think of the greenery, the lush nature we live in, all around us. Nothing of this can replace the fresh breeze, the cool walks, the birds singing, squirrels scamping about. Where will all those birds and animals go?? In my opinion, keep as much of the trees as they are. Make accommodation for trees. And, NO HIGH RISES please!
- Tower height and increase in density is too much. Prefer lower rise buildings with max height of 12 storeys. More townhomes with larger square footage for families. Need more parking underground.
- 1) no high-rises please 2) Park and community centre are good. 3) Townhouses only please. 6) We would like to maintain the natural, prestigious look of UEL. 5) No rentals please.
- Towers too high. Concerned about whether sufficient parking at community centre. I agree with the concerns raised by the CAC, which have still not been adequately addressed, though the current proposal is much better than the previous one.
- More lower income housing. More student family housing. More UBC professor housing.



- Not a bad proposal, but needs some improvements yet. Parking (for commercial, community centre and residential uses), building height, bylaw restrictions, all need work. A scale model is needed for the proposed approach to be understood. Building height and the relationship to tree heights needs to be clearly understood. Why was this not a requirement?
- Fifteen storey towers against proposed 18 storey towers, which are out of scale, would be much better. We need a model of the plan, required by every other municipality. Have no idea what overall plan looks like. Nowhere is the growing problem of building noise addressed. Urban Noise is becoming a worsening health hazard.
- concerns re: traffic - we do not want Acadia (North of Univ Blvd), Allison and Western Parkway, especially Acadia Road, to be used as "thoroughways" to Chancellor Blvd, and would want a system which somehow closed off that option. General concern about noise, construction and ongoing from buildings, etc, and concern for general quality of good NEIGHBOURHOOD which we have continued (with some difficulty of late) to maintain.
- 1) I assume that the general public (e.g. non-residents) will have access to all community amenities. 2) I feel that car parking should be as unintrusive as possible at grade. I.e. build it underground or in a tower - cars should not dominate the area.
- The proposed development in Zone F (particularly the high-rises) is not appealing. If anything, development should be as light as possible.
- I find these questions and the way they are phrased highly misleading. They direct answers instead of allowing for discussion. For instance #3 supposes I agree with the mix provided in the development. I do not and so cannot answer the question.
- Mixed use is generally a good idea but this plan is abusive. This townhouse designation came by fiat in the middle of a forest. A 22 acre 4 storey development would be boring I agree. But this plan including 4 18 storey buildings is an excuse to increase the density and the below market rentals and community amenities do not change this. Please can we have a development below 1,027,000 sq. feet and distributed in an interesting and intelligent way.
- Main concern is 18 storey buildings - feel this is too high - should not dominate park and tree lines (trees should be higher than highest tower). Reduce the overall density by reducing height of the four 18 storey buildings. This is not the downtown peninsula.
- The proposed buildings are too tall for the area *very against. The roadways and infrastructure seem insufficient surrounding the area for the increase in population. The balance of greenspace seems appropriate. More parking should be considered (underground?). Density proposed is too much for the area.
- 18-storey buildings towering above University Blvd destroy long-established character of the Point Grey peninsula that is known to millions of students, faculty, staff, visitors and UEL residents as they leave the city and are introduced to the glorious UBC campus through that boulevard that opens-up to the campus entrance at University Blvd and Westbrook Mall. If allowed to be constructed, those towers will forever change the character of the area and contribute to degradation of community living principles. Communities are not thriving in 18-storey, "vertical gated communities" as those proposed by the developer. Neighbouring UBC, self-imposes building height restrictions and builds residential towers within relevant



and appropriate context. Note that the residential towers in Westbrook Village are placed *behind* mature trees separating those buildings from 16th Ave. As a result the character of the approach to the UBC campus along 16th Ave has been preserved and the residential neighbourhood "opens-up" to a visitor in a very inviting way. Contrast that with the Block-F developer that wants to place residential towers "on-top" of University Blvd which will create The Wall of concrete, glass and steel in a streetscape of greenery so unique to this part of metro Vancouver. This is the reason why the existing UEL building bylaw calls for 4-storey height limit on buildings in block-F - to maintain the balance of greenery over concrete. Any contemplated increases to building heights could be appropriate away from the University Blvd towards Acadia Rd. and those developments that will be redeveloped by the UBC to include taller structures. As for the heights of the towers on Block-F, it would not be appropriate to exceed the height of 10-storeys, already 2.5x more than considered in the UEL building bylaw and only away from University Blvd. UEL Administration and UEL community would be well served to include UBC prof. XXXXXXXX to bring in xxx [their] expertise and perspective.

- (1) Maximum tower height of 18 storeys still too high. Are they seismically stable? (2) The parking for the community centre is really not adequate. need underground parking. (3) Senior housing is not addressed. Senior affordable housing. 55+ and over housing or assisted living housing is not included.
- I strongly endorse the concerns raised by the CAC Block F working group. All of those issues need to be addressed. There were an excessive number of display boards at the open house resulting in "information overload" too many "waffle words" and meaningless and/or exaggerated fanciful statements. Traffic / transport - what modifications to U.Blvd are proposed/needed? - will traffic lights be required at "Road A" / U Blvd? Toronto Rd./U Blvd? Acadia Rd/U Blvd? Impact of this on traffic flow? - Will there be provision for car sharing facilities e.g. Car2Go? - Charging stations for electric cars? - adequate parking is essential. Don't over-emphasize transit, cycling/walking. A nice concept but removed from reality. - How much public transit would be required to accommodate the needs of 2500 residents?
- I think all the high-rise along University Boulevard will be a positive identity for the development project. High-rise along the Acadia road won't be a good design, which would creates high traffic and increase density of whole area. I hope phase I would still keep low-density residential buildings and have high greening rate with existing free-hold complex
- I do not understand why development is taking place on a forested site when the adjacent, developed golf course is being maintained. Building should take place on the golf course.
- Then may not be sufficient retail for the area - with the area drawing from local and 10000 people arriving in Sept. and leaving in June. Also more medical, dental and restaurants are required.
- I am against this development or "proposed plan". Traffic will increase, noise, pollution (more cars, vehicles, buses) as well. We must be able to respect the few green areas this city has, it is not enough with all the development in west brook area 2.
- I have followed this plan from the outset and I am entirely in favor of both the process and the ultimate results.



- The development of high-rise building along Acadia Rd will cause a busy traffic on Acadia Rd. I will have the concern of sharing the road with cars, trucks (garbage collector) and cyclist (Norma Rose Point School students). The "set back" along University Blvd is great, it should also apply to Toronto Rd. and Acadia Rd. (where a lot of school aged children will use).
Thanks
- The plan looks well designed. My concerns are for parking (perhaps not enough?), and commercial space for a decent sit-down restaurant. Will bus routes accommodate the increase in density? I love the planned bike routes through and around the complex and that the mature trees and wetlands will be preserved
- Wetland should be active all year, where your concept is dryland in the summer, which is the most needed time for wetland.
- It was explained to me that in the morning buses that carry students to UBC would be utilized to carry future residents of Block F out of UBC to work, and in the afternoon buses that carry Block F resident home from work would carry students out of UBC after classes. It is supposed to be a better utilization of buses than the current situation when buses leave UBC empty after dropping off students in the morning, and come to UBC empty in the afternoon to pick up student after school. I find this argument illogical because Block F residents go to work much earlier than students come to UBC, and Block F residents comes home from work much later than students leaving UBC. Therefore, many extra buses are required to carry the Block F residents. Road traffic would be very busy. The only solution is rapid transit. Block F developer should contribute to the cost of this Translink extension. The development plan has even put aside space for the future construction of the Skytrain station.
- A few years ago stakeholders of the UEL went through a lengthily analysis and process to arrive at an Official Community Plan (OCP) for the UEL. The proposed Block F development is a significant departure from the OCP, and as such should not be permitted unless UEL stakeholders are in agreement to scrap the current OCP. At the most the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development should adhere to the current MF-1 zoning rules (FSR: 1.0 & 4-story height) for this development. An indication of UEL stakeholder sentiment toward the Block F development might be learned from a recent public hearing for a high-rise development proposal that included the 2200 block of Acadia Road - just across the street from Block F. The community members attending this event were unanimously against this development, citing a number of valid reasons – and this proposal represented a mere fraction of the floor space and population load of the Block F proposal.
- (1) Senior or student housing is not addressed (2) This project is too big for UBC. Increasing population to this density for Block F is high unsuitable. (3) Increasing the traffic on UBC etc. University Blvd, Westbrook, Toronto Rd, Acadia Rd and western parkway and will cause more congestion than present. (4) Increasing noise.
- No high rise buildings
- My family lives at xxxxxxxxxx Vancouver, just nearby this proposed plan. Its too close to our living area, we need more space. We strongly disagree with high-rises buildings. The density is too high. There will be too many people to live in this small area that will bring us too



many unimaginable problems. We love the forest, we have lived here for almost 10 years. Now the plan is too crowded. No high-rise buildings!

- I strongly disagree high-rise buildings. The density is too high.
- I worry that this development will make UBC too exclusive for students who wish to live on campus in market housing. I wish that were addressed more strongly.
- I am concerned about the potential rental units and conflict between short-term residents and long-term residents. I am also concerned about the affordable units in project and if they will be affordable. I am concerned about parking and traffic along Acadia Rd. It is SO busy here.
- Switch M to G so it can be one side townhouse area. The other side is high rise area
- Studies show that high rises are "not optimal for children."
http://www.researchgate.net/publication/233490985_The_Consequences_of_Living_in_High-Rise_Buildings and also not optimal for the forest. Please don't put high rises in the forest.
- Would much rather have the forest.
- Please do not allow this development
- Lower hi-rises. More mature trees.
- Plead for 4 storey max to south of St.Anselm's Church. Suggest the 6 storey be on University Blvd (switch the 2 heights)
- Would like to see Bldg. H a 4 storey rather than a 6 storey. Otherwise will shade churchyard and community garden and preschool playground. Thank you for putting on this open house and having so many qualified people to answer questions.
- *With the exception of the 18 storey high-rise buildings these spoil the natural tree line. The 18 storey should be no higher than allowed presently for the zoning. *The additional increased population density will increase an already highly populated (university) area. Noise and light pollution will increase unacceptably.
- Cheap car rental unit like Enterprise car rental. Super store like Hudson Bay, Canadian tyre, etc.
- There should be market place and Super Stores like Safeway, London Drugs, Shoppers Drug Mart, Canadian Tire, Home Sense, etc. There should be good transportation system like shuttle buses and preferably every after 15 minutes connected to the bus loop or may be downtown.
- Acadia Rd does not include bike lanes. With the substantial increase in traffic and the parking, it will become unsafe to cycle on. The path through Block F is not an adequate route for commuter etc cycling. Further consideration needs to be given to cyclists.
- More parking lot space
- The UEL community continues to grow without a concrete plan for increased service by the RCMP. The developer, UBC, and other key stakeholders (e.g., UNA) need to lobby for appropriate service levels from the RCMP. The UEL doesn't even have adequate Victim



Services support that is provided in other jurisdictions. This is a serious concern given the recent sexual assaults on our campus and the increased number of families living on campus (more children, more potential for domestic violence without adequate supports nearby, etc.).

- In my inquiry about family housing, I would suggest larger family housing (3 bdrms) both within the rental accommodation as well as any strata units. Parking under the commercial areas would be better as UBC continues to remove parking areas
- My main objection and concern about the plan falls completely on the height of the 4 high-rise buildings at 18 stories each. I believe it does not integrate into the standard of the community.
- The 18 story high rise is the problem. With no 3D rendering of the proposal, it is almost impossible to visualize the buildings within the space and tree canopy. I'd vote for 12 stories or so as a max bldg. height
- Needs signal light control corner of Acadia and Toronto. Absolutely essential for safety - schoolchildren/bicycle
- I prefer no zoning changes to the site.
- I am devastated by this plan. The UEL are a gift for all to enjoy. We do not need more infrastructure on these lands.
- There is no need to compromise between the proper balance of space for parks and density. If the high rises are needed for enough open spaces, then the square footage is too high
- Location of commercial is awful. Entrance for above grade parking across from my residential building. I presume deliveries will be made off of Toronto road - unacceptable. - Noise for my tenants: Increase traffic, noise, garbage - impacts my tenants
- Q11 - I believe the natural park space, "as is", is a great asset to the community and UBC. It is a habitat for frogs (in the wetland), as well as numerous bird species and animals. I do not believe the proposal accurately takes these current 'Block F' residents into consideration. Creating a new, smaller, human-accessible wetland is not a viable alternative! The area should be repatriated into Pacific Spirit Park. It already provides a natural link between the north and south portions of the park creating an important wildlife corridor.
- No development should be permitted.
- Not a good project, will have many negative repercussions.
- I would like to see more "dedicated" parkland. You still have only the government required 3 of 22 acres! Why not give more actual parkland than is required. I was extremely happy at the beginning of the process that the Musqueam Indian Band has this land. With their concern about the environment and protecting the land, as well as being the "heart of the community", I expected Block F to be developed with sensitivity to nature and the density the area can hold. The opposite has happened. It's such a shame and I was furious at the last open house that the design was so similar. I am not opposed to development if done with the community in mind and with protecting as much of our diminishing parkland as possible. I have to say that what is preached is the opposite of what was presented. We do not need



any commercial in this area as well. Walk 2 blocks either way and it is commercial. As well, the "trails" are just pathways around buildings and changing from 22 stories to 18 is just an insult. The revised rezoning application is so similar to the previous one I was VERY disappointed. I have joined one of the working committees and will support them in their concerns. Thank you for allowing me my input!

- I'm concerned about both the volume of pedestrian traffic that will walk through Acadia and the volume of car traffic that will be added to Acadia Rd and Osoyoos Cr. The common areas of Acadia Park are currently used as a shared backyard by residents, this would likely have to stop with increased traffic through the area. Traffic along Acadia Rd routinely exceed the 30km speed limit despite speed bumps and adequate signage - they speed right past the day care centres. Also - new residents will have dogs so you should include an off-leash area in your plan. Acadia Park (where residents are not allowed dogs) is currently used as an off-leash area.

