AGENDA

ELECTORAL AREA COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING

Friday, October 15, 2010
9:00 a.m.
2nd Floor Boardroom
4330 Kingsway, Burnaby, BC

Committee Members:
Chair, Director Maria Harris, Electoral Area A
Councillor Suzanne Anton, Vancouver
Director Andrea Reimer, Vancouver
Director Tim Stevenson, Vancouver
Director Richard Walton, North Vancouver District

Please advise Georgeta Stanese at (604) 432-6269 if you are unable to attend.
NOTICE TO THE GVRD
ELECTORAL AREA COMMITTEE

9:00 a.m.
Friday, October 15, 2010
2nd Floor Boardroom, 4330 Kingsway, Burnaby, British Columbia.

AGENDA

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1 October 15, 2010 Regular Meeting Agenda
Staff Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee adopt the agenda for its regular meeting scheduled for October 15, 2010 as circulated.

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

2.1 July 23, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes
Staff Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee adopt the minutes of its regular meeting held July 23, 2010 as circulated.

3. DELEGATIONS
No items presented.

4. INVITED PRESENTATIONS
No items presented.

5. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE OR STAFF

5.1 2011 Programs and Priorities of the Electoral Area Committee
Designated Speaker: Christina DeMarco, Division Manager
Policy and Planning Department
Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee endorse the proposed programs and priorities, as outlined in the report dated September 27, 2010, titled “2011 Programs and Priorities of the Electoral Area Committee”, as the basis for the budget to be considered at the Board budget workshop on October 27, 2010.

5.2 Comments on Proposed UBC Land Use Plan Amendments
Designated Speaker: Jason Smith, Regional Planner
Policy and Planning Department
Recommendations:
That the Board:

a) offer the following initial comments to UBC on the proposed Land Use Plan amendments:
   i. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to re-examine and adjust the Land Use Plan amendments to increase opportunities for on-site student housing and reduce the potential for market housing;
   ii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to establish height regulations in the Land Use Plan that would address the concern of the visual impact of development on Pacific Spirit Regional Park;
   iii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to ensure that sufficient open space is provided for recreation and associated municipal-type park facilities on its lands, therefore alleviating any future pressure for those type of uses to be provided in Pacific Spirit Regional Park;
   iv. As required by Ministerial Order 229, UBC provide an updated Regional Context Statement to Metro Vancouver for written comment.

b) delegate authority to provide formal comments on the actual proposed amendments to a special committee made up of the members of the Regional Planning Committee and the Electoral Area Committee should the circumstance arise that a public hearing on the proposed land use amendments is scheduled at such a time that the Board would not be able to meet in time to provide comments.

5.3 Indian Arm Debris Disposal Event Summary
Designated Speaker: Eric Aderneck, Regional Planner
Policy and Planning Department
Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee send a letter of appreciation to the District of North Vancouver for accommodating this event at Cates Point Park.

5.4 Background on UBC Thunderbird Arena Liquor Licence Application
Designated Speaker: Jason Smith, Regional Planner
Policy and Planning Department
Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated September 8, 2010, titled “Background on UBC Thunderbird Arena Liquor Licence Application”.

5.5 Manager’s Report
Designated Speaker: Christina DeMarco, Division Manager
Policy and Planning Department
Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated September 27, 2010, titled “Manager’s Report”.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

6.1 The Future of Citizen Involvement in Land Use Planning at UBC
According to Bill 20 - New Oversight Rule Changes the Role of Metro Director - Letter submitted by Director Maria Harris to the Campus Resident newspaper - August Issue.
6.2 UNA - Email sent by resident Angela Wheelock to Lois Jackson, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board.

6.3 Clarification of the implications of Bill 20 for Metro Vancouver Regional Planning functions at the University of British Columbia (UBC) - Correspondence dated August 4, 2010 from Deputy Minister Dale Wall addressed to Johnny Carline, Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer, Metro Vancouver.

6.4 Concerns about the change in local governance for land use planning and development at the University of British Columbia (UBC) Point Grey campus – Correspondence dated August 9, 2010 from Honourable Ben Stewart, Minister of Community and Rural Development addressed to Lois Jackson, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board.

6.5 Correction to the UNA Board Minutes - Correspondence from Director Maria Harris addressed to UNA Board of Directors.

6.6 Montizambert Wynd Request For Fire Protection Service - Correspondence dated September 1, 2010 from Jim Cook, Fire Chief, District of West Vancouver addressed to Johnny Carline, Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer, Metro Vancouver.

7. OTHER BUSINESS
No items presented.

8. RESOLUTION TO CLOSE MEETING
No items presented.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Staff Recommendation:
That the Electoral Area Committee conclude its regular meeting of October 15, 2010.
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Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) Electoral Area Committee held at 9:04 a.m. on Friday, July 23, 2010 in the 2nd Floor Boardroom, 4330 Kingsway, Burnaby, British Columbia.

PRESENT:
Chair, Director Maria Harris, Electoral Area A
Councillor Suzanne Anton, Vancouver
Director Andrea Reimer, Vancouver
Director Richard Walton, North Vancouver District

ABSENT:
Director Tim Stevenson, Vancouver

STAFF:
Delia Laglagaron, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Administrative Officer’s Department
Chris Plagnol, Deputy Corporate Secretary, Corporate Secretary’s Department

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1 July 23, 2010 Regular Meeting Agenda

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Electoral Area Committee:
   a) amend the agenda for its regular meeting scheduled for July 23, 2010 by adding Attachment 3 “Media Advisory” to Item 5.5; and
   b) adopt the agenda as amended.

   CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

2.1 May 11, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Electoral Area Committee adopt the minutes of its regular meeting held May 11, 2010 as circulated.

   CARRIED

3. DELEGATIONS
No items presented.

4. INVITED PRESENTATIONS
No items presented.
5. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE OR STAFF

5.1 Appointment of the Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commission Members

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Board appoint Bruce Bingham, representing Bowyer Island, as a member of the Electoral Area Advisory Planning Commission for the 2010-2012 term.

CARRIED

5.2 BC Solar Hot Water Ready Regulation for Electoral Area A
Report dated June 18, 2010, from David Boote, Electoral Area Planner, and Eve Hou, Air Quality Planner, Policy and Planning Department, providing information on the Provincial Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations and seeking Board authorization to include Metro Vancouver’s Electoral Area A in the list of local governments that will be included in this regulation.

Given a number of single family homes in the University Endowment Lands (UEL), members inquired if the EUL was aware of this regulation.

Request of Staff
Staff was requested to communicate with the University Endowment Lands Administration, through Gary Paget and Margaret Eckenfelder, to confirm whether it is part of Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations.

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Board authorize the inclusion of Metro Vancouver’s Electoral Area A in the Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations of the Provincial Ministry of Housing and Social Development’s Building and Safety Standards Branch.

CARRIED

5.3 Debris Disposal Facilitation at Indian Arm
Report dated June 30, 2010, from David Boote, Electoral Area Planner, and Eric Aderneck, Regional Planner, Policy and Planning Department, outlining a recommended approach to assist Electoral Area Indian Arm cabin owners with water access only regarding their debris disposal options.

Discussion ensued about the need for more information on debris removal in rural areas in order to communicate with residents about what services can (and cannot) be offered.

Request of Staff
Staff was requested to provide a follow-up report on the one-time debris clean-up event held in September 2010 for cabin owners in the Indian Arm.
It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated June 30, 2010, titled “Debris Disposal Facilitation at Indian Arm”.  
CARRIED

5.4 Status of the Memorandum of Understanding between UBC and Metro Vancouver
Report dated June 16, 2010, from David Boote, Electoral Area Planner, Policy and Planning Department, reviewing the status and content of the Memorandum of Understanding between Metro Vancouver and UBC concerning planning and development matters.

Discussion ensued on the following:
- The letter from Johnny Carlile to Dale Wall, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Community and Rural Development, regarding planning issues at UBC
- The necessity of the Electoral Area Committee being proactive in defining and articulating the role for Metro Vancouver in follow up to the response from Mr. Wall when it is received
- The importance of the GVRD-UBC Joint Committee as having been an important forum to discuss issues relevant to residents, the university and the regional district
- The need for the Electoral Area Committee being informed of major communications and media issues associated with UBC, and a mechanism to do that

Correspondence dated July 5, 2010 from Johnny Carlile to Deputy Minister Dale Wall is retained with the July 23, 2010 Electoral Area Committee agenda.

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated June 16, 2010, titled “Status of the Memorandum of Understanding between UBC and Metro Vancouver”.
CARRIED

5.5 Manager’s Report
Report dated July 7, 2010, from Christina DeMarco, Division Manager, Policy and Planning Department, updating the committee on the committee workplan, the implications of Bill 20-2010, governance arrangements for land use planning at UBC, and Montizambert Wynd (Howe Sound) fire protection.

Discussion ensued about updating the 2010 Workplan to include actions related to UBC governance and land use planning.

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Electoral Area Committee update 2010 work plan by including in the 3rd Quarter the following key priorities as additional bullets:
1. Report on Metro Vancouver’s role with respect to governance issues at UBC
2. Report on UBC land use planning issue in the regional context
CARRIED
In response to a question about the request for fire service by the Montizambert Wynd community to the District of West Vancouver, members were informed that the request was denied. Members felt it was important to understand the nature of the refusal as a basis to begin discussions with Electoral Area residents about services and infrastructure options.

**Request of Staff**
Staff was requested to write to the District of West Vancouver seeking further elaboration on why it refused the fire service request by the Montizambert Wynd community.

Members requested an update on UBC’s Thunderbird Arena liquor licence, and were informed of UBC’s intent to amend its licence to serve liquor at not only sporting events but also at musical concerts and other events.

Members felt that it was important to engage the RCMP, Vancouver Police Department, University Neighbourhood Association, City of Vancouver, Translink and UBC in making their views known to the BC Liquor Control Board.

**It was MOVED and SECONDED**
That the Electoral Area Committee direct staff to bring forward a report to the September committee meeting outlining the history, issues and recommendations for handing UBC’s application to amend the Thunderbird Arena liquor licence.

CARRIED

6. INFORMATION ITEMS
No items presented.

7. OTHER BUSINESS
No items presented.

8. RESOLUTION TO CLOSE MEETING
No items presented.

9. ADJOURNMENT

**It was MOVED and SECONDED**
That the Electoral Area Committee conclude its regular meeting of July 23, 2010.

CARRIED

(Time: 10:55 a.m.)

Chris Plagnol, Maria Harris, Chair
Deputy Corporate Secretary
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To: Electoral Area Committee  
From: Christina DeMarco, Division Manager, Policy and Planning Department  
Date: September 27, 2010  

Subject: **2011 Programs and Priorities of the Electoral Area Committee**

**Recommendation:**

That the Electoral Area Committee endorse the proposed programs and priorities, as outlined in the report dated September 27, 2010, titled “2011 Programs and Priorities of the Electoral Area Committee”, as the basis for the budget to be considered at the Board budget workshop on October 27, 2010.

---

1. **PURPOSE**

To present the 2011 programs and priorities under the purview of the Electoral Area Committee for discussion and/or amendment for Board consideration at the Board budget workshop.

2. **CONTEXT**

The current phase of the budget process is focused on the Committee review of the 2011 programs and priorities. This submission is based on broad Board objectives and direction and an annual Administrative Review in September wherein all proposed program costs were examined in detail. The review examined priorities, phased out, or cancelled some programs and assessed the appropriate staff complement, all within the context of the principles and priorities contained in the Sustainability Framework as approved by the Board. Deliberations on all Metro Vancouver budgets will be the subject of the Finance Committee meeting and the Board Workshop, both scheduled in October.

The proposed 2011 programs and priorities reflect the priorities of Metro Vancouver in the delivery of regional functions:

- Delivery of utilities: drinking water, wastewater treatment, solid waste
- Planning and policy development in the utilities, Regional Planning and Air Quality
- Regulatory functions in the utilities and Air Quality
- Regional Parks
- Affordable Housing
- Other regional services: 911, etc.

The 2011 budget is estimated to be $603 million, 5.8% higher than 2010 levels. On all functions, the estimated expenditures are below projections approved by the Board. The key drivers relevant to this Committee are outlined in this report.
3. DISCUSSION

Committee Programs and Priorities

Programs and priorities for the Electoral Area Committee are here presented as:

- Strategic priorities which include related implementation priorities (in other words those actions that are important elements for implementation of Board strategic priorities).
- Operational priorities (those priorities that are important to our operations.).
- Longer term priorities.

The Electoral Area Committee provides advice and recommendations to the Metro Vancouver Board on Electoral Area A matters, including planning, bylaw administration and enforcement, building inspection, environmental protection, and response to requests for local government services.

Accomplishments for the Electoral Area Committee have included:

- establishment of procedures for evaluating requests for infrastructure
- interim resolution of land use planning governance issue at UBC
- evaluation of service requests
- debris collection event held for Indian Arm residents
- review of Electoral A election procedures.

3.1 Strategic Priorities and Related Initiatives

- enact revised zoning and building bylaws for Electoral Area A
- assist in resolution of longer term governance solution at UBC.

3.2 Operational Priorities

- comprehensive review of building and zoning bylaws
- administer and enforce bylaws
- participate in boundary adjustment requests
- finalize arrangements for the transfer of the Barnston Island Dike from the Province to Metro
- support emergency preparedness program
- promote measures to increase actively farmed land on Barnston.

3.3 2011 Financial Drivers

The budget for this program has decreased from $265,958 in 2010 to $247,289 in 2011, a decrease of 7%. This is a result of Metro Vancouver no longer having local land use planning jurisdiction at UBC.

3.4 Longer Term Priorities

- determine most effective governance arrangements for all parts of Electoral Area.

3.5 Communication and Outreach

2011 is an election year and outreach will be carried out to increase awareness of the election.
3.6 **Program Summaries**

Complete program descriptions and level of resources are summarized in the Grey book. Attached are the Program Summaries under the purview of this Committee.

4. **CONCLUSION**

These will be the foundation for the program budgets for 2011. While adjustments can be made throughout 2011, as circumstances change, it is important to note that the expansion of the scope of any program subsequent to adoption of the budget could only be made if corresponding contractions can be made to programs elsewhere within the same overall function.

**ATTACHMENT**

Program Summaries for the Electoral Area Committee (Doc. #4456604).
Program Summaries

Electoral Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2010 Final Approved</th>
<th>2010 Approved Budget Carry-Forwards</th>
<th>2010 Approved Base Budget</th>
<th>2011 Budget</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011 New Staffing</th>
<th>Variance Explanation</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Area Services</td>
<td>$ 265,958</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 265,958</td>
<td>$ 247,289</td>
<td>$ (18,669)</td>
<td>(7.0)%</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Reduction in scope of program - Province responsible for UBC planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program: Electoral Area Services
Department: Policy & Planning
Committee: Electoral Area

Description
This program provides community services for Electoral Area 'A'. These services include general local government administration, assistance to the Electoral Area 'A' Director, planning, building inspection, election services, and other support for advisory committees and the Board of Variance.

Purpose
To provide general local government administration and services for Electoral Area 'A'.

Outputs
Reports on land use planning and related issues, bylaw reviews, rezonings and development variance permits.
Administration of planning and local government services.
Building permits and inspections, including bylaw enforcement.

Milestones / Performance Targets
Enact revised zoning bylaw for Electoral Area A
2/28/2011
Determine responsibilities and implementation for the maintenance of Barnston Island Dike
6/30/2011
Conduct local elections
11/21/2011
Complete boundary adjustment study if a proposal is put forward
9/30/2011
Finalize Building Bylaw Amendments for Electoral Area
2/28/2011

Outcomes
Responsive and effective local government of the Electoral Area.

2011 Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full Time</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Part Time</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Full Time</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Part Time/Auxiliary</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Staffing (FTE) 1.46

Total Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Area Services-allocated</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Area Services-initial</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$247,000
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To: Electoral Area Committee  
From: Jason Smith, Regional Planner, Policy and Planning Department  
Date: October 4, 2010  

Subject: Comments on Proposed UBC Land Use Plan Amendments

Recommendations:

That the Board:

a) offer the following initial comments to UBC on the proposed Land Use Plan amendments:
   i. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to re-examine and adjust the Land Use Plan amendments to increase opportunities for on-site student housing and reduce the potential for market housing;
   ii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to establish height regulations in the Land Use Plan that would address the concern of the visual impact of development on Pacific Spirit Regional Park;
   iii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to ensure that sufficient open space is provided for recreation and associated municipal-type park facilities on its lands, therefore alleviating any future pressure for those type of uses to be provided in Pacific Spirit Regional Park;
   iv. As required by Ministerial Order 229, UBC provide an updated Regional Context Statement to Metro Vancouver for written comment.

b) delegate authority to provide formal comments on the actual proposed amendments to a special committee made up of the members of the Regional Planning Committee and the Electoral Area Committee should the circumstance arise that a public hearing on the proposed land use amendments is scheduled at such a time that the Board would not be able to meet in time to provide comments.

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the proposed Land Use Plan amendments and offer initial comments to the University of British Columbia on how the land use proposals impact regional interests.

2. CONTEXT

In June 2010, the provincial government enacted legislation that transferred the responsibility for local land use planning for the University of British Columbia (UBC) Vancouver Campus from Metro Vancouver to the Minister of Community and Rural Development.
There were provisions made for the UBC Board of Governors to oversee any land use amendment processes. Subsequently, UBC initiated a process to amend the re-named Land Use Plan (formerly known as the UBC Official Community Plan).

2.1 Regional Interest

With the new legislation, Metro Vancouver’s perspective has changed to focus only on regional interests. There are two regional interests that arise in considering the proposed Land Use Plan amendments at UBC:

1. Regional distribution of population and employment growth and impact on infrastructure
2. The protection of Pacific Spirit Regional Park.

2.2 Regional Land Use Planning

Metro Vancouver has an interest in the regional land use impacts of the proposed Land Use Plan amendments. UBC is proposing a significant increase in market housing, doubling the allowable floor space area for residential and commercial uses, in the areas where non-institutional development is permitted. Some of this is intended for the use of UBC employees and their families and Metro Vancouver supports the provision of this type of housing.

Metro Vancouver’s concern is about the regional implication of significant residential development at UBC that would not be for students or employees. UBC states the changes they are contemplating in the Land Use Plan would allow for a non-student population of between 25,000 to 35,000 people. The current population in market housing is 6,410, so the proposed Land Use amendments envision an additional 19,000 to 29,000 people in the area for family housing. The current student population is 8,800 and the Vancouver Campus Plan (approved by the Board of Governors in June 2010) envisions an additional 8000 units of student housing. This would result in a total population on campus of between 41,800 and 51,800. The current target in the OCP adopted by the Metro Vancouver Board in 1997 is a population of 18,000 in 2021 and this includes students. This is summarized in the table below.

Table 1 - Population Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents: 6,410</td>
<td>18,000 with students</td>
<td>41,800 to 51,800 including students in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in residence: 8,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level of population growth was not contemplated in the preparation of the Livable Region Strategic Plan or the new Regional Growth Strategy. There are a number of concerns with this level of growth, especially if this results in substantial commuting off campus. UBC should clarify of those 25,000 to 35,000 non-students living they envision living on campus, how many would be employees and their families?
UBC is required to prepare a Regional Context Statement as part of its Land Use Plan. Under Ministerial Order 229 dated August 18, 2010 (Attachment 3), the Board of Governors is required to forward any new or amended Regional Context Statement to the chief planning officer of the Greater Vancouver Regional District for written comments on the relationship between the new or amended Regional Context Statement and the GVRD’s Regional Growth Strategy. The Regional Context Statement must be submitted to Metro Vancouver prior to submitting a new Land Use Plan or an amendment to the Land Use Plan to the Minister (Attachment 1, clause 16).

Given the scope of changes proposed in the amendments an updated Regional Context Statement is clearly required, Metro Vancouver should request that an update to the Regional Context Statement be part of the amendment package, including population, employment, and student projections for the years 2021 and 2031.

2.3 Pacific Spirit Regional Park

The region’s interest in protecting Pacific Spirit Regional Park is impacted in two ways by the proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan; first, in terms of the provision of open space for recreation and, secondly, in terms of the built form of development.

The provision of open space for recreation and associated municipal-type park facilities is an important factor to consider. If there is an inadequate amount of space provided on campus this could have impacts on Pacific Regional Spirit Park (e.g., pressure to provide space for municipal-type park facilities). The current range is 0.5-1.1 hectares per 1000 people. According to the tables provided in the policy briefs, see tables 1-3 of the Policy Brief: Amenities for Family Housing in Attachment 5, there is considerable access to open space on the UBC campus. UBC should ensure that it meets the best practice it mentions of 1.1 hectares per 1000 people.

The built form of development near or bordering Pacific Spirit Regional Park may have impacts on the park. Metro Vancouver has some concerns about changes being made to built form provisions and their potential impact on Pacific Spirit. UBC proposes to remove the maximum height limit of 53 metres (18 storeys) in all areas covered by the plan. Building heights and their impact on Pacific Spirit Regional Park have been an issue in the past (e.g., Marine Drive Student Residences). The loss of maximum height restrictions allows for this issue to arise again with no clear policy direction on how to protect park uses impacted by the height of buildings. Metro Vancouver asks that UBC develop and include in its Land Use Plan policies and land use controls that would ensure that there are no negative impacts on Pacific Spirit Regional Park as a result of the built form of development at UBC.

The existing Official Community Plan contains several policies that work towards protecting Pacific Spirit Regional Park and the retention and strengthening of those policies is in the region’s interest.

2.4 Land Use Plan Amendment Process and Public Consultation

UBC began the amendment process with a public consultation program that so far has consisted of two open houses held on July 15, followed by a 2-week online consultation period. The UBC staff has also held meetings with several groups, such as the University Neighbourhood Association Board of Directors, Alma Mater Society, City of Vancouver and the Friends of the Farm.
Comments on Proposed UBC Land Use Plan Amendments
Electoral Area Committee Meeting Date: October 15, 2010
Regional Planning Committee Meeting Date: October 8, 2010
Page 4 of 8

Metro Vancouver staff attended the open houses in July and met to discuss the amendments with UBC staff in early September.

According to UBC staff, the proposed Land Use Plan amendments will work towards achieving the following three objectives:

1. Simplifying the academic designations;
2. Changing the designation of the UBC Farm;
3. Improving housing affordability and community sustainability.

The meeting with UBC staff did not involve any details about the proposed amendments and focused on the objectives mentioned above and the rationale for why amendments were being sought.

In September, UBC staff presented the UBC Board of Governors with a report (Attachment 5) outlining the process for amending the Land Use Plan, the rationale for why changes were needed, a general outline of what those changes would be and the next steps towards adoption of the proposed amendments.

Additional public consultation began on September 27, 2010 with online consultation and there will be three public events on October 13 and 14. The public consultation period will end October 15. Metro Vancouver received a letter from UBC requesting comments by October 27, 2010. UBC staff will return to their Board with the results of the consultation and a public hearing is planned for the end of November.

The actual wording of the proposed amendments has not been made public. This makes it difficult to provide precise comments on the amendments and their implications. UBC is required to provide an updated regional context statement but this has not been provided in any materials made public to date. The policy briefs provide some detail as to what is being contemplated but it is not possible to ascertain exactly what is going to be adopted or how the revised land use plan will eventually read. This issue was raised with UBC staff and the response was that they were working on the precise wording and that they would be released when completed, in advance of the public hearing.

2.5 Outline of Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments

This UBC report (Attachment 5) provides some detail as to what the proposed Land Use Plan amendments are, though the specific wording of the amendments was not presented. UBC is proposing to reduce the number of designations for the UBC Campus to four. They would be ‘Academic’, ‘Green Academic’, ‘Primary Village Centre Academic’ and ‘Family Housing and Commercial Areas’. See the draft map in Attachment 1 for the boundaries of the proposed designations. A brief overview of each designation is provided below along with an initial analysis on how these proposed designations may impact regional interests.

a) Academic

The Academic designation would encompass all the lands intended primarily to support the academic mission of the university. Uses contemplated in this designation range from class rooms, commercial space, and student housing and support services. The rationale for this designation is that it would reduce the number of designations for academic uses and recognize that a modern university campus is a mix of uses. This rationale seems appropriate and does not impact the regional interest.
There is no clear indication of student housing densities or number of units. The recently adopted Campus Plan envisions as many as 8000 new student housing units but this number is not reflected in what has been provided to date. Clarity on the actual number of units is of interest to Metro Vancouver in terms of its growth projections.

It is proposed to remove the maximum height limit of 53 metres. Building heights and their impact on Pacific Spirit Regional Park have been an issue in the past (e.g., Marine Drive Student Residences). The loss of maximum height restrictions allows for this issue to arise again with no clear policy direction on how to protect park uses affected by the height of buildings.

The Academic designation does incorporate policies around stormwater management and cliff erosion. This is an issue with the interface with Pacific Spirit Regional Park and it is beneficial to have these policies in the Land Use Plan. There needs to be ongoing discussions of this issue with Metro Vancouver Regional Parks staff.

b) Green Academic
This designation would encompass the lands of UBC Farm, all of the lands currently designation ‘Fields, Stadium, Botanical Garden’ and the green edges of the campus. This designation appears to indicate that these lands will not be used for intensive, building-related academic uses, but rather will be kept as open areas to support land-based teaching, community engagement and athletics. It makes links to other planning documents for UBC Farm (Cultivating Place), athletics and recreation and the Botanical Garden that provide further policy detail as to appropriate uses.

The future of UBC Farm has been a local and regional issue in the past. These proposed amendments begin to give some clarity as to how these lands will develop in the future. They have stated that no family housing will be built on the farm but are silent on other types of housing. A specific designation unique to the UBC Farm listing permitted uses would give more clarity to this use.

The region has an interest in the adequacy of open space for active and passive recreation and associated municipal-type park facilities for residents. If there is an inadequate amount of space provided on campus this could have impacts on Pacific Spirit Park (e.g., pressure to provide space for municipal-type park facilities. The current range is 0.5-1.1 hectares per 1000 people. According to the tables provided in the policy briefs, see tables 1-3 of the Policy Brief: Amenities for Family Housing in Attachment 5, there is sufficient access to open space on the UBC campus to meet the requirements.

c) Primary Village Centre Academic
This is the smallest of the designations and it seeks to foster a pedestrian village with shops and services on the University Square area at University Boulevard and East Mall. Based on the information received to date this designation does not seem to have an impact on any regional interests.

d) Family Housing and Commercial Areas
This designation is proposed to encompass all of the non-academic land used for housing and commercial uses. It consists primarily of the existing designations of “Existing Housing Areas” and “Future Housing Areas”.
The changes contemplated in this designation are the most significant. It is proposed to more than double the buildable area by raising the floor space ratio (FSR) to an average of 2.5. The current averages are 1 FSR in existing areas and 1.2 FSR in future housing areas.

Given that this is an average for the whole designation and that most of the existing development complies with the 1-1.2 FSR average, new development could proceed at a much higher FSR than 2.5 yet still comply with the overall average of 2.5.

It is also proposed to remove the unit cap of 100 units to the hectare, to remove maximum height limit of 53 metres, to remove the policy direction that housing be primarily four storeys, and to remove the policy direction that 40% of new housing will be ground oriented. There does not seem to be any proposed limits on heights in the revised plan. As mentioned earlier height of buildings has been an issue in regards to their potential impacts on park uses and there will no longer be any policy direction on this issue.

There are several areas within this designation that are intended to receive “transferred” density, see Attachment 2. This density is supposed to be coming from the areas that are currently designated “Future Housing Reserve,” but no density is assigned to the current “Future Housing Reserve” so there is no real density to transfer to other areas. Additionally, it is not clear what it means to be an area that has increased density.

The current Official Community Plan provided for a target of 18,000 residents including students in residence by 2021. Current population counts show there are 6,410 people in family housing and 8,800 in student residences for a total of 15,210.

The policy brief describes a need for a population 25,000 to 35,000 people within the family housing designation to support local commercial activities and to provide affordable housing. This would result in an additional 19,000 to 29,000 people over the existing population. If current student numbers are added to this as well as the 8000 places in the planned student residences as shown in the Campus plan, the campus population could reach 41,800 to 51,800, or two to three times the population contemplated in the existing OCP.

This level of population growth was not contemplated in the preparation of the Livable Region Strategic Plan or the new Regional Growth Strategy. There are a number of concerns with this level of growth, especially if this result in substantial commuting off campus. There are no guarantees in the plan that the new housing will be primarily for staff, students, and faculty. The existing transit service with some modest improvements can support demand from the university. Adding additional people will require additional services on and off campus and current regional plans do not envision expensive high capacity investments to the peninsula. Community infrastructure, including additional schools would need to be built. Meanwhile in the City of Vancouver, many existing neighbourhoods would benefit from additional population to help keep schools open and utilize existing community infrastructure.

UBC states that the planned large increases in population are being made in an attempt to provide more affordable housing on the UBC Campus. UBC staff proposes that allowing these increases in density will allow for utilization of more efficient construction techniques and the development of smaller units, which could lead to more affordable housing. However, there is no indication how the proposed increase in floor space will be allocated in terms of unit size and price of rental and ownership housing.
It is also proposed to nearly double the ratio of commercial area permitted in this designation, from 0.74 to 1.4 square metres of commercial floor space per resident. UBC uses the argument that in order to provide a complete range of shopping and services, considerably more commercial space is needed and “maintaining a healthy and sizable year round population is then critical to the success of the commercial area”. The proposals therefore are to substantially increase neighbourhood commercial space and the locations would be determined in the neighbourhood plans. This would also have potential implications for the employment projections for the area.

3. ALTERNATIVES

The following options are provided for the Committee’s consideration:

That the Board:

a) offer the following initial comments to UBC on the proposed Land Use Plan amendments:

   i. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to re-examine and adjust the Land Use Plan amendments to increase opportunities for on-site student housing and reduce the potential for market housing;

   ii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to establish height regulations in the Land Use Plan that would address the concern of the visual impact of development on Pacific Spirit Regional Park;

   iii. Metro Vancouver requests UBC to ensure that sufficient open space is provided for recreation and associated municipal-type park facilities on its lands, therefore alleviating any future pressure for those type of uses to be provided in Pacific Spirit Regional Park;

   iv. As required by Ministerial Order 229, UBC provide an updated Regional Context Statement to Metro Vancouver for written comment.

b) delegate authority to provide formal comments on the actual proposed amendments to a special committee made up of the members of the Regional Planning Committee and the Electoral Area Committee should the circumstance arise that a public hearing on the proposed land use amendments is scheduled at such a time that the Board would not be able to meet in time to provide comments.

or

c) Recommend alternate direction on initial comments to the proposed UBC land use plan amendments.

4. CONCLUSION

Several issues have been raised in this initial review with respect to regional impacts of proposed land use amendments, though it is challenging to make complete comments in the absence of the actual wording for the proposed amendments and in the absence of a Regional Context Statement. The main concern is on the level of population growth contemplated at UBC. This will have implications on the regional transportation system and community infrastructure. UBC is an important academic institution for the region and the Province and its development as a university of renown is supported.
However, the development of the non-academic portion of the campus raises concerns and there appears to be a risk of some circularity in the supporting arguments. Additional commercial space is proposed to serve the increased population.

Increased non-academic housing is proposed to make the commercial space more viable. And the increase in both is then used to justify more public investment in supporting infrastructure.

The regional interest is best served by first expanding the opportunities for on-campus student housing, and secondly for providing affordable housing for family and staff. A significant increase in market housing, which will undoubtedly be 'high end' in terms of price, may benefit the university financially but this may equally increase the pressure for costly public infrastructure investment. This is not consistent with regional growth plans or the regional interest. It is therefore staff’s recommendations that UBC be requested to re-examine and adjust its proposed plans to increase the supply of on-campus student housing and decrease the amount of proposed plans to increase the supply of on-campus student housing and decrease the amount of pure market housing.

ATTACHMENTS

1 Map 1 – Draft Land Use Plan Designations for Academic Lands UBC’s Vancouver Campus (Doc. #4478333).
2 Map 2 – Draft Diagram: Transfer of Housing Density from Farm + Other Areas (Doc. #4478429).
3 Ministerial Order M 229 dated August 18, 2010 (Doc. #4398558).
4 UBC’s Request for Agency Comment on UBC’s proposed Draft Land Use Plan Amendments (Doc. #4461511).
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AUG 18 2010

Her Worship Mayor Lois Jackson
Chair
Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Dear Chair Jackson:

This letter is to advise that further to amendments to the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act (No. 3) (Act) passed by the British Columbia Legislature on April 29, 2010, and brought into force on June 24, 2010, I have approved the enclosed Ministerial Order (Order) pursuant to section 40(2) of the Act. The Order will apply to the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) public consultation processes related to the creation of a new Land Use Plan or the amendment of the existing Land Use Plan.

In a letter to you dated May 5, 2010, my predecessor, Honourable Bill Bennett, indicated that in his role as Minister, he would ensure that the public is heard, and the interests of Metro Vancouver, the Province of British Columbia (Province), and UBC are balanced when considering a Land Use Plan or plan amendment submitted by UBC to the Minister for adoption.

The Order delegates full responsibility for developing plans and engaging the public and other interests to UBC. It establishes consultation and public involvement requirements that meet or exceed those laid out in the Local Government Act for municipalities and regional districts. The legislation requires UBC to provide a report on public consultations to the Minister. If I am not satisfied with the consultations, I can choose not to adopt the proposed Land Use Plan or amendments.

.../2
Her Worship Mayor Lois Jackson, Chair
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The UBC must meet the minimum requirements in the Order but has scope to design and implement additional public participation and consultation processes that exceed these minimums. The UBC has committed to meeting these requirements as well as undertaking additional processes not mandated in the Order.

Residents living on campus are protected by public process requirements in the Order. This includes requirements for consultation and a public hearing outlined in the Order. The UBC is required to provide the University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) with representation on the Planning Committee which will hold public hearings on the proposed Land Use Plan and amendments to that plan.

In addition to protections in the Order, residents of the Point Grey Campus Lands continue to have the ability to bring issues to the UNA and utilize their access to the dispute resolution mechanism in section 18.4 of the Neighbour's Agreement between UBC and the UNA. Finally, UBC Board meetings are open to the public, and residents, neighbours and other stakeholders may attend Board meetings and raise their concerns.

I am also very aware of Metro Vancouver’s view that the regional growth strategy must continue to apply on the UBC campus and that the UBC Land Use Plan must be consistent with it. The legislation makes it clear that the regional growth strategy continues to apply. The legislation requires UBC to develop a regional context statement and requires the Minister to consider the consistency of the regional context statement with the regional growth strategy before adopting a plan. The Order reinforces this requirement by specifying that UBC must refer the regional context statement, and any amendments to the regional context statement, to Metro Vancouver for comment before it is submitted to me for adoption.

The Deputy Minister has committed in a letter to Metro Vancouver that if there are issues related to the consistency of the regional context statement and the regional district regional growth strategy, we will work directly with Metro Vancouver. Where there are differences, we are prepared to consider dispute resolution processes.

The Order requires UBC to meet the same standard of consultation that municipalities and regional districts would have to meet. The Order specifically identifies the City of Vancouver, University Endowment Lands, Metro Vancouver, University Neighbourhoods Association, Greater Vancouver Regional District, Vancouver School District, and the provincial and federal governments and their agencies.
Her Worship Mayor Lois Jackson, Chair
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If you wish further information, please contact:

Mr. Gary Paget
Senior Executive Director
Local Government Programs
Local Government Department
Ministry of Community and Rural Development
4th Floor – 800 Johnson Street
Victoria, BC V8W 9T1
Telephone: 250 953-4129
Facsimile: 250 387-7972
Email: Gary.Paget@gov.bc.ca

Sincerely,

Ben Stewart
Minister

Enclosure

pc: Honourable Moira Stilwell
Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development

Mr. Gary Paget
Senior Executive Director
Local Government Programs
Local Government Department
Ministry of Community and Rural Development
PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

MINISTERIAL ORDER

Ministerial Order No. M 229, Approved and Ordered AUG 18 2010

I, Ben Stewart, Minister of Community and Rural Development, do hereby order that the requirements attached hereto as Schedule A to this Ministerial Order be imposed on the Board of Governors (the “Board”) of the University of British Columbia (“UBC”).

Minister of Community and Rural Development

(Title part is for administrative purposes only and is not part of the Order)

Authority under which Order is made:

Act and Section: Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act (3), Part 10-2010, sections 38(2) (d), 40(2), and 43.

Other (Specify): OIC 427/2010
SCHEDULE A

Consultation in the Development and Amendment of the Land Use Plan

1. During the development of the Land Use Plan, or the repeal or amendment of the Land Use Plan, the Board must provide one or more opportunities it considers appropriate for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities it considers will be affected.

2. In addition to the requirements of subsection 40(1)(a) of the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act (3), Part 10-2010, the Board is required to specifically consider whether consultation is required with the following:
   (a) University Neighbourhoods Association;
   (b) University Endowment Lands;
   (c) Greater Vancouver Regional District;
   (d) City of Vancouver;
   (e) Vancouver School District; and
   (f) Provincial and federal governments and their agencies.

3. Consultation under this section is in addition to the public hearing required under subsection 40(1)(b) of the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act (3), Part 10-2010 and must be early and ongoing.

Engagement with the Musqueam First Nation

4. Prior to submitting a new Land Use Plan or amendments to the Land Use Plan to the Minister for adoption, the Board must engage the Musqueam First Nation regarding the new Land Use Plan or amendments to the Land Use Plan where they affect Musqueam interests.

Public Hearings

5. The Board is required to ensure that a public hearing is held before sending the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan to the Minister for adoption.

6. The Board is required to ensure that all persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan are provided with a reasonable opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions respecting matters contained in the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan that is the subject of the public hearing.

7. Subject to section 6, the Board is required to establish procedural rules for the conduct of the public hearing.
8. The Board is required to ensure that a written report of each public hearing, certified as being fair and accurate by the person preparing the report, and containing a summary of the nature of the representations respecting the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan that were made at the hearing, is prepared and maintained as a public record.

**Holding of Public Hearings by Committee**

9. If the Board establishes a committee to hold a public hearing, the committee is required to be comprised of:
   
   (a) Two Board members appointed by the Chair of the Board;

   (b) The Chair of the Board of the University Neighbourhoods Association;

   (c) The Vice President, External, Legal and Community Relations for UBC;

   (d) The Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning for UBC; and

   (e) Two external professional planners who are not employees of the Board appointed by the Chair of the Board.

10. If the Board establishes a committee to hold a public hearing, the Board is required to ensure the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan are not forwarded to the Minister for adoption until after the committee reports to the Board, either orally or in writing, the views expressed at the hearing and the Board has considered that report.

**Notice of Public Hearing**

11. The Board is required to give notice of a public hearing in accordance with this section, and the notice must state the following:

   (a) the time and date of the hearing;

   (b) the place of the hearing;

   (c) in general terms, the purpose of the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan;

   (d) a description of the land or lands that are the subject of the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan including, subject to section 14, a sketch that shows the area that is the subject of the proposed Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan, including the names of adjoining roads if applicable; and

   (e) the place, time and date that copies of the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan can be viewed.
12. The notice must be published in at least two consecutive issues of a newspaper, in the area affected by the Land Use Plan or amendment to the Land Use Plan, the last publication to appear not less than three and not more than 10 days before the public hearing.

13. If the amendment to the Land Use Plan for which the notice is given alters the non-institutional permitted use or density of an area designated for future housing, the notice must be mailed or otherwise delivered at least 10 days before the public hearing to:
   
   (a) the owners of any parcels, as shown on the assessment roll for the current year;

   (b) the tenants of all parcels in occupation of any leased premises;

   any part of which is within the Point Grey campus lands and is the subject of the change in permitted use or density; or is within 30 metres of the part of the area that is subject to the change in permitted use or density.

14. If the location of the land can be clearly identified in the notice in a manner other than a sketch, it may be identified in that manner.

15. In respect of a public hearing being held to consider an amendment to the Land Use Plan, the Board is required to:

   (a) post a notice on the land that is the subject of the proposed amendment, and

   (b) determine the size, form and content of the notice and the manner in which, and the locations where, it must be posted.

Regional Context Statement

16. Prior to submitting a new Land Use Plan or an amendment to the Land Use Plan to the Minister, the Board is required to forward any new or amended Regional Context Statement to the chief planning officer of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) for written comments on the relationship between the new or amended Regional Context Statement and the GVRD's Regional Growth Strategy. The comments received from the chief planning officer must be included in the package provided to the Minister.
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Ed Andrusiak
Manager
GVRD Parks
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Re: Request for Agency Comment on UBC’s proposed Draft Land Use Plan Amendments

Dear Mr. Andrusiak,

UBC is developing amendments to the Land Use Plan for the Vancouver campus. The Plan is 15 years old. Its vision and general provisions remain relevant and UBC has achieved the targets in the Plan for housing and transportation. However, some of the provisions in the Plan do not allow UBC to effectively support and implement the academic mission of the university in 2010 and beyond. UBC’s aspirations for academic integration and sustainable community development require adjustments to specific elements within the Land Use Plan.

UBC is therefore proposing amendments to the plan to address the following key issues:

- **Increase housing choices and improve housing affordability** for our faculty, staff and students. In particular, the ability to provide a greater number of smaller units within the housing stock delivered on campus, resulting in more affordable housing for a wider range of faculty and staff, and to accommodate a better range of shops and services is crucial to creating a more complete, sustainable community on campus.

- **Change the land use designation for the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic”** to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation.

- **Transfer housing density from the UBC Farm and other future housing areas to support sustainable community development and UBC’s academic mission.** These density transfers enable retention of the farm in its current location without losing the ability to have the year-round residential population needed to sustain viable shops, services, and transit on campus.
• **Regularize academic land use designations to better align with UBC's academic mission and vision.** This change will enable delivery of more integrated institutional facilities such as mixed hubs of teaching, research, student housing and academic support uses.

Enclosed are materials that provide background information, and further information on the proposed amendments. Additional information is available at [www.planning.ubc.ca](http://www.planning.ubc.ca). The amendments are identified in the policy briefs.

We welcome your comments on these proposed amendments, in the context of your agency’s responsibilities, on or before October 27, 2010.

Please direct your comments or enquiries to me at the contact information provided in the letterhead.

Yours truly,

Lisa Colby
Associate Director, Policy Planning

*cc: Mitch Sokalski, West Area Manager, Metro Vancouver*
LAND USE PLAN AND THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

The Official Community Plan (OCP) for UBC's Vancouver campus has been adopted as our Land Use Plan with the passing of the provincial Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, Part 10 - 2010. This legislation was introduced as part of Bill 20 on April 29, 2010 and passed into law in June 2010. The OCP was a bylaw of Metro Vancouver and established policies for land use on campus. The Act puts the provincial government in the place of Metro Vancouver, in a similar relationship with the university.

The Land Use Plan, like the OCP before it, is the "bylaw" establishing general land uses and policies for the entire 1,000-acre campus, with a special focus on non-institutional development. The OCP required public consultation in order to make any amendments, and those requirements for consultation are still in effect under the Land Use Plan.

DEVELOPING AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN

Updates to the Land Use Plan are currently necessary to support UBC's vision of creating a model university community that is vibrant, livable, and sustainable, and to support the university's academic mission.

The amendments will address long-standing issues the community has raised as barriers to realizing that vision and mission. Proposed changes will address these barriers by:

- Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
- Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from "Future Housing Reserve" to "Green Academic" to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation; also transfer housing density;
- Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC's academic vision.

These issues were identified in the Vancouver Campus Plan process, which included an extensive multi-year consultation with students, faculty, staff, alumni, campus residents and other stakeholders.

CONSULTATION: NEXT STEPS

UBC is committed to open and transparent public consultation in the process of developing amendments to the Land Use Plan to address the issues with the current Land Use Plan. Updates to the Land Use Plan will be proposed after consultation with students, faculty, staff, alumni, campus residents and other stakeholders.

ABOUT THE MUNICIPALITIES ENABLING AND VALIDATING ACT, PART 10 - 2010

The Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, Part 10 - 2010, was introduced by the Province as part of Bill 20 and passed in June 2010; it responds to the joint request from Metro Vancouver and UBC that the provincial government relieve the GVRD of its responsibilities for local land use planning for the campus. The Act transfers the responsibility for approving a land use plan for UBC's Vancouver campus from Metro Vancouver to the Minister of Community and Rural Development, who will consult with the Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. This enables Metro Vancouver to focus on their regional roles and responsibilities.
CONSULTATION: NEXT STEPS (cont’d)
UBC’s public consultation process will comprise an open house and
workshop on July 15, 2010, as well as three more open houses in the
2010 fall/winter. UBC will also hold an online consultation during the
fall/winter period. The Board of Governors will be regularly updated on
progress and on input received.

In addition, there will be a public hearing in late 2010/early 2011. All
consultation will take place in accordance with Part 10 - 2010 of the
Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
UBC’s Board of Governors has adopted a set of principles to guide the
process of preparing amendments to the Land Use Plan, and to ensure an
open and transparent public consultation process:

ACADEMIC MISSION
as one of the world’s leading universities, fostering an exceptional
learning and research environment is at the heart of UBC’s campus
planning;

SUSTAINABILITY
which includes environmental, social and economic considerations,
and the needs of current and future generations;

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY
with a key focus on providing opportunities for the University’s faculty
and staff to complement the significant efforts that will be put into
increasing the supply of affordable student housing on campus;

COMPLETENESS AND FUNCTIONALITY
to enable community members to meet their daily needs on campus
including access to transit, and that enriches the life of the community
of scholars;

CREATIVITY AND FLEXIBILITY
especially with respect to implementing the academic mission and
the concept of the campus as a living laboratory; and

STRONG GOVERNANCE
in the process of developing amendments by providing transparency
and accountability and an inclusive community consultation process.

UBC has taken
significant steps
towards creating a more sustainable campus
community:

TRANSPORTATION
• Transit ridership increased by 208%
• Single occupant vehicle trips
decreased by 14%
• Automobile traffic to and from UBC
decreased by 19%
• Measured between fall 1997 and
fall 2009; Reported in 2009
Transportation Status Report,
UBC, Feb. 2010

HOUSING
• Since 1997, 27% of the new family
housing is rental, two-thirds is
non-market
• 51% of new housing is home to at
least one UBC faculty, student or staff
person
• 29% of our full-time undergraduate
and 24% of our full-time graduate
students live on campus
• Planning and development for
UTown@UBC has been founded on the
three pillars of sustainability - ecology,
community and economy.
• Student Housing and Hospitality
Services Capital Plan will create 2,500
new student bed spaces in the next
five years.
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SUBJECT: Land Use Amendment Process – Referral of Policy Proposals
to Public Consultation

DECISION REQUESTED: That the Board approve the policy proposals as outlined in this
report for the second phase of public consultation in the
process for amending the Land Use Plan.

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
In June 2010, the UBC Board of Governors initiated the process to amend the Land Use Plan for
the Vancouver campus. The process will address three issues: regularizing academic land use
designations on the campus; retaining and re-designating the UBC Farm from ‘Future Housing
Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’ and transferring associated housing density; and improving
housing affordability for UBC’s faculty and staff and community sustainability on campus.
These issues arose through the recently-completed campus plan process for the academic lands
on the campus, but can only be addressed by amendments to the Land Use Plan. The Board
established principles to guide the plan amendment process, and also approved a thorough
consultation process that began in July 2010.
This report provides an update on input received in the consultation process to date, and the policy proposals for addressing the three issues that are the focus of this amendment process. The Board’s Community Planning Task Group reviewed the community input and policy proposals in detail and their input has been incorporated. The next step is to discuss these proposals with the community in a consultation process that will begin in late September and conclude in mid-October. The input received will be reviewed by the Community Planning Task Group before the finalized proposals are presented to the Board for referral to public hearing later this fall.

B. REPORT

History

The provincial government’s vision, when it established the University of British Columbia as the Province’s first university, was that the university would be part of a unique community. The province selected a site that was deliberately outside any municipal boundaries, and provided land for the development of the campus, for the development of a community, and to help fund the development of the university. Lands related to the latter - the endowment lands - were originally located in central British Columbia, but those were replaced with the lands west of Blanca Street (about 3,000 acres in total). Over time, that endowment land base was reduced to the campus’s 1,000 acres of today, with the most significant change being the creation of the 1,800 acre Pacific Spirit Regional Park in 1987.

In the 1980’s, the UBC Board of Governors decided to move forward in creating a community on the Vancouver campus to support the university’s academic mission as it develops into one of the world’s best universities. The Board had academic, social, environmental and financial goals.

- Academically, building a community on campus assists with recruiting and retaining excellent faculty and students from around the world. The campus is located in some of the most expensive real estate in Canada and the ability of faculty and students from other jurisdictions to move to areas near the campus has been and continues to be a major challenge in recruitment and retention. The development of a community on the campus also enriches the academic life of the campus, providing opportunities that are not present when people disperse to a wide range of communities after their day at the university. More recently, the opportunity to have the campus serve as a living laboratory for sustainability solutions is enriched by the existence of the community.

- Commuting long distances between where people live and where they work or study has a significant social impact in addition to its negative effects on university life and people’s university experience. The toll on families and individuals of spending significant portions of the day in commuting traffic is real and evident in those who must commute today. Many of our faculty, staff and students try to live close to the university to minimize these impacts, often sacrificing financial or other objectives to achieve a smaller commute time. There are also impacts on our neighbouring communities of significant commuter traffic.
• The separation of housing from the university campus and the resultant commuting traffic also has impacts on the environment, from tailpipe gas emissions that include greenhouse gas emissions to stormwater and other effects of heavily travelled roadways.

• Financially, the creation of a university community on the campus provided the opportunity to build the financial endowment of the university. The Board of Governors ensures that the net proceeds from land leasing are placed in the endowment and the income used to support academic excellence (e.g. scholarships, research funding).

The vision for the community in the Land Use Plan is one where the community development is in balance with the size and needs of the university and with the environmental setting. The vision is not a community of estate residential homes (which would have had strong financial performance but not met academic, social or environmental goals), nor of building a downtown environment (which would have overwhelmed the academic environment). As the university develops for the future in meeting the needs of the province, Canada and the world, the community will also need to evolve.

Considerable progress has been made over the past twenty years since work began on building a unique university community. The amount of student housing on campus has grown to 8,500 beds, and about 3,000 family homes have been built. But a number of pressing issues need to be addressed. To do that, the Land Use Plan for the campus must be amended.

As a reminder, the issues to be addressed through amendments to the Land Use Plan are:

• regularizing academic land use designations so that they better support implementation of the university’s academic mission, the campus plan and contemporary academic life;

• changing the designation of the farm from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’ and transferring housing density; and

• improving housing affordability for UBC’s faculty and staff on campus and community sustainability.

**Input to Date from the Consultation Process**

Two open houses and workshops were held in July, along with a two-week on-line consultation period. The consultation summary report is provided in Attachment 1. Highlights are:

• Over 160 people attended the in-person events, and there were over 110 unique visits to the website during the on-line consultation period.

• There was strong support for transferring housing density and for increasing housing density and providing more, smaller units to improve housing affordability.

• There was strong support for increasing the number of shops and services on campus to improve the livability, vibrancy and sustainability of the campus community.

• There was strong support for changing the farm’s current designation as a ‘future housing reserve’ and desire to have the new designation fully recognize and enable the
implementation of Cultivating Place. There was concern that the term ‘Green Academic’ is not specific enough for the farm area in particular.

- There was strong support for Cultivating Place as the academic plan for the farm area. There are opportunities to improve the community’s awareness and understanding of this plan.
- There was mixed support for regularizing academic land use designations. The policy brief has been revised to illustrate more clearly how the academic land use designations on the campus do not support the academic mission nor contemporary academic life.

The Administration is also meeting with a number of groups to ensure there is strong awareness of the amendment process and the opportunities to participate in the public consultation. The following groups have been engaged to date: University Neighbourhoods Association Board of Directors (UNA), Alma Mater Society (AMS) Executive, University Endowment Lands staff, Friends of the Farm, the City of Vancouver, the Point Grey Village Business Association, the Dunbar Residents Association, and the Western Canada Wilderness Committee.

While these outreach activities have sometimes resulted in a range of questions being raised, a few requests related directly to the amendments have arisen as summarized below.

- The AMS has requested that the Board consider including an aspirational target of having 50% of full time students being able to live on campus. This was not anticipated in the original scope of amendments discussed in the first phase of consultation, but will be included in the second phase. The AMS has also requested that the Board reconsider the University Boulevard and Gage South Neighbourhood Plans to ensure the type of housing in these plans is compatible with student life (e.g. smaller units, junior faculty and staff occupants only), and also with transit uses should the diesel bus facility be located near these areas. Neighbourhood Plan matters are a next step after the land use plan amendments are completed, and would be best addressed by a resolution of the Board at the culmination of the amendment process requesting review of these plans. This will also enable fuller consideration of the matter by the Community Planning Task Group.
- The UNA has requested that the Board ensure there are appropriate amenities provided. The City of Vancouver has also flagged this issue. This has been considered in the policy brief on amenities.
- The UEL has noted that compatibility of land uses along the border between the UEL and UBC campus will be important. This has been considered in the policy proposals for transferring housing density to ensure community sustainability.
- The Friends of the Farm have requested that Cultivating Place be referenced in the definition of Green Academic. These comments and others have been included in the development of the definition in the policy brief.

**Policy Briefs**

To prepare proposals for addressing the issues, the Administration developed policy briefs that summarize the issue, describe the constraints in the current Land Use Plan, review best practices
and provide proposals for how best to address the issue. These policy briefs will be important information to support the next phase of the consultation process.

The policy briefs for regularizing academic land use designations on campus and for redesignating the farm from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’ are provided in Attachments 2 and 3, respectively. The policy brief for improving housing affordability for UBC faculty and staff on campus and community sustainability is in Attachment 4 and the brief addressing amenities required to ensure a livable and sustainable community is in Attachment 5.

Regularizing Academic Land Use Designations:

The current Land Use Plan contains more than ten designations that affect academic land use, thus envisioning a campus where teaching, research and studying occur in separate, discreet parts of the campus. This approach is outdated and does not reflect either contemporary land use planning practice nor does it support contemporary academic practice. Today, the academic mission is ‘lived’ in a more mixed-use environment, where research, teaching and studying occur together for example. An ‘Academic’ designation for the campus’s academic areas is more appropriate, and is also consistent with how every other university campus is designated in the province.

Recognizing that there are significant parts of the campus that are used for land-based research, teaching and university life, however, the proposals put forward in the policy brief (Attachment 2) also recommend creating a special designation of ‘Green Academic’ for these land-based academic areas. The purpose of this designation is to signal the Board’s intent that these areas will be retained in open, non-building intensive academic uses to support implementation of the relevant academic plans for the areas. Building-intensive academic uses would be located in the general ‘Academic’ designated areas of the campus.

The final designation for the academic parts of the campus would be a ‘village centre’ designation, applied to the University Square area, to retain the intention that this area is part of the gateway to and social heart of the campus. The need to connect this area to the activities and built form of University Boulevard to the east is very important for the long term and thus worthy of a special designation.

Retaining and Redesignating the Farm:

This policy brief (Attachment 3) confirms that the Farm area will be retained for academic uses guided by Cultivating Place, and redesignated from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’. The Board’s condition that the housing density assigned to this area be transferred to other parts of campus to ensure that the University’s sustainable community and endowment goals will still be achieved is also discussed, and the areas to which housing density will be transferred from Future Housing Reserves and some Future Housing areas on campus.

The areas that will become new family housing areas were discussed with the campus community as part of the consultation process on the draft Campus Plan and there has been continuing support for these changes. These areas must be identified to enable the Future Housing Reserve designation to be removed from the farm area and other areas, and deleted from the Land Use Plan. The development of these new areas will occur over time and will be
carefully phased particularly in the Acadia East area to ensure that there is no net displacement of existing student families.

**Housing Affordability and Community Sustainability:**

A policy brief on improving housing affordability on campus for UBC faculty and staff and community sustainability is provided in Attachment 4. A sustainable community must be based on smart growth principles that include a mix of land uses for housing and jobs, a range of shops and services, transit, cycling and pedestrian transportation alternatives, a compact building form and a walkable and pedestrian-friendly public realm. Critical to this mix is a sizable year-round population base with close walking distance that will support the shops, services and transit.

The 1.2 FSR cap in the current Land Use Plan is too low to accommodate the density transfer of housing from the Farm and other future housing areas, and too low to adequately address contemporary smart growth, sustainable community objectives. In order to provide more smaller and affordable housing units for its workforce and to achieve a more complete and sustainable community, UBC proposes to:

- revise the Land Use Plan’s average FSR cap from 1.2 to a mid-range 2.5, similar to the Capers block development on 4th Avenue in Kitsilano or the Arbutus Lands;
- revise the emphasis on four-storey housing and 40% ground-oriented units, in order to take advantage of BC Building Code’s new allowance for more affordable six-storey woodframe construction; and
- revise the commercial floorspace cap to allow a complete range of shops and services on campus so that the population may meet its daily needs in the community.

**Residential Amenity Provisions:**

A policy brief on the provision of amenities to the residential community at UBC is provided in Attachment 5. UBC has committed substantial resources to ensure the residents of the university neighbourhoods are provided with beautiful open space, a community centre, school and daycare amenities in accordance with the requirements of the Land Use Plan. The scale and range of these amenities are detailed in the policy brief. More amenities will be provided in new growth areas to ensure the requirements of the Land Use Plan are met.

The proposals recommend that the Land Use Plan be amended to include a standard for daycare provision in the family housing areas. All of the other standards are consistent with or exceed best practices, and the policy brief illustrates how these can be achieved pursuant to the Land Use Plan amendments.

As Acadia is redeveloped, new University Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS) and a community centre will be provided in that neighbourhood. Similarly, new UNOS parks area will be added south of the Hawthorne Place along Stadium Road. In addition, an extensive Neighbours Agreement, concluded last year, details enhanced access privileges for the residents to excellent recreational facilities situated on the adjacent academic lands within walking distance. These facilities including the Aquatic Centre, Winter Sports Centre, tennis centre outdoor court, gymnasium at Osborne Gym, dedicated field space in Thunderbird Park, and basketball court. A
new school, and planning for a new community centre are already underway in the Wesbrook Place neighbourhood, and an additional school site for an elementary school has been reserved in Wesbrook Place.

**Second Phase of Community Consultation:**

The second phase of community consultation begins on September 27 and concludes October 15. It includes online consultation and three face-to-face events on October 13 and 14. Two of these events will be on campus and one will be off campus. There will also be online, social media and web-based communications, along with advertising to increase awareness of these consultation opportunities. The Administration is also working with the Faculty of Land and Food Systems to inform residents on campus and in neighbouring communities of the completion of Cultivating Place for the UBC Farm and the steps being taken in the Land Use Plan amendment process to change the designation from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’.

**C. Next Steps**

The results of this next phase of consultation will be reported back to the Community Planning Task Group in late October, along with any recommended adjustments to the policy proposals. The Board would then approve those proposals for referral to the public hearing in late November that is required under the provincial legislation governing amendments to the Land Use Plan.

**D. Attachments**

1. Consultation Summary Report for July 2010 Activities
2. Policy Brief – Regularizing Academie Land Use Designations
3. Policy Brief – Retaining and Redesignating the Farm
4. Policy Brief – Housing Affordability and Community Sustainability
5. Policy Brief – Amenities for Family Housing Areas
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OBJECTIVE

UBC began its series of public consultation events for the Land Use Plan amendments process with two public open houses and workshops on July 15, 2010 and a subsequent e-consultation process online from July 19th to 30th. The purpose of the events was to inform the UBC community and other interested stakeholders about the Land Use Plan, its role in UBC campus planning, the need to make specific amendments to the plan and the public consultation process being undertaken as part of the amendment process. The events also incorporated discussion specifically about the future of the UBC Farm as outlined in Cultivating Place: An Academic Plan for Applied Sustainability on South Campus and Beyond.

These first Land Use Plan public consultation events gave Campus and Community Planning an early opportunity to gauge public response to, and gain input toward, proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan that will address long-standing issues raised by the UBC community. The amendments will address these issues by:

1. Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
2. Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation; also transferring housing density; and
3. Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision.

Approximately 161 people attended the events (not including staff) and 19 emails where received as part of the e-consultation.

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSES/WORKSHOPS AND E-CONSULTATION

The public open houses and workshops were scheduled to accommodate the different schedules of the on- and off-campus community. Approximately 105 people attended session 1, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., and approximately 56 people attended session 2, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.: Registration and Open House</td>
<td>4 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.: Registration and Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.: Presentations</td>
<td>4:30 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.: Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:50 p.m. – 5:55 p.m.: Table/Issue discussions</td>
<td>4:50 p.m. – 5:55 p.m.: Table/Issue discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:55 p.m. – 6 p.m.: Wrap-up</td>
<td>5:55 p.m. – 6 p.m.: Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The public open houses had display boards available for viewing the entire evening, between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. Each session then included a presentation by Dr. Nancy Knight, Associate Vice President of Campus and Community Planning at UBC, in which she discussed the Land Use Plan, amendments, and consultation process. Her presentation was followed by Dr. Andrew Riseman, Associate Professor, Faculty of Land and Food Systems, and the academic lead for the UBC Centre for Sustainable Food Systems – UBC Farm. Dr. Riseman presented on the topic of *Cultivating Place*, the plan for the UBC Farm area. Participants then took part in the workshops, which involved smaller table discussions with resource people who answered their questions and collected feedback regarding specific Land Use Plan amendment issues.

The following provides a summary of the comments, concerns and questions that surfaced most frequently during each issue discussion:

- **Table/Issue discussion: How could UBC create affordable housing and a more complete sustainable community?**

  There was strong support for increasing density to increase the affordability of housing on campus and to improve sustainability. Participants also supported decreasing unit sizes, and exploring other ways to reduce housing costs (e.g. higher energy efficiency, capping rents, reducing parking requirements). The main concern was that providing land for non-UBC people could reduce affordability or availability for students, faculty and staff.

- **Table/Issue discussion: What are the most important aspects of a “Green Academic” land use category definition? [Words given as examples: green space, sustainability, academic excellence, teaching/learning, research, innovation, agriculture/horticulture, integration, living laboratory, non-building intensive, community engagement, ecology, ecosystem, stewardship, social sustainability, knowledge dissemination]**

  Participants expressed concern that the term “Green Academic” is not defined in sufficient detail yet and that it should include reference to the UBC Farm. They contributed their ideas as to what the designation should mean or include, e.g. sustainable building practices, non-intensive building, and minimizing or not exceeding existing footprints. Participants also said that the plans put forward in *Cultivating Place* should be followed, that they would like to see more open spaces for learning, improved ‘green’ transportation options on campus to help people visit areas in the Green Academic designation, and that the opportunity to create connections within the on-campus community (i.e. students and residents) and to achieve integration of teaching, research, community and recreation should be explored.

- **Table/Issue discussion: How would you regularize the academic land use designations to better support the integration of teaching, learning and research?**

  Participants requested information regarding how UBC develops land use designations, what those designations are, why it is better to have more or less designations, etc. Some participants also had suggestions about how to regularize the designations and some expressed concern over the current governance structure and who or what body oversees land use planning at UBC.

- **Table/Issue discussion: What are your thoughts on how *Cultivating Place* is proposing to use the UBC Farm Lands?**
Participants expressed support for *Cultivating Place* and the plan’s potential in bringing innovative sustainability programs to UBC students, faculty, staff and residents. Concerns and questions were raised about the meaning of the term “Green Academic” and the possibility of housing being built on the Farm.

Approximately 51 people submitted feedback forms and most (29%) gave the events a 4 out of 5 rating, identifying the workshop as “useful in understanding land use plan issues and the amendments process”. Twenty-four per cent gave the events a 3 out of 5 rating.

A number of feedback form comments indicated the workshop format felt rushed and individuals weren’t able to talk about issues thoroughly. Some feedback forms also commented on the need to preserve Wreck Beach and others expressed concern that the term “Green Academic” designation is not defined yet or inappropriate for the UBC Farm area. General concerns over loss of green space on campus were also indicated.

At the end of each session, participants were informed that all materials (PowerPoint presentations, display boards, infosheet, and agenda) would be posted on the Campus and Community Planning website by Monday, July 19, and that notes from the table/issue discussions would be posted as well.

An email was sent to all participants (whose email addresses were collected through sign-in sheets or electronic RSVPs) stating that materials could be viewed online. The email also contained table discussion notes and people were invited to comment on the notes between Monday, July 19 and Wednesday, July 21 (end of day) by email. Six emails were received in response to the table discussion notes. Each expressed that their comments were not reflected in the notes and asked that they be included. The notes were amended accordingly.

All materials, including the agenda, display boards, PowerPoint presentations by Nancy Knight and Andrew Riseman, and information sheet, were posted on the Campus and Community Planning website on Monday, July 19 in the “Document Library” and “E-consultation” sections. The e-consultation webpage identified that comments and feedback on materials was being collected between Monday, July 19 and Friday, July 30.

Nineteen emails were received during the e-consultation period, responding to the materials posted online. In total, the “E-consultation” webpage received 255 page views (108 unique views), and the “Document Library” received six page views (3 unique views) between July 19th and 30th.

Seventeen of the 19 email provided at least one comment about the UBC Farm. Nine emails followed the same format and messaging outlining four objectives for the farm, with one email identifying the source of messaging as Friends of the Farm. These comments supported a “UBC Farm” label over “Green Academic,” defining the size of the Farm as 24 hectares, governance of UBC Farm by stakeholders, and density transfer from the UBC Farm as well as density as a planning principal. The only other issue to garner more than one comment was the need for more affordable off-campus housing options for UBC students, faculty and staff.
2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Board of Governors Guiding Principles
In support of UBC’s *Place and Promise* vision to create a model university community that is vibrant, livable and sustainable, the Board of Governors will be guided by the following principles in developing amendments to the Land Use Plan for the Vancouver campus:

**ACADEMIC MISSION**
as one of the world’s leading universities, fostering an exceptional learning and research environment is at the heart of UBC’s campus planning;

**SUSTAINABILITY**
which includes environmental, social and economic considerations, and the needs of current and future generations;

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**
with a key focus on providing opportunities for the University’s faculty and staff to complement the significant efforts that will be put into increasing the supply of affordable student housing on campus;

**COMPLETENESS AND FUNCTIONALITY**
to enable community members to meet their daily needs on campus including access to transit, and that enriches the life of the community of scholars;

**CREATIVITY AND FLEXIBILITY**
especially with respect to implementing the academic mission and the concept of the campus as a living laboratory; and

**STRONG GOVERNANCE**
in the process of developing amendments by providing transparency and accountability and an inclusive community consultation process.

2.2 About UBC Campus Planning

UBC has a long history of physical planning to support its mandate as a world-class, leading academic institution.

Currently, UBC has three planning documents that collectively provide a strong foundation for guiding land use on campus: the Land Use Plan (formerly the Official Community Plan or OCP), Vancouver Campus Plan, and Neighbourhood Plans.

Developing these plans has involved participation from the public over the past few years. Alignment among these plans, in terms of both the broader vision and specific policies, is necessary to fully support and achieve UBC’s academic mission for a world-class university and its vision for a vibrant, livable, and sustainable community.
2.3 UBC’s Land Use Plan

UBC’s Land Use Plan, like the OCP before it, is the “bylaw” establishing general land uses and policies for the entire 1,000-acre campus, with a special focus on non-institutional development. The OCP required public consultation in order to make any amendments, and those requirements for consultation are still in effect under the Land Use Plan.

The Land Use Plan was developed between 1995 and 1997 through a consultative process involving the GVRD, UBC and interest groups from both on and off campus, and the public. The original OCP vision states:

Through future planning initiatives associated with this OCP, a special university community will evolve through innovation, renewal, and a quest for excellence based on experimentation and demonstration. It will be a diverse and stimulating place for living, working, and learning in harmony with the environment. The natural integrity of Pacific Spirit Regional Park will be a highly valued part of the community.

Milestones in the Land Use Plan’s history include:

- December 2000: Memorandum of Understanding was amended to support the plan’s implementation
- 2002 - 2003: the plan went through a review at the five-year mark
- 2001 – 2006: various neighbourhood plans were developed and accepted
- April 2010: the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, Part 10-2010, is introduced by the Province as part of Bill 20
- June 2010: Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, Part 10-2010, passes and the OCP becomes the UBC Land Use Plan. The Act puts the provincial government in the place of Metro Vancouver as the approving authority for the Land Use Plan, with UBC responsible for planning and implementation, including public consultation.

2.4 Amending UBC’s Land Use Plan

Updates to the Land Use Plan are necessary to support UBC’s vision of creating a model university community that is vibrant, livable, and sustainable, and to support UBC as a world-class university in its academic mission.

During the Vancouver Campus Plan Review process, and in consultation with the UBC community, several barriers to realizing that vision of a model university community were identified. Amendments to the Land Use Plan will address these barriers by:

1. Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
2. Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation; also transferring housing density; and
3. Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision.

These issues can only be addressed through amendments to the Land Use Plan and require immediate action. The Vancouver Campus Plan had a comprehensive three-year community consultation process in which these issues were identified, providing UBC with a mandate from the community to move ahead in a timely way.
2.5 Land Use Plan Decision-Making

Feedback from the campus community and other stakeholders gathered through this consultation process will help inform the technical and policy work used to develop the proposed Land Use Plan amendments. Feedback will also be recorded and summarized in consultation reports and presented to the Board of Governors throughout the process. Finally, a summary report covering all consultation activities will be presented to the Board of Governors for consideration prior to developing the final amendments for the public hearing process. Consultation materials and reports will be made available to the public through the Campus and Community Planning website.

3.0 LAND USE PLAN CONSULTATION PROCESS

3.1 Overview

UBC is committed to open and transparent public consultation in the process of developing Land Use Plan amendments. Students, faculty, staff, alumni, emeriti, and residents are invited to participate in the consultation process.

The timeline for public consultation activities and developing the proposed Land Use Plan amendments is as follows:

- July 15: Open Houses and Workshops – completed
- July 19 – 30: Online consultation process – completed
- August/September: Technical review to develop proposed amendments
- October: Public consultation process
- November/December: Public Hearing

4.0 LAND USE PLAN OPEN HOUSES/WORKSHOPS – JULY 15 AND E-CONSULTATION – JULY 19-30

4.1 Objective

The purpose of these first public consultation events was to inform the UBC community and other interested stakeholders about the Land Use Plan, its significant role in UBC campus planning, the urgent need to make specific amendments to the plan and the public consultation process required in order to make those amendments. In addition, the events provided an opportunity to discuss the future of the UBC Farm and Cultivating Place in particular.

These first Land Use Plan public consultation events also gave Campus and Community Planning an early opportunity to gauge public response to, and gain input toward, proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan that will address long-standing issues raised by the UBC community that are barriers to achieving the university’s vision in and academic mission.

The public open houses and workshops accommodated the different schedules of the on- and off-campus community. Approximately 105 people attended session 1, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., and approximately 56 people attended session 2, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
4.2 Background

In June 2006, UBC began reviewing the 1992 Main Campus Plan to create a new Vancouver Campus Plan. Several barriers to realizing UBC’s vision of a model university were identified through the Vancouver Campus Plan Review process, which included a three-year consultation process with students, faculty, staff, alumni, emeriti, campus residents and other stakeholders. Amendments to the Land Use Plan will address these barriers by:

1. Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
2. Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation; also transfer housing density; and;
3. Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision.

4.3 Public Open House

Ten display boards were available to the public for review. The boards outlined the Land Use Plan and amendments process in the following order:

1) Land Use Plan – amendments process (general intro to the Land Use Plan, formerly the Official Community Plan)
2) From OCP to Land Use Plan – timeline showing the key dates in the Land Use Plan’s history and how we got to where we are now
3) Commitment to Sustainability – outlined UBC commitment to their vision of creating a model university that is vibrant, livable and sustainable, and commitment to UBC’s academic mission
4) Housing and Transportation Targets – highlighted that UBC’s Land Use Plan has a number of targets related to housing and transportation for the Vancouver campus and that the university has met or exceeded these targets
5) Vancouver Campus Plan: Guiding Academic Land Use on Campus – outlined the history and purpose of the Vancouver Campus Plan and its role in identifying necessary Land Use Plan amendments
6) Land Use Plan Amendments: Guiding Non-Academic Land Use on Campus: Issue 1: Create more affordable housing and a more sustainable community - outlined how this issue was identified and the constraints within the Land Use Plan that need to be changed in order to resolve the issue
7) Land Use Plan Amendments: Guiding Non-Academic Land Use on Campus: Issue 2: Change the land use designation from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation - outlined how this issue was identified and the constraints within the Land Use Plan that need to be changed in order to resolve the issue. This board also provided a brief update as to the current status of the UBC Farm.
8) Land Use Plan Amendments: Guiding Non-Academic Land Use on Campus: Issue 3: Regularize academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision - outlined how this issue was identified and the constraints within the Land Use Plan that need to be changed in order to resolve the issue
9) Housing Density – provided information about housing density, density transfer, the community and financial benefits of maintaining housing density through transfer and where density is being transferred from and to on campus
10) Land Use Plan Consultation – highlighted UBC’s commitment to open and transparent consultation and the Board of Governors’ guiding principles that will be followed throughout the Land Use Plan amendments process; also gave a timeline of next steps
4.3.1 Presentations
Nancy Knight gave a presentation on behalf of Campus and Community Planning outlining what the Land Use Plan is, why it needs amending, the issues the proposed amendments will address, and the process for making those amendments. Key points included:

- Land Use Plan: the “bylaw” establishing general land uses and policies for the entire 1,000-acre campus, with special focus on non-institutional development.
- Land Use Plan was formerly the Official Community Plan, transitioned when the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, Part 10 – 2010, was passed into law in June 2010.
- Land Use Plan supports UBC’s vision of a model university community that is vibrant, livable and sustainable, and it supports UBC’s academic mission.
- UBC has achieved, and in some cases exceeded, former OCP targets in housing and transportation. However, there remains a desire to go farther in terms of sustainability and affordability in both areas.
- Land Use Plan amendments continue UBC’s commitment to sustainability and academic excellence
- Land Use Plan issues:
  - Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
  - Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and innovation; also transferring housing density
  - Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision.
- The issues identified in the Vancouver Campus Plan process can only be addressed through amendments to the Land Use Plan; UBC believes strongly that these issues require immediate action.
- Board of Governors guiding principles: Academic Mission, Sustainability, Housing affordability, Completeness and functionality, Creativity and flexibility, Strong governance
- Next steps timeline

Andrew Riseman presented Cultivating Place: An Academic Plan for Sustainability on South Campus and Beyond on behalf of the UBC Centre for Sustainable Food Systems-UBC Farm. Key points included:

- Cultivating Place is an academically rigorous and globally significant plan calling for world-class research, innovative experiential learning, and leadership in sustainability at UBC
- Vision: UBC Farm and surrounding South Campus areas will be a world-class academic resource, enabling UBC to explore and exemplify new globally significant paradigms for design and function of sustainable communities and their ecological support systems
- Mission: enable UBC to be a global leader in the creation of sustainable and healthy communities integrated with their surrounding ecology through research, learning, cross-faculty and interdisciplinary collaboration socially responsible community engagement, international dialogue and knowledge dissemination
- Cultivating Place describes the UBC Farm and surrounding areas on South Campus as a possible “living laboratory” and “agent of social change”
- Goal area 1: Integration, “No one thing does just one thing”
- Goal area 2: Teaching and Learning
- Goal area 3: Research, discovery and partnerships
- Goal area 4: Application
4.3.2 Table/Issue discussions
At the start of each session, participants were given a nametag with a coloured dot that corresponded to one of four tables in the room. For the table/issue discussions, each resource person brought with them one question related to a Land Use Plan amendments issue. Each of the four resource people spent 15 minutes at each table, talking about that particular issue and answering participants’ questions or addressing their concerns. A note-taker/facilitator accompanied each resource person to record participants’ comments and keep conversations focused.

The issue, resource person, and note-taker/facilitator were grouped as follows:

- **Issue: How could UBC create affordable housing and a more complete sustainable community?**
  - Resource person: Joe Stott
  - Notetaker/Facilitator: Ashley Sims

- **Issue: What are the most important aspects of a “Green Academic” land use category definition?** [Words given as examples: green space, sustainability, academic excellence, teaching/learning, research, innovation, agriculture/horticulture, integration, living laboratory, non-building intensive, community engagement, ecology, ecosystem, stewardship, social sustainability, knowledge dissemination]
  - Resource person: Nancy Knight
  - Notetaker/Facilitator: Tracy Bains

- **Issue: How would you regularize the academic land use designations to better support the integration of teaching, learning and research?**
  - Resource person: Lisa Colby
  - Notetaker/Facilitator: Sharon McCarthy

- **Issue: What are your thoughts on how Cultivating Place is proposing to use the UBC Farm Lands?**
  - Resource person: Andrew Riseman
  - Notetaker/Facilitator: Bernadette Amiscaray

4.3.3 Closing
At the end of each session, participants were informed that all materials (PowerPoint presentations, display boards, infosheet, and agenda) would be posted on the Campus and Community Planning website on Monday, July 19, and that notes from the table/issue discussion would be posted as well. An email was sent to all participants (whose email addresses were collected through sign-in sheets or electronic RSVPs) stating that materials could be viewed online. The email also contained table discussion notes and people were invited to comment on the notes between Monday, July 19 and Wednesday, July 21 (end of day) by email.

4.4 E-consultation
All materials, including the agenda, display boards, PowerPoint presentations by Nancy Knight and Andrew Riseman, and information sheet, were posted on the Campus and Community Planning website on Monday, July 19 in the “Document Library” and “E-consultation” sections. The e-consultation webpage identified that comments and feedback on materials was being collected between Monday, July 19 and Friday, July 30.
Nineteen emails were received during the e-consultation period, responding to the materials posted online. In total, the “E-consultation” webpage received 255 page views (108 unique views), and the “Document Library” received six page views (3 unique views) between July 19th and 30th.

5.0 ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS AND FEEDBACK

5.1 Feedback from table/issue discussions

The following identifies comments made at each table with the resource person on-hand, and the number of times that comment was made. Comments only mentioned once are not included in this summary.

➤ Issue: How could UBC create affordable housing and a more complete sustainable community?

Comments/responses:
- Increase density (7)
- Concern over market housing: takes up spaces that should be for students, faculty or staff; reduces affordability for students; causes more commuting outside of campus (5)
- Decrease unit sizes (4)
- Place cap on rent or base on income (3)
- Create more student housing (3)
- Improve or create more transportation options across campus (3)
- Keep buildings energy efficient with small footprints (3)
- More co-development wanted (2)
- Subsidize housing (2)
- Reduce parking (2)
- Create more opportunities for mixed use (2)
- Change FSR (2)

➤ Issue: What are the most important aspects of a “Green Academic” land use category definition?
[Words given as examples: green space, sustainability, academic excellence, teaching/learning, research, innovation, agriculture/horticulture, integration, living laboratory, non-building intensive, community engagement, ecology, ecosystem, stewardship, social sustainability, knowledge dissemination]

Comments/responses:
- “Green Academic” problematic because there’s no definition and doesn’t identify “Farm” explicitly (11)
- “Green Academic” should include sustainable building practices and features, be non-intensive, and utilize existing footprint (11)
- Follow Cultivating Place (11)
- Create open spaces for learning, create more opportunities for sustainable education throughout campus (11)
- Improve “green” transportation options to, from and on campus: transit, biking, pedestrian walkways (11)
- Create connections within on-campus community – students and residents (9)
- Preserve green space, keep as natural as possible (5)
- Better integration between recreation, research, teaching and community (4)
- Sustainability stewardship is important (3)
- Why can’t “UBC Farm” be the designation? (3)
- Who decides what happens at “Green Academic”? (2)
- No housing (2)

> **Issue:** How would you regularize the academic land use designations to better support the integration of teaching, learning and research?

**Comment/responses:**
- What are the current designations and how were they developed? (5)
- General questions/concern around plans to change the number of designations (5): What’s wrong with eight designations?; What’s wrong with one designation?; What’s good about the existing designations?; What is the intent of integrating designations?; Flexibility of use can be lost when going with (one) general “academic” designation; label can be restrictive
- Suggestions as to how to regularize land use designations (4)
- Concern over current governance structure and who or what body oversees land use planning at UBC (4)
- General planning questions (3): What does “regularize” mean?; What is a “land use designation”?: “Academic” includes student housing?
- Pharmacy – how did it change and why did it change? (2)

> **Issue:** What are your thoughts on how *Cultivating Place* is proposing to use the UBC Farm Lands?

**Comment/response:**
- Positive feedback about *Cultivating Place* (9)
- Like the possibility of neighbourhood and student interaction with the Farm (i.e. integration with broader community) (9)
- Questions/concerns about the term “Green Academic”? (7)
- Concern about housing being built on Farm (7)
- Why can’t “UBC Farm” be the designation? (4)
- What governance structure is in place for the farm and proposed capital projects (i.e. green college and residence)? (2)
- *Cultivating Place* is currently vague and broad, not outlining exactly what will happen to the land (2)
- Concern about development near Farm negatively affecting area (2)
- Concern/confusion over the farm having the same designation as the botanical gardens (2)

> Additional theme that emerged among different tables:
- Preserve Wreck Beach; no towers within visual or environmental proximity of the beach

### 5.2 Feedback from feedback forms

Of the 161 session participants, 51 submitted feedback forms.

Responses to the question, “On a scale of 1 – 5, how useful would you rate this open house/workshop in understanding Land Use Plan issues and the amendments process?” were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very useful)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various associations with UBC, or other:
- 18 Staff
- 16 Student
- 12 Alumni
- 10 Other
- 4 Resident
- 3 Wreck Beach users
- 2 Wreck Beach Preservation Society
- 1 Emeriti
- 1 Vancouver Native Health Society
- 1 volunteer UBC Farm
- 1 TRIUMF
- 1 PSPS
- 1 prospective student

Where participants live:
- 25 Vancouver City
- 11 UBC
- 8 Other
- 2 Burnaby
- 2 New Westminster
- 1 Langley
- 1 two blocks from campus
- 1 West Point Grey

Feedback form comments:
- Dislike workshop format – felt rushed and unable to discuss issues thoroughly (15)
- Preserve Wreck Beach (6)
- Concern – “Green Academic” designation is lacking definition or inappropriate for Farm (5)
- Concern – loss of green space on campus (4)
- Overall direction and vision is positive (3)
- Concern – what’s happening to the Farm? (2)
- Concern – changing land use designations (2)
- Governance and accountability – current system at UBC is undemocratic (2)
- Workshop was useful (2)
- No market housing/development (2)
- Sustainability on campus (2)

5.3 Feedback from e-consultation period
Comments:
- Explicitly label the area “UBC Farm” (not green academic) (17)
- Define the size of the UBC Farm as 24 hectares (11)
- Describe governance structure for farm (support governance by UBC Farm stakeholders - Students, faculty, staff) (11)
- Support housing density transfer from UBC Farm to other parts of campus (9)
- Support higher density as a planning principal (9)
- No housing (urban development) on UBC Farm (5)
- Support Cultivating Place (3)
- “Green Academic” ambiguous/vague (3)
- Find affordable housing solutions off campus (for students, staff, faculty) (2)
- Corrections to July 15 meeting notes (2)
Nine emails followed the same format and messaging, with one email identifying the source of messaging as Friends of the Farm. The vast majority of these emails state the following four objectives:

1) The “Green Academic” label does not follow recommendations of *Cultivating Place*. Change the Farm’s land use label to “UBC Farm” as explicitly recommended in *Cultivating Place*.

2) The new land use label for the UBC Farm should also include a size definition of 24 hectares.

3) No description of who will be responsible for governing details land use decision at the UBC Farm has been provided. UBC Farm stakeholders (e.g. students, staff, faculty, etc.) are the most appropriate decision-makers regarding detailed land use activities. The new land use designation for the UBC Farm should specify that *Cultivating Place* be the guiding framework governing land use decisions on site.

4) Given that a transfer of housing density from the UBC Farm to elsewhere on campus has been a barrier to removing the Farm’s “Future Housing Reserve” label, I support a transfer of density to elsewhere on campus. As a general planning principle, higher density living spaces on campuses create more affordable housing options for students and other members of the university community while promoting ecologically sound land use.

**APPENDICES (with Board Secretary)**

Display boards:

Nancy Knight presentation:

Andrew Riseman presentation:
http://www.planning.ubc.ca/database/rte/files/CultivatingPlace_Riseman.pdf

Infosheet:
Policy Brief: Regularizing Academic Land Use Designations

This policy brief reviews the subject of Academic Land Use designations on UBC’s Vancouver campus. It contains a summary of the challenges created by the current Land Use Plan, a review of best practices elsewhere in BC, and concludes with proposals more appropriate to UBC’s Vancouver campus context and in line with practices at other universities.

Current Practice on UBC’s Vancouver Campus

Consistent with The University Act, UBC Policy 92, and The Municipalities Enabling & Validating Act, all new projects at UBC’s Vancouver campus must be confirmed as consistent with the UBC Land Use Governance documents and Land Use Regulations. The Land Use Governance documents include the umbrella Land Use Plan (LUP) covering the whole campus, and the more detailed localized plans for the academic and family housing parts of the campus. All plans on campus must deliver the facilities and university environment needed to best serve the UBC academic mission. UBC’s Board of Governors gives careful consideration to a wide range of factors in making decisions on land use and projects on campus in addition to the academic mission. These factors include social, environmental and economic considerations, and broader community perspectives such as compatibility of adjacent uses.

The Vancouver Campus Plan (VCP) is a significant Land Use Governance document for the academic lands on the campus. The VCP contains the land-use policies and design guidelines applicable to all academic lands, and provides text and maps explaining these policies. The VCP is founded on current academic program needs, future Academic Planning enrollment targets and needs, and contemporary university community values. The VCP was developed through a 4-year comprehensive planning process and was adopted by the Board of Governors in 2010. The plannings process included extensive consultation with the campus community and neighbours and was based on rigorous technical work.

Challenges under the current LUP

Segregated LUP designations for academic areas are not consistent with contemporary academic practice which integrates different academic uses rather than separating them.

The current Land Use Plan (LUP) for UBC’s Vancouver campus is a 28 page document with 16 land-use designations applied to the UBC campus lands (list of categories in Table 1). Eleven of these categories apply to the academic lands. The remaining five land-use designations relate to the family housing and local commercial areas.

The LUP’s eleven categories applying to academic lands represent an out-of-date view of planning where single uses are separated physically from other uses. This approach is not consistent with current and rapidly evolving practice on campus nor with the VCP vision of a more academically integrated, sustainable, mixed-use, livable campus; one that encourages cross pollination of academic disciplines, and physical integration of collaborative teaching, learning, and living laboratory opportunities.

Several examples illustrate this issue:

A) The LUP defines several areas on campus to be used for research activities exclusively, thus not allowing classrooms, student spaces, student residences, or other academic support uses in these areas. This is contradictory to how a modern, research-intensive university operates,
where teaching, learning, research and living are physically integrated physically. The new Centre for Brain Health which combines research, clinical services, teaching and other programs, supported through a partnership between Vancouver Coastal Health and UBC. This facility is world-leading and could not be located in a research area of campus due to the mix of uses within the complex. Nor could it be sited in an area designated as support that is in close proximity to allied disciplines and other clinical services.

B) The LUP also defines several areas on campus for support uses such as solid waste management facilities, energy facilities and works yards. As sustainability teaching, learning, research and operations are integrated on the Vancouver campus, these support uses become academic uses as well. A recent example is the Bioenergy Research and Demonstration Facility. This is an energy-generating facility and thus a support use, but integral to the project’s inception and funding are the research and teaching components focused on the innovative aspects of this project. Several potential locations on campus were not viable due to LUP constraints. Similarly, the objective of using the campus as a living laboratory for sustainability solutions and more—a key part of Place and Promise-the UBC Plan—is not supported by a segregated land use approach; sustainability by its very nature requires an integrated, systems-based approach. Sustainability is a core value and focus of Place and Promise, and also of the VCP.

C) The current segregated academic designations in the LUP would compromise the development of the seven strategically located mixed-use hubs within the campus that are identified in the VCP. These hubs are intended to integrate teaching, academic support and convenience services, daycare, student residential and recreational functions. Each hub will also have its own sustainable, smart energy system. They will become catalysts for greater social and academic interaction between disciplines, students, faculty and staff, and will enable more effective infill, greater student housing capacity, a reduction in sprawl, and a reduction in greenhouse gases from commuting students. Many of these hubs could not be realized under the current designations.

To support the academic mission and enable more seamless implementation of the VCP, the 11 academic land use categories should be regularized into fewer integrated academic designations.

Distinguishing between more intensively-used academic lands and those to be used for land-based teaching and research.

UBC’s Vancouver campus contains a number of academic areas that are used for land-based teaching, research and community engagement. Designating these areas as ‘Green Academic’ signals that these areas are different from the more intensively developed parts of the academic campus but still part of the academic land base of the university. This designation will provide assurances that these areas will be retained for land-based academic activities, that they will not be used for intensive academic building sites or for academic uses inconsistent with the academic plans for the areas, and that they will not be used for family housing that is privately held. This designation will ensure that a change in use to a more intensive academic or family housing use would first have to a) receive the support of the academic community and b) be reviewed with the community in a consultative process including a public hearing, and c) be approved by the Minister of Community and Rural Development.

There are also some areas on the campus designated in 1997 as ‘Future Housing’ or ‘Future Housing Reserve’ that have since been identified for academic and institutional purposes or for family housing. The designation of these areas as either Academic, Green Academic or Family Housing needs to be addressed in the Land Use Plan amendments.
The areas to be converted from ‘Future Housing’ to academic institutional lands include the UBC Farm, Totem Field, University Square, and the Thunderbird Neighbourhood. The housing density assigned to these areas must be transferred to other parts of campus to ensure that the community that develops on campus is ecologically, socially and financially sustainable. For more information on proposed housing density or retention of the UBC Farm, please see the separate Policy Briefs entitled: Retain UBC Farm, and Housing Affordability & Sustainability at UBC.

**Best Practices**

All university campuses in BC are classified as one simple ‘Institutional’ (or similar) land use designation at the OCP planning level except UBC and Simon Fraser University (SFU) (See Table 1 attached). The definition for the land use designation is typically less than a half page.

SFU is in a context similar to UBC where residential and academic land uses are combined on campus. SFU is designated as ‘Institutional’ on the Existing Generalized Land-Use Map within the City of Burnaby’s OCP bylaw. An amendment to that bylaw (called the SFU Official Community Plan) then divides the campus into 6 land use areas. The academic area is one category called the University Enclave. The other land-use areas serve to cover the various UniverCity residential, commercial, schools and business/amenity areas outside the academic part of campus.

All BC examples surveyed confirm a consolidated approach to land-use policy on academic lands rather than the approach reflected in the 11 categories and accompanying detail within UBC’s current 28 page LUP. The consolidated academic approach allows universities to support their academic mission with appropriate land-use.

**Proposed Changes**

The LUP amendments would consolidate the 11 academic land use designations within the current LUP into three academic designations, and one Family Housing and Commercial Local Area designation as follows:

1. **Academic**

   The intent of this designation is to identify those parts of the academic lands on campus that would be used for classrooms, research facilities, libraries, offices, and other buildings and uses needed to support the academic mission of the university and academic life on campus. These would include but not be limited to: academic and medical buildings, recreation facilities, libraries, student social space, support services, administration buildings, parkades, cultural facilities, student residences, research laboratories, campus as a living laboratory projects, commercial services needed by the academic community (e.g. bookstore, university oriented conference centre, food services, multi-tenant research and service facilities, and UBC support services (plant and utility facilities, district energy systems, fire, police and ambulance facilities, power substations).

   Green spaces, courtyards and plazas will also be included for campus life, social and study space, beautification, recreation, and circulation.

   This change would see student housing areas, separately identified research and support areas designated as academic.
UBC would incorporate policies from the North Campus Neighbourhood Plan to ensure Storm water and cliff erosion issues are addressed for the academic areas north of Chancellor Boulevard. UBC is preparing a stormwater management plan for the campus.

2. **Green Academic**

The ‘Green Academic’ designation identifies those parts of the academic lands on campus that will not be used for intensive, building-related, academic uses, but rather will be kept as open areas to support land-based teaching, research, community engagement and athletics.

This academic category encompasses areas on campus including the UBC Farm, the Thunderbird Athletic Fields, Stadium, Botanical Garden, Totem fields and various other significant green academic areas including green edges.

Buildings and structures to support the Academic Plan programming for areas within the Green Academic designation, including visitors’ centres, sports pavilions, fieldhouses, classroom facilities, laboratory space, farm buildings, and a residential college for student housing, would aspire to be built to the highest green building standards with minimal footprints.

This designation will accommodate land-uses consistent with the relevant academic plans which include *Cultivating Place* dated Dec 2009 for the UBC Farm Area, the *Athletics and Recreation 5 Year Business Plan* dated 2008, for the Thunderbird Field and Stadium areas, the *Botanical Garden and Centre for Horticulture Master Plan 2001* for the Botanical Gardens (including Nitobe Gardens), the latest research plan for Totem Field as coordinated through the Dean of Land and Food Systems, and the *5 year Strategic Academic Plan for Land and Food Systems*, all as amended from time to time and received by UBC’s Board of Governors.

3. **Primary Village Centre Academic**

The intent of this designation would be to support a pedestrian oriented village centre with shops and services on the University Square academic area at University Boulevard and East Mall. This area is intended to serve as the year-round social heart for the campus community and the shops and services are intended to meet the daily needs of the community of scholars in particular. It is also intended to be proximate to the main transit terminal on campus. And of great importance, this area and the University Boulevard area to the east is the gateway or ‘front door’ for the campus to the broader community, and must provide a welcoming signal through its design and year-round activities, of the stature and significance of the university.

4. **Family Housing and Commercial Local Areas**

The intent of this non-academic land-use designation is to identify the parts of campus where family housing and commercial uses to support that family housing will be developed. These areas are shaded gray on the attached map. Requirements to accommodate schools, commercial areas, parks and community centres are in the existing LUP and physically defined in subsequent Local Areas plans.

The general location of these designations is provided on the attached Map.
Additional policies and guidelines for future projects within the academic area are provided through the *Vancouver Campus Plan (VCP)*, the *VCP Design Guidelines*, and other applicable Land Use Regulations under UBC Policy 92.

Table 1. Survey of other BC Universities, OCP Land-Use Designations and Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Number of OCP/LUP designation categories</th>
<th>OCP /Land Use Plan Designations</th>
<th>Designation Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UBC 's Vancouver Campus</td>
<td>Minister of Community and Rural Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Academic Areas (11):</strong> Existing Housing (Student Residences) UBC Core UBC Support North Campus Bio Sciences Research Fields, Stadium, Botanical Garden (Collection of Open Academic Lands) Commercial Centre Greenway Green Edges UBC Park <strong>Residential Areas (5):</strong> Future Housing Future housing Reserve Community Centre School Theological Area</td>
<td>28 pages of text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC’s Okanagan Campus</td>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational/Minor Institutional</td>
<td>Schools, university, colleges, correctional facilities, hospital, fire halls, cemeteries, major government, cultural or recreational facilities, religious assembly and seniors facilities. (1 paragraph long)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>Saanich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge Centres</td>
<td>A Knowledge Centre supports an environment of information and technology transfer that nurtures the start up, incubation and development of innovation-led knowledge based businesses. (2 ½ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>No further definition provided in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community Facility</td>
<td>Includes schools, hospital, community care, Correctional centres, airport, TR University, federal, provincial and municipal facilities. (2 ½ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Number of OCP/LUP designation categories</td>
<td>OCP/Land Use Plan Designations</td>
<td>Designation Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Western University</td>
<td>Township of Langley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;Rural/Residential Agric&quot; in OCP &quot;Small Farm Country Estates&quot; (Rural OCP Amending Plan)</td>
<td>Township Council shall support further development of Trinity Western University and the establishment of a university in the municipality in an appropriate location subject to land use policies in this plan. (⅔ page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern BC</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Institutional</td>
<td>Includes UNBC, Airport, Correction Centres, govt institutions, civic buildings, places of worship (1 ⅓ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Centre Area Plan</td>
<td>Private/Public Institutions allowed in all designations within City Centre Area Plan - 1 paragraph specific to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Variety of recreational, civic uses, college, golf course. Covers 3 zones. (1 paragraph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano University</td>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional: Existing and proposed sites for schools, churches, theatres, recreation centres, and public buildings. (2 lines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Fraser Valley</td>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Range of public and private institutional sites: Civic Precinct, hospital, Matsqui institution, college, public and private schools (1 paragraph).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Island University</td>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban Nodes</td>
<td>Focus and character of &quot;University Urban Node&quot;: City-wide and regional centre for educational and recreational services as well as related commercial, professional services, and higher density residential. (1 ⅓ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>General OCP Land Use Map: Institutional</td>
<td>6 land use categories in SFU OCP Schedule Land Use Concept: Land-Use controls associated with each like a CD zone. (13 pages on web – including maps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Special sub area SFU OCP Schedule:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Areas (1): University Enclave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Areas (5):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Number of OCP/LUP designation categories</td>
<td>OCP/Land Use Plan Designations</td>
<td>Designation Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU OCP schedule</td>
<td>Core Residential Areas</td>
<td>Swing Residential Areas</td>
<td>Commercial Services</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Policy Brief: Retain and Redesignate the Farm

This policy brief reviews the retention of the UBC Farm for academic use and its redesignation from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’. It contains a summary of the current land use policies, the challenges presented by the current Land Use Plan, and the suitability of applying best practices in land-use designations for farmland to the UBC Farm. It concludes with Land Use Plan amendments that will enable retention of a UBC Farm for academically rigorous and globally significant teaching and research on issues of sustainability. This brief also discusses other areas of campus affected by the Future Housing Reserve designation.

Current Land Use Policy on UBC’s Vancouver Campus

The ‘UBC Farm’ is situated within UBC’s Vancouver campus boundaries south of 16th Avenue (see location Map 1). The Faculty of Land and Food Systems has overall academic stewardship of this area on behalf of all disciplines and faculties in the university. Any structures, buildings and activities on the Vancouver campus farm are subject to the land use policies and associated requirements that apply to all of the UBC campus, as discussed below.

Consistent with The University Act, UBC Policy 92, and The Municipalities Enabling & Validating Act, all new projects at UBC’s Vancouver campus must be confirmed as consistent with the UBC Land Use Governance documents and Land Use Regulations. The Land Use Governance documents include the umbrella Land Use Plan (LUP) covering the whole campus, and the more detailed plans for the different portions of the academic and family housing and commercial parts of the campus. All plans on campus must deliver the facilities and university environment needed to best serve the UBC academic mission.

Each new development on campus is assessed through a review process for its contribution to UBC’s academic mission, Academic Plan, and the LUP including performance targets established in 1997 regarding student housing capacity, family housing density, form, tenure, amenities, and traffic reduction.

The strategic academic mission at UBC is outlined in Place and Promise – The UBC Plan. The University’s vision is to ensure that as one of the world’s leading universities, UBC creates an exceptional learning environment that fosters global citizenship, advances a civil and sustainable society, and supports outstanding research to serve the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world.

Cultivating Place is the academic plan recently completed for the UBC Farm area, and it will now inform physical land-use planning for this area. Cultivating Place was developed by the South Campus Academic Planning Committee (representing eight UBC faculties), and was established at the direction of the UBC Provost. The vision for Cultivating Place is “UBC Farm and surrounding South Campus areas will be a world-class academic resource, enabling UBC to explore and exemplify new globally significant paradigms for design and function of sustainable communities and their ecological support systems”.

Key elements of this plan include:
- Integration, “No one thing does just one thing”: integrating research, teaching and community engagement on the UBC Farm;
- Teaching and Learning: expanding interdisciplinary teaching and learning opportunities for UBC students through the creation of an “outdoor classroom”;
• Research, discovery and partnerships: developing a collaborative sustainability research model that includes partners in academic, professional, private-sector, civil society, cultural and government organizations; and
• Application: creating a “living laboratory” for sustainability innovation.

Future Housing Reserve designation (FHR): In 1997, the Land Use Plan designated several areas on campus, including the land on which the UBC Farm is situated, as ‘Future Housing Reserve.’ This designation identified where approximately 300,000 square metres of residential floor space would be located. This residential floor space would complement the other future housing areas to help achieve the threshold population needed to support the range of shops, services, transit and amenities needed for a sustainable, viable and university town community.

Board of Governors’ Conditions for Retaining the UBC Farm: Future academic program facility needs as well as operational and campus community needs were reviewed during the recent Vancouver Campus Plan process, including enrolment projections and capital infrastructure requirements related to the Academic Plan.

In response to community input, the Board of Governors directed that the UBC Farm would be kept free of market family housing development on two conditions:
• that a new academic plan for the Farm area be prepared for teaching and research purposes that are academically rigorous and globally significant around issues of sustainability, and that will enhance UBC’s position as Canada’s most sustainable university and a recognized world leader in campus sustainability; and
• that the university’s housing, community development and endowment goals be met through transferring housing density to other parts of campus.

UBC and its Board of Governors remain committed to the academic mission and principles in the current LUP that are transforming UBC’s Vancouver campus from a commuter campus to a more engaging, complete, vibrant and sustainable university community. UBC needs this type of community to enhance the university experience and success of its academic mission, and the university in return enhances the community.

The completion of Cultivating Place met the first requirement for retaining the UBC Farm by providing a suitable updated academic plan for the farm area.

The completion of the Land Use Plan amendments will address the second requirement, by transferring the housing density associated with the farm and other future housing reserves to other parts of campus. The completion of the Vancouver Campus Plan is also important in this regard because Phase 5 of that process identified suitable locations to receive this housing density. Those sites were discussed with the campus community in the consultation process that accompanied Phase 5 of the Vancouver Campus Plan and adopted by the Board as part of the final Plan (See Map 1 attached).
Challenges under the current Land Use Plan

The current designation of the UBC Farm site as a ‘Future Housing Reserve’ is not appropriate for a site that will be used for academic purposes. This site will be redesignated from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’. This new designation will enable the implementation of Cultivating Place and ensure that the area cannot be used for market family housing or for academic uses not consistent with Cultivating Place.

The LUP’s current designations do not anticipate the alternative family housing sites identified in the Vancouver Campus Plan that will receive the housing density from the UBC Farm and other areas. The current policies applying to these areas must be amended to allow family housing. There are also two future housing areas where planned family market housing will no longer be pursued: Thunderbird Neighbourhood, and University Square within the University Boulevard Neighbourhood. The designations applying to these areas will need to be changed to academic.

Best Practices

The typical land use policies applied to farmland in municipal plans and those of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) in BC are oriented towards farming as a business rather than a research and teaching activity. These definitions encourage and protect economic activity on farm lands and are explicitly designed to limit the use of agricultural lands for activities that do not conform to this farming model. They generally allow some uses that may not be appropriate at the UBC Farm, and also prohibit some uses that are important to retain at a university farm (see below). For these reasons, what is best practice in farmland designation is not well-suited to the UBC Farm.

Municipal Farm Policy: Typical municipal plans and implementation policy for farmlands narrowly define the farming activities allowed in the area. They also only typically support one farm house, plus an additional farm house under limited circumstances, with all other buildings being oriented to agribusiness (e.g. animal facilities and processing facilities). These plans can allow additional agribusiness or rural business activities such as golf courses, driving ranges, marinas, community care facilities, equestrian centres, and vet clinics. This type of land use policy would not enable the breadth of activities outlined in Cultivating Place and is not an appropriate approach.

Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) farm Policy: even more tightly than municipal land use policy for farming areas, the ALR regulations also focus protecting land for agri-business, and tightly control the type of activities and structures allowed. These include:

- Education and research buildings limited to 100 square metres total for the whole parcel
- Unlimited farm buildings are permitted including greenhouses, structures for intensive livestock operation, mushroom farming, and aquaculture).
- One single family dwelling and secondary suite is permitted for residential purposes
- Winery processing, storage and retail sales permitted
- A food and beverage lounge up to 125 square metres permitted
- Agri-tourism and sleeping accommodation up to 10 sleeping units is permitted
- Bed and breakfast up to 4 bedrooms is permitted
- Breeding pets or operating a kennel or boarding facility is permitted
- Structures for production and development of biological products used in integrated pest management up to 300 square metres maximum are permitted
- Education and research buildings limited to 100 square metres total for the whole parcel
- Retail buildings are permitted up to 300 square metres for the farm produce or commodities
Of note, a significant number of activities outlined in *Cultivating Place* would be prohibited under the ALR definition of farming. Those activities include:

- academic needs such as seminar teaching facilities
- research and demonstration projects and facilities
- many types of green technology and alternative energy projects
- a residential college
- external research business facilities with academic links (all listed as potential programming in *Cultivating Place*).

The definition would however permit intensive farming uses such as pig farming and mushroom farming and composting, which are not anticipated under *Cultivating Place* or by UBC’s academic and residential communities.

**Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments**

1. **Redesignate UBC Farm from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’**

The UBC Farm designation will be changed from ‘Future Housing Reserve’ to ‘Green Academic’ (See Map 2 attached). This designation enables full implementation of Cultivating Place, and does not allow family market housing. The farm will continue to be referred to as “UBC Farm” on its signage, in its daily operating practices, and in broader communication, development and similar documents.

**Green Academic**

The ‘Green Academic’ designation identifies those parts of the academic lands on campus that will not be used for intensive, building-related, academic uses, but rather will be kept as open areas to support land-based teaching, research, community engagement and athletics.

This academic category encompasses areas on campus including the UBC Farm, the Thunderbird Athletic Fields, Stadium, Botanical Garden, Totem fields and various other significant green academic areas including green edges.

Buildings and structures to support the Academic Plan programming for areas within the Green Academic designation, including visitors’ centres, sports pavilions, fieldhouses, classroom facilities, laboratory space, farm buildings, and a residential college for student housing, would aspire to be built to the highest green building standards with minimal footprints.

This designation will accommodate land-uses consistent with the relevant academic plans which include *Cultivating Place* dated Dec 2009 for the UBC Farm Area, the *Athletics and Recreation 5 Year Business Plan* dated 2008, for the Thunderbird Field and Stadium areas, the *Botanical Garden and Centre for Horticulture Master Plan 2001* for the Botanical Gardens (including Nitobe Gardens), the latest research plan for Totem Field as coordinated through the Dean of Land and Food Systems, and the *5 year Strategic Academic Plan for Land and Food Systems*, all as amended from time to time and received by UBC’s Board of Governors.

UBC’s Vancouver campus contains a number of academic areas that are used for land-based teaching, research and community engagement. Designating these areas as ‘Green Academic’ signals that these areas are different from the more intensively developed parts of the academic campus but still part of the academic land base of the university. This designation will provide assurances that these areas will retained for land-based academic activities, that they will not be used for intensive academic building sites or for academic uses inconsistent with the academic plans for the areas, and that they will not be
used for family housing that is privately held. This designation will ensure that a change in use to a more intensive academic or family housing use would first have to a) receive the support of the academic community and b) be reviewed with the community in a consultative process including a public hearing, and c) be approved by the Minister of Community and Rural Development.

Subsequent to approval of the LUP amendments, the Vancouver Campus Plan mapping would then be amended to label and identify more specific academic purposes (e.g. Centre for Sustainable Food Systems).

2. Transfer of displaced Family Housing Density to other areas of campus:
The approximately 300,000 square metres of family housing capacity previously attributed to the UBC Farm and other future housing areas that will be retained for academic uses will be redirected to the locations indicated in yellow on Map 2, attached.

The new land use designation in the LUP for the areas receiving density would change to allow future family housing uses and higher density infill capacities. Prior to any housing projects proceeding, neighbourhood plans would be prepared in consultation with the campus community. It is also important to note that the development of these areas would occur over the next twenty years, and would be carefully phased particularly in the Acadia area to ensure no displacement of current student families in that area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Housing Site Description</th>
<th>Current LUP Designation</th>
<th>Proposed LUP Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia East</td>
<td>Existing Housing (institutional)</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Road Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old BC Research Site</td>
<td>Future Housing Reserve</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook Place densification</td>
<td>Future Housing</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP 1: Location of Farm and Diagrammatic Locations in VCP for Potential Family Housing Density Transfer

MAP 2-0
Generalized Future Academic and Housing Locations

- Campus Heart
- Mixed Use
- Student Housing Hubs
- Potential Hubs
- Academic Infill Sites - Known Projects
- Academic Infill Sites - Not Assigned
- Student Residence Infill
- Student Family Housing
- Family Housing

Note: The general outline and location of the UBC Farm is superimposed for information purposes (see black dotted line).
MAP 2: Transfer of Housing Density from Farm and Other Areas

DRAFT
Diagram: Transfer of Housing Density from Farm + Other Areas
Policy Brief: Housing Affordability and Sustainable Communities

UBC’s vision for housing on campus is one of a sustainable, unique university town that enriches and is enriched by UBC’s academic mission. It is to be a living laboratory for contemporary sustainable living with a mix of housing choices and tenure, and a variety of useful shops and services to meet the daily needs of residents and the larger UBC community. Sufficient population is required to ensure year round support and viability for the critical range of shops and services, transit, amenities and social infrastructure needed for a complete community. This will include parks, recreational facilities, schools, and daycare. The community must also reflect high quality design, and a people and pedestrian-friendly public realm that is well integrated within its academic context, location and environment.

This policy brief reviews the subject of housing affordability on campus for UBC faculty and staff and community sustainability. It contains a summary of the challenges created by the current Land Use Plan, a review of best practices elsewhere in addressing those issues, and concludes with proposals appropriate to UBC’s Vancouver campus context.

Current Practice on UBC’s Vancouver Campus

Consistent with The University Act, UBC Policy 92, and The Municipalities Enabling & Validating Act, all new housing development at UBC’s Vancouver campus must not be inconsistent with the UBC Land Use Governance documents and Land Use Regulations. The Land Use Governance documents include the umbrella Land Use Plan covering the whole campus and the more detailed localized plans for the different portions of the academic and residential campus lands. The primary driver of all plans on campus is to deliver the university environment needed to best serve the UBC academic plan and mission.

The strategic academic mission at UBC is outlined in Place and Promise – The UBC Plan. The University’s vision is to ensure that as one of the world’s leading universities, UBC creates an exceptional learning environment that fosters global citizenship, advances a civil and sustainable society, and supports outstanding research to serve the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world.

The current Land Use Plan (formerly known as the 1997 Official Community Plan) for UBC’s Vancouver campus designates approximately 200 of its 1000 acre campus to accommodate family housing and commercial areas. There are significant quality of life and academic engagement benefits for those faculty, staff and students who choose to live on campus. Housing availability, affordability, and the distances one must travel to work for off-campus alternatives are often a recruitment issue. Traffic and emissions related to a commuter campus are also an important consideration. The creation of a sustainable, affordable and appealing community within campus lands to limit commuting and increase quality of life for those who live there is strongly linked to the UBC academic mission. The Land Use Plan has identified general parameters and performance targets related to housing density, type, location, and associated amenities for the on-campus residential community.

Neighbourhood Plans are local area plans that provide detailed guidance within the residential and commercial local areas identified in the Land Use Plan. The Neighbourhood Plans provide more detailed layout and distribution of housing, parks, schools, community centres within each neighbourhood. They are developed in consultation with the UBC community, the University Neighbourhoods Association and other affected neighbours. No housing proceeds in any neighbourhood until its Neighbourhood Plan is complete and adopted by the Board of Governors.
Challenges under the current Land Use Plan

UBC has met its key performance targets regarding housing and sustainability in the 1997 OCP. Through increases to parking rates, introduction of a U-Pass system, and construction of on-campus housing and services for the academic community, UBC has reduced single occupant vehicle traffic to 14% lower than 1996 levels, and all automobile traffic has reduced by 19%. The 15,000 parking stall inventory for commuters has decreased to 10,000. In addition, UBC has exceeded its target to house more than 25% of its undergraduate students (UBC has housed 29%), and exceeded the target that over 50% of new family households (excluding student housing) are home to someone who either works, studies or teaches on campus (51% is the current ratio). More detail on 1997 OCP targets is provided in Attachment 1.

UBC has heard from its students, faculty and staff during the Campus Plan consultations and through recent studies that improving housing affordability on campus and ensuring a yet more sustainable community with more shops, services and better transit are a high priority. Data from our 2010 UBC Staff & Faculty Housing Demand Study indicates:

- Affordability challenges are prevalent across Metro Vancouver
- The household income of at least 56% of UBC’s workforce is below the $138,000 threshold income required to purchase a two bedroom condo, a townhouse, or a single detached home in Vancouver today with 10% or less down payment. Younger individuals and those just starting out in their academic and housing careers will therefore find it challenging to get into the Metro Vancouver Housing market and will have to drive further distances from work to find affordable housing, or will have to accept smaller housing.
- 90% of faculty and staff say that affordability is the most important things they consider when making housing choices
- 60% are living in one- or two-person households – 20% are living alone
- 59% of renters are saving for a down-payment
- 41% want to live closer to campus (19% would definitely live on campus if they could)
- 83% said proximity to shopping and transit was important to them for housing at UBC (higher percentage than for parks, schools and daycares).

Data from our 2009 UBC Student Housing Demand Study indicates:

- 43% of students who live off-campus would live on-campus if they could
- Over 45% are commuting more than 40 minutes each way to campus
- 74% said that more shops and services would improve the quality of the on-campus living experience
- The demand pressures, competitive nature, and diminishing supply of rental housing in Vancouver means that UBC will need to provide capacity for up to 45% of its full time students to live-on campus over the next 20 years just to maintain the current availability of student housing choices.

Increasing the supply of student housing on campus has been addressed in the Vancouver Campus Plan. This policy brief and the Land Use Plan amendments focus is on family housing for faculty and staff. Improving housing affordability for UBC’s workforce is defined as providing the opportunity to rent or purchase without having to use more than 33% of household income assuming a 10% down payment for purchase options, and 25 year amortization at a 5% interest rate.
The Land Use Plan in its current form presents some barriers to achieving the housing form, choice, and the range of shops and services needed for a more affordable and sustainable community. The Land Use Plan policies result in:

1. **Units sizes that are too large:**
   The current floor space ratio and unit density caps allow for a maximum total floor space on campus, but no more than 100 units per hectare, resulting in an average unit size of approximately 120 m² (1300 ft²). This average size results in mostly 2 and 3 bedroom units and higher purchase and rental prices. If UBC builds smaller units in order to supply more affordable studio or one bedroom units to singles, childless couples, and younger people who do not need large units and may be on lower salaries, the unit cap is used up more quickly. This situation leaves the remaining buildable area to be divided into fewer units that become excessively large and expensive for the needs of the UBC community, or leaves unused floor space development potential, which erodes the population levels that are critical to support the shops, services, and transit in the community.

2. **Building form that is too small:**
   Physical form constraints that emphasize four storeys or less, and a ground-oriented design (exterior access to the ground) for 40% of new housing, is not supportive of higher density or more affordable living. These must be changed to allow more smaller units.

   These LUP limits originated from a former wood frame height limitation under the BC Building Code, as well as a Metro Vancouver concern that families would not opt to live in apartments. This target is no longer included in the draft Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy due to the large number of families who are living in apartments and should be removed from the Land Use Plan. The BC Building Code has also recently been amended to allow wood frame construction to a height of six storeys instead of four. Wood frame construction is more affordable than concrete housing, so the two additional storeys of wood frame provide more affordable homes for the campus community.

   The 4 storey emphasis also prevents use of taller residential towers in order to achieve the density transfer from future Housing Reserve and Future Housing areas. Approximately 300,000 m² of residential buildable area is being transferred to a smaller land area 30 acres smaller. More land-efficient (taller) building forms are necessary. (Please see Policy Brief: Retain and Redesignate the Farm for more information on this housing transfer).

3. **Populations that are too low for strong year round support for shops, services and transit:**
   The long-term target population must support the shops, services, transit and other amenities required for a complete, sustainable community. A population of 25,000 to 35,000 is reflective of contemporary conditions and practice for this purpose.

   More people support and attract a better range of shops and services which, in turn, attracts people to live in the community. The summer academic session has a significant negative impact on the viability of shops and services on campus unless there is a robust year-round and 24 hour residential population to support them.

4. **Limits that prevent a better range of shops and services:**
   The current Land Use Plan limits the ground floor commercial floor space in the Wesbrook Place and University Boulevard neighbourhoods to 10500 m². This results in a ratio of approximately 0.74 m² (8 ft²) per resident. An increase is needed to achieve the desirable range of businesses
that can meet people’s daily needs, so they can shop in their neighbourhood rather than having to travel off-campus.

The Wesbrook Place neighbourhood currently has Save-On Foods, Mozart School of Music, and Blenz coffee shop. Negotiations for a few other tenants are underway but the remainder of available permitted commercial space will soon be used up. Feedback to date indicates that a stronger range of services is desirable in this neighbourhood. An increase would enable the neighbourhood to achieve more cafes and retail uses (e.g. a hardware store) or services (e.g. a travel centre).

**Best Practices**

There is a strong link between sustainability and housing on campus. Most communities are now recognizing the affordability and sustainability benefits of higher density housing and are adopting ‘Smart Growth’ principles in their land-use development plans.

‘Smart Growth’, as defined on the Smart Growth BC website, refers to a collection of land use and development principles that aim to enhance our quality of life, preserve the natural environment, and save money over time. Smart growth principles ensure that a community’s growth is fiscally, environmentally and socially responsible and recognizes the connections between development and quality of life. Smart growth enhances and completes communities by placing priority on infill, redevelopment, and densification strategies.

Particularly relevant to the neighbourhoods at UBC, these principles include:
- Mixing land-uses so that each neighbourhood has a mixture of homes, retail, business, and recreational opportunities.
- Building well-designed compact neighbourhoods where residents can live, work, shop and socialize in close proximity, residents can easily access daily activities, transit is viable, and local businesses are supported.
- Providing a variety of transportation choices with attractive and safe infrastructure for walking, cycling and transit.
- Creating diverse housing opportunities or different family types, life stages and income levels.

The City of Vancouver is addressing housing affordability and supply through allowing higher densities, taller buildings, decreasing the smallest permitted unit size, reducing parking requirements, and providing more rental housing. Projects surveyed within the more moderate 1.5 to 5.0 density range include South East False Creek (3.5), East Fraser Lands (1.5-2.0), Arbutus Lands Carling Brewery site (2.4), Capers Block Development (2.5), Burrard slopes (3), and Concorde Pacific Place, North False Creek (4.5). Imagery of what these densities look like is provided in Attachment 1.

As another measure intended to address affordability, the City of Vancouver amended their regulations last year to permit smaller more affordable unit sizes: 37 m² (400 ft²). This size can be reduced even further at the discretion of the Director of Planning. Many cities around the world are similarly exploring smaller units for affordability reasons. This scale of housing appeals to singles and childless couples. Imagery of this small unit housing is provided in Attachment 3.

UBC has been aggressively following Smart Growth policies for some time. On-campus parking is more limited, and parking maximums rather than minimums are enforced in neighbourhood construction. UBC builds proportionally more rental housing than other lower mainland municipalities, and offers
rental rates for faculty and staff at approximately 20% lower than equivalent rental units in Vancouver. UBC has also established a residential community in which more than 50% of the family housing units are home to someone studying teaching or working on campus, helping to dramatically reduced commuting to campus. However, the Land Use Plan maximum 1.2 average FSR across the residential neighbourhoods, and resulting average 120 m² (1300 ft²) units does not allow UBC to keep pace with best practices in progressive housing density for smart growth urban communities. UBC should be building smaller, more affordable units. The 1997 LUP limits need to change.

In a sustainable community, the relationship of the size of theyear-round population to the range of shops, services, and transit is important. In the past some urban projects have been developed with the objective of first supplying housing, and then determining what shops and services they might support, often yielding a lesser range and lower ratios of commercial floor space per resident (e.g. 3 to 7 ft² (0.27 to 0.65 m²)). More recently, with more wide-spread acceptance of Smart Growth principles and the mutually dependant relationship between residential and commercial needs, greater attention is being given to first ensuring sufficient commercial floor space to deliver a practical yet complete range of shops and services, and then ensuring the population density to support them is accommodated. Sustainable communities support more commercial floor space per person, phased in carefully over time with the development of the community.

UBC has surveyed the residential commercial relationship in some local, traditional, successful mixed-use communities, as well as some newly planned communities of similar scale and context to UBC. The neighbourhood of Dunbar supports a ratio of 1.5 to 2.6 m² (16 to 28 ft²) per person, and Kerrisdale supports 3.5 m² (38 ft²) of commercial per person. New plans recently approved for lands at Simon Fraser University will permit up to 1.8 m² (20 ft²) of commercial floor space per resident, and the East Fraser Lands have recently been approved for 2.3 m² (25 ft²) of commercial per resident.

UBC’s current Land Use Plan allows approximately 0.74 m² (8 ft²) of commercial floor space per resident. A ratio of approximately 1.4 m² (15 ft²) per resident, comparable to the community of Dunbar or just slightly lower than Simon Fraser University, is proposed to allow a wider range of services. This value recognizes the unique challenges for commercial operators at UBC that include the seasonal nature of student population, and additional commercial providers at the UEL village (not part of UBC Campus). New commercial outlets would be introduced over time as needed.

In addition to establishing floor space for a good range of services, maintaining a healthy and sizable year-round residential population is then critical to the success of the commercial area. The density transfer and infill of additional wood-frame units for affordability reasons within the neighbourhoods are important contributors to the viability and range of shops and services.

**Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments**

UBC is not seeking the high downtown densities of 4 or 5 FSR or higher, nor low density large acreage estates for its community, but instead intends to provide the type and scale of community that meshes with and supports the university’s academic mission, community vision and overall sustainability objectives. Proposed amendments to the LUP would enable mid-range densities (average 2.5 FSR), and a population of approximately 25,000 to 35,000 people on a land area smaller than that already approved for family housing and commercial local areas in 1997. This population would be sufficient to support the range of shops services and transit needed on campus to ensure it remains viable year round.
This population will create UBC a reasonably dense community with variety that includes lower density residential pockets (those already built), and new higher-density areas similar to the scale of development on the Arbutus lands (see imagery in Attachment 1).

The additional density would be achieved through taller buildings rather than expanded building footprints. Some housing areas will be relocated in order to retain the Farm and to enable other Future housing areas to be converted back to Academic lands. Acadia would be redeveloped, through a neighbourhood planning process that would be designed to be a highly pedestrian-friendly, animated, and walkable neighbourhood with significantly improved amenities. The phasing of Acadia redevelopment would be coordinated so as not to disrupt current residents. There would be no net loss to existing student housing in Acadia. Student housing would be relocated to the west side of Acadia and redeveloped in a manner intended to deliver a net increase in units.

More specifically, the LUP amendments needed to address housing affordability and sustainability on campus would be to:

1. Increase the permitted residential floor space ratio from an average 1.2 FSR across the residential neighbourhoods of campus, to 2.5 FSR average across campus (like the Arbutus Lands in Vancouver).

2. Eliminate the unit cap, thereby allowing UBC to generate more, smaller, and thus more affordable housing units within the allowable floor space ratio.

3. Change the four storeys or less height emphasis to enable maximum use of six storey wood frame construction where feasible, plus taller apartments where required, to achieve the density transfer from future Housing Reserve and Future Housing areas that have been redesignated for academic purposes (see Policy Brief: Retain and Redesignate the Farm for more information on housing transfer). By eliminating the four storey height limit emphasis, the density transfer can be accommodated on less land than previously provided for residential development in the 1997 LUP. In some cases, heights greater that 18 storeys (53 meters) would be needed. These taller buildings would be carefully located to avoid privacy and shadowing impacts. Specific locations would be determined through a neighbourhood planning process.

The resulting floor space ratios for new development in these areas may range from approximately 1.5 to 2.9 with an average across the residential areas no greater than 2.5.

4. Eliminate the requirement that 40% of units be ground-oriented with direct exterior entries, thereby allowing UBC to generate more, smaller and more affordable housing units.

5. Replace the permitted commercial floor space in the neighbourhoods from a figure based on 0.74 m² (8 ft²) per resident to one allowing 1.4 m² (15 ft²) of commercial per resident. Locations will be determined in the neighbourhood plans.

As in the current Land Use Plan, a detailed Neighbourhood Plan or local area plan will be required prior to development of any housing in an area. Character, sustainability, integration and interface with the academic campus, public realm, pedestrian street and ground floor appeal, and universal accessibility, will all be important principles taken into consideration at that time. Proposals to address open space, school and other community amenities needed within the family housing areas are discussed in a separate policy brief entitled: Amenities for Family Housing Areas.
Attachments

1. Original 1997 OCP Performance Targets and Results to Date
2. Images indicating a Range of Density Examples
3. Images of Small Unit Housing
Original 1997 OCP Performance Targets and Results to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Plan</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>At Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of full-time undergraduate students to be housed in residence.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of new housing to be available as short term rental.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of new rental housing that is to be non-market</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all market and non-market housing in family housing areas occupied by faculty, staff or students.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue Transportation demand management to reduce traffic</td>
<td>20% lower than 1996 levels</td>
<td>20% lower (see results of some key high traffic locations below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Traffic Locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Marine Drive</td>
<td>Fall 1997: 2,040</td>
<td>Fall 2009: 1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Blvd.</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>9,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Boulevard</td>
<td>14,610</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Avenue</td>
<td>12,880</td>
<td>12,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Marine Drive</td>
<td>23,410</td>
<td>17,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking capacity</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Land Use Plan Requirements to be addressed:

- Maximum 1.2 Floor Space Ratio (FSR).
- Maximum 1.0 FSR in the existing institutional housing areas Acadia, Totem and Vanier student housing areas,
- Primarily 4 storeys or less height limit for housing (with some exceptions),
- Maximum 6 storey building heights in the Village Centre of Wesbrook Place,
- Maximum 5 storey height limit in University Boulevard neighbourhood,
- 150 units per apartment building or 50 units in any one ground-oriented housing project,
- 40% of housing must be ground-oriented housing (with direct exterior entries),
- 4500 m2 of retail commercial at ground floor in the University Boulevard area
- 6000 m2 at ground floor in the family residential areas in South Campus
FSR Range

FSR 1.06

UBC, Westchester Townhouses

FSR 1.08

UBC, Logan Lane

FSR 2.4

Arbutus Lands (Brewery District)

FSR 2.5

Capers Block Development, West 4th Avenue, Vancouver
FSR 3.0

The Rise, Cambie Street, Vancouver

FSR 3.5

South East False Creek, Vancouver

FSR 4.5

Concord Pacific Place, North False Creek Vancouver
Small Unit Examples

270 Ft²

Burns Block 18 W. Hastings St, Vancouver BC

250 - 350 Ft²

Cubix Living, San Francisco
320 Ft²

Studio Apartment, The Hague, Netherlands

344 Ft²

Convertible apartment with sliding walls, Hong Kong
Policy Brief: Amenities for Family Housing Areas

UBC's vision for housing on campus is one of a sustainable, unique university town that enriches and is enriched by UBC's academic mission. It is to be a living laboratory for contemporary sustainable living with a mix of housing choices and tenure, and a variety of shops and services to meet the daily needs of residents and the larger UBC community. Sufficient population is required to ensure year round support and viability for the critical range of shops and services, transit options, amenities and social infrastructure needed for a complete community. The community will have access to ample parks, recreational and cultural facilities, schools, and childcare amenities. It must also feature high quality architecture, and a people and pedestrian-friendly public realm, well integrated within its academic context, location and environment.

This policy brief outlines how amenities and community services will continue to be provided to the campus residential community consistent with the current Land Use Plan requirements and standards.

Current Land Use Governance on UBC's Vancouver Campus

Consistent with The University Act, UBC Policy 92, and The Municipalities Enabling & Validating Act, new housing development at UBC's Vancouver campus must not be inconsistent with the UBC Land Use Governance documents and Land Use Regulations. The Land Use Governance documents include the umbrella Land Use Plan covering the whole campus and the more detailed localized plans for the different portions of the academic and residential campus lands. The primary driver of all plans on campus is to deliver the university environment needed to best serve the UBC academic plan and mission.

The strategic academic mission at UBC is outlined in Place and Promise – The UBC Plan. The University's vision is to ensure that as one of the world's leading universities, UBC creates an exceptional learning environment that fosters global citizenship, advances a civil and sustainable society, and supports outstanding research to serve the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world.

The current Land Use Plan (formerly known as the 1997 Official Community Plan) for UBC's Vancouver campus designates approximately 200 of its 1000 acre campus to accommodate family housing and commercial local areas. The local Neighbourhood Plans then bring further detail to the layout form and standards for these areas.

Current and Future Amenity Provisions

No sustainable community is complete or successful without a robust and integrated system of parks, community centres, schools and childcare. UBC is committed to providing high quality and ample amenities to its university residential community, comparable to contemporary best practices for new development in the City of Vancouver.

The year-round population at UBC would be expected to reach 25,000 to 35,000 people under the amended Land Use Plan. The community would be constructed over many years and amenities will be phased in as population increases require them.
The standards and approach to delivery of open space, community centre, school and daycare amenities appropriate for a livable and sustainable residential community at UBC, are outlined below.

*Open Space*

**Land Use Plan Requirements**

The Land Use Plan requires that 1.1 ha (2.75 acres) of University Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS) be provided for every 1000 persons living on campus. UNOS is the term used in the Land Use Plan to describe neighbourhood park space. This ratio of open space within a neighbourhood may be reduced to 0.5 ha per 1000 residents when access to university open space and facilities on academic lands is provided. The Neighbours’ Agreement 2008 between the University Neighbourhoods Association and UBC establishes that access on an ongoing basis for the community.

**Best Practices**

The LUP UNOS requirement of 1.1 ha per 1000 residents is comparable to the City of Vancouver’s neighbourhood park requirement of 1.1 ha per new 1000 residents.

**UBC Current and Planned Delivery**

The Neighbourhood Plans approved to date provide 6.71 hectares at a ratio of 0.60 UNOS per 1000 residents.

*Table 1: UNOS in approved Neighbourhood Plans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hectares at build out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Place</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook Place</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Place</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The planned population under the Land Use Plan amendments would generate a minimum requirement of 12.5 hectares of UNOS at 0.5 hectare per 1000 residents. This would be met through the addition of a number of areas to UNOS in amended and new Neighbourhood Plans, or is already secured in the Neighbours Agreement 2008, as illustrated in Table 2. The addition of these areas would result in a ratio of 0.86 hectare per thousand residents. Community gardens will be integrated into the design of new UNOS networks in consultation with residents, similar to what has been achieved in Nobel Park in Wesbrook Place.

Recreational facilities to which residents have enhanced access through the Neighbours’ Agreement, also occupy additional UBC academic lands. This type of facility would normally be built on neighbourhood park space in the City of Vancouver. The Thunderbird Winter Sports Centre, the UBC Aquatic Centre, gymnasiums and the Tennis Centre occupy approximately 5 hectares of lands outside the neighbourhoods.
Table 2: New UNOS to be included in amended and future Neighbourhood Plans, or in the Neighbours Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Field in Thunderbird Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field, Artificial Field and Baseball Field in Thunderbird Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Open (RO) spaces in Chancellor Place</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Park in Westbrook Place</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Streets in Westbrook Place</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron Wood</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future parks in Acadia East</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future parks in old BC Research area</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing field in Westbrook</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNOS total from Table 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UBC also has a wide range of other open green spaces, walks and gardens throughout campus that are open to the general public including, but not limited to, the Rose Garden, Main Mall greenway (runs contiguous to and through some neighbourhoods), and Main Mall Commons, the open space immediately north of Hawthorne Place. Residents on campus have special access privileges with the Botanical Gardens, provided through an agreement between the University Neighbourhoods Association and the Garden.

Table 3: Selected Academic open spaces available to the general public including residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Green Space Access</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thunderbird Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitobe Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Garden</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Centres and Recreational Facilities

Land Use Plan Requirements

The Land Use Plan requires Community Centre space at a ratio of 0.15 m² per person. In addition, the Land Use Plan calls for play facilities to be built in conjunction with the elementary school and for a new community centre to be built adjacent to or in conjunction with the new village commercial area in Westbrook Place.

Best Practices

The Land Use Plan standard of 0.15 m² per new resident person is higher than the 0.11 m² (1.2 ft²) per person ratio required in the City of Vancouver.

UBC Current and Planned Delivery

At full build-out 3750 m² to 5250 m² would be required. It is proposed that at least 3750 m² of purpose-built community centres be delivered in the following neighbourhood locations.

- The existing 987 m² Old Barn Community Centre in Hawthorn Place currently serves the Hawthorne Place neighbourhood and all other residents.
- Plans for a new 1600 – 2000 m² community centre in Westbrook Place are underway for a site adjacent to the school and village square. It is proposed that the design be expandable up to 2800 m².

- In future, when the long-term redevelopment of Acadia East proceeds, a new community centre of approximately 765 to 1165 m² is proposed to be included in that Neighbourhood Plan. The possibility of combining this facility into a larger community centre that also serves the adjacent planned new student family housing in Acadia West will also be considered.

In addition, residents have enhanced access to existing built recreational facilities on University lands. The Neighbours’ Agreement 2008 between the University and the University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) outlines enhanced access for residents to the university facilities listed in Table 5 below. The residents contribute annually to the operating costs of those facilities (like UBC students) and have community programming and reduced rates. Through this arrangement the UNA enjoys access to a scale and range of rink, pool, gymnasium and fitness facilities that a community of this size would not be able to provide. A future recreational access enhancement that will be considered is a family change room in the Aquatic Centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Enhanced Access to Academic Facilities for University Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC Aquatic Centre and Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunderbird Winter Sports Centre rink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunderbird Fields (Spencer Field Dedicated for community usage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Centre Outdoor Tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium space (Osborne Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball Court at Thunderbird Blvd and Health Sciences Mall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schools**

**Land Use Plan Requirements**

The Land Use Plan requires that an elementary school site of not less than 3 ha will be sited in the Westbrook Place neighborhood adjacent to the community centre.

**Best Practices**

The Vancouver School Board (VSB) is responsible for delivery of elementary and secondary school services for children on campus and its requirements are deemed to represent best practices. The Vancouver School Board assesses school site demands based on a per unit formula rather than a population based formula. Different ratios are applied to different unit types depending upon the number of bedrooms. Units with one bedroom or less are assumed to contain no children.

The Vancouver School Board reviewed the 1997 LUP in consultation with UBC to determine the school facilities required to service the planned community. The Vancouver School Board determined that while a 3 ha site would still be needed, the site identified in the Land Use Plan would be better used for a secondary school. The existing U-Hill secondary school will move into the renovated building on the 3 ha site in Westbrook Place. The vacated U-Hill secondary school site will be redeveloped for elementary and middle school use. The school board also determined that an additional site for a future kindergarten to grade 5 elementary school would be needed when the Future Housing Reserves are developed.
UBC Current and Planned Delivery

The NRC building is being renovated for the relocated high school and targeting completion for opening September 2012. The vacated U-Hill Secondary school east of the UBC Acadia neighbourhood will be converted to an elementary facility targeted for completion in September 2012. An additional school site (approx 1 ha) has been reserved within Wesbrook Place just south of the high school field for a future possible elementary school. Construction would only proceed if the School Board determined there was sufficient demand.

Given the redistributed location of the Future Housing Reserve density, UBC is considering possible relocation of the reserved elementary school site from Wesbrook Place to either the Stadium Road site adjacent to the Main Mall greenway, or adjacent to the community centre in Acadia. More detailed site review at a Neighbourhood Plan level would be required to ensure that various site planning considerations unique to schools can be addressed. Any location would need to be agreed upon by both UBC and the Vancouver School Board. Should an alternate location not prove suitable, the planned school site would remain on reserve in Wesbrook Place.

Additional school demand above previously understood Land Use Plan levels is not expected, especially given the anticipated increase in the number of bachelor or one bedroom units for singles and childless couples. This segment of the university population has been underserved in the housing program to date. The 2010 Faculty Staff Housing Demand Study determined that 60% of UBC’s faculty and staff live in 1 or 2 person households, yet most new housing is in the 2 to 3 bedroom range.

Child Care

Land Use Plan Requirements

There are no childcare requirements in the current Land Use Plan.

Best Practices

To address childcare demand on campus, UBC engaged a consultant in 2009 to gauge demand and to prepare a childcare expansion strategy in that context.

The study outlined that the existing daycare supply serves 18% of children on campus. Province-wide 15% of children are served by daycare so UBC is better supplied than the average. However the study stated that UBC may have a higher percentage requiring care due to its unique demography. Surveys conducted as part of a 2010 Faculty Staff Housing Demand Study indicated that 24% of respondents considered proximity to daycare important in their choice of housing (less important than proximity to shopping and transit (83%), parks and recreation (79%), healthcare (55%), or pet-friendly housing (44%)). A 2009 Student Housing Demand Study indicated that 11% of students considered access to childcare an important aspect of on-campus housing. Over 50% of the units on campus (not including institutional student housing units) are lived in by someone working, teaching or studying on campus.

The consultant adapted the City of Vancouver unit-based formula used to calculate demand to more accurately reflect UBC’s unique demography and proceeded to assess demand in both the neighbourhoods and institutional campus areas. The consultant’s demand formula assumed a 50% overlap with the neighbourhoods to account for people who would be both working and living at UBC. A resulting projection of childcare spots needed on campus suggested 533 to 611 spots were required.
UBC Current and Planned Delivery

An increase of 500 new spots in addition to the 526 in existence would be distributed throughout the academic and neighbourhood lands in the following locations:

- 144 to 150 spaces in new academic student housing hubs and spaces around campus.
- 60 out of school care spaces at the new elementary school.
- 48 to 50 spaces in the new Wesbrook Place community centre
- 16-20 spaces for occasional childcare within the new Student Union Building
- 15 to 21 childcare spots for 0-7 year olds within 2 to 3 family childcare units
- 150 to 210 spots with 30 licensed family childcare providers for 5 to 7 children each

The daycare study did not take into account the Future Housing Reserve density within the Land Use Plan. The additional units generated by including this square footage, could trigger up to 400 more childcare spots depending on the unit mix. A strategy to phase in any new spots would rely upon space within the reserve school site, the new Acadia community centre, purpose-built childcare facilities in some family housing projects, and some licensed and license-not-required family daycares within the additional housing units. Roles and responsibilities between UBC and the UNA regarding ongoing management of these services would be discussed.

Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments

No Land Use Plan amendments are required because UBC will continue to follow the per unit or per capita standards already established. However UBC proposes to introduce into the Land Use Plan the requirement that daycare be added to the amenity obligations for ongoing long-range community planning purposes, referencing the best practices at the City of Vancouver as a benchmark, tailored as appropriate to the UBC demography.

The University will continue to work within the established ratios and principles determined in the existing LUP in order to deliver the quantity and quality of amenities appropriate to a highly sustainable and livable residential community. The general locations of anticipated open space, community centres, schools and childcare outlined in this brief are indicated on the map in Attachment 1. Configurations are approximate in areas where Neighbourhood Plans have yet to be completed.
Attachment 1: Proposed Amenity Locations

Current + Proposed Amenity Locations

- Useable Neighbourhood Open Space
- Academic Open Space Accessible for Public
- Community Centres
- Schools
- Daycares
- Family Housing Local Areas

DRAFT
Configurations of open space, community centres, schools and childcare are illustrative where Neighbourhood Plans have yet to be completed.
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To: Electoral Area Committee  
From: Eric Aderneck, Regional Planner, Policy and Planning Department  
Date: September 28, 2010  
Subject: Indian Arm Debris Disposal Event Summary

Recommendation:

That the Electoral Area Committee send a letter of appreciation to the District of North Vancouver for accommodating this event at Cates Point Park.

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the Indian Arm debris disposal event held on September 25, 2010.

2. CONTEXT

As directed by the Committee on July 23, 2010, staff organized a one time debris disposal event for cabins with water access only on Indian Arm within the Electoral Area. The event was scheduled for Saturday, September 25, 2010 from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Cates Point Park dock facility in the District of North Vancouver. Notification was through direct letters mailed to property owners on title. Two emails were received from cabin owners expressing disappointment that the disposal event did not include arranging a barge to collect debris directly from cabins on Indian Arm. This option was investigated by staff, however determined to have significant logistical and communication challenges and not be cost effective.

Cabin owners could bring various types of debris to the site by boat where it was appropriately sorted and disposed, and recycled where possible. This debris clean up event coincided with the national Great Canadian Shoreline Cleanup, occurring September 18 – 26. A contractor was retained to provide debris bins and disposal services and a Metro Vancouver staff also attended the event.

There were approximately 6 boats that participated in the event, some of which made multiple trips, and some boats represented more than one household. Participants expressed appreciation for the event. In total, the following items were collected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debris Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 tonnes of garbage</td>
<td>90L of paint cans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 tonnes of metal</td>
<td>4L flammable liquids cans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 large batteries</td>
<td>18L of oil cans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One 25 cubic yard bin (approx 8 ft wide, 25 ft long, and 6 ft high) was used for each the garbage and the metal materials. In terms of volume, the garbage bin was nearly completely filled and the metal bin was approximately one-third filled. These items were properly disposed of by the contractor, rather than being at risk of polluting the sea or land. The cost of the contractor was $6300 including HST, in line with the initial budget.

3. ALTERNATIVES

None presented.

4. CONCLUSION

This report provides a summary of the Indian Arm debris disposal event held on September 25, 2010. The cooperation of the District of North Vancouver was very much appreciated.
To: Electoral Area Committee  
From: Jason Smith, Regional Planner, Policy and Planning Department  
Date: September 8, 2010

Subject: **Background on UBC Thunderbird Arena Liquor Licence Application**

**Recommendation:**

That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated September 8, 2010, titled “Background on UBC Thunderbird Arena Liquor Licence Application”.

---

1. **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to respond to the committee’s request for background on how Metro Vancouver responded to the previous liquor licence application for Thunderbird Arena at UBC.

2. **CONTEXT**

In anticipation of receiving an application to change the existing liquor licence for Thunderbird Arena, the committee should be aware of the conditions for the existing liquor licence, the key issues and how Metro Vancouver handled public consultation on the original application.

The existing liquor licence allows alcohol to be served in the licensed areas of the arenas and on a patio. The existing liquor licence does not allow for alcohol to be served at any non-sporting events. UBC had requested that alcohol be served at non-sporting events in their original application but this was turned down. It is anticipated that a new application would seek to licence the serving of alcohol at non-sporting events.

The key issues that were raised last time this liquor licence was considered were:

- Noise, and the impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Security, there were concerns about the adequacy of security provided by UBC at events. These concerns were in part why the original application to include concerts and other events other than sporting ones as part of the liquor licence was denied.
- Increased vehicular traffic, as many of these events would be held during off-peak hours concern was expressed that this could lead to more vehicles coming to UBC and increase the incidence of drinking and driving.
- Limited police resources, the additional events could place additional demands on limited police resources.
Public consultation for the last application was handled as follows. UBC, as the applicant, posted signs on the site outlining some of the details of their application and advertised in two editions of the Vancouver Courier. Metro Vancouver mailed out a notice of a public meeting to over 1000 people in the area. Written submissions were received by Metro Vancouver. Approximately 25 people attended the public meeting.

3. CONCLUSION

If and when a new application is received from UBC to seek changes to the existing liquor licence, Metro Vancouver should ensure that the issues raised last time have been addressed, most importantly the adequacy of security and noise concerns. Consultation with the public will also be necessary and a public process similar to what was done last time would be appropriate.
To: Electoral Area Committee

From: Christina DeMarco, Division Manager, Policy and Planning Department

Date: September 27, 2010

Subject: Manager’s Report

Recommendation:

That the Electoral Area Committee receive for information the report dated September 27, 2010, titled “Manager’s Report”.

Electoral Area Committee 2010 Workplan
The attachment to this report sets out the Committee’s work program and schedule for 2010. This does not include all items to be brought before the Committee but the priorities previously determined by the Board and Committee. The matrix will be updated regularly to include new issues that arise, items requested by the Committee, and any changes in the schedule. The items highlighted in bold identify the work program elements that have been completed. The items not highlighted in bold reflect the work program elements where work is still on-going.

Solar Hot Water Ready Regulation
The Electoral Committee requested staff to enquire as to whether the University Endowment Lands (UEL) would be adopting this regulation. Staff was informed that the UEL had no plans to participate.

Metro Vancouver Ownership of Local Infrastructure in the Electoral Area
On May 11, 2010, the Electoral Area Committee considered the report titled “Metro Vancouver Ownership of Local Infrastructure in the Electoral Area”, dated April 28, 2010, and forwarded the report for a Board decision without a Committee recommendation. On May 21, 2010, the Board referred the report to the Water, Finance, Intergovernmental and Regional Planning Committees for their examination of the potential impacts on Metro Vancouver. In July 2010, the Water and Finance Committees passed a resolution to receive the report for information, and that it be clarified that the application of the policy be consistent with the objectives of the Regional Growth Strategy and principally for works of an emergent local nature. Also in July, the Regional Planning Committee passed the staff recommendations in the report, as did the Intergovernmental Committee in early September.

Comments at the Committees related to infrastructure maintenance, costs, taxation, liability, risks, and possible increased development pressures and the impact of infrastructure on decisions regarding potential amalgamation of unincorporated areas. These Committee comments and the report were brought back to the Metro Vancouver Board on September 10, 2010 and the report recommendations were endorsed.
Status of Specific Infrastructure Requests
In terms of specific previously discussed infrastructure items for communities within the Electoral Area, an update is as follows:

• Strachan Point community has expressed interest in an upgrade to their water system; Metro Vancouver staff has been in contact with their representative to determine the current level of interest by residents to pursue such upgrades. Preliminary indication from residents is strong support and commitment for proceeding with some form of upgrade to the water system.

• Montizambert Wynd community had expressed interest in upgrades to their water system, receiving fire protection coverage, and upgrades to the road serving their community; Metro Vancouver staff is in contact with District of West Vancouver staff to further discuss levels of interest and possible options to advance discussions at this time.

• Passage Island community had expressed interest in constructing a new breakwater, and technical studies were completed earlier this year. There has not been any further recent discussion or progress on this item.

Barnston Island Fire Protection Service
There has been recent correspondence with the City of Surrey Fire Department with regards to fire protection service. The Surrey Fire Department would like to discuss with Metro Vancouver the respective roles and expectations of the City of Surrey and Metro Vancouver in regards to emergency responses to Barnston Island.

Montizambert Creek Wild Fire
On September 3, 2010, there was a small wild fire at Montizambert Creek in the Electoral Area near Lions Bay. The fire was very quickly extinguished thanks in large part to the collaborative approach of the BC Forest Service, Metro Vancouver, Lions Bay Fire and Rescue and West Vancouver Fire and Rescue. RCMP conducted an investigation concerning a possible squatter and a marijuana grow operation that may be linked to the fire. There were no injuries, and no significant property damage.

Bowyer and Passage Islands
Bowyer and Passage Islands are within the jurisdiction of the Islands Trust. For the new Official Community Plan for the Gambier Associated Islands, the bylaw has received initial readings by the Islands Trust and is currently with the province for review; final adoption is expected in Fall 2010. Passage Island is largely designated as ‘Residential’, and Bowyer Island is designated as ‘Residential Comprehensive’, ‘Residential’, and ‘Forest’. Once the Official Community Plan is completed, the Islands Trust will commence work on a zoning bylaw for Bowyer and Passage Islands.

Metro Vancouver Electoral Area Communications
In order to best keep residents / landowners in the Electoral Area informed about Metro Vancouver initiatives, staff will maintain an email list of residents / landowners by geography and / or issue. At every opportunity, residents / landowners will be asked to provide their name and email address for inclusion in this distribution list if they are interested. This list will be expanded and updated as appropriate and will be used to inform the public about various Metro Vancouver initiatives which may be of interest to them.

ATTACHMENT

Electoral Area Committee 2010 Workplan (Doc. #4051687).
## Electoral Area Committee 2010 Workplan

### 1st Quarter

**Key priorities**

- Report on Bowyer Island governance issues
- Review of the Islands Trust OCP for Passage and Bowyer Islands
- Report on debris collection at Indian Arm

### 2nd Quarter

**Key priorities**

- Report on Metro Vancouver ownership of local infrastructure in the Electoral Area
- Report on Passage Island breakwater
  - Initial report on the resolution of governance issues at UBC, in particular to land use planning
- Report on the issues related to the transfer of the Barnston Island dike
- Follow-up report on debris collection at Indian Arm

### 3rd Quarter

**Key priorities**

- Report on Metro Vancouver’s role with respect to governance issues at UBC
- Report on UBC land use planning issue in the regional context
- Report on proposals for boundary adjustments in the Electoral Area
- Consideration of relationship of Islands Trust to Metro Vancouver jurisdiction

### 4th Quarter

**Key priorities**

- Finalize zoning and building bylaw amendments for Electoral Area A
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The Future of Citizen Involvement in Land Use Planning at UBC According to Bill 20

New Oversight Rule Changes the Role of Metro Director

How many of you living at UBC, either as members of the academic side of the house or in the residential neighbourhoods, know that the regulatory framework governing land use planning changed radically in June 2010 as a result of Bill 20? While most urban areas are incorporated as municipalities with land use planning being the responsibility of locally elected municipal councils, this is not so at UBC.

Bill 20 transferred authority for land use planning on UBC’s Point Grey Campus Lands from Metro Vancouver (GVRD) to the provincial minister of community and rural development. The locally elected UNA board continues to represent residents’ views on land use and development in dealing with the university and the Province. Like municipal council meetings, UNA board meetings are open to the public and have time set aside for the public to speak. However, the UNA (like the UEL Community Advisory Council) does not have legal power to make land use decisions. Its power with respect to land use and development is simply consultative and advisory. Only UBC and the Province have legal power to make decisions about land use. Given the context of rapid urbanization on Point Grey Campus lands, this raises important questions about the degree to which UBC and the Province will act on advice of UNA residents and how the UNA can best equip itself to address land use and development issues.

Bill 20 led to significant change in responsibilities of the Electoral Area director, but only with respect to land use. The Electoral Area director will continue to represent local interests with respect to regional planning, utilities and certain local matters such as liquor licensing. Prior to Bill 20, a core role of the Electoral Area director was to co-chair the GVRD/UBC Joint Committee and to advocate with respect to land use planning issues at Metro Vancouver on behalf of residents, students and the institution at UBC as distinct but closely linked entities in an increasingly urban setting.

The GVRD/UBC Joint Committee heard from local residents and students as well as from third parties with an interest in land use matters at UBC. Thus, the committee provided a forum where members of the public could speak in the presence of both bodies that had legal authority to make development decisions. Bill 20 made void the Memorandum of Understanding under which the Joint Committee was created and, to this point, no further meetings of the Joint Committee are scheduled and no other such liaison committee has been constituted. Although the Electoral Area Director no longer has an official role with respect to local land use matters, I have spent much of my term in office considering governance and land use in the area and will continue to welcome the opportunity to engage with local residents and with the UNA Board in discussion of Bill 20.
Changes brought about by Bill 20 may indeed offer new opportunities for the local community to ensure that land use planning and development is conducted in an accountable, transparent, and responsible way that serves both local and broader regional interests. We must wait on developments here. In my view, it is critical that UBC Point Grey Campus lands continue, over the long-term, to lead the region in sustainable development, providing live-work proximity and a community that people want to live in. I can’t help but agree with UNA resident, Gary Gibson, in the July edition of the Campus Resident where he noted that there must be a large number of UNA residents asking, “What’s going on?” Gary posed a number of specific questions himself and in addition, I pose others for residents to consider and respond to if they wish:

1. Given the difficulties incorporating UBC Point Grey Campus as a separate traditional or special municipality, what is the position of UNA residents on present residential governance arrangements? If status quo is the preferred option, then what if any additional steps should the UNA take to engage in land use and development decisions? Likewise, if change is desired, then what are the underlying objectives?

2. Will the new legislation affect only land use planning or is future governance of the UNA neighbourhoods also part of the legislative package?

3. Will consultation on land use planning and implementation of land use plans at UBC be conducted by UBC and reported through UBC? If so, what mechanisms can be used by the UNA to ensure that land use planning and implementation options are presented fairly and what control will residents have over the process?

4. Are there specific concerns or issues of interest to the community with respect to land use decisions on Point Grey campus lands?

5. Are you aware that additional densities beyond what was previously approved are under discussion as part of the UBC Land Use Planning process this summer and fall?

6. Few communities in the Metro Vancouver region were designed with as much attention to live-work proximity as UBC’s family housing neighbourhoods. How important is it to existing residents that UBC faculty and staff will be able to afford housing on campus 20 years from now? And how important to this community is regional sustainability with respect to live/work proximity?

7. Given the rapid urbanization of UBC’s Point Grey Campus lands, local decisions in many instances affect neighbours and the broader region. Through what forum should such issues best be addressed?

8. What if any forum should exist for agencies and members of the public to make representations to the UNA, UBC and the local planning authority at the same time on issues related to land use?

MARIA HARRIS
Director Electoral Area A
Metro Vancouver
mariaharris@telus.net
Pamela Goingo

From: Paulette Vetleson
Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 2010 12:35 PM
To: Pamela Goingo
Subject: FW: UNA

---

From: Lois Jackson [mailto:LJackson@corp.delta.bc.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 2010 12:03 PM
To: Johnny Carlile; Maria Harris; Paulette Vetleson
Subject: FW: UNA

For your information.

Dona Packer
Executive Assistant to the Mayor
Corporation of Delta
604.946.3210

---

From: ANGELA WHEELOCK [mailto:awheelock@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 2010 11:40 AM
To: Mayor Lois Jackson
Subject: UNA

Dear Mayor Jackson,
Thank you very much for the letter that you wrote that went into the newspaper that UNA residents receive. I have lived in Hawthorn Place, within the UNA neighbourhoods, for 9 years and I continue to be very concerned about the lack of true democratic government here. Despite the protests that Jim Taylor and Mike Feeley make in a letter that also appeared in this paper, I do not consider an association true representative local government. In many ways, I will agree that the UNA has done a good job within the parameters that it must work within. The reality, however, is that UBC has the final say in any decisions that the Board makes and that non-elected representatives sit on the UNA Board and have the right to vote. Imagine, if you will, appointed members from Telus or another large corporation sitting on the City Council of Vancouver and getting to vote. As you are no doubt aware, the UNA Board has, as far as I know, no control over land use and development issues. That control remains with UBC and the Province. Surely, a situation that is bound to be less than responsive to local residents.

I think what has happened is that UBC has very cleverly created a Board that will then defend the status quo, because they are the status quo. This Board cannot or will not ask the tough questions about true democratic governance. I fail to see how a local municipality would take local control away from residents!

So, despite what you may hear elsewhere, there are certainly many residents who have concerns about the present situation. However, we do not feel very hopeful about the province doing the right thing on this issue.

7/28/2010
By the way, in the same issue of the local newspaper, Gary Gibson calls for a forum on governance issues to allow all sides to speak to residents on this issue. I couldn't agree more.

Thank you again for speaking out.

Yours,
Angela Wheelock

P.S. I used to edit the UNA newsletter, but I quit over issues related to governance. I did not feel that I could write objectively about an issue that I so completely disagree with.

This message is provided in confidence and should not be forwarded to any external third party without authorization. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return email and delete this message along with any attachments.
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Ref: 136682

Mr. Johnny Carline
Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer
Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Dear Mr. Carline:

Thank you for your letter dated July 5, 2010, outlining the Regional Planning Committee’s (Committee) request for clarification of the implications of Bill 20 for Metro Vancouver Regional Planning functions at the University of British Columbia (UBC). I appreciated the opportunity to discuss these issues on July 20. I am confirming our responses to the Committee’s questions.

1. Metro Vancouver’s role in relation to UBC’s regional context statement

A fundamental objective of the Province of British Columbia (Province), in drafting the proposed legislative amendment to the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, is to ensure that Metro Vancouver retains its pre-eminent role in regional planning and servicing. The legislation includes the requirement in section 38 that a Land Use Plan for the Point Grey campus lands must contain a regional context statement and a provision that the Minister of Community and Rural Development (Minister) may, by order, establish matters that the UBC Board must address in a regional context statement, including the consistency of the Land Use Plan with the regional growth strategy of Metro Vancouver. Section 39 specifies that the regional context statement in a Land Use Plan must describe the relationship between the Land Use Plan and the regional growth strategy, and that the regional context statement and the Land Use Plan must be consistent.

Section 41 specifies that when the UBC board submits a Land Use Plan to the Minister for adoption, it must provide a report that includes a description of the extent to which there is consistency between the Land Use Plan and the regional growth strategy of Metro Vancouver, including the reasons for any inconsistencies. The legislation gives the Minister the responsibility for the adoption of the plan and ensures that the Land Use Plan and the regional context statement are in harmony with the regional growth strategy.
Based on our experience to date, we expect that the UBC will submit a Land Use Plan and regional context statement consistent with the current regional growth strategy. Regardless, the legislation requires the Minister to consider the consistency of the regional context statement and the regional growth strategy before adopting a Land Use Plan. In addition, we are prepared to recommend that the Minister use the power contained in section 38 to require the UBC to submit the regional context statement to Metro Vancouver for comment before submitting the Land Use Plan to the Minister. If there are outstanding issues related to the regional context statement and the regional growth strategy, we will discuss these directly with Metro Vancouver. Where there are differences, we are prepared to consider dispute resolution processes.

2. Meaning of the statement in Section 44(vii) that Part 25 remains in effect

This is necessary to make it clear that the regional growth strategy applies to the Point Grey campus lands. Metro Vancouver retains responsibility for developing the regional growth strategy, and Metro Vancouver can recover the UBC campus lands’ share of the costs of developing and maintaining the regional growth strategy.

However, the community planning power to designate specific lands on the UBC Point Grey Campus for specific purposes now rests with the Minister. As mentioned above, we are prepared to recommend that the Minister use the power contained in section 38 to require the UBC to submit the regional context statement to Metro Vancouver for comment before submitting the Land Use Plan to the Minister. The Minister, in considering whether to adopt a Land Use Plan or amendment, is obligated to consider Metro Vancouver’s interest. The intent of this approach is to fulfill our mutual objectives that Metro Vancouver is able to focus on its regional strategic growth strategy responsibilities and be relieved of responsibility for detailed local planning on the UBC campus.

3. Role for the Electoral Area A Director in the new planning process and public meeting structure

I do not believe that the Metro Vancouver/UBC Joint Committee is necessary since the Minister has replaced the Metro Vancouver Board as the local land use planning authority on the UBC’s Point Grey campus. The Electoral Area and Regional Planning Committees of the Board will continue to provide forums for discussion of local government and regional matters affecting the area. The Director will continue to represent residents on the UBC campus, the University Endowment Lands (UEL) and other parts of the Electoral Area on the Board. In this role, the Electoral Area Director will have an important role in articulating resident interests in regional planning and service delivery, such as the Pacific Spirit Park.

.../3
With respect to public meeting structure and community input, we will recommend that the Minister use the power contained in section 38 to pass an order requiring the UBC to follow a process that will ensure community input is received and taken into consideration by the UBC in preparing a plan for his approval that meets or exceeds the consultation and public process requirements in the *Local Government Act*.

4. Timeline for governance review

Our focus over the next few months will be on interim governance matters. At the same time, consideration will be given to scope and timing of the long-term governance discussion. The Province has indicated to the UBC, its communities, and UEL residents that it is prepared to explore the idea of greater local self-government in this area. Residents of the many communities on the Point Grey peninsula (including the University Neighbourhoods Association and the UEL) will be involved in determining what form of government is necessary to carry out the civic functions of governance, planning and service delivery.

I hope this addresses the issues raised by the Regional Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Dale Wall
Deputy Minister
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AUG 09 2010

Her Worship Mayor Lois E. Jackson, Chair
and Members of the Board
Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Dear Chair Jackson and Board Members:

Thank you for your letter dated May 31, 2010, regarding concerns about the change in local governance for land use planning and development at the University of British Columbia (UBC) Point Grey campus. I apologize for the delay in responding.

Consultation and Public Process
I appreciate your concerns with consultation and public process and I can assure you that over the next few months, the Province of British Columbia (Province) will focus on implementing the Bill 20 planning system for the University of British Columbia (UBC) Point Grey campus. This will include the development of a Minister’s Order to establish process requirements that UBC must follow when developing or amending its Land Use Plan. The requirements will meet or exceed the public process and consultation requirements for a local government when preparing an Official Community Plan (OCP) pursuant to Part 26 of the Local Government Act.

Residents of the Point Grey Campus Lands, which are the focus of the legislation, will continue to have the ability to take issues to the University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) and have access to the dispute resolution mechanism in section 18.4 of the Neighbours’ Agreement between UBC and the UNA. In addition, we will ensure that the UNA will have representation on the Planning Committee that will hold public hearings on the proposed Land Use Plan and amendments to that plan. UBC Board meetings are open to the public, and residents, neighbours and other stakeholders may attend Board meetings and raise their concerns.
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With respect to the Metro Vancouver/UBC Joint Committee, I do not believe the committee is necessary given the change in planning responsibilities that has me replacing the Metro Vancouver Board (Board) as the local land use planning authority for the Point Grey campus. The Electoral Area and Regional Planning Committees will continue to provide forums for discussion of local and regional matters affecting the area. The Director will continue to represent residents on the UBC campus, the University Endowment Lands (UEL) and other parts of the Electoral Area on the Board. In this role, the Director will be able to articulate resident interests in regional planning and service delivery, especially in relation to Pacific Spirit Regional Park.

Land Use
Your letter requests two points of clarification in regard to the two foreshore lots of Pacific Spirit Regional Park and the scope of the amendment that allows development of the pharmaceutical building. The two foreshore regional park lots are not included in the prescribed geographical area of the Point Grey campus lands, as shown on the enclosed map. Therefore, they will not be included in the scope of UBC’s Land Use Plan.

The provisions in UBC’s OCP approved by Metro Vancouver in 1997, which are designed to protect adjacent Pacific Spirit Park lands and values from development at UBC, continue in full force and effect. Given the importance of Pacific Spirit Park for UBC, the Province and the region, I anticipate that any new Land Use Plan developed by UBC will contain similar protection.

In relation to the development of the pharmaceutical building, I can advise that the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences is undertaking the construction of a new teaching and research facility that will be located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Wesbrook Mall and Agronomy Road, immediately north of the Thunderbird parking structure. The proposed 23,500 square metre structure will include facilities for the Centre for Drug Research and Development that is currently using temporary lab space on campus. The site is currently occupied by a surface parking lot. In the future, it is anticipated that the site will also accommodate a student housing hub with some academic and other ancillary uses.

With respect to the farm, I understand that the UBC Board has committed to maintaining the farm, and to manage the site to maximize opportunities for research with both regional and global relevance—particularly, in the fields of sustainable land use and community design, individual and community health, ecosystem services and biodiversity, material cycling, carbon management (including capture and sequestration), clean energy research, energy flows in managed landscapes, and teaching and community-based action research.
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At the same time, the UBC Board has stipulated that no market housing will be pursued on the 24 hectare parcel, which contains the UBC Farm, as long as the university’s housing, community development and endowment goals can be met through transferring density to other parts of campus. The UBC Board has also committed to the continuation of current land uses until academic plans are completed and a decision has been reached on density transfer.

**Future Governance**
I recognize that the actions that the Province has taken to date through Bill 20 do not represent a long-term solution to the governance challenges on the Point Grey peninsula. In a May 5, 2010 letter, my predecessor, Honourable Bill Bennett, advised that it may be time to start thinking about a more representative local government for the Point Grey peninsula, given the significant population and projected growth, and the increasing complexity of managing the area without the benefit of a municipal government. I can confirm that the Province will be exploring the idea of greater local self-government in the area.

Consideration is being given to the scope and timing of the process that will be established to study a new governance model for the area. The Province will develop a process that includes residents of the many communities on the Point Grey peninsula, including the UEL, UBC, the Director of Electoral Area A, and the Musqueam First Nation, in its review for greater local self-government.

**Conclusion**
I will ensure that the public is heard and the interests of Metro Vancouver, the Province and UBC are balanced. If I am not satisfied with the level of consultation undertaken by UBC, with the public process employed and/or with specific parts of the plan, I can choose to not adopt the land use plan.

Thank you, again, for your letter. I look forward to working with you in the coming months.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Honourable Ben Stewart  
Minister

Enclosure
pc: Honourable Moira Stilwell
Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development

Mr. Dale Wall
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Community and Rural Development

Mr. Stephen Owen, Vice President
External, Legal and Community Relations
University of British Columbia
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Dear UNA Board of Directors and Ms. Fialkowski:

Re: Correction to the UNA Board Minutes

Sorry to be a nuisance, but I just reviewed April and May UNA Board minutes and wish to draw a couple of points to your attention since the issue of governance at UBC is a sensitive one. First, prior to the May Board meeting when April minutes were to be approved, I raised three concerns but only one is reflected in the May amendments. The following points are not reflected and I would appreciate formal acknowledgement and correction to the minutes at the next UNA Board Meeting on September 14th and the next Governance Committee Meeting on September 16th.

First, the second paragraph of the April minutes, item 5a, reflects comments of the UNA Board rather than my own report. It was UNA Board members and not I who reported that, “UNA Residents are happy with the status quo and the UNA Board has developed strong communications with the university to resolve issues of UNA concern. The UNA Board expects UNA residents to make decisions that affect the governance of their ‘city’. This change is being driven by Metro Vancouver and does not seem to be in the interests of the community. Nancy Knight indicated that UBC has put forward the views of students, UBC and UNA to the Provincial Government.”

Second, the record of my report does state that, “The Province is now considering options regarding legislative changes for UBC”, however, it excludes a very important key message about UNA self-governance, namely that the UNA Board and residents should consider whether they wish to represent themselves to the province rather than relying on UBC and Metro Vancouver to do so on their behalf.

Lastly, it would be helpful to include a note under Item 5a of the April minutes to indicate that they were amended prior to approval in May.

In closing, I wish to reiterate that my report last April, and particularly the report about UNA self-governance, was conveyed with the best of intentions and support for the UNA community. It is this commitment to the community that makes it so important to make sure that my message is set straight for the record books.

Sincerely,

Maria Harris
Director, Electoral Area A
Metro Vancouver
604-225-2254
mariaharris@telus.net
MH/ms

cc: UNA Governance Committee
Metro Vancouver Electoral Area Committee
Christina DeMarco, Regional Development Division Manager, Metro Vancouver
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September 1, 2010

Johnny Carline, Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer
Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Dear Mr. Carline,

RE: Montizambert Wynd Request For Fire Protection Service

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 11, 2010 regarding the request from the Metro Vancouver Electoral Area Committee for additional information on the District of West Vancouver’s decision to decline the request for fire protection services to homes located on Montizambert Wynd.

Please find enclosed a copy of the letter to Catharine Johnston that contains the significant reasons for the decision to decline the request. I am not able to elaborate further on the information provided in my original response.

Yours truly,

Jim Cook, Fire Chief

JC/mc

cc: Grant McRadu, Chief Administrative Officer, District of West Vancouver
July 06, 2010

Catharine Johnston
10 Montizambert Wynd
West Vancouver, BC V7W 1R8

Dear Catharine,

RE: January 23, 2010 Letter: Request for Fire Protection Services

On behalf of Mayor and Council, I am writing in response to your letter written on behalf of yourself and the residents of Montizambert Wynd dated January 23, 2010 requesting fire protection services.

The District of West Vancouver has considered your request and has decided that Fire Protection services will not be provided to the residents of Montizambert Wynd. This decision was mainly due to safety issues related to access and egress for fire personnel and emergency apparatus and the absence of an adequate water supply in the area.

I regret that more encouraging news is not forthcoming.

Sincerely,

Jim Cook, Fire Chief

Cc: Mayor and Council
    Grant McRadu, CAO
    Joan McIntyre, MLA
    Maria Harris, Metro Vancouver