



Public Hearing Record

FOR THE UBC LAND USE PLAN

NOVEMBER 7, 2023



Summary of Speaker Submissions

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

LAND USE PLAN PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Minutes from a Public Hearing held on Tuesday November 7, 2023 in the Jack Poole Hall at the University of British Columbia Alumni Center, 6163 University Blvd, Vancouver, BC.

PRESENT: Noha Sedky, External Professional Planner, **Chair**
Alison Brewin, UBC Board of Governors
Robin Ciceri, Vice President, External Relations, UBC
Brent Elliot, External Professional Planner
Byron Thom, UBC Board of Governors
Michael White, Associate Vice-President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC

ALSO PRESENT: Chris Fay, Director, Strategic Policy, Campus and Community Planning, UBC
Joanne Proft, Associate Director, Campus and Community Planning, UBC
Haely Lindau, Elevate Corporate Consulting, Committee Clerk

There were approximately 250 members of the public in attendance in person and online. A full recording of the public hearing is available here: <https://campusvision2050.ubc.ca/lup-hearing-recording>

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone, introduced herself, advised that she was appointed by the Chair of UBC's Board of Governors as one of the two external professional planners to the Board's Public Hearing Committee, and called the Public Hearing to order at 4:00 p.m.

A Musqueam land acknowledgement was made.

The attendees were advised that the Public Hearing was being livestreamed online and that the face, name and/or comments of all speakers, both online and in-person, may be captured by the livestream.

2. Purpose of the Hearing

The Chair noted that the Public Hearing was convened under the authority of the statutes, regulations and ministerial orders of the province of British Columbia.

The Chair further noted that the purpose of the Hearing was to receive comments from the public on the proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan for the University of British Columbia (UBC) Point Grey Campus lands.

Finally, the Chair noted that anyone with an interest in the Land Use Plan amendments would be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard and advised that following the Hearing, all comments will be forwarded, by the Committee, to the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors will consider all Public Hearing feedback when making a decision to submit the amended Land Use Plan to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for adoption.

3. Roll Call

The Chair stated that the Members of the Public Hearing Committee were established in the Provincial Ministerial Order M229, dated August 18, 2010, and noted that a copy of the Order was available at the registration table.

Public Hearing Committee Members in attendance included:

- Board of Governors Member: Byron Thom – PRESENT
- Board of Governors Member: Alison Brewin – PRESENT
- Chair of the Board of the University Neighbourhoods Association:
Richard Watson – ABSENT
- Vice President, External Relations, UBC: Robin Ciceri – PRESENT
- Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC:
Michael White – PRESENT
- External Professional Planner appointed to the Committee by the Chair of UBC's Board of Governors: Brent Elliot – PRESENT
- External Professional Planner appointed to the Committee by the Chair of UBC's Board of Governors: Noha Sedky – PRESENT

The Chair declared that, with the conclusion of the roll call, a quorum was present, and the Committee was duly constituted for the purposes of the Public Hearing.

4. Review of Procedure and Conduct

The Chair informed the Hearing of the following items:

- Individuals are allowed to join the speaker's list at any time until the end of the Hearing via the website campusvision.ubc.ca/lup or by visiting the registration desk which was located at the entrance to the room.
- Once registered, all speakers will be given a speaker's list queue number and called to speak in the queue order.
- All speakers were asked to begin by clearly stating their name, and indicate if they are a student, faculty, staff member, resident, alumni or have another affiliation with UBC, such as a neighbour.
- All information gathered is done so in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Any questions regarding the collection of their personal information, should be directed to Madeleine Zammar, Engagement Manager at Campus & Community Planning, UBC.

- Each speaker will be given a maximum of five (5) minutes to speak, or ten (10) minutes if the speaker requires and provides a translator. The speaking time limit ensures that all have an opportunity to be heard.
- Each speaker may speak only once.

5. Written Comments

The Chair outlined the guidelines for written comments and noted the following:

- All interested parties, including speakers, may make a written submission online.
- All written submissions must be delivered online before the conclusion of the Public Hearing.
- All written submissions will be retained by UBC, and copies of submissions will be available on the campusvision.ubc.ca/lup website.
- Additional assistance is available at the registration desk or via the registration email.

6. Reporting on the Public Hearing Notice and the Interim Record

The Director, Strategic Policy, Campus and Community Planning, UBC reported that the Public Hearing for the Land Use Plan was publicized in the following manner:

- Notice was posted in the October 31st and November 1st editions of the Vancouver Sun and Province newspapers.
- Notice was posted online in the Ubyyssey, Campus Resident, newsletters issued by the Alma Mater Society and Campus and Community Planning, and on social media.
- Notice was posted on large-format boards at the Wesbrook Village Community Centre and near the plaza outside the Alumni Centre.
- 7,680 notices were mailed via Canada Post to the addresses within all UBC neighbourhoods and those in the University Endowment Lands within 30 meters of the campus boundary.
- Notices were posted in the lobbies of student residences.
- Notification was included at an information session, which was held November 1, 2023 from 4:00-6:00pm, in the lobby of the Alumni Centre.

With respect to the correspondence and written submissions received prior to the start of the Public Hearing, there were a total of 20 written submissions received by the November 2nd 2023 5:00 p.m. deadline. These are included in the Interim Record posted on the Campus and Community Planning website.

7. Presentation

The Director, Strategic Policy, Campus and Community Planning, UBC presented a summary of the proposed Land Use Plan Amendments.

- Over the past two years, UBC has undertaken the Campus Vision 2050 process to develop a 30-year vision for the campus lands. The Land Use Plan amendments are

required to implement that Vision, as well as the parallel update to UBC's Housing Action Plan, the university's housing affordability strategy.

- The Land Use Plan is a provincially approved regulatory guide to how the UBC Point Grey campus' will grow and change over the next 30 years. Provincial adoption of the proposed Land Use Plan amendments enables UBC to commit to Campus Vision 2050 and the proposed Housing Action Plan.
- The Public Hearing is the final phase of a nearly two-year long engagement process, UBC's most extensive land use engagement ever, which included 13,000 touchpoints with faculty, students, staff, residents, partner organizations, and First Nations, including Musqueam.
- Feedback from the engagement and Public Hearing will be presented to UBC's Board of Governors when the Board considers submitting the Land Use Plan to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for adoption.
- Schedule A of the Land Use Plan sets out campus land uses. The amendments adjust these land uses to implement Campus Vision 2050, including expanding green academic land on the Totem Fields and in south campus, and expanding neighbourhood boundaries in Westbrook Place, Hawthorn Place, Stadium and Acadia areas, which will be developed over the next 30 years.
- Schedule B is a new addition to the Land Use Plan. It includes the maximum growth in these future neighbourhoods, to be developed over the next 30 years, and reflects a 20% increase to the amount of neighbourhood housing above UBC's current Land Use Plan. Over 30 years, this is projected to approximately double UBC's campus neighbourhood population to 35,700.
- The amended Land Use Plan also includes policies to shape this growth, including affordable housing requirements, amenity requirements, building heights, biodiversity and ecology measures, and climate action initiatives.
- The Land Use Plan also includes implementation commitments, such as ongoing update to the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan, more detailed academic and neighbourhood planning, and Musqueam and community engagement
- The Public Hearing Committee will report back to the Board of Governors on feedback heard this evening, expected at the December 5th, 2023 Board meeting.
- The Board of Governors may endorse, decline, or further amend the Land Use Plan. If the Board amends the Land Use Plan to change the land uses discussed above, or to decrease or increase the density, another Public Hearing is required.
- If the Board approves submitting the LUP, and the Province adopts it, the Board can formally approve Campus Vision 2050 and the Housing Action Plan.
- At the same time, UBC is updating its Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan and preparing for an update to the Westbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan.

8. Speakers

- 8.1 Bridgette Clarkston, faculty, and resident:** The speaker acknowledged the work on the Plan but stated that the current plan has fundamental issues arising from prioritizing

profit above all other items. She appealed to the Board of Governors to demand amendments to the Plan for their legacy to UBC. Specific concerns noted included:

- The proposed population increase and the lack of a concrete plan that includes specific, enforceable targets for biodiversity and climate action leadership.
- The lack of quantifiable guidelines for tree canopy coverage.
- The Plan does not include language that will require all new development to adhere to the forthcoming Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan (NCAP) policies.
- The Plan does not act in the best interests of the university, as required by the University Act.
- The lack of affordable housing for students, faculty, and staff will have a negative impact on recruitment.

8.2 Brad Powers, faculty, and resident: The speaker stated that the financial model used for the Plan was shortsighted and focuses on short term cash flow. He noted that the current and continuing financial model uses Provincial resources, and that it should be revised to not exacerbate the affordability crisis. He further noted:

- Affordable student housing should be prioritized and then affordable housing for faculty and staff. There should be no more market housing which is driving the short term cash flow.
- A long term cash flow plan should be the focus.
- The provincial restrictions on UBC borrowing money for student housing should be revisited.

The Chair requested that staff respond to the questions around borrowing for student housing.

Staff reported that the provincial government has a moratorium on post-secondary institutions taking on debt. UBC has had many discussions with the Provincial Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Post-Secondary Education looking for an opportunity to borrow money for student housing but has not been successful. Staff asserted that UBC is fortunate that it has the Endowment to assist with financing student housing.

8.3 Connor Kerns, faculty, and resident: The speaker expressed concerns that the Plan had fundamental issues with housing affordability, environmental sustainability, and accountability to the community and requested that the Board reject the Plan. Her specific concerns with the Plan included:

- The lack of affordable housing for students, faculty, and staff and the negative impact it will have on recruitment.
- The lack of clear, measurable targets to address the climate emergency and no targets to reduce adverse effects. The speaker cited a recent UBC ecological study that concluded that over 50% of the campus soft landscapes are already in low or very low ecological condition. The Plan aims to double the population

and increase building heights but does not include language to address the environmental effects or how they will be mitigated.

- The Plan proposes a reduction in usable open space in the neighbourhoods to a level below World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations.
- The lack of a plan for infrastructure to support the proposed larger community which will be the size of Port Moody.

The Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC requested that staff provide information regarding uses of the Endowment.

Staff advised that the land development proceeds have been placed into the Endowment and are used for infrastructure and amenities, building student housing, and faculty home ownership programs. The money in the Endowment generates income which is added to the UBC operating budget to support things like new academic buildings and student financial aid.

8.4 Corrine Larson, resident: The speaker passionately voiced concerns regarding the Plan's lack of consideration for residents' current, and future, livability and noted the following:

- The regulations on commercial spaces do not promote innovation or entrepreneurship.
- The Plan does not address the need for more services such as hardware stores, grocery stores, transportation, parking, traffic planning, community spaces, and washrooms.

The Chair requested that staff provide information regarding UBC's transportation plan.

Staff advised that a comprehensive plan for future transportation has been developed, a business case for the UBC SkyTrain Extension is being developed with the province, and that UBC is working with TransLink to improve the network. This is all included in the Land Use Plan and further plans to ensure traffic is managed will be developed through the Campus Plan and neighbourhood plans.

The Chair requested that staff provide an overview of the engagement process that was undertaken as part of the Land Use Plan.

Staff reported that through the 18-month engagement process input and feedback was collected from stakeholders and is included in the Engagement Summary Report that will be part of the expected December Board of Governors report. Staff updated Campus Vision 2050, the Housing Action Plan, and the Land Use Plan to reflect stakeholder input throughout the process.

8.5 Kate Rho, alumni, and staff member: The speaker advised the Hearing that the lack of affordable housing on campus meant that she had a long commute to UBC. This placed

limitations on her ability to participate in important extracurricular activities on campus and get good grades. She further noted the following:

- The Plan does not address the importance of affordable housing for equitable education for marginalized and vulnerable groups that are unable to commute to UBC.
- The Plan should prioritize student and staff housing over market development and should increase housing for students and staff while following the Climate Action Plan.
- UBC should decouple the Land Use Plan from its revenue model.
- The Plan should not be approved until ecological reports and recommendations from sustainability experts are released and the findings are integrated into the revised Plan.

8.6 Lacey Samuels, faculty: The speaker urged the Board of Governors to decline the plan noting that it places the interests of investors ahead of students and staff. The speaker acknowledged the work of the team but made the following statements:

- The Plan does not address the housing crisis at UBC.
- Currently only 45% of homes on campus are occupied by residents.
- The Plan does not mitigate climate change and recommends adding more residents to environmentally degraded areas.
- The lack of governance oversight must be resolved before adding more residents.

8.7 Michael Kerns, resident, staff, and student: The speaker advised the Hearing that he has grave concerns with the Plan as it stands. Specific items noted included:

- Lack of housing affordability affects recruitment and retainment of staff and students.
- Concerns about sustainability, the impact on the local ecology, sewage plans, bird migration patterns, wind patterns, and erosion from runoff.
- A new governance structure for the campus and its residents is needed.

The Chair requested that staff respond to the question regarding sewage plans and the impact of tall buildings on bird migration.

Staff reported that UBC collaborated with Metro Vancouver in developing the Plan, and UBC growth projections have been factored into Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy and sewage service plans. Staff also noted UBC's Bird-Friendly Design Guidelines will be followed for all growth.

8.8 Wren Zhu, resident: The speaker noted that the population proposed in the Land Use Plan is equivalent to that of Port Moody but in half the space. Additional concerns noted by the speaker include:

- The Plan's lack of affordable housing will have a negative impact on recruitment and is not in the best interest of UBC.
- The Plan does not include enough indoor public space or critical services such as medical facilities and grocery stores.
- The Plan does not address the environmental degradation it will cause.

8.9 Eagle Glassheim, faculty, and resident: The speaker noted the challenge in finding the right balance between short and long term growth and sustainability. The speaker further noted the following:

- The Plan does not include targets, strategies for measurability, guidelines, and recommendations to ensure that UBC honours its Climate Action Plan, and appears to prioritize money over climate action and sustainability.
- Indigenous reconciliation should be one of the foundations of the Plan.
- At least 50% of the proposed accommodation should be affordable housing for students and faculty.

The Chair requested that staff provide information regarding the Climate Action Plan.

Staff reported that the Land Use Plan commits to working towards the targets and policies of UBC's institutional Climate Action Plan, as well as the updated NCAP. The neighbourhood climate plan has been in place since 2013 and the update will be finalized in 2024.

8.10 Mohkam Singh Malik, student: The speaker voiced a concern that the Plan prioritizes profit over students and the environment. He further noted:

- The proposed 3300 new student housing units equates to 1% of the housing on campus.
- The Plan does not address the affordability crisis, nor does it address the housing crisis and continued student population growth.
- The Plan will cause a multitude of environmental problems and does not include enough green spaces to meet the minimum requirements of the World Health Organization (WHO).

The Chair requested that staff report on the Plan's projected student housing.

Staff reported that the Plan enables future student housing growth but does not commit to the number of student housing beds. Staff further noted that the student housing commitment comes from UBC's Housing Action Plan and is dependent on UBC's financial capacity. The Housing Action Plan can be amended to respond to changing opportunities and needs. The draft of the Housing Action Plan commits to 3300 new student housing beds, which is approximately a 25% increase on what is currently available.

- 8.11 Olive Huang, student:** The speaker voiced a concern that the Plan does not include enough housing for the growing population. She further noted that the majority of the housing proposed in the Plan is not affordable and the Plan will maintain barriers preventing students from being adequately housed. Finally, she noted that the Plan not only ignores the needs of the students but will also harm them.
- 8.12 Claire England, resident:** The speaker noted this is a once in a lifetime opportunity for UBC to become a world leader for housing stability and environmental protection and the Plan does not embrace this opportunity. The following specific concerns were noted:
- The Plan does not address the housing crisis with 70% of the housing to be sold at unaffordable prices. The speaker recommended at least 50% affordable housing.
 - The Plan will increase UBC's population to the size of Port Moody. However, governance and representation have not been considered. A meaningful avenue for civic representation is necessary.
 - The Plan should include stronger language, real commitments, and measurable policies in the NCAP to address the impact on the environment.
- 8.13 Oluwakemi Ola, faculty:** The speaker passionately advised the Hearing that she is appalled that this Plan is the best that UBC could do. She noted that the land is stolen and offered her opinion in recognition of the land's history. Specific concerns noted include:
- The Plan further marginalizes people and creates barriers for UBC's students. A 3300 bed increase will not alleviate the housing problem. 70% of the housing should be built for students, faculty, and staff.
 - It appears that developing the Plan is more important than developing the people.
 - The Plan does not address environmental concerns.
 - We need an equitable solution. We need to create a better future. When do we prioritize lives over the bank?
- 8.14 Ryan Jaco, former resident:** The speaker encouraged the Committee to put the Plan on hold until the NCAP has been solidified and encouraged bold actions for the environment. The speaker further noted:
- A data driven climate action plan is essential to ensure that UBC is doing its best to protect the land and the people living on it.
 - The Plan lacks proactive planning in response to the heat dome. A NCAP must be in place before the Land Use Plan is solidified.
 - Lack of response from the UBC and UBC Properties Trust regarding an 18,000-signature petition about the coning of a campus neighbourhood eagle's nest reduces confidence in UBC's ability to listen proactively.

Alison Brewin, UBC Board of Governors requested that staff report on the role of UBC Properties Trust in the Land Use Plan.

Staff reported that the Land Use Plan is the responsibility of the UBC Board of Governors. UBC Properties Trust is the university's vehicle to develop projects that are implemented under the Plan.

- 8.15 Estefania Milla-Moreno, alumni, employee:** As a former resident of Acadia Park the speaker voiced strong concerns regarding the Plan's omission of a policy to address the vulnerability of students and noted that tenancy rights for students should be a top priority.

The Chair requested that staff report on students' rights according to the Residential Tenancy Act.

Staff reported that in 2002 the provincial government excluded all university- and college-owned student housing from the Residential Tenancy Act, and tenant rights are described in the housing agreements between students and the university.

- 8.16 Oliver Dicks, resident, researcher:** The speaker advised the Hearing that the Plan does not serve UBC's primary goal which is its academic mission. Additional concerns noted included:
- The addition of 3300 new beds is not enough. UBC currently has housing for 23% of its population. The Plan commits to increase this to 25%. He asked why this goal is not 100% and noted that the housing crisis limits UBC's ability to attract students and faculty.
 - Increasing UBC's commitment to affordable housing will help housing prices throughout Vancouver.
 - The Plan does not commit to the sustainability goals of the City of Vancouver and does not address green space and tree cover. The NCAP should be in place before the Land Use Plan and the Plan should commit to the goals of the NCAP.

*** 5:59 p.m. to 6:18 p.m.**

The Hearing adjourned for a break

- 8.17 Olav Slaymaker, retired faculty:** The speaker expressed concerns that the Plan does not include climate change mitigation strategies, nor does it include a framework for measuring the Plan's social and cultural impacts. The speaker suggested that determining the size of the campus (i.e. the campus footprint) that would minimize destruction and consideration of degrowth as an option.
- 8.18 Patrick M. Condon, faculty:** The speaker advised that it is time to stop the privatization of public assets, referencing UBC's leasehold housing model. He noted that only a small portion of the Plan's housing is for students, faculty and staff and asked the Board to

radically increase affordable housing for students, faculty, and staff. The speaker further noted that he is delivering a petition signed by 200 faculty members calling for a new approach to affordable housing.

8.19 Murray McCutcheon, resident, alumni: The speaker stated that the Plan is based on a failing model of development, premised on profit over priorities that protect the public. He encouraged the Committee to think outside the box to create a new development model that addresses the needs of the community and the environment. He further noted the following:

- In the midst of climate emergency, the Plan is being rushed through before a neighbourhood climate plan is in place.
- The proposed residential density will be greater than that of downtown Vancouver.
- It appears that UBC set a revenue goal and the plan is working around that.
- Input from the University Neighbourhood Association (UNA) was not considered in the Plan.

8.20 Sklyer Sauer, student: The speaker noted the that the Plan does not adequately address the housing crisis and affordability and stated that 90-100% of the accommodation at UBC should be affordable housing. Additionally, he noted the following items:

- The Plan should not be finalized before the NCAP is completed. The proposed plan may be fine for the next five years but not for the next 30 years.
- The Plan does not address Indigenous issues.
- Lack of governance is a core problem. The residents are not able to vote on what happens in their community. It is not possible for the Board of Governors to effectively manage the Plan when they are not accountable to people that live in the area.

The Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC requested that staff provide information regarding the Land Use Plan's role for student housing.

Staff advised that the UBC Housing Action Plan outlines how UBC uses its land and financial resources to provide affordable housing. An updated Housing Action Plan will be presented to the Board of Governors in December 2023. It includes a commitment to 3300 new student housing beds as a priority. If new financial opportunities emerge, the Housing Action Plan commits to revisiting the 3300-bed target and updating it. The Land Use Plan has the capacity to deliver more housing but an issue with financial constraints exists.

The speaker responded that the core problem is that the governance strategy does not make sense.

Alison Brewin, UBC Board of Governors advised that the structure of the Board of Governors is similar to nonprofit organizations in BC. At UBC, all Board members are volunteers. The majority of the Board are appointed by the provincial government and the remainder are elected by faculty, staff and students.

- 8.21 Rebecca Todd, faculty, and resident:** The speaker expressed concerns that the Plan prioritizes short term development over people and the environment and is incompatible with UBC's mission. The speaker further noted the following:
- Excellence in research and teaching relies on getting people to come to UBC and the high cost of living is an impediment. The obstacles to recruitment are insurmountable directly thwarting the goal of fostering excellence.
 - Resident representation on the Board of Governors, to ensure residents are involved in decision making, is necessary and has not been addressed in the Plan.
 - Prior to being approved, the Plan should extend the UBC Climate Action Plan to the UBC neighbourhoods.

The Chair requested that staff provide clarification on NCAP in the neighbourhoods.

Staff reported that UBC has two different climate action plans. One for the neighbourhoods and one for UBC on the academic lands. A neighbourhood climate action plan has been in place since 2013 and is currently being updated. The Land Use Plan includes some commitments that will be in the NCAP, and others that will address non-land use issues such as waste and transportation.

The speaker noted that the Land Use Plan is going forward without the NCAP in place.

The Chair requested that staff provide a commentary on the sequence of the NCAP and the Land Use Plan.

Staff reported that the greenhouse gas emissions in UBC's neighbourhoods are estimated to be half of the per capita regional average. This reflects the land use decisions that UBC has made. The Land Use Plan is a critical part of the NCAP which is an evolving document. The NCAP is expected to be finalized by mid-2024 and will shape Land Use Plan implementation.

- 8.22 Jennifer Klenz, faculty:** The speaker acknowledged the work on the Plan but noted that producing a plan that addresses the housing crisis, the climate, and Indigenous interests does not align with making a profit. She encouraged the Committee to stop prioritizing development over the environment and further noted the following:
- A recent study reports that the campus is degraded, and the Plan will make it worse. The Plan should focus on the maximum population size that can be supported without additional degradation.

- The Plan should be in the best interests of the university and should include at least 70% affordable housing.
- UBC is the home to world leaders in climate change research. The Plan provides no quantifiable strategy related to ecology and biodiversity with only a vague target to identify, enhance, and manage important areas of biodiversity on campus.
- The Plan does not meet the City of Vancouver's commitment to increasing tree canopy cover to 40%.

8.23 Vicky Baker, staff: The speaker noted that the details in the Plan, including selling land for profit, do not align with UBC's principles. She further noted the following concerns:

- The Plan does not include infrastructure or adequate governance.
- The Plan does not include language on the Musqueam rights and decision making power.
- The market housing is not in line with the UBC community's needs.
- The NCAP should be completed before the Land Use Plan is finalized. The long term impact on the environment should be considered.
- The Plan focuses on the profitability of the land and does not consider UBC's responsibility to the land and the pressure that is put on it to deliver resources now and for future generations.

The Chair requested that staff provide clarification regarding Musqueam's role in the Land Use Plan.

Staff advised that consultations with Musqueam started in 2021 and included nearly 120 staff and leadership meetings, information exchanges, and community events. The engagement included co-developed engagement principles, consultation on growth, identification of potential impacts from the Plan on Musqueam interests, and strategies to manage those impacts.

8.24 [Name redacted at speaker request], resident and faculty: The speaker noted that if UBC contributes to market housing, it is adding to Vancouver's high housing prices. He further noted the relationship between market prices/revenue and the Endowment; whereby higher housing costs (which the speaker attributed to market housing) require higher subsidies, bursaries, scholarships etc. to be generated from the Endowment. According to the speaker, the focus on market housing and its revenue was the start of this cycle. Additional concerns noted include:

- Traffic issues will increase with increased density.
- UBC's history of pushing plans through too quickly has resulted in a sense of mistrust in the neighbourhood.

8.25 E David Klonsky, faculty: The speaker noted that the Plan is a contradiction to what UBC stands for and does not hold the decision makers accountable. He further noted:

- The Plan does not address the housing and affordability crisis for students, faculty and staff and stated that this has resulted in the loss of world class tenured faculty and graduates at UBC.
- Construction noise to build the new buildings should be considered.
- He did not agree with the decision to cone an eagle's nest to facilitate the building of for profit townhomes.

The Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC requested that staff provide information regarding uses of the proceeds from the sale of land.

Staff advised that UBC is a nonprofit and makes significant revenue from the land. The money from land development goes into the Endowment and is used to build student housing and provide low-interest faculty home ownership loans. Income from land Endowment investments is used to support academic capital projects, research, scholarships, bursaries, and UBC's rent-geared-to-income housing program for low- and moderate-income staff and faculty, along with other academic priorities.

The speaker responded that the foundation and decision making is wrong and unfair and sidesteps the points that are being made.

The Chair noted that the Public Hearing process follows provincial regulations. The broader engagement process included many other opportunities for feedback, and it is hoped that the participants felt their input was heard.

A Hearing participant noted that some speakers were no longer in attendance because they thought that the Hearing ended at 6:00 p.m.

Staff reported that no timeline was in place for the Public Hearing. A Public Hearing continues until all speakers have been heard.

The Chair apologized if there was misunderstanding about the Hearing timeline and noted that the opportunity for speakers to register until the Hearing closes is available. She further noted that the Hearing will run until all speakers are heard or, if all speakers are not heard before approximately 10:45 p.m., the Hearing will adjourn and resume the next day at 4:00 p.m. Finally, she noted that anyone interested in speaking is invited to sign in and/or submit written submissions.

8.26 Andrew Owen, faculty, and resident: The speaker noted that through consultation with stakeholders, serious flaws were repeatedly raised but this did not influence the Plan. He noted the following:

- The Plan should focus on sustainability and affordable housing for students, faculty, and staff. The university is losing exceptional faculty members because they cannot afford the housing.
- The Plan does not support UBC's academic mission, equity for students and the maintenance of excellent staff.

8.27 Sarah Brown, alumni, former resident: The speaker raised concerns about the lack of voice that residents had in the Plan, people were unaware of the consultation process and the needs assessment is not reflected in the Plan. She also passionately voiced her concern about the future of Acadia Park family student housing and noted the many benefits of living there.

The Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning, UBC requested that staff provide information regarding the future of Acadia Park.

Staff advised that in 15-20 years, a portion of student family housing in Acadia Park is expected to be affected by development. The housing that would be impacted will be part of the future planning process in the townhouse area. Information regarding what makes Acadia Park successful will be used to redevelop the existing buildings into higher density family housing.

8.28 Monica Lambton, resident: The speaker noted that the Plan has many encouraging points but it is not sufficiently ambitious or detailed to meet today's requirements and will not be adequate for 2050. She further noted that:

- The Plan does not sufficiently demonstrate that it will be up to the task of creating a sustainable community.
- The Plan is inflexible and much of what the Plan proposes is challenging and untested on a larger scale. It does not include avenues to submit questions about unforeseen impacts, specific concerns, or lack of adherence to the plan.
- The Plan does not include confidence-building measures and does not show how transparency has been built in.

8.29 Angela Low, alumni, former resident: The speaker noted the value of living in Acadia Park and hopes that future families will be given the opportunity to have subsidized housing and access to green space. She noted that these things were not considered in the Plan. She further noted that mental health should be addressed in the Plan as well with a goal of students thriving not just coping.

8.30 Carly Hilbert, resident, student, and staff: The speaker voiced concerns around the insufficiency of the Plan's proposed 3300 student housing beds with 75% of the housing for wealthy people with no connection to UBC. Additional concerns noted:

- The Plan is based on revenue not people and the environment. UBC is not a landlord.

- How UBC will cope with being a small city. There is currently a shortage of schools, hospitals and transit, the Plan does not outline how it will meet the increased needs of the community.
- The Plan is not considering environmental concerns and is recommending just over half of the recommended greenspace. An eagle's nest has been disrupted to build luxury homes. We should respect the land that we are on.

8.31 Jen McCutcheon, resident, alumni: The speaker raised a concern that the Plan is doubling UBC's population without considering governance structure. She further noted:

- The Plan lacks accountability and does not consider the rapid population growth.
- The planning and approval process is disconnected from the residents. The University Neighbourhoods Association Board only has advisory capacity.
- If UBC is not going to get into the business of running a city, then changes need to be made before the plan is fully implemented to ensure that a city of 37,000 people can operate effectively and with a system of governance that allows for some level of accountability from residents.

8.32 [Name redacted at speaker request], resident: The speaker voiced concerns that the Plan does not include guidelines regarding governance of the proposed relatively large city at UBC. He further noted concerns about the plan to turn UBC into a development corporation.

***8:05 – 8:21 p.m.**

The Hearing adjourned for a break

The Chair apologized for the confusion regarding the Hearing times and noted that the notice of the Public Hearing did not include an end time. The Hearing will resume tomorrow if any speakers do not have a chance to speak this evening. She advised that speakers that were registered and had not yet spoken will be contacted by staff and notified that the Hearing is ongoing and they can speak, before the end of the Hearing, either in person or virtually. She further noted that written submissions will be accepted until the conclusion of the Hearing.

8.33 [Name redacted at speaker request], student: The speaker noted that Wesbrook housing is unaffordable. Graduate students have to choose between a long commute or living in very poor conditions. UBC is being built for rich people and grad students are given the message that they don't belong. He further noted that when he lived on campus many of the housing units were empty.

8.34 Jorge Hollman, resident, and alumni: The speaker acknowledged that the Plan was prepared by competent people, but it does not reflect the needs of the students and residents. He further noted:

- The community needs proper governance and representation and should have a foundation rooted in respecting the residents.
- New funding options for housing delivery need to be explored.
- The Plan should be good for the community for many generations.

8.35 Mary O'Connor, faculty: The speaker noted that she is a professor in the Zoology Department and works on biodiversity research. Her faculty depends on the campus's outdoor spaces and teaching spaces. She stated that the Plan directly undermines the University's academic mission by undermining the ability to sustain leadership in biodiversity education and she voiced a concern that the Plan does not show that due diligence in the area of biodiversity has been conducted. She further noted:

- The Plan perpetuates a disconnection from the land.
- High population density takes steep tolls on the ecology, biodiversity, and health.
- The Plan will have a negative effect on recruitment and impact UBC's ability to be a leader in society.
- The Plan should contain clear commitments, definitions and explicit acknowledgement of the ecological costs associated with it. These costs include the credibility of the institution, costs to UBC's reputation, and the damage to UBC's efforts as a university toward reconciliation which is based on knowing the land.

8.36 James Connolly, faculty: The speaker noted that although the Plan represents a robust planning apparatus and a very articulate statement, it creates a generalized sense of discomfort and dissatisfaction. People feel that the priorities are out of balance. He further noted that the primary goal of the Plan appears to be maximizing profit. He suggested removing revenue-based conditions from the process and focusing on balancing social, environmental, and governance goals.

8.37 Christopher Rea, resident, faculty: The speaker noted that if this is not the best plan that UBC can produce then they should go back to the drawing board. He further noted:

- The profit motive should be removed from the Plan.
- The current plan includes rentals funded through leases. Instead of doing this UBC should work with the province to change the rules so UBC can borrow money to invest in student housing.
- UBC should aim for 100% affordable housing for students, faculty, and staff.
- UBC is the steward of the land. Revenue generated from leaseholds is lower than from market rental.
- All issues around UBC's climate policy need to be resolved before finalizing the Plan.

- 8.38 Graham MacDonald, student:** The speaker noted that the housing affordability issue is due to UBC's inability to borrow money for student housing and noted that the requirements should be challenged.
- 8.39 Susan Eadie – resident, alumni, retired faculty:** The speaker noted the following areas of concern and advised that she will also submit a written statement:
- The Plan should prioritize both environmental and human needs which will guide the economic and development goals.
 - The Plan does not address the need for a direct voice from the communities in the decision making discussions for living and working at UBC.
- 8.40 Linda Fong, staff:** The speaker expressed skepticism that the engagement process provided a true representation of the shareholder's input regarding concerns about housing affordability, the environment, removal of green spaces, and governance.
- 8.41 Ishwarjyot Singh, student:** The speaker offered a very personal story regarding being in the position of having to choose rent over food and noted that he often only was able to afford one meal a day due to high housing prices at UBC. He advised the Hearing that he, and the majority of students, are struggling with housing and food insecurity. He further noted:
- Green spaces help with climate resilience.
 - The university should consider ways to build the city that eliminate the need to think about heating or cooling.
 - Food insecurity should be included in the Plan.
 - The Plan should include a policy outlining requirements for green buildings and canopy cover requirements.
- 8.42 Monika Rudwaleit, resident:** The speaker voiced a concern regarding a lack of democratic representation on land use decisions for UBC residents. She further noted that residents should be provided with information on how things are regulated as well as avenues for implementation and enforcement for issues including construction noise, dust and debris, and traffic regulation.
- 8.43 Kamil Kanji, student, resident, and representative for the Alma Mater Society (AMS):** The speaker acknowledged the work that has been put into the development of the Land Use Plan and the years of robust and fair consultation that has gone into it. He noted that the AMS represents 60,000 students and they support increased density beyond the proposed Plan in order to provide at least 50% below market housing for UBC students, faculty, and staff. He further noted that 57% of the students in the AMS annual academic experience survey reported financial hardship related to housing. Students are being forced to move further away from campus and significantly increase commute times which affects their physical, mental, and academic well-being. The AMS also recommends exceeding the 25% full-time student population residing on campus as

set out by the Land Use Plan draft. They hope that the university can accelerate the pace of construction for the student housing portion and expect the university to go above and beyond the current commitments of 3300 beds for students once these units are completed. He noted that increased density will help address the housing crisis. He further noted that the AMS is looking for a commitment to a robust transportation system.

- 8.44 Carolyn Canfield, resident, faculty:** The speaker urged the Board of Governors to reject the Plan as it does not reflect what the university can, and must, do. She further noted:
- The Plan should include planning for unpredictability.
 - More democratic access to decision makers is needed.
 - Once the mistakes are made, they cannot be undone.
- 8.45 Afonso Issa, student:** The speaker encouraged the university to keep valuing humans when considering the complicated balance of economics and humans (especially the more vulnerable people).
- 8.46 Richard Watson, resident:** The speaker noted that he is the Chair of the University Neighbourhoods Association Board and appointed a member of the Public Hearing Committee, that the University Neighbourhoods Association has chosen to not participate on the Committee, and that he was speaking in his capacity as a resident. He encouraged the Board to remove the financial factor and then consider the Plan to see if it makes sense. He further noted:
- Affordability, accessibility, sustainability, and climate action are much more important than market pricing.
 - It is important to consider if it is wise for the university to set a plan with this density.
- 8.47 Ethan Ogrodniczuk, resident, and student:** The speaker noted that this Plan provides an opportunity for the future legacy of the university. He voiced the following concerns with the Plan:
- The Plan does not address UBC's priorities and infrastructure such as hospitals, transit, roads, and grocery stores all of which are already at maximum capacity.
 - The Plan doesn't address how UBC will move forward in a sustainable manner.
- 8.48 Hester Mulhall, resident, and staff:** The speaker noted that allowing the Hearing to run to such a late hour was not a good idea. She also voiced concerns regarding the confusion with communication which led to some people to think that the Hearing ended at 6:00 p.m. Her concerns with the Plan included:
- The Plan leads to more unaffordable housing on campus.
 - The Plan's proposal for an increase in concrete and reduction in green space will have a negative impact on water runoff.
 - The importance of sustainability doesn't show up in the Plan.

8.49 Joshua Kim, student, and interim Vice President AMS: The speaker advised the Hearing that the AMS supports the construction of high density housing on campus and noted that they expect much more than 3300 beds to be constructed on campus to ensure that affordable housing is available for the students who are currently suffering from the housing affordability crisis. He also noted that 50/50 rental to market housing is preferable but understands that that may not be a possibility. He also noted support for the UBC SkyTrain Extension and improved transit to campus.

8.50 Amanda Marc-Ali, student: The speaker voiced a concern about biodiversity and noted that the chain of command has been obscured making it difficult to see where input can be received, and meaningful change can be made. She also voiced the concern that UBC will continue to erode the environment.

At this point, the Chair listed the names of the people on the speaker's list that had not yet spoken and provided them with an opportunity to speak.

8.51 Hal Bradbury, faculty, and resident: The speaker noted that running the meeting so late was not good for anyone and voiced a concern regarding people's confusion regarding the end time being at 6:00. His concerns with the Plan included:

- The Plan should include 100% affordable housing for students, staff, and faculty.
- The climate action guidelines should be clear before approving the Plan and the Plan should include concrete measurable ways to ensure the climate action guidelines are being followed.

8.52 Jaxon Slaney, student: The speaker noted that the engagement with students, for the development of the Plan, was not adequate. She also noted the following concerns with the Plan:

- 3300 new student housing beds are not sufficient for UBC's needs.
- The Plan's growth model is short term and should be based on a long term model.

The Chair noted that at this point all names on the Speakers' List for in-person and online speakers had been heard. She further noted that, next, the staff will play the speaker video submissions and the Chair will then make a final call for other speakers.

8.53 Sonja Saqui, resident, and student: The speaker spoke about the positive aspects of living at Acadia Park and voiced concerns about the future of Acadia. She further noted that:

- The current configuration of Acadia works and should be maintained.
- It is important to consider green spaces and outdoor spaces.
- Supporting the community and families at UBC is invaluable.

- 8.54 Jeff Clune, faculty, and resident:** The speaker voiced a very strong concern that the current Plan will ruin UBC and implored UBC to stop building skyscrapers, noting that more large buildings and less sky will impact the happiness of people and limit recruitment. He further noted that UBC is big enough.
- 8.55 Sarah Benson-Amram, faculty, resident:** The speaker expressed concerns about plans for how the university will support the large population proposed by the Plan. Her additional concerns included:
- The Plan's proposal for greenspace is below the recommendations from the World Health Organization.
 - UBC is already having a difficult time with recruiting and the proposal for 25% affordable housing is not enough.
 - The Plan does not position UBC to lead the way for providing sustainable and equitable nonprofit housing.
- 8.56 Sarah Stevens, faculty:** The speaker voiced concerns that the Plan prioritizes land development and money over people and should instead include additional affordable housing. She further noted that the Plan does not address climate change and encouraged the addition of measurable climate change action.

At this point, the Chair informed the Hearing that all video submissions had been played and all names on the Speakers' List had been heard. She then called for any additional speakers. She called three times for additional speakers and there were none.

Staff advised the Hearing that an estimated 119 written submissions had been received, with the exact number subject to checking for completed online submissions and duplicates. After the Public Hearing's conclusion, staff confirmed receipt of 80 written submissions, which will appear in the Public Hearing Record.

9. Closure

The Chair declared the Public Hearing for the Land Use Plan closed at 10:25 p.m. and advised that there would be no further submissions regarding the proposed Land Use Plan amendments received after this point.

In closing, the Chair noted that the Public Hearing Record will be made available to the public as an attachment to a Board of Governors Report on the Public Hearing, which is expected to be held on December 5th 2023.



Noha Sedky, Chair



Haely Lindau, Clerk

These minutes are certified as being fair and accurate

Written Submissions Received

Written Comment Submissions

The following written comments were typed into the online registration form or emailed as plain text. Written comments were accepted between October 18th, 2023 to the end of the Public Hearing on November 7th, 2023.

Written comments have not been edited other than to redact names, personal identifiable information, and specific information requested by the author.

Aidan Haigh

As a supposed leader in education and as a massive university with Architecture, Urban Planning, Engineering, as well as faculties studying justice and equality in all realms of life including housing, not to mention organizations like campus and community planning, surely UBC has the capacity to come up with much more affordable, equitable, and climate conscious housing. In the plan there is a commitment to building more housing, but so much of the housing already built is sold off to people who do not live and work at UBC. Not only does this contribute to the financial burden carried by students, staff and faculty who have to find other places to live or have to pay increased rents as a result of this competition but this increases the overall carbon footprint of this university by forcing tens of thousands of people into commuting every day (not to mention that staff do not receive a Upass which would encourage them to take transit). Additionally, the cost of housing should not be compared to the market value around UBC, as the West Point Grey area is one of the most expensive places to live in one of the most unaffordable cities in the country. If that is your yardstick, you may as well be fudging the numbers as even below market value is unaffordable for most. Instead of looking to the market to price housing on campus, rents should reflect the amount that staff and faculty are being paid, and the amount students can actually afford to pay. Additionally, UBC needs to seriously reconsider its food offerings on campus. It is unaffordable to eat on campus, whether that be trying to grocery shop, or pick up lunch from somewhere, and the campus is so isolated from the rest of the city that it becomes a food desert for eating affordably. Finally, this plan barely touches on cycling (and other forms of flexible mobility). UBC needs to work with the city of Vancouver to improve the connection between the city and the campus via bike lanes. There are too many bottlenecks and awkward sections that slow down and make a commute by bicycle dangerous. Often, one must choose between either being too close to comfort with cars or taking infrastructure designed for pedestrians. For example cycling to campus via South-West Marine there is no separation between the bike lane and traffic, and although the intersection at Westbrook Mall actually has a bike lane that goes through it, the next intersection at W 16th does not, and cyclists must either attempt to cross two lanes of turning traffic and then take the very tiny shoulder through the intersection, or take the pedestrian crosswalk which is slow and awkward. Neither option is very good when you think of the

constant flow of cars doing 80 km/h during the commuting times. All these awkward and dangerous points add up to make the commute much harder than it needs to be. Similarly, options like going through Pacific Spirit Park are awkward and frustrating as well. The park is primarily designed for pedestrians and dog walkers and they often take up the whole path and look shocked and horrified to see cyclists and so you have to continually slow down to almost a stop to proceed. We must prioritize smooth cycling routes that are away from traffic, distinct from pedestrian spaces and prioritize bikes movement and not the stop-starting at awkward bottlenecks that exist now. If you take the Powerline trail, which is the main artery in the south section of Pacific Spirit Park, towards campus, after the trail ends, your choices are either to take pathways designed primarily for pedestrian use, so there are intersections and narrow sections that force you to slow down or you must take roads without bike lanes - neither are very appealing options. Bike overpasses, separate bike and pedestrian lanes (such as on the Arbutus Greenway) and smooth, linear bike routes should be prioritized as a relatively low cost, environmentally friendly, and healthy way to get people to campus. Then, once on campus we need safe places to lock bikes that don't require every individual to bring their own bike lock (and not just one pilot project somewhere on campus, but multiple convenient locations) and facilities like lockers and showers.

Amanda Haggett

When reading the HAP, I was mainly concerned with the staff housing opportunities. While I do believe that more rental options are a necessity in the current housing market, I couldn't help but notice there is a lack of accessible ways for staff (CUPE, M&P) to own housing in the HAP. In Section 5.2, a majority of the policies cater towards tenure-track faculty and senior management staff, but hardly any are geared towards staff who are not senior management. The only policy is Policy 11, which based on the wording "commit to innovative projects[...]", does not sound actionable or measurable.

If one of the HAP goals is staff retention as mentioned in Section 3.1, then why is there not more of a focus on removing barriers for staff to own a home at UBCV?

Andrea Jones

Role: UBC student and resident

As a UBC postdoctoral fellow, resident doctor, and mother, I am hoping to raise my family and pursue my career with the UBC community. The fundamentals for this are affordable housing, sustainable infrastructure, and healthy, safe community spaces. Unfortunately the 2050 Land Use plan is missing some of these fundamentals of healthy living. I am concerned about the significant increase in population density compared to the existing infrastructure. As a university-centered community, there should be greater than 25% of housing allocated to

student, staff and faculty to facilitate healthy commute and affordability (defined by CMHC as housing cost <30% of salary). In addition, there is no finalized climate action plan or environmental assessment to support this population increase at this time. What is the impact of this population increase in terms of waste management, carbon emissions, and stress on the limited fire, acute response, and healthcare facilities available? Further, I am worried about the significant reduction in open space to 0.5 hectares per 1000 people. This neighbourhood's safe, open green spaces are what drew my family and I to this neighbourhood. Prioritizing affordable, below-market housing, sustainable infrastructure, and thoughtfully designed community spaces are imperative to retain and nurture this diverse academic community. Please incorporate the UNA Submission and UBC Communities for Sustainable Development recommendations into the UBC Land Use Plan immediately. Thank you.

Andrea Patricia Barragan Rivero

The definition of affordable housing is not stated, and the intention to define it is not clear. There is an acknowledgement of the fact that what is currently established is not working well for the UBC community, but there is not a clear pathway on how to address that.

The aim to have 50% of on-campus housing designated for the UBC community is not enough, unless the other 50% was saved for First Nations only. Since that is not the case, all on-campus housing should be exclusively available to people working/studying at UBC and other University Endowment Lands endeavours.

Current below-market housing for faculty and staff is not affordable for a lot of staff/faculty and their needs. Keeping a 25% below market rent is not affordable with the exorbitant rent prices of the area.

Would you consider the rates model for the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP)?

Would you consider Co-Ops for faculty and staff on campus?

Additionally, considering the deplorable provincial and federal support for people with disabilities and the extra financial weight that puts on their family members and caregivers, would you also consider special rental units/costs for single people and families with members living with long-term visible and invisible disabilities?

Given the reliance of UBC and Canada on immigrants to propel the workforce, would you consider on-campus multi-family, dignified and affordable housing that could accommodate some Immigrants' cultural, social and financial responsibilities?

Are you working on a plan to facilitate housing for IBPOC and other minorities who have been historically oppressed and disadvantaged in an attempt to at least strive for equity?

Lastly, is it even worth talking about affordable and equitable housing on campus without a clear commitment to transparency from the UBC Properties Trust?

Andrzej & Irena Wroblewski

Written submission on the Campus Vision 2050:

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed doubling of the number of residents on campus without any concrete plans for the upgrading of the necessary infrastructure to ensure a sustainable community and no further in-depth study of the ecological impact of this growth. We appreciate urgent need for more housing in BC but the size and pace of growth of any single community needs to involve responsible consideration of all the environmental and social consequences.

The plan, as presented, marks new neighbourhoods and buildings but does not indicate locations nor provide designated space for new schools, supermarkets, medical facilities and other commercial spaces necessary to service such an expanded community. The plans are also silent on the improvements to the municipal infrastructure such as water, sewer, and BC Hydro, nor additional fire protection and policing, which will no doubt be required. They do not mention adjustments that will be necessary to the roads to and within the campus to ensure safe and convenient commuting and access to campus facilities.

Vague references that such matters will be eventually addressed in future neighbourhood plans do not instill confidence that the plan has been sufficiently thought through and that it will ensure environmental and social sustainability.

There is also no consideration of the impact of the planned construction on those already residing, studying and working on campus, which will no doubt be very significant given the scale and pace of the proposed expansion. There is no mention in the plan of how the related traffic congestion, noise and pollution will be managed.

Finally, there is no consideration of a governance model appropriate for such a large new town to replace the current practice of a university board acting as an unelected municipal council, where taxpayers have no ability to impact on the decisions critical to their community.

We urge the UBC Board of Governors to postpone approving the new land use plan until these concerns are adequately addressed.

Andrzej and Irena Wroblewski
Hampton Place Residents

Anonymous 1

Please extend the SkyTrain from Arbutus all the way to UBC.

Anonymous 2

I am very worried about the implications of this proposal. As Dr. Tara Martin stated: "I am deeply concerned about how the proposed plan supports the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff and attracts a diverse student body now and going forward." Dr. Anna Kindler summed up another one of my worries: "My concern is also for UBC's academic mission. Taking responsibility of such a large residential community would be a significant mission drift for the university and for the board." This land use plan is a slap in the face to so many who believe that UBC is trying to be a world leader in ecological sustainability. Please take a step back and address the myriad of issues raised by the UBC Communities for Sustainable Development/

Anonymous 3

I am a new PhD student here at UBC and housing affordability is a major issue that nearly prevented me from doing research here. It has taken me months to find affordable housing in the area and one bedroom apartments are almost non-existent. Many other graduate students have had the same struggles and spend well over half of their stipend on housing costs, leaving very little remaining for food (which is also very expensive). 25% of below market housing is simply not enough to meet current needs. Many graduate students commute over an hour to reach campus, which can have a negative impact on their research.

I would also love to see the housing plan address the major lack of pet-friendly housing near UBC and throughout Vancouver. Older students, faculty, and staff are already at a disadvantage because many of us have pets, but very few places allow them and most of the places that do are completely unaffordable for a single person.

Anonymous 4

The proposed land use plan is unacceptable in its current state. The dedication of 75% of new properties to market rate is ludicrous. Students, post docs and staff simply cannot afford to live on or near campus, which creates a massive equity issue. Students and post docs are the backbone of research excellence at UBC and we cannot hope to recruit or retain top candidates when they cannot afford to live in Vancouver. We need more dedicated housing for both undergraduates and graduate students. Furthermore I am concerned about the environmental

impacts of this proposed building increase. Also, the UNA and UEL do not provide municipal services such as animal control or noise bylaws, and doubling the population at UBC without allowing us to be part of metro Vancouver seems foolish.

[NAME REDACTED], Faculty and Campus resident

Anonymous 5

The plan seeks to change the UniverSity to a UniverCity: the focus and detachment required for outstanding Scholarship is lost in the scattered and disparate needs of a Common city. This change began with Hampton Place and has already diluted the prestige and effectiveness of UBC. To make the campus look more like an urban jungle with huge towers and light-deprived streets, and to connect it more easily to the existing concrete landscape that Vancouver has become, is to further dissolve the specialness of UBC into the blandness of a modern North American city.

Look to how the traffic along Marine Drive has changed; look to how many trees have been cut down; look to the distractive nature of the commercial buildings.

Stop this entropic trend and realize that the prime purpose of the university is scholarship, not commerce.

Thank you.

Anonymous 6

The plan does not seem to be doing enough for the student housing shortage. 3300 extra beds does not even account for the number of students currently on the waitlist.

Anonymous 7

I am very disappointed that there is no focused plan to build more student housing. 3000 student beds (including renovations) is not enough. Students should be the primary focus on a University Campus. 15,000 non student residents will not help solve the student housing affordability crisis.

Anonymous 8

As it stands, the current proposed plan cannot be allowed to proceed without further focus on affordability of Housing for Staff and students And it cannot be allowed to proceed without

continued consultation and oversight for overall environmental sustainability. As it stands, this proposal does not ensure the continued growth and wellbeing of future societal knowledge expansion, only a promise to expand and deepen the pockets of the few at the cost of many.

Anonymous 9

As a new UBC resident, I am surprised to see a world leading academic institution be in a position of having prepared voluminous land use planning documents that are unfortunately misaligned with the fundamental housing requirements of its staff, students, and the local UNA neighborhood association.

Please revise the land use plan to realign it in accordance with the forthcoming concerns to be delivered at the November 7, 2023 land use planning public consultation.

Thanks.

Anonymous 10

I am a 4th-year graduate student at UBC in the department of psychology. We live in student housing at UBC and are very grateful for it. With childcare, housing, and work in close proximity, I am able to give my hundred percent to the research that I am doing in order to benefit the broader academic society as well as the industry it can be applied to.

If I did not have the option of student housing, I would not have been able to afford to continue my PhD. I would have had to live out of Vancouver and leave my daughter with her grandparents to be able to afford to commute longer distances. We like going on walks to Pacific Spirit Park, being able to see sports teams practice in the field, and spending quality time together as a family. It also gives my daughter a wholesome space to grow up in. All of this is a boon to our mental health and only possible because of the facilities offered at UBC.

Having said that I shudder to think of a future UBC with not having affordable housing. A 25% commitment to affordable housing is not enough. With sky-rocketing rents in Vancouver, twenty years from now the city will be even more unaffordable. Majority of the students don't make enough to live at Vancouver and now UBC is heading in the same direction.

Is UBC more concerned with making money from private companies than with building a safe, healthy space for all those who work for it? A 25 % commitment is not enough given the population who work for and study on our campus. The committee must promise to do more to preserve our green spaces, family housing for graduate students, and an increase in the percentage of affordable housing.

Anonymous 11

We are very concerned with the plan to grow the community as there is already a lack of services for current residents such as childcare. I currently have a 16 month old and we are still unable to get childcare. We have been on the waitlist for 3 years and counting. Please address the needs of the current population before trying to grow the population such as childcare and schools. If ubc is wanting to future proof itself, having childcare and schools will allow the community to grow and flourish. If we don't offer any of these, we will set families up to fail-like Olympic village and Yaletown.

Anonymous 12

As a resident who owns their home that backs onto the UBC farm, there needs to be consideration to the needs and well-being of residents who live in the vicinity of academic space. What I mean by this is, the Farm hosts live music and festival type parties with no noise restrictions or oversight or regulations by the university. There is no way that this would be allowable in any other municipality, to have amplified music and speakers so close to homes. The level of noise is unsafe, and the parties continue past the time of a typical child's bedtime. Some of these parties are ubc related. Often they are not. There is no consultation wiry the UNA or publication of the events, or limitations to the noise level.

I realize that the neighborhood has changed and the Farm used to be alone in a field. However, there are now thousands of residents who live immediately next to the Farm's party area. With the development of our adjoining community, the needs of the neighborhood for safety and well-being of families inside their homes needs to be considered with the academic spaces. Currently there is no strategy or outlet for residents to get help with noise issues from the farm. With additional residents moving into the neighborhood, it will just impact more residents. The land use plan needs to bring the academic facilities along with the neighborhoods.

Anonymous 13

Hi

My name is [NAME REDACTED]. I'm a Professor at UBC and a campus resident. I've been here since 2010.

I hope the BoG and other parties recognize from the resounding response this community has delivered that the current Campus Plan can and should be a lot better. To approve this proposal without signifiant amendments will invite such discontent among all groups who live, work and study on this campus.

Please ask yourselves why so many people have stood up to ask for a pause so that the plan can be revised to make firmer commitments that prioritizes specific goals that UBC has indicated it wants to champion.

Please ask yourselves whether you think a vision plan that is truly excellent would be met with such concern and objection by so many people who are invested in this university and in this campus.

Just because this has been several years in the making doesn't mean the end result is the best in class or even acceptable. The theme of the many messages delivered is this isn't nearly good enough. To vote in favor of this plan without serious amendments will further erode the very community such a plan is trying to nurture.

If you vote in favor of this plan without substantial amendments then please ask yourself what makes it good enough to justify not working to incorporate the pointed and informed suggestions that have been made by so many on this campus.

Please think about what message you are sending to the people who have spoken out against specific limitations and concerns with this proposal. A community is built from within and can be destroyed from within. The concerns raised by everyone point to the myriad ways in which this community will significantly erode if more care isn't given now to rethinking key parts of this vision for our campus moving ahead.

Please do not vote in support of this plan at this time without significant amendments.

[NAME REDACTED]

Anonymous 14

I'm writing today to share with you my lived experience as a student resident in family housing at UBC (Acadia Park Townhouses). My experience, added to that of thousands of families who have had the fortune of living in Acadia Park, is evidence of the importance to maintain such space and culture on campus for the wellbeing of its student residents, their families and the continued weaving of a diverse, engaged and multicultural UBC community. I moved to Acadia Park in 2009 with a 6 month old baby. My husband was pursuing his Masters and I was on maternity leave from my masters. Moving to Vancouver from a foreign country is challenging, particularly when you don't have a stable support network to have your back in vulnerable periods (e.g., raising young children with financial and academic pressures). However, we found that extended and supportive family in Acadia. We were surrounded by other young families whom with we shared the multiple experiences of: being an international/out-of-province/BC but not local student; living on a student salary, having young children, struggling and enjoying parenting, seeking social support and for many of us, living in a country and a place where a sense of safety, community living, and sharing were unheard of before. Our family grew while

living in Acadia Park, not only we brought to the world another child, but we gained life-long friendships. We lived in Acadia for 12 years: masters, doctoral programs, maternity leaves and a pandemic explain that but also, in my children's words: "It is the best place to grow up, it is magical". In addition, living in Acadia provided us, as a family, with outstanding quality of life (affordability, knowing all our neighbours, ample green spaces, townhouses with appropriate space for children, newborns, occasional visiting grandparents; community activities). It is in this context that, with our student salary, we could focus on our studies while raising a healthy, culturally aware and community minded family. Acadia Park (its layout, our neighbours, the activities) was crucial to maintain our mental and health wellbeing during the challenging years of pursuing graduate studies while raising a young family in one of the most expensive cities in the world, and during a pandemic. I know many families whose experience is similar to ours. While I understand the urgency to build more affordable housing for more families to have this experience, I strongly disagree with reducing green spaces and building towers that mix market and student housing as it will completely destroy the atmosphere that enabled us to successfully find our space as parents, neighbours, students, workers and community members at UBC. What is the LUP prioritizing? The wellbeing and emergence of a vibrant community or the income that market housing could yield? UBC is more and more focused on prioritizing student wellbeing and mental health, well, Acadia Park and student family housing as is, is already quite a successful approach to foster that amongst its community members. Keeping a space where residents (of all ages) know and can trust their neighbours, where they feel a sense of belonging deeply rooted in interaction with the community, is much more valuable for UBC's social fabric, academic production and student recruitment than the financial profit that tall towers, market value condos and reduced recreational spaces are.

Avery Chan

My name is Avery, a student at UBC.

I strongly support the amendments to the Land Use Plan. I believe the plan adequately addresses critical issues facing the campus community, including but not limited to the housing shortage, public transportation, the climate emergency, and reconciliation.

I urge the Board to endorse the amendments as presented. Thank you.

Bridgette Clarkson

My name is Bridgette Clarkston, I am a teaching professor in the Faculty of Science at UBC Vancouver, as well as a resident of the Vancouver campus. I first want to acknowledge the work of Campus and Community Planning and the herculean task of crafting a plan that simultaneously mitigates climate change, lessens the housing crisis, furthers Indigenous

reconciliation and generates profit for the UBC endowment. But that is the task before you. And the current Land Use Plan has fundamental issues stemming, in my opinion, from prioritizing short-term profit of the UBC Endowment Fund over anything else.

My first point: Our university sees itself as a climate change and sustainability leader, saying, for example that we “lead the way in climate action and global impact” as stated in our UBC Forward campaign to donors. But this LUP doesn’t move us forward, it leaves us stuck in the past. For example, this plan is very clear that building height will increase to 39 stories in Wesbrook and the resident neighbourhoods population increase from 15,000 to 35,000. Yet the plan provides no quantifiable strategy related to ecology and biodiversity, with only a vague target to [quote: “Identify, enhance, and manage important areas of biodiversity on campus.”] The city of Vancouver is committed to increasing tree canopy cover to 40% and we can’t even provide any quantified commitment? How is this leadership? This is 2023: we know the importance of tree canopy cover to climate change mitigation, we know that unhealthy ecosystems are unhealthy places to learn, work and live. We also know from the recent baseline ecological assessment that the ecological health of this campus is degraded. Strong leadership is required for its improvement. Treating ecosystem health as, at best, an afterthought is how development was done in the past. This LUP is our leadership document so let’s actually demonstrate climate action leadership and amend this plan to strengthen and quantify the ecology and biodiversity section.

My second point: The University Act mandates that “the members of the board of a university must act in the best interests of the university.” How on earth is it in the best interests of the university, in our current and worsening housing crisis, to commit 60% of new housing to private market-rate development that will be unaffordable to the people who actually study and work here? Yes, we gain immediate profit for the endowment, but long term what do we lose? We are already losing high-quality faculty and student recruits because of our lack of affordable housing; this will only get worse with this LUP. Let’s actually demonstrate sustainability leadership and amend this plan to increase affordable on-campus housing for students faculty and staff.

Finally, my comments are a direct appeal to the Governors. This is your legacy as leaders of UBC, your actions now will have decades-long consequences. This plan is not in the best interests of this university. I implore you, the UBC governors, to demand amendments to the LUP, specifically: 1) To commit to much more than 3300 new student beds over 27 years, 2) to allocate more than 25% of new housing to faculty and staff below-market rental, 3) to put language into the LUP that will require all new development to adhere to the forthcoming NCAP policies, and 4) to commit to specific enforceable targets in the LUP for ecological and biodiversity protection and enhancement.

I love UBC. I am not against development on this campus. I am advocating for sustainable, responsible development which this LUP does not provide. On Dec 5, please require

amendments to this LUP. Wouldn't it be wonderful if this Board's legacy was to truly move us forward and be the climate and sustainability leaders we say we are.

Kelpfully yours,

Bridgette

Bridgette Clarkston, Ph.D. (she/her/hers)
Associate Professor of Teaching, Botany Department
University of British Columbia

UBC is located on the traditional and unceded lands of the x̱məθkwəy̱əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səlílwətał (Tsleil-Waututh) people.

Ceres Barros

To whom it may concern,

I am deeply concerned with the new Land Use Plan for UBC, particularly in respect to affordable housing and ensuring a safe and sustainable UBC community for present and future generations of the UBC community.

Already many faculty members, students and postdocs cannot afford to buy or rent a family home near UBC. This puts unwanted strain on their personal and professional lives, creates disappointment and can lead to the loss of excellent faculty and students.

This is bound to worsen with the new Land Use plan given that only 25% of the proposed housing will be below-market rate rental for faculty, students and staff and only 3300 student beds will be added in 30 years; while the population is expected to double (~50K) as are the allowable building heights (from 20 to 39 stories). Only the very rich will be able to afford living near UBC, decreasing access to academia for those less financially fortunate.

It seems to me that the societal, safety and environmental impacts of the new Land use Plan are either not well understood, or being ignored for the benefit of UBC economic profits.

I stand with other faculty members of the Board of Governors, notably Dr Charles Menzies and Dr Anna Kindler, in that this plan does not support UBC vision of a sustainable, accessible and equitable academic community, and is steering towards a profit making and environmentally unsafe one. This is deeply disappointing for someone like me, who has often been impressed at the "forward-thinking" of the UBC community. This plan goes against forward-thinking and feels very much like decades-old economic-focused management and planning.

I sincerely hope that the plan is revised and a thorough assessment of societal and environmental impacts of the proposed developments is presented for further evaluation before final approval.

Regards,

Ceres Barros

Adjunct Professor, Department of Forest Resources Management

Chris Finch

The public meeting was informative and well organized. Thank you for that. The comments from the floor certainly focussed on the need for affordable housing for students, staff and faculty in conjunction with a financial model that gets away from the obsession to build leased market housing to fund the other types of housing. The inability of UBC to take out loans despite there being affirming statements in the Act, is a concern and shuts down alternate funding.

Has UBC researched in depth what the demand for university enrolment will be over the next 15, 30 and 50 years? Birth rates are dropping well below replacement levels. In the US colleges and universities are starting to see falling enrolments. Are we going to be simply fill the spots with foreign students? Are we going to support higher levels of immigration? What are the ethics of poaching students and faculty from other countries that depend on them?

The Governors have some big challenges and need to re-evaluate the amendments to meet them particularly the demand for more affordable housing into a future of potential falling demand.

Are the LUP amendments considering the ecology of the bluffs particularly on the wreck beach side? The erosion is on-going and significant. The lands on the bluff side at Cecil Green and the President's home have been lost to erosion. In the early 60's the gun towers actually were accessible fr

Chris Shelton

What form of transportation infrastructure are you wishing to include, a subway line which can not pay for itself, that creates 27+/-5 times more greenhouse gas emissions that the at grade LRT? I hope you can measure the GHGs so that you can manage the GHGs.

Yours Truly

Chris Shelton

Vancouver BC

Cindy Seto

The city has evolved
Must help people
Especially ubc
Love hope joy

Claire England

My name is Claire England and I am a resident of UBC, my husband is a researcher at the University.

I support the goals articulated in the Land Use Plan, particularly the following: “Supporting the academic mission, via pursuit of excellence in research, teaching, learning and community engagement”; to “Confronting the affordability crisis, including affordable housing”; “Taking bold action to address climate change and enhancing campus ecology” and “ensure the campus lands benefit the UBC community today and for generations to come, using campus lands to continue to fund academic excellence, using residential development to create affordable housing for faculty, staff and students and also providing livable and sustainable communities”. However, after a lot of participation with Campus Vision 2050 over the last year, I strongly consider that the current Land Use Plan does not achieve these aims and I am asking the Board to make amendments in order to make these a reality.

I have three main areas of concern.

1) Housing

Firstly, housing. We all know we are in a housing crisis in Vancouver - many of us, including myself, have felt the personal effects of it. I absolutely support the construction of affordable and environmentally responsible residential housing in Wesbrook. Unfortunately, this current Land Use Plan does not yet provide this.

If the academic mission is truly being supported then student housing should be the priority, as the waiting list is thousands of people long and rents elsewhere in Vancouver are becoming ever more impossible on a student budget. The Land Use Plan shows that only 23% of students are currently housed on campus, and that there are higher numbers of private residents than students.

However, the current plan only creates 3,300 new student beds over 27 years and will in fact take out existing student supply at Acadia and Thunderbird while those are refurbished. This is at the same time as increasing student numbers and adding over 20,000 private residents in 9,500 new units at Wesbrook. The Land Use Plan “commits” to only a 2% increase in the amount of full-time students who will be housed by 2050. We know that student housing is

profitable for UBC and UBC Professor Chris Rea's open letter of April 2023 sets out multiple financing options.

Regarding general affordability, the LUP only commits to 30% of neighbourhood housing being rental, and only 15% to be non-market rate rental for "faculty/staff, social, or other housing needs". This means that potentially 70% of housing will be sold at unaffordable market rate, and thereby lost as any form of revenue to UBC for the 99-year lease period, and half of the remaining stock will be unaffordable market rate rental. One-bedroom apartments are currently being rented for over \$3,000 in Wesbrook. The Land Use Plan in its current form is not tackling the housing crisis – this is perpetuating inequality by wasting opportunities to be a world leader in prioritising affordability. This is UBC's last chance to address this – after this Plan, there will be nowhere left to build at UBC.

Please amend the Plan to commit to at least 50% student and affordable staff and faculty housing.

2) Environment

My second concern is ecological and environmental protection, and climate change mitigation.

The huge amount of building envisaged in the Land Use Plan will have a drastic effect on the local environment, from construction to lifetime emissions and climate change adaptability.

Much of the language in the Land Use Plan refers to plans which have not been drafted yet, such as the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan, or NCAP. The Land Use Plan does not make adherence to the NCAP mandatory, instead saying it will "work towards targets and policies" and I urge adopting stronger language around this. We all know how serious climate change is and that urgent action is required now – a Land Use Plan for the next 27 years must reflect that. The few measurable targets which are set out in the draft NCAP and LUP are not ambitious enough – for example the LUP commits to net zero carbon by 2050, while the City of Vancouver does this by 2030.

The wording of the Plan is to "Identify, enhance and manage important areas of biodiversity on campus and "Develop biodiversity strategies". I and many other residents have been saying throughout the Campus Vision process that it is backwards to plan Land Use before using UBC's considerable expertise to fully understand biodiversity and environmental needs. The NCAP must set concrete targets and parameters for the Land Use Plan and inform the content of the Land Use Plan, not the other way around.

Please amend the Plan with robust language to state that any building work which takes place will be subject to the requirements of the NCAP, to state that the Land Use Plan will at least meet the climate targets and timelines of the City of Vancouver, and to set measurable, research-backed policies in the NCAP which are not able to be discarded in favour of maximising profit at the expense of the climate.

3) Governance

Lastly, the elephant in the room is Governance. As a Governor, Anna Kindler, pointed out in your recent meeting, this Land Use Plan will increase the population size at UBC to match that of Port Moody. However, as residents do not have elected representatives with decision making power over large issues such as this Land Use Plan, as would be the case if we had a City Council, there is no current method for the residential community which UBC has chosen to create here to have meaningful impact or say on the plans which affect them. Attempts to do so are unsuccessful: nearly 900 UBC faculty, staff, students and residents signed an open letter to the Board about Campus Vision 2050, which the Board took 5 months to even respond to. Over 18,500 people signed a petition asking you not to cone the bald eagle nest in Wesbrook, which the Board never responded to.

The UNA, as our elected representatives, have voiced strong concerns regarding this Land Use Plan, both recently in their letter of October 25 and on previous occasions. There is no transparency around how the Board considers or responds to the UNA, and they have previously ignored UNA communications.

Realistically, given UBC's plans to increase the Neighbourhood population to match that of Port Moody, the only long-term democratic solution is likely to be incorporation of the residential Neighborhoods into the City of Vancouver. It is undemocratic to have 15,000 people living here without the ability to vote in local elections or to have civic input into decisions which deeply affect them, let alone the 35,700 people this Plan envisages by 2050.

Please amend the Land Use Plan to address this democratic deficit and include meaningful avenues for civic representation, such as a commitment to asking the Province to create voting resident representatives on the Board.

Conclusion

Uniquely, UBC is in complete control of what happens with land on campus and in the Neighbourhoods, with very little input from the City or Province. This is a once-in-a lifetime opportunity for UBC to be a world leader in innovation for housing affordability and environmental protection.

I therefore ask the Board to vote to amend the Land Use Plan on Dec 5th to commit to 50% student and affordable staff / faculty housing, to commit to the NCAP taking priority over any other Land Use targets, and to creating meaningful democratic governance for the thousands of residents living here.

Cole Burton

I am very concerned about the housing plan. I am a UBC faculty member but can't afford to rent or buy comfortable housing for me and my family near campus. And I work with many colleagues and current or prospective students and postdocs who can't afford to live near campus. This seriously undermines the sense of community, morale, and productivity of UBC faculty, staff and students.

UBC is a world-class institution that has the potential to develop a world-class sustainable community on campus, one that rises to the imperative to provide affordable housing, access to green spaces and amenities, and critically meets the need to address the linked biodiversity and climate crises.

I am concerned that this opportunity has been squandered in the past, and that the current plan would continue to do so.

My understanding is that only 25% of the proposed housing will be below-market rate rental for faculty, students and staff, and I take issue with the idea of a taxable benefit for rates below the Point Grey prices which are among the most expensive in Metro Vancouver (and thus in the world). I also understand that only 3300 student beds will be added in 30 years and that there would be a reduction in usable open space in the neighborhoods to .5 hectares per 1000 residents, a level below the .9 hectares per 1000 residents recommended by the World Health Organization.

I understand that only 1 of the 3 faculty-elected governors voted in favor of the plan, and that the environmental, social, and safety impacts of the proposed plan have not been adequately considered.

UBC should be leading the world in ecologically sustainable, equitable non-profit housing for our faculty, staff and students. I urge you to reject this plan and to step back and craft, with experts, a much better one that addresses the converging climate, biodiversity and housing crises.

Connor Kerns

My name is Connor Kerns, I am associate professor in Department of Psychology here at UBC. I am also a UBC resident in the Hawthorne neighborhood. My husband is a UBC graduate student, my 7 yo son goes to Norma Rose Point and UBC aftercare, my 2 yo son is in UBC's Huckleberry Daycare. My career and my family are growing up here at UBC... so I care a lot about this place and the plans being crafted now to shape, safeguard and ensure its prosperity in the future.

Developing a plan to suit the needs of a large, diverse UBC community for the next 30 years is a momentous task, and I understand fully that it is quite difficult to make everyone happy. Nonetheless, the problems inherent to the proposed plan are not squabbles related to small group interest. They reflect fundamental issues related to housing affordability, environmental sustainability and preparedness, and accountability to the community, which are not adequately addressed in the proposed land use plan and which question whether this plan, in its current form, can truly serve the best interests of UBC's academic mission, its community and its legacy.

The Board has already been alerted of the need for amended plan by its own members. I would like to use my time today to magnify those points, to ensure they receive the full discussion they merit.

Governor Dr. Charles Menzies put forth a motion for to DEFER the land use plan before this hearing. He described:

“in the midst of a climate emergency, the land use plan contains no clear, measurable targets to mitigate adverse effects...seeks to significantly increase population density on campus while simultaneously cutting usable neighbourhood open space by as much as 50%, and... limits UBC’s faculty/staff target housing to 15% of build out in the context of a global housing affordability crisis”

- In support of Dr. Menzies’ concerns it is worth noting that the LUP proposes a reduction in usable open space in the neighborhoods to a level below which international guidelines associated with the World Health Organization show compact cities should minimally provide.

- In further support of the need for concrete and enforceable ecological targets, a recent ecological baseline report conducted for UBC concluded that > 50% of campus soft landscapes (i.e. not paved) are already in low or very low ecological condition. Yet, the current LUP aims to double population density and building heights with no data provided on the anticipated environmental effects or how they will be mitigated.

- Experts in social and environmental sustainability within UBC’s own faculty have asserted that there are simple solutions and language that could be added to this Land Use plan to ensure that population growth and large intact ecosystems are jointly achieved, but that language is missing from this plan. The expertise of UBC is missing in this plan, but does not need to be the case if an appropriate amendments required by the board.

Housing Affordability

- The Housing Action Plan, submitted alongside the LUP, plans for 75% of new development to be market-rate housing – that is housing that is unaffordable to the majority of UBC faculty, staff and students. For context, the current market rate in Wesbrook for a new build is 1.5million for a 2 bedroom, ~1000 sqft apartment and >\$4000/month for a 2 bedroom rental.

The represents a direct threat to our ability to recruit, retain and promote the well-being of a truly exceptional and diverse student body and workforce. UBC salaries, UBC TAs, UBC fellowships cannot keep up with this market now, let alone in 30 yrs. An amended plan is needed which will balance the need to grow our endowment with an equally pressing need to ensure that the people who are what make UBC a world class institution, have a means to live here now and in the decades to come.

Finally, with regard to Accountability and Governance.

Governor Dr. Anna Kindler drew a direct comparison between UBC to Port Moody (a city of comparable size to that projected for 2050). She asked:

“ Is UBC ready and able to manage a city of this size?...Port Moody has 10 schools, 2 fire houses, and its own community hospital with a 24 emergency room. It has 500-1000 employees with exclusive mandate to manage the city. CV 2050 and the LUP are silent on how our new large city will be managed, governed, and serviced and do not provide any concrete estimates of the necessary level of services or new infrastructure that will be required to support it. Who and how will we look over the wellbeing, quality of life and sustainability of this large new community?"

She continued: "My concern is also for UBC's academic mission. Taking responsibility of such a large residential community would be a significant mission drift for the university and for the board."“

Finally, she raised concerns about safety: “Adding another 25k or so residents also begs the question of UBC's ability to protect residents, students, staff and others in case of a significant emergency. With UBC situated on the peninsula with research facilities that elevate risk of chemical, biological and nuclear emergencies well above those of typical city and with a large forested area that separates UBC from rest of city, that creates wild fire risk, the fact that CV 2050 does not address this matter is concerning. Do we have the capacity to adequately respond to ensure safe evacuation of such a large population.”

These are significant concerns that must be addressed before the LUP moves forward.

To borrow from my UBC colleague, Dr. Fritz Goetz, UBC's Mottos are Tuum Est (It is yours) and a Place of Mind – if this plan is enacted in its current form, which prioritized private development and growing the endowment above all else - I fear it will be neither. I ask the board to require amendment to proposed land use plan to ensure balance in the ways we safeguard UBC's future and its community.

Courtney Collins

My name is Courtney Collins and I am a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Biodiversity Research Centre at UBC. The current land use plan proposal will have strong NEGATIVE impacts on campus biodiversity including plant, bird and other wildlife species due to the proposed extremely high density human population on the campus. This will create overcrowding on the already limited green spaces within the UBC campus will all but ensure the loss of habitat for many native species which call this area home including Bald Eagles, Coyotes, and numerous plant and tree species. As a result, it will put increased pressure and use onto other nearby open spaces such as Pacific Spirit Park and diminish the integrity of these ecosystems. This will also limit our ability as professors to use these spaces for teaching and outdoor laboratory activities. 50,000 students living on UBC's campus is NOT a sustainable target for either the students themselves

and/or the ecosystems in which they are living in and will create devastating environmental consequences. Please reconsider these proposed 2050 Land Use Plan to reflect the stated values in UBC's 20 Year Sustainability Strategy Published in 2014 which highlights the use of campus as a living lab and the need for integration of campus-scale energy, water, waste, and food systems to improve quality of life for students, staff, faculty and campus community and to enhance ecological integrity.

David Morrissey

Vancouver is in the midst of an extreme housing affordability crisis, with no end in sight. This has impacted students and staff at UBC very negatively, with many pushed below the poverty line or forced to commute very long distances. The UBC Campus Vision 2050 does not sufficiently address this crisis. Much more student housing is needed than the roughly 3000 units in the plan. A higher fraction of rental housing, both at market and below-market rates, is needed as well.

Enabling members of the UBC community to live (affordably) near campus also supports accessibility, equality, and the climate. Reducing travel distances and promoting active and public transportation reduces pollution from commuting and enhances accessibility. Providing affordable housing options on or near campus supports equality by reducing financial barriers to attending or working at UBC.

At current prices, private market rate condominiums are out of reach for nearly everyone in the UBC community. This means that most of the new housing proposed in the plan is likely to go to people with little to no connection to the university. There connects to the important question of municipal representation on UBC lands. With about 65% of the 15,000 current non-student residents not directly connected to the university, the lack of representation is untenable. More private, market rate housing will only make this tension worse. Indeed, enacting the 2050 plan as proposed seems likely to trigger a change in the municipal representation structure, a loss of planning control by UBC, and a high probability that the plan will be rewritten or abandoned before it can be completed.

The UBC Campus Vision 2050 contains many positive elements, but more is needed. Specifically, a much larger fraction of student and staff housing would support the academic mission of UBC than the predominant market rate private housing proposed.

Drako Odic

As a faculty member at UBC and an on-campus resident, I have deep concerns about the current Land Use Plan (LUP). It neither clearly articulates how this plan will properly advance the mission and values of UBC. It is especially poor on the Sustainability values and on providing

affordable student housing. I am also in agreement with Dr. Kindler on her comments regarding the lack of proper support for emergency and governance for such a high increase of residents on campus. We cannot adopt a system where we build and then hope that these things get figured out later: UBC should lead with a clear vision, values first, and demonstrate a commitment to its students, staff, faculty, and residents. The current LUP falls well short of these goals.

E. David Klonsky

Dear UBC,

I write this as a faculty member who lives at and cares about UBC. It is unconscionable to allot up to 75% of available UBC land to market-rate housing. This housing is unaffordable to 99% of us at UBC. You are choosing to leave us behind.

Practically, this plan harms our ability to achieve long-term housing stability — and I say this as a Full Professor with a high salary. It harms our financial stability, it harms our ability to thrive, and it harms our sense of belonging and mattering to UBC.

Morally, the plan is a mean, uncaring, and unethical way to treat us. We work hard for UBC. We ensure UBC functions. We are the reason for UBC's national and international contributions, success, and high rankings. We represent UBC to Canada and the world. Yet, as we struggle with affordability, the plan sidelines us, and instead prioritizes developers and unaffordable complexes for wealthy non-UBC buyers. It is offensive.

I would also note the harm to morale caused by construction of unaffordable homes. Each unaffordable building constructed means we must endure construction noise for 18 months 6 days per week starting at 8am. If you are home sick you cannot rest in peace. Your family cannot sleep in on a Saturday morning. You cannot nap in peace (I happen to have a sleep disorder and require naps). The inconvenience could perhaps be justified if the construction produced affordable housing. But it doesn't; it provides properties for wealthy non-UBC members, and enriches developers and UBC Properties Trust. Every loud bang, drilling noise, smash, and burst of vehicle noise is a reminder that our quality of life is sacrificed because UBC is building homes we can't afford. We are left behind.

Finally, we are losing world-class faculty and students due to affordability. I know of multiple cases in which absolutely top candidates, who want to come to UBC, balk deep into the process because housing affordability is unobtainable. It is 100% clear that UBC land should be prioritized for affordable housing for UBC members, not market-rate housing we cannot afford. Please, course-correct.

For 14 years at UBC I had felt proud to be here. I had viewed UBC as an institution that cares about us, and that cares about positively impacting its community, country, and the world. The land use plan changed this. It is offensive that the plan values wealthy non-UBC property investors and entities more than us, its members. It is painful to feel us being left behind by a board that just does not seem to care.

Please, someone with power, understand the financial and psychological harm you are causing — and do something different.

Most sincerely,
David

--

E. David Klonsky, PhD
Professor
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia
[EMAIL REDACTED]
www.PEBL.org

Elisabeth Bailey

As a faculty member and UNA resident, I am committed to building a life for my family here at UBC. My family and I currently live in faculty and staff rental housing. While we appreciate the opportunity to live on campus while I am employed by the University on a full-time basis, I am deeply concerned that there is no realistic path towards home ownership for our family – and many other UBC families – in this place where we have built important community connections. As others have highlighted, the Housing Action Plan, submitted alongside the LUP, plans for 75% of development to be market-rate housing – that is housing that is unaffordable to the majority of UBC faculty, staff and students, my family included. For context, the current market rate in Wesbrook for a new build is 1.5million for a 2 bedroom, ~1000 sq ft apartment and >\$4000/month for a 2-bedroom rental. Even if we were able to secure a \$500,000 down payment – a very steep order – this would still leave us with a million-plus dollar mortgage. It is frankly disheartening to imagine that the only path for us is to remain in rental housing in the community where we are raising children and forging friendships until my retirement and to then leave this community because it simply isn't affordable to stay.

I found Dr. Christopher Rea's 2022 open letter addressing affordability on UBC campus (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Itxk8avNLJ9PdKMiFSRd80AsO9y7qqPJ/view?pli=1>) inspiring and implore the Board of Governors to review these clear and actionable recommendations. In

his appeal, Dr. Rea clearly articulated the concerns I have as a faculty member, mother, and community member.

Dr. Rea and others have also raised concerns about the limited development plans for student housing (~3300 beds over 30 years) when many of our students are facing immediate housing needs and affordability challenges. As a former academic advisor in the School of Nursing, I have worked with students who are both housing and food insecure, some actually living in their cars for periods of time due to lack of affordable housing near UBC. This is clearly a crisis. From my perspective as an educator of critical healthcare providers, I firmly believe that these are barriers that no students, certainly not our future nursing workforce, should be asked to bear for the privilege of receiving a UBC education.

UBC must do better. I urge the Board to consider the recommendations put forth by UBC Communities for Sustainable Development as an excellent starting point (https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe9qJR_s_QY1ErP48D-Wbe_kQHGOleu1pwrVTmpmgh4hSpDJvg/viewform).

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Bailey, Associate Professor of Teaching, Faculty of Applied Science/School of Nursing

Emily Fuchs

Hello, I am a UBC alum and staff member who lives off campus. I am submitting this comment in support of the Open Letter written by UBC Communities for Sustainable Development (UCSD) and signed by over 900 UBC faculty, students, staff and residents. UCSD has identified a number of concerning points about the UBC Land Use Plan, including a lack of affordable housing reserved for students, staff, and faculty, an expansion of residential population without adequate environmental assessment, and a reduction in usable open space in UBC neighbourhoods. I stand with UCSD in urging the university to act on its stated environmental and social sustainability goals when undertaking building development on campus lands. I am only aware of these issues thanks to communication from UCSD, and I urge other members of the UBC community to join their mailing list to hear about upcoming events and initiatives.

Thank you and take care,

Emily

Emily Fuchs (she/they)

Lead Course Coordinator | Department of Computer Science

[ADDRESS REDACTED]

xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) Traditional Territory | The University of British Columbia |

Vancouver Campus

[EMAIL REDACTED] | [PHONE REDACTED]

Erin MacMillan

Dear Campus Vision 2050,

I am writing due to evidence that there is currently too narrow a view of how the land at UBC can best serve the students, UBC community, and Lower Mainland overall. Recent land use decisions such as coning the eagles' nest, insufficient numbers of family sized condo units in new developments, and insufficient number of below market rental developments, demonstrate that the current priorities in the Land Use Plan (LUP) do not reflect the reality of the campus community as it is today.

I strongly support the feedback on the LUP from the University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) and the UBC Community Sustainable Development team. In particular, the LUP needs to be adapted to reflect the needs of the community on campus, with a lower priority for market level leasehold development. I support:

- 50% of housing dedicated to below market rentals and affordable purchase options for UBC affiliated staff and faculty
- An increase in the number of 3 + den and 4 bedroom condo units, the current average of 3 or 4 of these units per development falls far short of the needs of UBC families. The townhouses are absolutely unaffordable for faculty and staff of UBC
- Develop Neighbourhood Climate Action plans to address the carbon intensity of existing buildings, energy systems, transportation, and waste
- Commission Environmental Impact Studies for each new development
- Provide a minimum of 5 hectares of green space per 1,000 inhabitants
- Limit condo tower height to 20 storeys
- Demonstrate a LUP with a focus on the development of green urbanism that puts residents as the highest priority

Thank you,

Erin MacMillan

Friedrich Götz

Dear UBC Board of Governors, dear Campus Vision 50-Team, To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my concern about several aspects of UBC's proposed land use plan – which is being discussed today (November 7th) in a public hearing.

I am writing this letter as a resident of Wesbrook village, but first and foremost as a faculty member at UBC and as a current and future advisor to a multitude of undergraduate and graduate students at UBC.

I am most concerned about the plans laid out in section 4.2 ("Housing Choice and Affordability") of the current version of the UBC Land Use Plan, which reads as follows:

"4.2.1.1 Uphold UBC's Housing Action Plan commitments to increase housing choice and affordability for students, faculty, staff and community.

4.2.1.2 Ensure at least 30% of total Neighbourhood Housing is rental—at least half of which is nonmarket housing including faculty/staff, social, or other housing needs—and enable higher targets for rental in new Neighbourhood Housing through UBC's Housing Action Plan.

4.2.1.3 Aspire to have at least 50% of Neighbourhood Housing occupied by those who work or study on campus.

4.2.1.4 Uphold the Student Housing targets and timelines of UBC's Housing Action Plan. 4.2.1.5 Commit to housing at least 25% of the full-time student population in different types of on-campus Student Housing and Neighbourhood Housing, with an ambition to increase to up to 33% depending on available fundings, sites, and demand."

In short, according to these plans, a total of 15% (i.e., 50% of 30%) of all Neighbourhood Housing will be non-market housing. The 2050 Campus Visions anticipates a total of 35,700 UBC Neighbourhood residents in 2050 (UBC Land Use Plan, p. 19; not counting Student Housing). Taken together these numbers would translate into non-marketing housing provisions for 5355 people (15% of 35,700). Against "80,000 daytime population including students, faculty, residents, staff, and visitors 58,800 students enrolled full-time 17,300 faculty and staff 29,000 people living on campus (14,000 in student housing, 15,000 in neighbourhood housing)" (direct quote from UBC Campus Vision 2050; p.24-25) – this is not ambitious enough, if it is ambitious at all.

Furthermore, the UBC Housing Action Plan (p.4) commits to creating 3,300 new student housing beds (and 1,000 replacement beds, against 14,000 existing beds). In short, while the overall number of UBC neighbourhood residents – without students is projected to more than double (UBC Land Use Plan, p. 19 from 14,900 people in 2023 to 35,700 people in 2050), student beds will increase by just about 25%.

These are not the numbers that would be needed to improve – or even maintain – the already low levels of affordability for UBC faculty, staff, and students, who are the heart of this university.

In other words, while UBC claims commitment to mitigating the ongoing housing and affordability crisis in Vancouver – there is very little evidence in the concrete plans that this is actually achieved or even attempted. If the 2050 Campus Vision is implemented as it is

currently outlined, I worry, that it will decrease, not increase access and affordability. We are already seeing record numbers of food insecurity among students, and talented prospective graduate students and faculty members show an increased hesitation to accept offers from UBC, knowing that their purchasing power in this real estate market is far from appealing. Ensuring that we can recruit and retain the best and brightest should be the mandate of a university and UBC has the means to make this happen. So it should.

Let me close by reminding you that UBC's mottos are "tuum est (it is yours)" and "a place of mind" – if this plan is enacted, I fear that it will be neither.

Haibo Feng

Campus should be focused on students, faculty, and staff that are working and living here. The new residences should be set to solve the affordability issue while pursuing campus sustainability targets.

Hal Bradbury

My name is Hal Bradbury, and I am a current faculty member and resident on campus. While I appreciate the effort put into the development plan, I feel that the current plan has several serious issues and I suggest that the current plan is not approved. The first of these is the lack of affordable housing. The relatively small increase in student housing (3300) is not nearly enough to match the current level of demand, given the student numbers are currently around 60k. The lack of affordable housing for students is already impacting undergraduate and graduate students and is deterring some excellent students from applying or attending UBC. The lack of affordable housing for students is also a major Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion consideration, with students from less advantaged backgrounds being less likely to be able to afford the rocketing housing rental prices around UBC.

Furthermore, the affordability of Vancouver is decreasing rapidly for both staff and faculty, with house prices increasing at a rate of around 8.5% per year in recent decades. There has also been an average increase in housing rental prices of around 9% per year in recent decades. Given these rises in price, many new faculty will never be able to save the amount to afford a deposit on the average 2-bedroom house on campus if it they are sold at current market rate. The university needs to provide below market rate housing for the staff and faculty, as well as potential opportunities for staff and faculty to purchase houses to keep the retention and recruitment of staff and faculty, which is key to the growth and continued excellence in the research and teaching at UBC.

Finally, the Campus Vision shouldn't be approved until the neighbourhood climate housing action plan has been completed and there needs to be specific metrics within the plan to link all of the developments on campus to responsible ecological development and climate action.

Harry Nelson

The Draft LUP as currently constituted appears to view UBC primarily as a property developer with the University as the public-facing face. It makes little long-term sense as to how it will strengthen the University and allow it to prosper going forward (clearly this would generate significant amounts of revenue but that is another issue I address later in my comments). There are a number of different factors affecting the University; some of these are outside our control but some are and are also ones that can be dealt with in a smart LUP that put's the University first, not property development.

First is the issue of affordable housing-and by this I mean truly affordable housing, not Vancouver's strangely self-referential standard that puts most affordable housing beyond the reach of most people. UBC has relied on its ability to attract students, staff and Faculty because of the quality of its education and work environment. It is becoming an increasing challenge for all of them to attend or work at UBC because of the cost of living in Vancouver and the difficulty in finding a place to live. By offering more affordable options, UBC will be able to better attract students, staff and Faculty which are all vital to remaining a globally competitive institution. UBC through its LUP has the ability to move the dial on this and provide housing in a meaningful way (the 25% considered now is far too low). One way or another UBC will eventually have to face these recruitment costs now-either by building more space for them-or down the road when it becomes increasingly difficult to attract and retain people (and the options in doing so will be limited to simply having to pay more or find a way to reduce the cost of attending).

Secondly, it is unclear how the revenue generated from past property development-and this future development-go towards the University's mission and are being used to mitigate these issues, and how these additional funds would contribute to the University's long-term success. There is always the concern that these kinds of revenues, from one-time development, end up simply going towards covering annual expenditures and at some point when the development stops the revenue dries up, without anything to replace it.

Thirdly, the University has the ability to identify what kind of community it would like to create on campus-and what responsibility it will take in doing so. What kind of infrastructure and services would be necessary to support the planned increase in residents, and has UBC identified that and will it be willing to invest in that? Or would this be a cost offloaded either onto surrounding areas and service providers, including the City of Vancouver?

For a University that promises it is a leader in sustainability, offers itself as a role model and wants to remain globally recognized as an educational leader, it seems like these are questions it would need to address if it is sincere about those aspirations.

Isaiah Rawlings

I second those who do not see this plan reflecting the needs of the community. The plan is incredibly out of touch with the values that our community on campus holds. This plan dedicates too few resources to alleviating the pressures that students, staff and faculty feel from the current cost of living crisis. The lack of affordability on campus is hurting everyone and locking many students out of UBC.

I also second those who don't believe this plan to be ambitious enough in terms of sustainability. As a university that strives to present itself as a global leader in the Climate Crisis, this plan does very little to reflect that. The plan must be more ambitious in setting clear climate oriented goals.

I do not agree with those who believe a building is ugly simply because it is tall. Tall buildings are a necessity to increase density and allow new students to study at UBC. Density is a key tool in increasing affordability when used correctly.

Above all, I agree with those who feel that their voices have not been represented. Without a proper fully elected body to represent community members of UBC this decision feels illegitimate. The need for a municipal body is clearly a priority of the community and a standard for governing in this country.

Joanne Breckenridge

I am writing out of concern for the future of student family housing on campus. The Acadia Park townhouses factored directly into my choice to pursue a doctorate at UBC and the community I found there enabled me to complete that doctorate. I was conflicted about whether to pursue a doctorate because, as a mother, there is a sense that doing so is a selfish pursuit that negatively impacts your children. The presence of the Acadia Park townhouse community allayed that guilt. The design of the community is special – it is child-centered and it promotes community by having windows and doors open onto common, car-free play areas. My children benefitted tremendously from living in Acadia, both from the ample access to outdoor play and from the friendships they developed with children from around the world.

Community is important, but for parents, it can be hard to find within academic departments because our ability to engage centres around our children. The community that I found at UBC

was the Acadia Park townhouses. During my time living there, within one year I had a child and lost both my parents. I can't emphasize enough the role that the community of Acadia Park had in supporting me through this period and helping me complete my program of study. I strongly believe that the existence of community like this is important to retaining women, and in particular mothers, in academia.

I have to stress that this amazing community was specific to the townhouses and was due to Cornelia Oberlander's design. From my time as a member of the Acadia Park Residents Association and as a former resident, the Acadia apartments did not share this level of community. In fact, in our 6 months living in the Point Grey apartments, we met a single neighbour. He came by to complain about the noise of our 2 year-old. I am very grateful for the time spent living in the townhouses. It's my hope that future generations of student families at UBC will have that same opportunity to build their own communities and a sense of identity and pride at UBC.

Juliet Lu

I currently reside in Wesbrook Village and am a new Faculty member at UBC. I'm concerned by the abysmally low promise of open space - which is currently far lower than international guidelines set as a bare minimum - as well as near silence on the provision of services related to the proposed increase in residents in the area. The lack of access to child care and stress of getting children into local schools and extracurricular activities is a constant issue for recruiting talent to UBC. Housing prices are a major deterrent for students, which also seems deprioritized in the plan by allotting 75% of building to be market-rate. It seems to me that such a massive undertaking requires far more careful planning, integrative thinking, and would mean a serious shift in the mission of the University.

Kathleen Coupland

The plan to increase UBC's population to around 50 000 is troublesome. I worry that we won't have the correct infrastructure to support a population that size. Additionally, I fear that increasing the population to that size will only occur if there is a reduction in treed areas, green spaces and outdoor recreation. Part of what makes UBC amazing and desirable isn't just that it is surrounded by forests, but that it has a huge internal urban forest. Going up is fine, but it needs to be done with caution.

I am also concerned about the lack of proposed below rental housing for students and staff. Already students are facing housing crises' and food insecurity because of the cost of living. It is hard to draw or maintain top tier Faculty and Staff because of cost. If UBC wants to be a part of the solution they MUST increase student/staff/faculty housing. Presently there isn't enough so I can't see how doubling the population AND only having 25% of new builds falling into this

category is going to actually help the problem. The numbers as they are presented will only worsen the problem.

UBC must be accountable and provide students with affordable housing and residences. This plan does not sufficiently address this issue and there should not be passed. This plan presents itself as a plan for UBC to sell off residential property at a profit without any benefits to those who work, play and learn here.

UBC MUST do better. This plan is a failure and will ultimately hurt UBC as a whole.

Kenny Kwan

I am bringing up a matter of increasing concern to many residents in our community: the issue of night parties and excessive noise no matter on the streets or at premises in our residential area. While we all appreciate the vibrant atmosphere and social interactions that make our neighborhood a great place to live, it's becoming evident that some residents are experiencing disturbances due to loud gatherings, especially during nighttime.

Kerry Greer

Dear Committee,

I attended some of the Vision Planning meetings as both a UBC faculty member, and as a campus resident. During the consultation phase I was disappointed to find that the conversation focused on irrelevant details, like the kinds of plants that would replace existing landscaping, so I stopped attending. What matters are the larger issues around HOUSING and TRANSPORTATION.

The current Campus Vision 2050 plan fails to address the single most important aspect of UBC's major challenge moving forward, and that is around housing and transportation:

The proposed plan does not meet the need for affordable housing for UBC faculty, staff and especially, students.

The cost of housing in Vancouver is a major obstacle to recruitment and retainment of UBC faculty.

The cost of housing in Vancouver is a major contributor to inequality at UBC, with faculty who came prior to 2011 being able to "buy into" Vancouver housing, and thereby securing a healthy investment, while faculty who came after 2011 do not have the initial finances that would enable them to purchase a home in Vancouver.

To maintain its position as a globally recognized and sought after institution for undergraduates, UBC needs to ensure that students can afford to live here--the Vision 2050 plan does NOT meet the needs of students in terms of providing enough housing to future students

The Vision 2050 plan falls short on transportation to UBC's campus for students, staff and faculty. UBC needs to insist on the province and the city providing a subway line to UBC campus and while this is "in the works" this needs to be elevated to a top priority. Accessing UBC via mass transportation is a major obstacle, and the existing public transportation system is inferior to most other "world-class" cities.

UBC needs to ensure that the City and Province support the development of roads for vehicular traffic to access UBC, specifically for cars. Cars are not going anywhere and UBC needs to ensure that major traffic routes to UBC maximize the flow of automobile traffic. The traffic on, for instance, Marine Drive is a major barrier to people being able to commute from the south-suburbs.

UBC needs to recognize its poor planning in Wesbrook, and hold the decision-makers to account to ensure that these same mistakes are not repeated:

Wesbrook roads are entirely too narrow to accommodate the flow of traffic, bikes, and pedestrians, and the traffic line-ups due to buses and pedestrians causes unnecessary drops in air quality.

The failure to coordinate with Vancouver School Board to get a school opened in Wesbrook results in a lot of stress for families who end up not being able to send their child to the local school, and subsequently, a lack of social development for kids who do not know their neighbourhood classmates.

The lack of places on campus to purchase food at competitive prices needs to be addressed - particularly grocery stores. The line ups at Save On, despite the high prices, for instance, show that we need more grocery stores on campus.

The successful integration of green spaces are so valuable, and the current plan decreases them significantly. We need these spaces to make up for the lack on space inside our small homes!

Sincerely,

Kerry Greer
Wesbrook Resident
Faculty renter
Faculty member

Laura Castrejon-Violante

Laura Castrejón-Violante

Alumni and current UBC student

Former Acadia Park resident

To whom it may concern (to everybody),

Acadia Park should not be demolished, it should be expanded. My family and I had the wonderful opportunity to be Acadia Park residents for 6 years. You will probably hear a lot of testimonies from families about the beauties of being part of the Acadia Park community. I will just add to the testimonies stating those years were probably the best of my life.

Acadia Park's configuration (townhouses surrounded by playgrounds, pedestrian paths and ample green spaces) provides the ideal setting to become a community. Families naturally bump into each other, introduce themselves and little by little learn how to trust each other, how to care for each other, how to make community. UBC students face many challenges, about 30% of us are food insecure for example, but living in Acadia Park provides us with the network to offer and ask for help when food is insufficient for example. As a woman I face even more challenges than my male colleagues, but developing my studies by a window with a view of my kids safely enjoying a monkey bar makes all my sacrifices worthy. Actually I don't think I would have been able to produce the quality of my research if not for the peace of mind I had courtesy of the playground outside my window. The mom students after me have the same right as I did to have that privilege. Don't take that away from her, expand that right and make sure more and more have the right to Acadia Park.

Laura Cottle

How can you "continue [to aspire that] at least 50 percent of neighbourhood housing [be] occupied by people who work or study at UBC" when 70% of the housing being developed is designated as market housing?

If we commit 70% of the housing to market housing, will we be creating a community for people who work or study on campus or are we creating expensive investments that the former can in no way afford.

I look at the reality of Wesbrook -- a more and more crowded place with ever increasing tower heights -- and it seems so contradictory to UBC's aspiration to sustainability. Certainly not any definition of sustainability that includes environment and social together, and at the same level as economic in the sustainability triangle.

There have been some incredibly articulate speakers in the public hearing this evening.

Key important points:

- sad that the plan is warped from the beginning by the population density imposition
- who will govern the new town? Will they have a say in land use decisions?
- extremely sad that the wonderful neighbourhood of Acadia Park is not kept and grown. UBC needs to celebrate this neighbourhood not destroy its integrity by making a chunk of it market housing in which no student family could possibly afford to live.

Lauren Emberson

I have multiple relationships with UBC. I graduated with my Bachelors of Science in 2005. After 15 years doing my PHD and then academic positions in the US including Cornell, Brown and Princeton, I am now an Associate Professor in Psychology. I am also a resident on campus living here with my husband and two little kids. This Land Use Plan makes me feel much less proud to be affiliated with UBC. It is an amazing opportunity that UBC has to put forward a vision not only of our campus but also of our future as a human species at a critical moment. With this plan, UBC has chosen to not only uphold the status quo which has gotten us into deep crises related to the environment, social and economic inequality and a deep division between our governments and the people. They not only uphold all of those deeply seated issues, they are positioning themselves to profit from them.

The current plan prioritizes maximizing profit for UBC over building affordable housing for the students, faculty and staff. Housing is a basic of life that so many are struggling with in Vancouver and UBC is profiting off of dramatically unaffordable housing. My department just opened a food bank as a stop gap for the incredible rise in food insecurity in our students. The paltry 3300 new student beds in 35 years proposed in this plan is embarrassing for a campus this size in a housing market is unaffordable. The lack of affordable housing on campus will further social inequality of who can access the first rate education at UBC. If I were a student now, I wouldn't have been able to. I was barely able to in the early 2000s.

The aspects of sustainability and addressing the climate crisis are window dressing at best. This plan was decided without any of the environmental assessments that would ensure sustainable development. We are at a point when we have very few years (6 or less) to make major changes to our carbon emissions to avoid irreversible changes to the climate that will result in mass displacement and death all over the globe. UBC had acknowledged the climate emergency on their main campus but want to continue to profit from carbon heavy construction and unsustainable car focused living where they stand to profit.

Finally expanding the permanent population to 50k without any kind of democratic representation for these people is unconscionable. This Land Use Plan and the processes around it have not given me any confidence that UBC is prepared to run a city of this size and

without representation the residents will have no accountability or recourse. I'm already talking with my neighbours about building interest in incorporation.

Board of Directors: you need to vote no and send this land use plan back. Be on the right side of history. If you take the issues of social inequality, the climate crisis and democracy seriously as this university says it does, then you cannot vote to approve this plan.

This land use plan would be seen as greedy at any other point in history. At this point it's jaw dropping in how it pushes against any progress on every major issue of our time. This is not only an issue of ideology. It's an issue of basic sense. Building a city of 50k isn't the same as running one. Saying you're a public institution that supports equity and an anti-racist agenda but making it increasingly impossible for students without highly advantaged backgrounds to come is backwards and saying we want to be a leader of climate while building your own city on the status quo that is killing the planet is deeply hypocritical.

Lesley Watson

I am a resident of Wesbrook Place.

The Land Use Plan needs to allocate a much larger percentage of housing to truly affordable housing, not token, and the eligibility for its rental should be means tested.

There must be many more public Level 3 charging stations for EVs. The two existing are already not enough, and the number of EVs is increasing rapidly.

It should be mandatory for all new buildings to allow for facilities for EV charging in their design, and for all existing buildings to retrofit their electrical systems to allow EV charging for residents.

There should be more green spaces in the design, and most of them should be parks and playgrounds.

The heights of new buildings should be less, with more attention given to shading.

The new Skytrain line should come all the way to UBC, not stop at Arbutus.

Lisa Chen-Wing

The last time I signed up to speak at a UBC Land Use Public Hearing I waited for hours but never spoke because my 3 month-old infant needed to go home.

At that time, the residents of Acadia Park were not consulted before the land they lived on was re-zoned for market housing. And we were upset.

For the next 6 years my spouse worked toward a PhD, I worked on my career, we worked to raise our children and we advocated for saving Acadia Park and the space that makes it possible to have a family while attending UBC.

It is so important that Acadia Park stay a park and not turned into high rise buildings to make room for market housing. I was so upset I talked about the change in the Land Use Plan with everyone I met. I made friends, we organized.

The community responded to the University: we organized a World Café, we met with with Vice Presidents of the university, with a postcard campaign we sent thousands of postcards to the offices of 4 different university presidents, we restarted the Resident's Association, we protested the removal of a rope swing, we met with planners. We hope we can still make a difference.

But now my child is 13 years old and Acadia Park is still at risk of being turned into high rises.

Both of my parents lived in Acadia Camp as undergrads, I lived in Acadia Park with my spouse and children for 6 years, and I hope one day to visit the green spaces as a grand parent.

UBC should learn from Acadia Park and plan its communities as places for people live and not just places for developers to profit.

Madeline Woodley

To the Chair and Members of the UBC Board of Governors,

My name is Madeline Woodley. I recently completed my Bachelor of Science at UBC and am currently employed, full-time, as a research technician by the University. I am writing to you to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed land use plan, specifically with respect to the Board's plans around the future of housing at the University. During my five years as an undergraduate student, it was only in my first year that I was offered housing by the University. Myself, as well as many friends and peers, spent the majority of our degrees struggling to compete in one of the world's most competitive and expensive housing markets, while UBC profited off of our tuition fees and congratulated themselves on our hard-earned achievements. Many of us were and are forced to undertake the stressful search process on an annual basis, while writing final exams and trying to find summer jobs that will give us the experience and qualifications necessary to compete in our chosen career paths. The University expects much of us, to further their own prestige, while offering no support with respect to our most basic of needs. I have watched world-class professors, without whom the University would not be what it is, have to resort to expensive Airbnbs in order to be able to teach their classes and support their amazing graduate students, because the few rooms that the University has made available to out-of-town Faculty who can't afford to buy or rent in Vancouver is full. It is unacceptable that an institution who brands itself as innovative and

diverse continues to write plans which prioritize for-profit housing developments for people unaffiliated with the University over the tens of thousands of students, Faculty and staff whose hard work allows UBC to be recognized on a global scale. Creating enough AFFORDABLE housing to house ALL those who work and learn at UBC (not the "ambitious target" of 15% for faculty/staff rental housing, or the "aspiration" to have 50% of housing occupied by those affiliated with the University).

On the note of affordability, UBC should be working to address food affordability on campus. Food insecurity is an enormous issue at UBC, particularly amongst undergraduate students, as the price of food at UBC is outrageous and highlights UBC's for-profit, capitalist values which fail to prioritize the welfare of its own people (even its vending machine snack prices are inflated).

Furthermore, UBC should have far more ambitious and innovative aspirations with respect to addressing energy and water sustainability, as well as enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity on campus. There are many talented individuals working at UBC and doing this very work, perhaps consulting them would yield better results than those proposed in this plan. I am a strong advocate for the University adopting more of a "living lab" approach, particularly when it comes to campus planning and design. Ironically, limiting the need for folks to commute by prioritizing the supply of affordable housing for people affiliated with UBC would lower the University's footprint considerably.

The issue of transportation involves both the concerns of affordability and sustainability. I have a few specific comments on this section of the land use plan. First, this campus needs dedicated bike lanes, as the foot traffic during weekdays on zero/limited traffic streets makes it almost impossible to bike. Cyclists are given lowest priority when it comes to transportation planning on campus. Given bike commuters are plentiful at UBC, there should also be more secure bike storage options for staff, students, and faculty, as well as access to showers and change rooms in all major buildings. When cycling is not an option for commuters, public transportation is indeed the next best option, from the perspective of sustainability. With that in mind, UBC should offer all staff, faculty, and students the option of discounted transit passes (like the U-Pass) to incentivize commute via public transit. Additionally, there should be far fewer streets available for single-occupancy vehicles to use throughout campus to further disincentivize unnecessary car use on campus.

Finally, these land use plans should reflect a focus on prioritizing the needs of Musqueam in the future of UBC, yet I see no mention of meaningful collaboration with Musqueam nor any efforts to dismantle the systemic barriers which the University continues to uphold.

Mathias Lecuyer

There are several key issues that I feel: are completely missing from the land use plan; are not discussed in specific, actionable enough ways (and are hence likely to be relegated to afterthoughts); are planned with too little ambition:

- The plan to increase and protect bio-diversity is not ambitious, and not really specific and actionable. It looks like it'll be neglected for other priorities, and that things will only get worse. We need to preserve the few high diversity places left on campus, and have a concrete plan to create new ones that will take precedence over development.
- Similarly, there is not much of a plan for green spaces available to campus residents. Those are extremely important, and need to be planned for from the start, and not only as super landscaped parks in which one can't do much. We need nature around for physical and mental well being.
- The population on campus will grow a lot under the plan. I did not see any plan for social infrastructure and quality of urban life. As far as I can tell, there is no plan for lively streets (e.g. with street level commerce), hopefully pedestrian. We know that lively streets are good for safety and quality of life. There doesn't seem to be any plan for space and attractivity measures for important and diverse commerce (restaurants, coffees, groceries, activities, ...), or for crucial services (schools, medical care, etc...). The current plan does not look like it will create a lively, high quality urban neighbourhood on campus.
- The plan for public transit is not specific or actionable, and sounds very passive. If the population doubles, quality of life will decrease drastically without a stronger transit plan.
- The plan for subsidized/below market housing is not ambitious enough to meet the housing challenges of the university community (both students, staff, and faculty), let alone be competitive with other locations.

Meadow Reed

The plan crafted for the next 30 years requires adaptivity and constant renewal of a plan. This Land Use Plan needs to be amended, in opposition to its weak targets in the benefit of housing goals with the proposed growth. It needs stronger, quantitative goals for the benefit of all people, in opposition to quick profit to the Endowment Lands.

If the current Land Use Plan is to be a large container with umbrella plans, it must predict them, and set a timeline of necessary umbrella plans over the proposed time (until 2050).

The following comments are proposals for the post-amended LUP:

More transferrable format of LUP

To put forward a Land Use Plan growing to about 30,000 people in the year 2050 has the government of a Board of Directors. The city of University Endowment Lands governance must grow with this campus, student body, and faculty. How is the Land Use Plan transferrable to a larger government? What within the plan is a quantitative measure with constant renewal/check-in that the quantitative targets are being met?

UBC as Leadership of Reconciliation

A proposed plan with affect over the next 27 years lacks the stable container reconciliation needs. The efforts of meeting with Musqueam and other First Nations people pre-public hearing is not enough. As sustainable technology and Indigenous relationships grow exponentially, the LUP does not account for this. The LUP needs a stronger, more continuous measure of reconciled relationship with Musqueam people. This continuous measure also needs paralleling implementation.

How is the proposed Land Use Plan representative of demonstrative leadership in reconciliation with Musqueam people? This is an opportunity for UBC to be the leader it is, and the leader Canada and the world needs.

Michelle Marcus

I am very concerned that the land use plan does not have high enough targets for affordable housing.

Only 25% of new housing will be below market rate, which means the other 75% is market rate housing which at today's prices means only the rich can afford it. More market rate housing will further increase the housing crisis in the region by allowing prices to continue to rise unfettered and limiting supply of housing that people can actually afford.

UBC claims that they need to build for profit housing to make money to use to build student housing, but they already have \$2 billion in their endowment fund which they invest in the stock market and privatized infrastructure projects around the world. They should use that money instead to build student housing and affordable housing here on campus!

For context, the current market rate in Wesbrook for a new build is \$1.5 million for a 2 bedroom, ~1000 sqft apartment and >\$4000/month for a 2 bedroom rental. This is not affordable, and even "below market rate" will not necessarily be affordable.

UBC can do better!

Mohammadjavad Meghrazi

Hello,

My name is Mohammadjavad Meghrazi and I am a master's student in Biodiversity Research Center at UBC. I do not live on campus, because student housing is not affordable and readily available, and I will not stay in Vancouver for the rest of my career, one main reason being the housing situation. I am writing this to voice my concern about the 2050 LUP.

UBC is one of the top 5 universities in my field, which is studying biodiversity. One of the main features that make biodiversity research at UBC unique is the accessibility of study systems. Many of my peer graduate students study natural systems that occur at the UBC campus, for example, bird hybrid zones. This is an invaluable asset, not only for UBC but for the international scientific community. One would expect UBC to protect this valuable asset, but increasing the resident population on campus will definitely damage the biodiversity.

Unfortunately, 2050 LUP will sacrifice biodiversity to maximize short-term profits, which is not a responsible decision in terms of sustainability. The only justification could be improving the student housing situation, which clearly is not a priority in the current plan. It has been argued that there is not enough funding available to develop student housing and private housing development can provide that funding. I suspect that there are no other ways of providing funding for student housing, but even if that is true at the moment, this is not a good solution. It is possible that in a couple of years situation will change and there will be new avenues of funding available for this purpose (more government support or donations). However, there is a limited area of land available on campus, and the allocation of land to private housing is an irreversible decision. The limited land must be used efficiently for the housing of students, faculty, and staff. It is not reasonable to allocate this limited resource to private housing to make a profit, even if part of that profit is used to fund the development of student housing. UBC will definitely regret this decision in the long run.

In the end, it is worth mentioning that Vancouver's housing crisis is getting worse every year. The only way that graduate students can continue pursuing their studies at UBC in the future is by having access to affordable housing, which they currently do not. UBC cannot address this growing demand unless it prioritizes this issue over making a profit in the short term.

Natalie Schimpf

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to register my support for the points for revision raised in the Submission to the Public Hearing Committee by UNA Board Chair Richard Watson, on behalf of the Board of the UNA. The Land Use Plan Changes are vague at best, and UBC appears intent on making these

changes based on financial gain, without truly considering the long-term needs of faculty, staff and student residents. Without taking these needs into account, UBC is jeopardizing its existence and reputation as the world class learning and research institution that it prides itself on. Without affordable and suitable options for long-term residency, particularly for families, the very people that enable UBC to exist will choose to go elsewhere. UBC already has problems with faculty recruitment and retention, and the current plan does not appear to address this issue.

I am also concerned at the apparent lack of foresight regarding amenities planning. The two elementary schools that serve campus are already insufficient. With provision for only one additional elementary school, yet a doubling in housing density planned, it is clear that this problem will only be exacerbated, let alone fixed. Plans regarding sufficient access to grocery stores are also vague.

Finally, UBC must ensure meaningful climate action, sustainability and adequate green space as part of the Land Use Plan. There is already much research on the benefits to wellbeing of green space. Feedback from residents has already been given regarding the importance of this.

UBC is good at talking the talk, but not good at walking the walk. It is time to heed the strong and widespread feedback regarding the Land Use Plan.

Sincerely,

Dr. Natalie Schimpf

UBC Campus Resident.

Neil Armitage

I attended the hearing for the first hour and a half, and was registered to talk. However, I was unable to stay. My comments and opinions to reject the LUP Amendment were covered by many speakers; from an inadequate financial model for student, staff and faculty housing, that is more likely to fuel the affordability and climate crisis than dampen it, to the lack of governance and accountability. I strongly ask the board to reject the amendment.

What struck me was how the hearing and the hall was set up, which to say the least was very intimidating. The isolation and daunting walk of getting up to speak, even for experienced faculty members was tangible. Isolated and alone.

How does this encourage more speakers to come forward and have their voices heard. Please show greater thought over how these hearings are held in the future if you really want to hear the public.

This reflects not only the lack of democratic oversight at UBC, but the lack of institutional knowledge on how to practice it. Similarly being told not to applaud or praise comments, further created a hearing and a climate that was not really public or encouraging of participation. It was hard not to think this was deliberate. Without clearer and better governance and transparency, I do not see this improving.

Fortunately the strength and depth of opposition to the LUP amendment among those congregated in the hall, and the speakers, gives me faith in the community to push for greater democracy on campus. Hopefully this will result in sustainable and collective vision for the development of the UBC campus. A vision that actually aligns with the academic mission, that is not fixated on growth at any cost, and puts livability at the centre.

Nora Timmerman

I lived in Acadia Park Family Housing for four years during the completion of my PhD. I live in the homes that were demolished. Mine was one of the very last families to move out before the final demolitions took place in 2013.

My children are now 15 and 12. The 12 year old was born inside the townhouse that was part of Acadia Park. While he was almost two when we moved away and he can't remember living there, my older son does. And he is now bound and determined to attend UBC as an undergraduate student in large part because of his memories.

In the last year or two before I finished my dissertation and we moved, my neighbors and I learned about UBC's development plans. We learned that the homes we were living in were not only slated for demolition, but the entire community was set to be flattened and remade into high rises, much of which would become homes (or simply rental properties for profit) to non-UBC residents. We were heartbroken and incredibly angry. I am still angry and you need to know why.

The community that was created at Acadia Park, the commonsblock, the community garden, and the day care centres, was the best community I have ever lived in and I'm sure nothing in my future will surpass it. We had independent, though connected, homes, but we shared a backyard. The backyard contained a 90-plot community garden, walkways with no cars, a community centre, field for playing games, pockets of forest with swing sets in them, fields for running, and all of these spaces became a safe haven for young children and families who thrived in their connection with each other and nature. We were able to complete our degrees at UBC because of the community that the space helped foster. We decompressed from our work because of the gardening and immersion in the natural world.

I have in no uncertain terms called Acadia Park a utopic neighborhood, an ideal of how things should be. How could you knowingly destroy such a place and replace it with high density market housing? At this moment of extreme climate crisis, we do not need any more endless

and mindless growth. We need to learn how to live with each other, build community, grow food, and care for one another.

In those last couple years of living in Acadia Park, my neighbors and I created a group - Acadia Families for Sustainable Communities. We worked with Kiran Mahal, the VP Academic for the AMS to conduct a needs assessment, we initiated a letter writing and postcard campaign to lobby the UBC BOG to preserve Acadia Park, if not the old buildings themselves, the type of neighborhood and dedication to student family housing. We met with university planning officials, we followed all of the institutional channels for providing input, and when it was clear our needs weren't being heard and that our stories would be lost in the 10 years between when we were forcefully evacuated until now when the land use plan is back under review, we mounted as big of a grassroots campaign as we could, given the work of raising children, finishing dissertations, and searching for jobs. You may still have our old postcards or have seen our facebook site.

These were our demands then, and as an alumni and parent of a potential future UBC student, these remain my demands for you now:

- Market housing designation and development ONLY after student family housing needs are addressed
- Outdoor access for all families
- Safe, car-free zoning & greenspaces oriented toward children
- Designate a student-family [includes couples] neighbourhood within future developments
- Communal spaces, outside & indoors
- Affordable & accessible housing
- Meaningful consultation with all residents (children, families, partners)
- Preserve long-standing tradition of cooperation and community in Acadia Park

Sincerely,

Dr. Nora Timmerman

UBC alum, 2013

Oliver Alfred Dicks

My name is Dr. Oliver Dicks and I am a postdoctoral fellow at the Stewart Blusson Quantum Matter Institute in UBC and a resident in staff and faculty housing on campus.

I believe, as does UBC, that the primary goal of a university is its academic mission, the teaching of its brilliant students and the cutting edge research carried out by its members.

I do not believe that the land use plan in its current form serves this mission or is in the best interests of the university. In fact I believe this plan carries fundamental risks to UBC in terms of its stated mission of sustainability, its ability to attract the best students, staff and researchers, its financial future and its reputation.

Last week I received an email from our new president Benoit-Antoine Bacon where he writes, and I quote, “UBC is uniquely positioned to shape the next century in BC, Canada and globally. The incredible strengths of UBC – ... the deep commitments to indigenous relationships, to inclusion, to sustainability...”. The land use plan in its current form does not even commit to the sustainability goals of the city of Vancouver with regard to reaching operational net zero carbon. The Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan, or NCAP, that is currently only in its development stage is fundamentally kneecapped at its inception by approving a land use plan before it is completed. Construction on some of the planned developments will be finished before the NCAP even plans to set limits for embodied carbon in 2030. It also does not address how scientifically derived commitments to needed areas of open green space, or tree cover, or coastal ecosystem protection in the NCAP will be compatible with a land use plan that has not considered the data, as that data does not yet exist. UBC cannot claim to be positioned to shape the next century globally when it can’t even demonstrate leadership to the city it neighbors, nor retain the trust of its academics working towards combating climate change and environmental breakdown. I urge the board to amend the land use plan to commit to any goals set by the NCAP to supersede the commitments in the land use plan.

Next we come to inclusion, and its intersection with social sustainability. The land use plan only commits to 3300 new student beds by 2050, when there are longer waiting lists for student housing right now. Why does UBC only commit to housing 25% of its student population, when market rent in Vancouver continues to rise meaning students cannot live on or near the campus they study at, or for low income students, afford to study at UBC at all. We know from UBC’s own accounts student and staff housing is profitable, but with the land use plan only committing to 30% rental, of which only half is affordable rental for faculty and staff, the affordability of studying or working at UBC starts to become unsustainable. I already personally know of academics who have quit or refused jobs at UBC once they have discovered the cost of housing and years long waiting lists for childcare. What happens to UBC when world class postdocs, faculty and staff members are priced out completely, and UBC struggles to maintain its current level of teaching and research? The university, in order to support its academic mission must prioritize students and staff over private residences.

I would like to commend the letter* written by Prof. Patrick Condon of the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture at UBC and signed by over 92 UBC academics which asks why the university has not even considered aiming for 100% affordable housing for staff and students given their unique situation of owning 1,000 acres of land in Vancouver given to it as a public trust. Not only do they question the financial validity of the current land use plan, they also point out the risks to UBC of signing away control of a vast area of its land

endowment for 99 years. As pointed out in the letter, if UBC commits to affordable housing they can improve affordability in Vancouver as a whole. University members living on campus are not using housing stock elsewhere in Vancouver, or contributing to congestion via commuting. Commuting, which as the population of Wesbrook increases will require drastically increased public transportation, yet the land use plan highlights that it does not control public transport into and out of UBC, but merely hopes to "advocate" and "work with" TransLink. UBC cannot guarantee that public transportation will be provided by the city, and unlike other neighborhoods in Vancouver there is no political representation provided by elected officials to Metro Vancouver to put pressure on the Mayor's Council.

UBC has stated it cannot incur debt from financial markets, yet has given no evidence that it has attempted to challenge this or adequately explained why it cannot raise money this way to develop and maintain ownership of those developments, rather than signing public land away to private owners. I would urge the board to thoroughly examine this matter and determine what the legal landscape actually is and reconsider the starting hypothesis of the land use plan.

The board has the chance to cement a lasting and positive legacy from the development of the university and its land, to bring affordable housing that Vancouver desperately needs and nourish an academic ecosystem that is a global leader in sustainability. I urge them to radically amend the land use plan before it is too late.

* <https://thetyee.ca/Opinion/2023/04/06/Plea-New-Housing-Approach-UBC/>

Robert DeWreede

As a resident of Hampton Place (The [BUILDING REDACTED]) since 1998, and an Emeritus Professor of the Faculty of Science, I have the following concerns about Campus Vision 2050. Among the issues I would like to see addressed are the following:

1. Useable open space designed to be 0.5 hectares/1000 persons;

As mentioned by others, this is below guidelines recommended by the World Health Organization, and should be increased to at least the minimum of 0.9 hectares per 1000 persons.

2. I wish to echo the concerns raised by Dr Kindler, ones she raised at the BOG Meeting on the land use plan, and which I felt were not adequately addressed at that meeting:

A. " Is UBC ready and able to manage a city of this size?...Port Moody has 10 schools, 2 fire houses, and its own community hospital with a 24 emergency room. It has 500-1000 employees with exclusive mandate to manage the city. CV 2050 and the LUP are silent on how our new large city will be managed, governed, and serviced and do not provide any concrete estimates of

the necessary level of services or new infrastructure that will be required to support it. Who and how will we look over the well-being, quality of life and sustainability of this large new community?"

B. "Is UBC ready and able to manage a city of this size?...Port Moody has 10 schools, 2 fire houses, and its own community hospital with a 24 emergency room. It has 500-1000 employees with exclusive mandate to manage the city. CV 2050 and the LUP are silent on how our new large city will be managed, governed, and serviced and do not provide any concrete estimates of the necessary level of services or new infrastructure that will be required to support it. Who and how will we look over the wellbeing, quality of life and sustainability of this large new community?"

C. "Adding another 25k or so residents also begs the question of UBC's ability to protect residents, students, staff and others in case of a significant emergency. With UBC situated on the peninsula with research facilities that elevate risk of chemical, biological and nuclear emergencies well above those of typical city and with a large forested area that separates UBC from rest of city, that creates wild fire risk, the fact that CV 2050 does not address this matter is concerning. Do we have the capacity to adequately respond to ensure safe evacuation of such a large population."

Much work and thought has clearly gone into this Campus 2050 Land Use Plan, but the concerns raised above, should be addressed in detail and with thoughtful input.

Robert DeWreede
Professor of Botany (Emeritus)
And Hampton Place resident.

Ryan Jaco

Dear members of the UBC LUP committee,

I would like to begin with the acknowledgement that the land on which we gather is the unceded territory of the Coast Salish Peoples, including the territories of the xwməθkwəyəm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), Stó:lō and Səlílwətaʔ/Selilwitulh (Tsleil- Waututh) Nations.

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the acceptance of the LUP as written. I firmly believe that we can not have a LUP without first having a rigorous, data-driven NCAP.

We are currently living through a climate crisis that has truly hit home in recent years: heat domes, wildfires, droughts, atmospheric rivers, to name just a few recent catastrophic weather events in the Vancouver Metro region. I believe that it is your responsibility, as a world leading

academic institution, to ensure that you are doing your absolute best to protect both the fragile ecosystem on which your land is situated as well as the people who live upon it. You have a unique opportunity before you to effect real and significant change and I urge you to act boldly.

As a former resident of Mundell House in Wesbrook, I experienced the heat dome of 2021 in a profoundly negative way. Our unit remained at 33* 24 hours a day for 7 days. My child, who was 14 months at the time, and I had to check into a hotel as it was an unsafe environment for her. Unfortunately, we were unable to find a pet-friendly hotel and so my husband and dog had to remain in the apartment. Mundell was finished in September 2020 based on the Wesbrook Village Neighborhood Plan and an outdated version of REAP, and so did not have any cooling installed nor even any passive cooling measures installed (such as awnings or blackout curtains). These types of climatic events have long been forecasted yet UBCPT and its developers did not amend its building plans to incorporate ever changing climate change data into their plans. As a result, many people suffered greatly during the heat dome and UBC is still putting in place retrograde outfits. It took the organising efforts of residents to get UBC to offer retrogrades, at a cost to residents. These included mobile AC units offered at a discount which were not delivered and installed until September 2022, after the summer season and more than a year after the heat dome of June 2021. This lack of proactive planning and intervention by UBC in response to this heat event gives me little confidence that UBC will effect change in similar situations in the future if the NCAP is not created before the LUP. As a result, my family chose to move to Musqueam 2.

Mundell is situated adjacent to Lot 6, which is currently under construction. As a result of its location across from an active eagles' nest, UBC chose to seek a special permit from the province giving it permission to cone the nest, thereby renovicting the eagle pair, who just that spring had successfully hatched an eaglet. Rather than taking a stand for biodiversity against profit, UBCPT further hindered UBC's biodiverse footprint. Further, UBCPT intends to apply for an extension of this permit to allow construction at Lot 26.

I attended the public hearing, similar to this one, for lot 6 wherein a number of attendees, myself included, raised concerns over the future of that nest. We were offered no response and our concerns were not even noted in the meeting notes. When I learned about plans to cone the nest, I, along with many other community members, raised concerns by repeatedly reaching out to members of UBCPT, CCP, and the BOG. When we received no response we reached out to media outlets and started a petition, signed by over 18,000 people. Unfortunately, this did not stop the coning nor provide us with any feedback from any UBC entity. It was not until we managed to speak directly with a member of the BOG, who in turn emailed Michael White, that we were given an opportunity to speak with members of CCP on this issue. This lack of proactive community outreach and listening by UBC in response to the community's concerns over the nest gives me little confidence that UBC will effect change in similar situations in the future if the NCAP is not created before the LUP.

While the former LUP has language around biodiversity and the new LUP has admittedly stronger language regarding biodiversity, my above personal experiences give me little confidence that UBC will do better. In fact, were the current LUP to be adopted, I imagine a continuation of more of these shortcomings magnified by 10.

I am asking for you to pause the LUP until the NCAP has been solidified. Give us hope for 2050 and beyond.

Ryan Jaco
(She/her)
Former Wesbrook resident
Wife of Associate SCARP professor

Ryan Poon

There needs to be more services available for current residents before more prospective residents. There is a current lack of childcare facilities and schools to support the current population. Our family has been on the wait list for childcare for more than 2 years, and we still have no spots or timeline.

We need more services to support the current and future community.

Samar Devraj

How does UBC plan to bridge the gap between its goal of reaching zero waste and fostering a circular economy, given the current issues with recycling education, the inconsistent recycling practices among residents, and the mismatched garbage bags? What specific strategies or initiatives can UBC implement to improve recycling education and promote individual responsibility for recycling within the campus community?"

Sara Schroeter

I moved to Acadia Park in 2009, when my daughter was 9 months old and I was about to begin my PhD. Acadia Park was, in fact, the reason I moved my young family to Vancouver from Toronto, where I turned down a full funding offer to do my PhD at York. I knew from my uncle's experience with his family that Acadia Park offered a community and living experience unparalleled at any other Canadian university. I must say that while my academic experience at UBC was not always easy, and funding equal to that offered by York never materialized, moving into Acadia Park remains the best decision we made as a family.

The community provides a much-needed safety net for students who come from all over the world and are often overwhelmed with the dual responsibilities of family life and heavy academic programs. From the time my husband had appendicitis in my first week of classes, to the birth of our second child, and after I suffered a concussion at the end of my degree, the people of Acadia Park surrounded us with love, meals, trips to the hospital, and childcare. We also became active in helping people in our community, organizing meals for other families, providing tech support, and throwing Acadia Parks famous backyard potlucks. The community provides students and their families with indispensable friendships that enable them to make it through their programs. I have often said that I most likely would have quit my program were it not for the community that supported me through the most challenging times. In return, I was always happy to read a term paper, lend a book, or just listen to a friend when they were struggling through their program or parenting journey.

Most importantly, our children were able to grow up in a place where they were free to run outside and play with friends, often barefoot, in the comfort and safety of knowing that there were always caring adults nearby that they could turn to if needed. They walked and cycled to daycare past their friends' houses, past the community gardens, through the "fairy forest," to some of the best daycares I have seen in Canada. We supported one another by looking out for, and after, each other's children, to the extent that our children often referred to our friends as their "other mamas and papas."

I hold the friendships that we made during our seven years in Acadia Park close to my heart, and still dream of being there, in the comfort of those relationships. I still miss the community terribly, seven years after leaving. Where else can doctoral, medical, and undergraduate students/parents step out their front door, share their personal joys and frustrations with their neighbours, engage in an intellectually stimulating conversation, and return home with a new idea for a paper or a solution to a complex problem? Or maybe just the satisfaction of being heard? In a world struggling through a moment of divisive politics and environmental catastrophe, communities like Acadia Park are a balm for the soul that help combat isolation and depression.

Having easy access to communal, pedestrian outdoor spaces is key to the special connections and communities that have been created at Acadia Park for generations. I went to high school with people who grew up there and who spoke of it fondly when they heard that I had returned to live there with my family. Acadia Park should serve as a global model for healthy, child and play-centered, sustainable communities. I have never been as happy as I was in my years there, and I believe that I will spend the rest of my life trying to replicate the excellent living conditions we all experienced. My hope is that my children might be able to go to UBC one day and live at Acadia Park with their families, should they so choose.

It is a community that should be protected and expanded. Not with high-rises and car-friendly streets, but with more townhouses and duplexes, where families have access to communal spaces. UBC should harness the research being conducted by its faculty and students in play-

centered cities and sustainable development to make its student housing a model for universities worldwide. In fact, I'm quite certain that hundreds of alumni would be happy to help spread the word.

Shiva Zargar

Status: UBC Alumni, and a PhD Candidate at UBC

I've followed the development plans for UBC's Point Grey Campus with great interest and have a few inquiries and suggestions I believe are crucial to consider for the sustainable and inclusive growth of our community.

Noise Pollution Mitigation: With the proposed construction of new housing facilities, it's essential to question and understand the measures that will be adopted to mitigate noise pollution. High noise levels not only disrupt the daily activities of existing residents but can also impact mental health and overall well-being. What strategies are being employed to ensure minimal disturbance during construction and even post-construction?

Travel Mode Hierarchy & Ground Suitability: The hierarchy rightly emphasizes biking, rollerblading, and skateboarding as preferred modes of transport. However, has there been consideration for the type of ground or path materials used in ensuring they are suitable, especially for activities like rollerblading? Ensuring smooth and safe surfaces for these activities is paramount to encouraging their adoption.

Pathways for Cycling & Micromobility: Will there be dedicated paths for those using micromobility devices (e.g., rollerblades)? Or will they be sharing pathways with pedestrians or cyclists? It's imperative to clearly delineate these pathways and establish rules that ensure the safety of all campus residents and visitors.

Embodied Emissions of New Beds: With the ambitious plan of implementing 3,300 new and 1,000 replacement student beds, I'm curious about the discussions around the embodied emissions of these products. As a leading educational institution, UBC should consider the environmental footprint of every initiative, including the materials used in these beds, mattresses and their lifecycle emissions.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Shiva

Sophia Colliins

By only having 25% of proposed housing at below-market rate, the proposed land use plan will not address the cost of living crisis in Vancouver. The amount of student beds added does not address the housing crisis, and will ensure that demand continues to exceed supply far into the future, exacerbating student stress for generations to come. The LUP proposes a reduction in

public space that is below the level advised by international guidelines associated with the World Health Organization, and does not take tangible action to mitigate adverse environmental effects resulting from the project. The LUP should imagine a future at UBC where the social and environmental needs of the community are met - the current plan does neither.

Stephan Koenig

To the Board of Governors,

My name is Stephan Koenig, I am a staff member in the Faculty of Science at UBC Vancouver, as well as a resident of the Vancouver campus. I first want to acknowledge the work of Campus and Community Planning and the herculean task of crafting a plan that simultaneously mitigates climate change, lessens the housing crisis, furthers Indigenous reconciliation and generates profit for the UBC endowment. But that is the task before you. And the current Land Use Plan has fundamental issues stemming, in my opinion, from prioritizing short-term profit of the UBC Endowment Fund over anything else.

My first point: Our university sees itself as a climate change and sustainability leader, saying, for example that we “lead the way in climate action and global impact” as stated in our UBC Forward campaign to donors. But this LUP doesn’t move us forward, it leaves us stuck in the past. For example, this plan is very clear that building height will increase to 39 stories in Wesbrook and the resident neighbourhoods population increase from 15,000 to 35,000. Yet the plan provides no quantifiable strategy related to ecology and biodiversity, with only a vague target to [quote: “Identify, enhance, and manage important areas of biodiversity on campus.”] The city of Vancouver is committed to increasing tree canopy cover to 40% and we can’t even provide any quantified commitment? How is this leadership? This is 2023: we know the importance of tree canopy cover to climate change mitigation, we know that unhealthy ecosystems are unhealthy places to learn, work and live. We also know from the recent baseline ecological assessment that the ecological health of this campus is degraded. Strong leadership is required for its improvement. Treating ecosystem health as, at best, an afterthought is how development was done in the past. This LUP is our leadership document so let’s actually demonstrate climate action leadership and amend this plan to strengthen and quantify the ecology and biodiversity section.

My second point: The University Act mandates that “the members of the board of a university must act in the best interests of the university.” How on earth is it in the best interests of the university, in our current and worsening housing crisis, to commit 60% of new housing to private market-rate development that will be unaffordable to the people who actually study and work here? Yes, we gain immediate profit for the endowment, but long term what do we lose? We are already losing high-quality faculty and student recruits because of our lack of affordable housing; this will only get worse with this LUP. Let’s actually demonstrate

sustainability leadership and amend this plan to increase affordable on-campus housing for students, faculty and staff.

Finally, My comments are a direct appeal to the two Governors here today. This is your legacy as UBC governors, your actions now will have decades-long consequences. This plan is not in the best interests of this university. I implore you, the UBC governors, to demand amendments to the LUP, specifically: 1) To commit to much more than 3300 new student beds over 27 years, 2) to allocate more than 25% of new housing to faculty and staff below-market rental, 3) to put language into the LUP that will require all new development to adhere to the forthcoming NCAP policies, and 4) to commit to specific enforceable targets in the LUP for ecological and biodiversity protection and enhancement. I love UBC. I am not against development on this campus. I am advocating for sustainable, responsible development which this LUP does not provide. On Dec 5, please require amendments to this LUP. Wouldn't it be wonderful if this Board's legacy was to truly move us forward and be the climate and sustainability leaders we say we are.

Regards,

Stephan Koenig

Tara Martin

Dear LUP committee,

I joined the Faculty of Forestry in 2018 and I am the Liber Ero Chair in Conservation at UBC. Since taking up my position, I have applied for the PIRL grant and have been looking for a home within the Metro Vancouver area. I have two children and my partner runs a metal fabrication business that requires industrial space. We have not been able to find an affordable living situation anywhere near UBC and I now commute >1 hour each way to work. My post-docs and graduate students are also finding it challenging to find affordable housing. The proposed LUP does not align with the housing crisis that students, staff and faculty are currently facing or will face in the future. Nor does it align with the climate and biodiversity loss crisis or metrics of healthy living developed by the World Health Organization. UBC should be a leader in sustainable building design for healthy affordable living, creating solutions not adding to the problems.

If a chaired Professor is unable to find affordable housing anywhere near campus, how are staff and students going to be able to afford to work and study here? UBC needs non-profit housing, not more commercial free market housing. I wonder who this plan is actually serving and worry to what end.

Warmly,

Tara

Valentine Lafond

I have been working at UBC for the last 6 years, first as a Postdoctoral Fellow and then as a Research Associate, with additional teaching responsibilities. Unfortunately, and like many people with families and young kids, I have reached a point where I simply have to leave UBC and Vancouver, because I cannot afford to live here anymore. The increasing costs of living in Vancouver and the rental costs are driving many families away, as is the quasi impossibility to find affordable childcare. Affordable housing on campus is very hard to get (and not that affordable!), with long waiting lists and obscure priorities. I was lucky to find cheaper elsewhere. With the proposed plan, it will likely get harder in the future to secure affordable housing on campus. The trajectory is very concerning, as UBC will completely lose its capacity to attract or retain young career researchers (as well as a diverse crowd of students). The priority for future developments MUST BE affordable housing (at lower prices than today!), with more student and family housing, as well as more daycare places; not for-profit housing.

UBC should be a leader in sustainable development, with a better ratio of open public spaces and parks than what is suggested.

Written Comment Submissions - Files

The following written comments were uploaded via the online registration form or emailed as an attachment. Written comments were accepted between October 18th, 2023 to the end of the Public Hearing on November 7th, 2023.

Written comments have not been edited other than to redact names, personal identifiable information, and specific information requested by the author.



November 7th, 2023

AMS Response to UBC Land Use Plan (LUP) Draft

For Immediate Release
November 6th, 2023

VANCOUVER, BC – The Alma Mater Society (AMS) of the University of British Columbia (UBC) Vancouver represents 61,000+ students, including thousands of students who reside in university neighbourhoods.

We endorse the UBC Land Use Plan Draft's goal for at least 50% of the neighbourhood's housing to be occupied by UBC students, faculty, and staff. However, we would like to see students prioritized in obtaining housing on campus and for students to exceed the minimum 25% full-time student population residing on campus as set out by the UBC Land Use Plan Draft. With 57% of students in the AMS' annual Academic Experience Survey reporting facing financial hardship related to housing, we see that students are forced to move further and further away from campus and significantly increase commute times, affecting their physical, mental, and academic well-being.

We appreciate the reiteration of meeting the goals of the Housing Action Plan. However, the AMS continues to ask for an increased pace in the construction of units for students and for significantly more than the currently planned 3,300 student beds to align with previous and projected student population growth rates. Seeing the University make commitments towards student housing is admirable, but seeing timely progress be made on these commitments and increased ambitions in target numbers is what we hope to see from a top 40 institution.

We align with the calls for a 50/50 for rental to market-developed housing to be a part of the Land Use Plan's goal. Still, we understand that would entail a higher cost for the University. Therefore, we additionally support increased density than what is proposed to ensure that affordable housing is at the forefront of the Land Use Plan.

We also welcome and appreciate the reference to the UBC Child Care Expansion Plan and the University's commitment to upholding the Plan, but noting that we offer over 900 childcare spaces on campus and are one of the largest university-based childcare



November 7th, 2023

providers in North America, we hope that this does not come at the expense of plans to increase housing for students on campus.

We are excited to see the University's commitment to a robust transportation system on campus with its commitment to continue to advocate for Skytrain to UBC until it is constructed and operating. With the expected increase of population in Metro Vancouver, the University's commitment to increase transit usage to and from campus, and the 99-B Line continuing to be the busiest bus line in North America, Skytrain to UBC continues to prove itself to be a necessity rather than a luxury. We also commend the University's commitment and support for the Rapid Bus Transit Lines along the 41st/49th Corridors connecting the Campus to Metrotown, a Skytrain station to be built in the Southern side of the campus near the Wesbrook Neighbourhood, as well as exploring greater on-campus shuttle lines to provide students with greater accessibility to transportation to, from, and within the campus. We look forward to continuing working collaboratively on these fronts in the coming years to improve transit accessibility for all students.

We also appreciate the University's continued support for the U-Pass program, which continues to benefit thousands of students.

Finally, we welcome the University's vision for urban, high-density housing, which would help solve the housing affordability crisis in a limited area of land to work with, that is, the University Endowment Lands.

Overall, the AMS welcomes the goals set out by the current Draft of the Land Use Plan but will continue to expect the University to go above and beyond when it comes to affordable and greater housing on campus for students and looks forward to working collaboratively on advocacy efforts for an accessible transportation network connecting the campus.

Kamil Kanji (he/him)
AMS Vice-President Academic
and University Affairs

Joshua Kim (he/him)
AMS Interim Vice-President External

October 25, 2023

Sent by email to: [Campus Vision 2050 Email]

RE: Submission to the Public Hearing Committee

From: University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) Board Chair Richard Watson, on behalf of the Board of the UNA

To Whom It May Concern:

The University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) represents 15,000 UBC residents who will be directly impacted by UBC's revised Land Use Plan. Throughout UBC's Campus Vision 2050 planning process, the UNA has advocated for prioritizing sustainable, affordable, and livable neighbourhood development. These goals align with the University's own stated commitments on climate, housing availability and affordability, and the quality of its urban form. In spite of these shared goals, UBC has advanced a Land Use Plan that prioritizes the sale of land leases for market housing, much of which would come in the form of unaffordable, high-rise housing at twice the density of current neighbourhoods. The UNA, along with other representatives of UBC residents, faculty, staff, and students, have registered their profound disagreement with this order of priorities, but these calls have gone unheeded. We urge the Board of Governors to require the following revisions to the Land Use Plan before its final adoption.

1. Before setting the parameters of development in a revised Land Use Plan, UBC should complete its comprehensive revision of the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan. The LUP currently under consideration offers to "work towards the targets and policies" of the as-yet unfinished NCAP. Instead of this vague and non-committal formulation, the Land Use Plan should draw on the NCAP to set clear and measurable targets for greenhouse gas emissions, waste, and ecosystem services, and commit UBC to achieving them. Given our current climate emergency, the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan should be foundational to the Land Use Plan, not an afterthought.
2. In the face of the unprecedented shortage of local housing for UBC's faculty, staff, students, and area employees, UBC should increase the proportion of neighbourhood rental to 50% of total housing. Rental housing on campus addresses several priorities of the University, including attracting and retaining employees, decreasing the social and environmental costs of commuting, and generating revenue (through rents) for the endowment. In spite of these benefits to the University and its people, the proposed Land Use Plan sets a target of only 30% rental, reserving 70% of neighbourhood housing for market developments.

We call on the Board of Governors and the provincial government to prioritize the long-term financial, social, and educational interests of the University, rather than the short-term cash infusions derived from leasehold sales.

3. The Land Use Plan should establish parameters for the design of world-class residential neighbourhoods, with ample green/open space and community amenities. The proposed Land Use Plan promises only 1.1 hectares of open/green space per 1000 residents, which is at the lower end of the World Health Organization's recommended range of .9 to 5 ha. But the LUP reduces this to .5 ha in the case of "appropriate resident access to UBC-owned open space and facilities." This is both vague and very low, and would seriously compromise livability and the University's commitment to ecological and climate goals for the neighbourhoods.
4. Above all else, the Land Use Plan should reflect UBC's values and commitments to sustainability, housing affordability and availability, and leadership in urban design. The proposed Land Use Plan would sharply increase densities on UBC's remaining land endowment by enabling construction of at least twenty new towers, many over thirty stories tall. These new developments would be twice as dense as current neighbourhoods, with substantial, but under-studied, environmental and social impacts. UNA residents are accustomed to dense urban living, but they are concerned that the scale of the planned developments is far out of proportion to that of existing neighbourhoods.

We also want to express our disappointment with the Board of Governors Public Hearing Procedural Rules adopted at the Board's October 16 meeting. Any Land Use Plan amendments, current or future, should provide residents and other stakeholders meaningful opportunities for public comment and avenues for demanding public accountability. As mandated by provincial legislation, on October 16 the Board of Governors referred the Land Use Plan to a public hearing. Yet the Board's referral explicitly and unaccountably prohibits the Board from amending the Plan to lower neighbourhood densities following the public hearing. We fail to see the point of a public hearing that precludes changes based on public input. Residents want and deserve governance that gives them opportunities to question policy makers and hold them politically accountable.

Since early in the Campus Vision process, the UNA has supported calls for neighbourhoods that would be models of low carbon, sustainable, socially responsible, community-oriented urban planning. These priorities reflect UBC goals and values, as articulated in key documents such as the UBC Strategic Plan, the Declaration of Climate Emergency, and the Campus Vision 2050 Terms of Reference. In other words, UNA residents and UBC share an interest in vital, sustainable, and human-scaled neighbourhoods. The proposed Land Use Plan instead perpetuates a development



UNIVERSITY
NEIGHBOURHOODS
ASSOCIATION

strategy prioritizing leasehold condo sales. While leasehold market housing has a place in the mix of housing types, it should not comprise 70% of all housing in UBC neighbourhoods. We call on the Board of Governors to realign the Land Use Plan to a different set of priorities and values: sustainability, climate urgency, rental housing availability, and the long-term stewardship of UBC's land endowment.

Sincerely,

Richard Watson
Chair, Board of Directors
University Neighbourhoods Association

CC: Hon. David Eby – MLA for Vancouver Point-Grey and Premier of BC
Hon. Anne Kang – MLA for Burnaby-Deer Lake and Minister of Municipal Affairs
UBC Board of Governors via the UBC Board of Governors Secretariat
Michael White – UBC Associate Vice-President, Campus + Community Planning
UNA Board of Directors
Sundance Topham – UNA Chief Administrative Officer

UNIVERSITY NEIGHBOURHOODS ASSOCIATION

202-5923 Berton Ave., Vancouver, British Columbia V6S 0B3 T: 604.827.5158 F: 604.827.5375 reception@myuna.ca www.myuna.ca

Riley Plunkett

Written by: Riley Plunkett, current UBC undergraduate student.

Each year I apply for student loans. They are required for me to be able to attend UBC, because I do not have extraneous funds to cover the costs. Each year I qualify for the maximum amount of student loans, despite documenting my mother sending what money she can monthly. This year, as I reached the end of the application, I was told by the website that the maximum amount of student loans that I qualified for in conjunction with assistance from my mother, was not enough to support me for the year. The amount of money I receive in student loans, grants, and financial support from my parent was not enough for me to afford living and studying at UBC.

I live in a "below market" rental complex on campus. I put below market in brackets because I find it laughable that \$1500/month is considered any kind of affordable. I buy all generic brands of grocery items. I haven't purchased new clothes in a year. I dread having to purchase new shoes, even though my current ones have holes in them, and it rains in Vancouver at least 3 times a week. I don't own a car, I don't eat out more than twice a month, I don't lead an expensive life. And despite gaining nearly \$10,000 in debt every year in order to attend this school, they don't seem to care.

They clearly don't value the people that go into making UBC the awarded, respected, sought-after, and well-regarded place that it is. Because 10% of new development being "below market" and for UBC student, faculty, and staff is, in the most respectful of terms, absurd. How is 3000 student beds enough when there are 60,000 of us? Unless the other 57,000 are affordably housed- and let me tell you, they're not- it's not enough.

Individual student housing waitlists get as long as 4000, and the solution is adding 3000 student beds? I'm not a math major, but that doesn't seem to add up.

Do you know how few of the students currently living in student housing have access to a semiprivate outdoor space? Almost none. How is the solution to that to further reduce the amount of shared outdoor space? To take away more of Pacific Spirit Park, to shrink the distance between new developments, to build more market housing, and no services? How *unsustainable*.

UBC can do better. Its constituents want better, and know how it can be done better, all they have to do is listen.

Alexandra Volkoff

Submission to the Public Hearing of November 7, 2023 on UBC's proposed Land Use Plan (LUP) – Alexandra Volkoff, Alumna, Resident (Hawthorn)

The Board of Governors is poised to make a “legacy-level” decision on the future of UBC. Will it vote to use the little land left to build a vibrant academic community, one that is sustainable and climate-resilient with affordable housing for people affiliated with UBC? Or will it try to squeeze the last penny of profit from the land by prioritizing the sale of land leases for market housing, much of which would come in the form of unaffordable, high-rise units at twice the density of current neighbourhoods?

UBC's two most precious assets are not its buildings and its large endowment; they are its **people** and its **reputation**. The proposed LUP threatens both.

- a) Without excellent faculty, world-class researchers, staff and students, a university is nothing, but UBC has difficulty attracting the best because of the lack of affordable housing. At present UBC has the highest level of non-owner-occupied housing in Canada. The lands that UBC still holds could and should be used to fix that situation, to build housing – rental and for purchase – for those affiliated with the university at a price that they can afford. It should not continue the practice of building units for investors, many of whom do not live on campus. The current price of most condos and rents are amongst the highest in Vancouver, and certainly beyond the pockets of those who would like to come to UBC. The current LUP claims to be taking steps towards greater affordability, but it could do so much more.

At \$2.26 billion, UBC already has the second largest endowment of any university in Canada. At this critical juncture, instead of adding to this endowment, UBC should use the land it has creatively to house prospective faculty, staff and students. Why is it not putting a priority in this LUP on doing all it can to attract the right people to make this institution great now and into the future? If you can attract the right people by building affordable housing NOW, you will be able to build your reputation and attract more funding for the endowment LATER. Do not go for the “sugar hit” of quick financial returns from investment properties that do not help attract the people you need.

- b) The UBC campus – built on unceded territory – currently also has a reputation for being one of the most beautiful campuses in the world. The university advertises itself by showing pictures of green spaces and leafy trees. But this is getting less true over time: a baseline ecological assessment shows that more than half of the soft landscapes on campus are low or very low quality, with another 40% rated as only in a moderate ecological condition. UBC CLAIMS to be a leader on

climate action, but the LUP has a nebulous approach to protecting biodiversity and enhancing environmental health, and the Board is moving forward despite there being no Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan with firm, measurable goals in place. Moreover, the LUP calls for a reduction in usable open space in the neighbourhoods from 1 ha per 1000 residents to 0.5 ha, well below WHO standards. The Board is not even listening to its own climate scientists.

The population density of Vancouver is already more than 5,700 people per sq km, one of the highest in North America (after New York City, San Francisco, and Mexico City); for comparison, that of Shanghai is only 4,200 people per sq km. The current LUP calls for density in the neighbourhoods that is close to double the density of Vancouver's downtown core which is 18,832 people per sq km; the LUP anticipates the density of the UBC neighbourhoods will be approximately 37,000 people per sq km by 2050. Many of these are expected to be housed in buildings up to 39 stories in height. Why does the Board want to build "Manhattan on the peninsula"? Once ruined, you will never be able to get the beauty of this campus back. The Board is in danger of losing its reputation as a climate leader, and of having a beautiful, healthy campus with livable, affordable neighbourhoods, all for the sake of a few quick bucks. Is this what Board members want their legacy to be?

Finally, why is the Board rushing this LUP forward when there is no clear idea at present – as outlined by the Provost during the Oct. 16 Board meeting – of what the student growth on the UBC campus should or could be. Indeed, he noted that for a number of reasons, despite expected growth in BC's population, it is NOT expected that numbers of students would expand a lot at the Point Grey campus. At an even more fundamental level, has the Board considered when bigger is simply too big? Just as no LUP should be approved before the completion of climate action plans that include the WHOLE peninsula (academic campus, neighbourhoods, UEL and Musqueam), so too, no LUP should be approved before a new academic planning process takes place that seriously considers what growth means.

I urge the Board of Governors to reject this LUP, and to guard UBC's most precious assets – its people and its reputation – by rethinking some of the basic premises underlying the current plan.

Rebecca Todd

I am a UBC faculty member and a campus resident. I would like to raise major concerns about aspects of the land use plan that are not only inconsistent with but actively undermine UBC's academic mission of *pursuing excellence in research, learning and engagement to foster global citizenship and advance a sustainable and just society across British Columbia, Canada and the world*. This clash between the plan and the university's stated mission is reflected in the fact that at the Board of Governor's meeting only 1 of the 3 elected faculty representatives voted in favor of moving the plan forward.

Excellence in research and learning depends on competitively recruiting and retaining faculty members who are world-recognized leaders in their fields. As someone who has recently chaired search committees, I can attest that unaffordable housing is one of the greatest – if not THE greatest — impediment to hiring our top choice candidates. Yet the land use plan limits UBC's faculty/staff target housing to 15% of build out in the context of a global housing affordability crisis. The Housing Action Plan plans for 75% of development to be market-rate housing – that is housing that is unaffordable to the majority of UBC faculty, staff and students and staff. For context, the current market rate in Wesbrook for a new build is 1.5million for a 2 bedroom, ~1000 sq ft apartment and >\$4000/month for a 2 bedroom rental. Under the circumstances the obstacles to recruitment and retention of faculty will be nearly insurmountable, directly thwarting the stated goals. This looks to me like prioritizing a short term development cash grab at the expense of the university's mission.

Fostering excellence in learning engagement and a just society also entails that students have roofs over their heads. Yet at UBC there are currently unacceptably long waits for student housing. As a reflection of financial stresses on students and the high cost of living, food insecurity among students is at an all-time high. Yet the plan commits to building only 3300 new student beds in 30 years. Given the rate of growth planned this is trivial expansion of student beds, and suggests that mere lip service is being paid learning and a just society.

With regard to sustainability, as faculty representative to the Board of Governors, Dr. Charles Menzies, has pointed out that, "in the midst of a climate emergency, the land use plan contains no clear, measurable targets to mitigate adverse effects." Moreover there are major concerns that taking responsibility for governing a city of 50,000 will a major deviation of the university's academic mission.

These are not my only concerns about the land use plan, but they are concerns that to my mind render it incompatible with the university's stated mission in its current form.

Rebecca Todd

Associate Professor Dept of Psychology

Residence: [Address Redacted]

Patrick Condon

An open letter to the UBC Board of Governors.

Dear Governors:

Since the 1990s, and the construction and sale of UBC [Hampton Place](#) market condominium project, the university has been slowly privatizing the 1000 acres of the remaining land endowed to it. The current "[2050 Vision](#)" is in this same spirit. The bulk of the new housing proposed is either market rental or market strata units. While exact numbers are, at this stage, intentionally unclear, what is clear is that new student housing and new affordable housing for staff and faculty will comprise a relatively small portion of the new housing proposed. The question is, "why?"

The plan, as written, leaves the answer to this question unclear, when, at key points in the housing plan, exact numbers of non-market university owned housing for students, staff and faculty are not given. I quote from the text, "[exact percentage to be determined](#) by community engagement and UBC Board of Governors." These numbers are yet to be released.

What is alarming about this plan is that the option for all of the new housing to be affordable was not, and is not, considered. And yet a plan based entirely on providing affordable housing for faculty, staff, and students is not only practical, it makes sense for the university and the BC citizens who, in the end, support it.

First, why it's practical, and then why it's imperative.

Why it's practical:

In the City of Vancouver, out of control land price inflation has made it impossible for developers to produce affordable housing, particularly on the city's west side. In most cases, land now costs twice as much per "buildable" square foot as the cost to construct that same square foot. And it doesn't help to increase the allowable density of a project in hopes of diluting the land share of the final purchase price, as adding density inflates land price. Sadly, only land speculators gain.

The University, in its now 30-year tradition of selling off chunks of the UBC endowed lands, is only adding to this speculative land inflation inferno. But UBC is the only place in the Lower Mainland that need not contribute to this tragedy. Why? Because UBC owns the land, or at least it does now. Thus, it can produce housing for just the cost of construction.

Amortizing (paying off) the cost of construction [can easily be done](#) by charging affordable rents, pegged to 30 percent of current average faculty and staff salaries, with students housed at prices that are less than what the university currently charges. In short, and to keep this simple, the university can afford to build all of the proposed new housing itself, still keep the remaining UBC endowed lands as a public trust, and still make money.

A wrinkle that is often raised when this sort of suggestion is offered is that the university is currently not allowed to approach the financial markets for construction financing. But the 2050 plan, in many cases, alludes to the need for this restriction to change in order that they might achieve even their currently modest ambitions for non-market housing. So presumably this will change.

Finally, and most importantly, this proposal to bring students, staff, and faculty closer to UBC through building affordable housing on our endowed lands is entirely consistent with the university's long-held policy to create a fully sustainable campus. Indeed, a proposition to marketize UBC land is a radical

inversion of sustainability goals, as it adds to lengthy commuting which raises UBC's carbon footprint. In contrast, a sustainable campus, based on work-study-residence proximity, is climate friendly and healthier, as walking and cycling options become practical. Affordable housing would also address the vexed question of university recruitment and retention".

Why it's imperative:

UBC is the single institution big enough to single handedly make a dent in our regional housing crisis. With its current proposal for thousands of new housing units it could, should it so choose, take enormous pressure off of the regional housing market. If rents at UBC were pegged, not to market rates, but to a reasonable share (say 30 percent) of average incomes, the sheer mass of this affordable community would put downward pressure on the larger regional housing market. For proof look at [Vienna, where over 50 percent](#) of housing is non-market (mostly co-ops). This puts downward pressure on the remaining market housing, since the non-market share is large enough to offer a more affordable choice.

UBC can also make a huge contribution to a much more sustainable region with a stroke of a pen. Numbers are hard to arrive at, but less than a third of students, staff, and faculty now live on the endowed lands. And frustratingly it seems that the large majority of new market rate homes built on campus since the 90s are not owned and resided in by university students, staff and faculty. About half of these new strata units are investor owned, suggesting that UBC is a net contributor to housing price inflation, with recent housing efforts doing more harm than good.

Finally, the taxpayer expenditure of four to five billion dollars for the UBCX subway expansion now (post Covid) seems very far in the future, if ever. It is not the purpose here to debate the efficacy of that transit plan, only to suggest that shifting the bulk of the transportation demand exerted by UBC's remote location would be offset, now and in the future, if the majority of its researchers, faculty, staff and students lived within walking distance. The wait for the UBCX now seems at least a decade off if not more. A housing first alternative can begin, literally, Monday.

Should the privatization stop here?

In the end the larger question raised here is this: Is it time to stop the privatization of our public assets? Since the 1980s Canadian politics has been in the grip of a privatization wave. Assets developed in common for the public good are more and more privatized, in the faith that the private sector can do it all better than the public sector. Housing, generally, has been the test case for this theory, with the federal and provincial governments largely abandoning their responsibility for affordable housing. Now, with the housing crisis apparently unsolvable, we can clearly see how this has worked out.

Make no mistake, even if UBC "leases" the land as proposed, 100-year leases paid entirely up front are the equivalent of an outright sale. This public university thus loses control of an enormously useful capital asset, UBC's endowed land, forever. Once it's gone it can't be recovered.

Perhaps we should do something truly sustainable and protect this public trust for at least the next seven generations, and at the same time establish a continuing stream of housing support for those same generations as well.

Signed by:

Shane Hunt

November 6th, 2023

Dear UBC Board of Governors,

Thank you kindly for taking the time to engage with the campus community around the 2023 Draft Land Use Plan (LUP).

Having followed Campus Vision 2050 since 2021, I have had the opportunity to observe the transformation of the myriad aspirations of the campus community into a relatively unified whole. However, the proposed Land Use Plan diverges from the public interest and that vision in several important ways that render the campus community's aspirations relatively inert. This is evident in the lack of an expanded land-use classification system which could provide formal protection for campus greenspace, the persistence of a 1:1 tree replacement policy for campus neighborhoods, the lack of commitment to a campus, or at the very least, an academic campus-wide urban forest management plan, as well as the absence of an industry-standard tree protection by-law that protects trees from development, while also overlooking the benefits that the urban forest provides for climate resilience across the academic campus. I hope that my voice will resonate with that of others in advocating for the amendment of the proposed LUP to help address these gaps before it becomes officially adopted.

Two of the 'big ideas' in Campus Vision 2050 were 'restorative and resilient landscapes' as well as 'climate mitigation and adaptation'. In the preliminary engagement phase, it was made clear under Draft Guiding Principle 5 that the campus community was very concerned about the potentially antagonistic relationship between development and ecological stewardship on campus (C+CP, 2022). While protecting and conserving 'high-value' biodiversity areas has been integrated into the final Campus Vision 2050 and the proposed LUP, 'high-value' is not defined making it uncertain to which areas on campus this will apply. While other areas of campus may be regarded as moderate to low value to biodiversity, they may still contain elements, such as large mature trees, that are nonetheless valuable to biodiversity. As such, they have the potential for their habitat value to be enhanced (e.g. through intentional planting of native species). For example, Rhododendron Wood is full of large mature trees but is classified as being in 'moderate' ecological condition by Diamond Head Consulting's Ecological Baseline (2023) report produced for Campus Vision 2050. Despite this, the protection and enhancement these important, if 'moderate' ecological value greenspaces, is not supported through the proposed LUP. While the structural diversity of Rhododendron Wood is limited (i.e. it does not have a substantial understory, or trees from a wide range of age classes), this remnant patch of forest is one of the more important greenspaces on campus that deserves formal protection, if not only for its habitat value, then for the number of students and faculty that use it for course work in the Faculty of Forestry.

Habitat loss due to urbanization or land-use change is the primary driver of biodiversity loss, globally (Faeth, 2011; McKinney, 2006; Czech et al., 2000). This is significant because relative to other land-use changes, urbanization is comparatively permanent, making post-development ecosystem recovery difficult or impossible (McKinney 2006). While it is important to protect large

'high-value' greenspaces to help steward an ecologically sustainable landscape, the significant role that small patches of greenspace for supporting biodiversity in urban areas has been increasingly recognized (Kendal et al., 2017; Riva and Fahrig, 2022; Soanes et al., 2018). Contrary to the common belief that cities are taxonomically homogeneous, Aronson et al. (2014) demonstrate that native bird and plant species richness is greater than non-native species richness for most cities globally, and it is likely that this trend can be observed across campus. Therefore, it is important to preserve the remnant patches of greenspace that we have on campus for the protection and enhancement of urban biodiversity. Despite this, there is currently no land-use type proposed in the LUP that would formally protect these valuable, if smaller, patches of greenspace, such as Rhododendron Wood, Fairview Grove (which has seen many of its western red cedars cut down for the Beaty Biodiversity Centre Addition), the Old Arboretum, or the nameless stand of Douglas fir trees behind West Mall Annex, which are some of the low-moderate greenspaces identified by Diamond Head Consulting (DHC, 2023). It should be noted that while Tree Guideline Areas existed in the previous LUP (Section 4.1.2.2), there were very few of these areas, and they had no formal protection, despite the additional attention to their development that was required, making this designation relatively ineffective. This is particularly concerning as Campus and Community Planning seeks to increase the intensity of development on campus (i.e. density and building heights) through in-fill development.

While the campus neighborhoods have committed to a tree management plan (LUP Section 4.4.3.2), the academic campus lacks an urban forest management plan, as well as an industry-standard tree protection policy that would protect groups or individual trees before, during and after development. While medium to large sized trees provide exponentially more ecosystem services than small trees, it is not uncommon to observe large trees lacking tree protection zones (i.e. wooden or metal fences that prevent entry of people, machinery or equipment) throughout the academic campus during construction. On the contrary, heavy machinery or equipment and fences are often stored right up to the trunk of a tree, instead of the specified distances from tree trunks which are listed in arboriculture standards such as the ANSI A300 Construction Management Standard or the ISA Best Management Practices for Managing Trees During Site Development and Construction, and are widely used throughout the Lower Mainland. Large mature trees are in decline globally and are more sensitive to development than younger trees (Le Roux, et al., 2014; Lindenmayer et al., 2012; Matheny, Nelda and Clark, 1998). Therefore, to preserve the larger proportion of ecosystem services that these trees provide, it is important to provide them with suitable opportunities to survive and thrive during the rapid development projected for campus over the next ten to thirty years (Stephenson et al., 2014). For an example of the considerations involved in tree protection, and the sequence in which could be integrated into the development process, see Appendix A. Moreover, a commitment to a campus-wide urban forest strategy and management plan could play a pivotal role in helping to achieve a more restorative and resilient landscape, while improving the quality of life of the campus community.

Compounding with the absence of adequate tree protection policies during development on UBC's academic campus, the removal of large valuable trees is effectively supported by the proposed LUP's advocacy for a 1:1 tree replacement ratio in UBC neighborhoods (Section 4.4.2.4). This is unacceptable because in effect, it justifies the replacement of a 100-year-old western red

cedar, a tree highly valued by Musqueam and other Indigenous Nations, with a 10-year-old sapling that will likely never in its lifetime reach the age, size, or value of that cultural heirloom. As previously mentioned, large mature trees have also been shown to provide exponentially more ecosystem services (i.e. the services that nature provides to people). For example, on average large mature trees (>100cm DBH) can sequester more carbon per year than is contained in a medium sized tree (~103kg) (Stephenson et al., 2014). Since large mature trees provide a disproportionate amount of ecosystem services, C+CP should emphasize the protection of trees in older and larger age and size classes, especially for trees with long lifespans that are in good health and condition. A thorough review of the 1:1 replacement ratio should be conducted to determine at which point (1:2, 1:3, 1:4) the benefits (i.e. ecosystem services) of the replacement trees compensate for the tree lost within a certain specified time range (e.g. 5-10 years), and C+CP should provide special protection to groups or individual trees that are above 30-60cm in diameter at breast height (DBH), which is measured at 1.37m from the base of the tree, because it will take several decades for individual replacement trees to reach these sizes and replace the benefits that are lost when these trees are removed (e.g. 50+ years). However, the climate crisis is already here, and we should be recognising the valuable role that the urban forest can contribute to climate mitigation and adaptation, and ultimately, in realising the vision of a restorative and resilient landscape.

Overall, the development of an urban forest management plan for campus as well as a land-use classification that provides formal protection for campus greenspaces would result in a LUP that better responds the needs and interests of the campus community. Addressing the insufficiency of the 1:1 tree replacement ratio in campus neighborhoods, and the lack of an industry-standard tree protection policy campus-wide, are two other aspects of urban forest management planning on campus that are especially important to address, due to the intensive development expected on campus over the next decade.

Many thanks for your thoughtful consideration of the gaps identified in the proposed LUP and I hope, for helping to address them.

Kind regards,

Shane Hunt

Bachelor of Urban Forestry (4th Year)
University of British Columbia

References

- Aronson, M. F. J., La Sorte, F. A., Nilon, C. H., Katti, M., Goddard, M. A., Lepczyk, C. A., Warren, P. S., Williams, N. S. G., Cilliers, S., Clarkson, B., Dobbs, C., Dolan, R., Hedblom, M., Klotz, S., Kooijmans, J. L., Kühn, I., MacGregor-Fors, I., McDonnell, M., Mörtberg, U., & Pyšek, P. (2014). A global analysis of the impacts of urbanization on bird and plant diversity reveals key anthropogenic drivers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1780), 20133330. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3330>
- C+CP. (2022). UBC Campus Vision 2050: Needs and Aspirations Engagement Summary Report. In *Campus Vision 2050*. UBC. <https://campusvision2050.ubc.ca/engagement-summary-needs-and-aspirations>
- Czech, B., Krausman, P. R., & Devers, P. K. (2000). Economic Associations among Causes of Species Endangerment in the United States. *BioScience*, 50(7), 593. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2000\)050\[0593:eaacos\]2.0.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2000)050[0593:eaacos]2.0.co;2)
- DHC. (2023). *UBC Campus Vision 2050: Ecological Baseline*. Diamond Head Consulting.
- Faeth, S. H., Bang, C., & Saari, S. (2011). Urban biodiversity: patterns and mechanisms. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1223(1), 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05925.x>
- ISA. (2023). *Best Management Practices: Managing Trees During Construction*. International Society of Arboriculture. <https://www.isa-arbor.com/store/product/139/>
- Kendal, D., Zeeman, B. J., Ikin, K., Lunt, I. D., McDonnell, M. J., Farrar, A., Pearce, L. M., & Morgan, J. W. (2017). The importance of small urban reserves for plant conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 213, 146–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.07.007>
- Le Roux, D. S., Ikin, K., Lindenmayer, D. B., Manning, A. D., & Gibbons, P. (2014). The Future of Large Old Trees in Urban Landscapes. *PLoS ONE*, 9(6), e99403. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0099403>
- Lindenmayer, D. B., Laurance, W. F., & Franklin, J. F. (2012). Global Decline in Large Old Trees. *Science*, 338(6112), 1305–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1231070>
- McKinney, M. L. (2006). Urbanization as a major cause of biotic homogenization. *Biological Conservation*, 127(3), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.09.005>
- Riva, F., & Fahrig, L. (2022). The disproportionately high value of small patches for biodiversity conservation. *Conservation Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12881>
- Soanes, K., Sievers, M., Chee, Y. E., Williams, N. S. G., Bhardwaj, M., Marshall, A. J., & Parris, K. M. (2018). Correcting common misconceptions to inspire conservation action in urban environments. *Conservation Biology*, 33(2), 300–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13193>
- TCIA. (2019). *Tree, Shrub and Other Woody Plant Management - Standard Practices: Management of Trees and Shrubs during Site Planning, Site Development, and Construction*. Tree Care Industry Association, Inc. <https://www.isa-arbor.com/store/product/75/>

Appendix A

Phase of Development	Report Type and/or Required Action	Methodology & Standards	ISA Certified Arborist Required	Responsibility	Start Date	Report Due and/or Action Completed	Interval (Frequency)
1. Planning & Design							
	<i>Tree Inventory</i>	A300	x	Arborist	2023-03-27	2023-04-03	Once
	<i>Tree Risk Assessment</i>	A300	x	Arborist	2023-03-27	2023-04-03	Once
	<i>Review Construction & Design Plans</i>	A300	x	Arborist	2023-03-27	n/a	Throughout the process and whenever plans are modified.
	<i>Tree Protection Plan (CRZs and TPZs)</i>	A300	x	Arborist	2023-04-03	2023-04-07	Once
2. Pre-Construction							
	Communicate goals of the TPP with property owner, project management and relevant contractors	A300	x	Arborist	2023-04-10	n/a	Upon completion of the TPP, and immediately prior to the commencement of construction.
	Construct TPZ (2m metal interlocked and staked fences) as indicated in Figure 1 and the Tree Protection section of the attached report	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-01	2023-05-05	Once
	Install explanatory signage for TPZs and identify arborist contact information	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-01	2023-05-05	Once
	Install at least 10" wood chips as indicated in Figure 1	A300	x	Project Manager	2023-05-08	2023-05-08	Once
	Pruning for clearance along mulched area to a height of 3m	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-09	2023-05-10	Once
	Root Pruning along staging area indicated in Figure 1	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-11	2023-05-18	Once
3. Construction							
	Monitoring compliance with the TPP	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-23	2024-02-23	Weekly
	Monitoring tree health, soil moisture, soil compaction and physical damage to trees or their roots.	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-23	2024-02-23	Weekly.
	Reporting and communicating damage to the property owner, project manager and relevant contractors.	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-23	2024-02-23	As necessary
	Mitigating damage to trees and conducting remedial actions.	A300	x	Arborist	2023-05-23	2024-02-23	As necessary
4. Landscape							
	Monitoring compliance with the TPP	A300	x	Arborist	2024-02-26	2024-04-01	Bi-weekly
	Monitoring tree health, soil moisture, soil compaction and physical damage to trees or their roots.	A300	x	Arborist	2024-02-26	2024-04-01	Bi-weekly
	Negotiated removal of the TPZs to facilitate installation of landscape elements	A300	x	Arborist	2024-02-26	2024-03-29	As necessary
4. Post-Construction							
	Monitoring tree health, soil moisture, soil compaction and physical damage to trees or their roots.	A300	x	Arborist	2024-04-01	2023-04-05	Immediately after construction and landscape phases of development. Once a month for the first 6-months.
	<i>Tree Risk Assessment</i>	A300	x	Arborist	2024-04-01	2023-04-05	Immediately after construction and landscape phases of development, every year for the first 2 years and then every 5 years for the following 10 years.
	Complete removal of TPZs	A300	x	Arborist	2024-04-08	2024-04-10	Once
	Removal of protective mulch	A300	x	Project Manager	2024-04-11	2024-04-12	Once

Murray McCutcheon

UBC Land Use Plan Public Hearing Submission, Nov. 7, 2023

My name is Murray McCutcheon. I have been a resident of the UNA since 2016. I have undergraduate, Master's, and Doctoral degrees from UBC. My father has been a professor (now emeritus) for more than 50 years. I work for a UBC spinoff company. And I have been an elected Director representing residents on the Board of the UNA since 2019.

Needless to say, I have strong ties to this university and care deeply about its future. It is from this connection that I feel a sense of responsibility, of stewardship, for this public institution.

And I feel compelled to speak against a plan that is based on a failing model of development, is not accountable to community concerns, and that ultimately does not serve the long-term needs of the university or this burgeoning municipality.

To understand the driving force behind Campus Vision 2050, you just need to look at where we're gathered – in the Robert H. Lee Alumni Centre. Robert Lee was profiled in a March 2019 article in the Vancouver Sun entitled, "UBC Turns Land into a River of Gold." As the pioneer of UBC's land development model, Robert Lee's goal was to create an income stream for the university that would flow, like a river of gold, in perpetuity. If the measure of success for this model is building up the Endowment, then it is mission accomplished. However, by other measures, it falls seriously short.

This plan is premised on profit over priorities that serve the public interest – namely providing security of housing for UBC faculty, staff, students, and neighbourhood employees; creating an environmentally responsible plan that befits a leading academic institution in the midst of a climate emergency; and building livable neighbourhoods, with ample green space, services, child-care, schools, that are the basis of thriving communities.

The problem with the plan is it is based on an outmoded land development model. Let me ask some questions:

- If the development model has been so successful, why are my UBC faculty friends so worried about being able to recruit great colleagues into their departments?
- Why are so many postdocs and students struggling to find places to live?
- Why is it that UBC has the highest proportion of non-owner-occupied housing units – 49% - in Metro Vancouver, as reported by Andy Yan of SFU? In other words, half of the units are investor owned. What a lost opportunity!
- If UBC believes there is a climate emergency, which it declared in 2019, why is this plan being rushed through before a Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan is in place?
- Why are the development planners not accountable to elected representatives?

The lack of meaningful accountability to the public has been evident throughout this planning process. The number that really matters can be found buried in Table 2 on p. 17 of the Land Use Plan. Total area of planned development: 16,483,000 sf. This is a 50% upsizing of the current plan and will create a residential density greater than downtown. It was revealed only at the end of the terms of reference consultation period in May 2022. Since then, it has not changed, but it is now dressed up in a 66-page glossy report. Let's call it what it is. UBC set a revenue goal and

the rest of the plan is solving for this. There has been no meaningful consultation or accountability for concerns about affordability, about the scale of the development, over the financing objectives, the constraints or opportunities.

The lack of accountability has been evident in how the UNA has been marginalized in this process. Before I was a UNA Director, I became involved in land use planning issues as a concerned resident, and I and other residents were given time to address the Board directly, and to meet with the university president, and our concerns were taken seriously and incorporated into revisions to the Stadium Road plan.

What has been my experience on the Board of the UNA, which is the only elected Board representing the 15,000 residents? We are “managed” via a side liaison committee of the Board. Our request to meet with the Board of Governors was denied. We have repeatedly expressed concerns that represent the feedback from residents. And these concerns have not been addressed.

So you can forgive me for being cynical about this process. Why do I bother? I bother because I feel a sense of responsibility for this place. My fear is that in 2050, people will look back and say – whatever were they thinking?

What would Robert Lee have done? He was an entrepreneur. I think he would have realized that version 1.0 of UBC’s land development model from the 1990s is not suitable for the complex challenges facing the university in the 2020s. He would say, as he told the Vancouver Sun in 2019, “you need an entrepreneur to get it done.” In these times, we need outside the box thinking. We need to be creative, to establish a new development model that solves for the problems today and for the future ahead, not double down on an out-moded model that is failing.

You can do better. You have to do better. And that is why I think the Province should reject this plan and send UBC back to the drawing board.

Eagle Glassheim

Public Hearing Comments
7 November 2023

Eagle Glassheim

- Professor of History at UBC
- Resident of Wesbrook Neighbourhood
- Also an elected Director of the University Neighbourhoods Association, but I'm speaking here for myself and not on behalf of the UNA.

Like many universities in North America, UBC has a land endowment meant to serve the academic and financial needs of the university. Historically, land endowments have often involved large tracts of forest, from which universities could derive revenue through timber, mineral, or real estate sales.

There were two approaches to stewardship of timber endowments, which offer some valuable lessons for our current circumstances. Universities could clear cut their forests, to generate quick income to finance immediate campus growth. Alternately, they could selectively harvest timber, opting for a slower, but more sustainable, revenue stream. This stewardship model prioritized the longer-term financial and ecological sustainability of the forest, and ultimately of the university.

UBC faces a similar choice now. Our land endowment isn't forest any more, and it sits in one of the hottest real estate markets on the planet. But the challenge the University faces with its land use planning is finding the right balance between short-term growth and long-term sustainability.

This is not only a financial challenge. The stewardship model the University chooses for developing its land endowment also directly affects the ecological and social sustainability of the lands and neighbourhoods of the Point Grey campus. And these in turn connect directly to the values and mission of the University.

The Board of Governors has given us a blueprint of the University's values and mission in the 2018 Strategic Plan, the 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration, and the 2021 Climate Action Plan.

The Strategic Plan describes the purpose of the University as “Pursuing excellence in research, learning and engagement to foster global citizenship and advance a sustainable and just society across British Columbia, Canada and the world.” Sustainability, defined “as simultaneous improvements in human and environmental wellbeing,” is a core value underpinning all of the University’s programs and operations.

Elaborating on well-being, the plan declares “we must address the significant challenges related to housing and transportation,... enhance the student experience and improve quality of life for all members of the university community.”

And more specific to land use planning, the Strategic Plan promises to “ensure harmony with the environment through the ecologically sensitive design of new buildings and open spaces.”¹

The University has intensified its commitment to environmental and social sustainability with its Climate Action Plan, approved by the Board of Governors in 2021. The Climate Action Plan commits UBC to significant reductions in Green House Gas emissions through dozens of specific actions relating to construction, transportation, waste management, ecosystem services, and public education.

Unfortunately, the Climate Action Plan does not apply to residential neighbourhoods, an oversight reflected in the proposed land use plan. The land use plan has no targets, no actions, and ultimately no guardrails or mechanisms for ensuring that the University honour its commitments on climate action as it develops its remaining land endowment.

At the same time, this land use plan prioritizes lease-hold sales—70% of the total of all neighbourhood development—at densities that would require dozens of towers and very little green and open space in residential neighbourhoods.

This plan is like clear-cutting the UBC land endowment. It prioritizes the front-loaded cash infusions of leasehold sales over more sustainable investments in rental and cooperative housing for those who study and work at the Point Grey campus.

¹ UBC Strategic Plan, pp. 39, 40, 42.

Instead, climate action, sustainability, and Indigenous reconciliation should be foundational to the land use plan, not an afterthought.

The plan should prioritize housing for those who study and work at UBC, with rentals making up at least half of the total housing stock.

It should provide a blueprint for human-scaled neighbourhoods, with ample green space, stores, schools, and connections with the University.

The Board of Governors should reject this land use plan and start over from different foundations, ones rooted in the University's values and commitments to the well-being of the people and environment of UBC and British Columbia.

Lianne Tomfohr-Madsen



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Department of Educational & Counselling Psychology, and Special Education, Faculty of Education

The University of British Columbia |
Vancouver Campus
[Address Redacted]
Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4

Phone [Phone Redacted]
Fax [Phone Redacted]
www.ecps.educ.ubc.ca

November 6, 2023

Dear Board of Governors,

Re: Proposed Land Use Plan

I am writing in opposition to the proposed land use plan. As a graduate of UBC and now a proud member of the academic community, I believe that UBC has the potential to be a leader in sustainability, community development, and human rights. I fear that the pressure to generate revenue through this land use plan overshadows environmental and community commitments. As a psychologist, I can tell you that climate change and affordability are chief drivers of historically high levels of anxiety within our community (and beyond). As a parent, fears about the planet's livability in the next 20-30 years are ever-present.

There are several reasons that the current plan does not have my support, chiefly the lack of fulsome environmental planning, lack of proposed governance and school infrastructure and lack of affordable housing for future students, staff, and faculty at UBC. Additionally concerning has been the lack of true transparency and collaboration around integrating feedback into the plan.

I believe that taking the time to get this right is worth it. Many experts on campus and in the community want to help. Now is the time to think boldly to preserve this beautiful space that we live in and make it a welcoming home and learning environment for generations to come.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lianne Tomfohr-Madsen PhD/RPsych (She, Her, Hers)
Canada Research Chair in Mental Health and Intersectionality
Associate Professor
Education | Educational and Counselling Psychology, and Special Education
The University of British Columbia | Vancouver Campus | Musqueam Traditional Territory
[Address Redacted] | Vancouver BC | V6T1Z4 Canada
Phone [Phone Redacted] | Cell [Phone Redacted]
[Email Redacted] | [Redacted]
<https://www.healthyfamilieslab.com> | <https://www.pregnancyduringthepandemic.com/>

The UBC Vancouver campus is situated within the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam).

Julia Ostertag

Written Submission: Amending UBC's Land Use Plan

Submitted by: Julia Ostertag, PhD

Date: November 7, 2023

I lived in Acadia Park during my PhD studies in the Faculty of Education (2009-2014), and my first child was born in Revelstoke Court one month into my PhD program in 2009 and later we moved to Yalta Place when our initial apartment was demolished. During this time, Acadia Park was rezoned for market housing without a democratic process and consultations, and I became one of several leaders in our community concerned about the future of student family housing due to the changes to the LUP at the time. Since changes would not be implemented until after we would all leave, we worked with the AMS to conduct a Needs Assessment of student family housing ([chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://bog2.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2014/01/4.7_2014.02_Acadia-Park-Report.pdf](https://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://bog2.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2014/01/4.7_2014.02_Acadia-Park-Report.pdf)). That report is in essence a time capsule of an unparalleled community, made possible by innovative architecture and landscape design.

While we all understand the need for higher density housing, student families are faced with incredible pressures to survive with school, work, and childcare responsibilities – largely with extremely limited finances and nearly no support systems from extended family or friends. And yet, in Acadia Park we were able to thrive with our children and our studies. Shared outdoor spaces such as the community garden and the parks behind our laneway houses (safe from cars!!!) made for many friendships and support systems to emerge, and our children could play safely with minimal supervision. As a researcher in environmental education, I knew exactly how significant this was for healthy child development!

Now that we have gone our various ways, I still try to re-create Acadia Park in my housing cooperative where I currently live. And yet, we all reminisce that Acadia Park was the best experience in housing any of us have ever had. Considering the mice, mould and asbestos we were living with, that says a lot!! Jane Jacobs herself couldn't have designed a better community. So, please read the Needs Assessment and reconsider any plans for high density

student family housing where children (and their parents) no longer have rapid access to outdoor spaces to play. In particular, female students will have the most to lose, so equity issues must also be taken into consideration. Student families are confronted with so many stressors – every effort must be made to ensure that mental health is a priority, and a neighbourhood design such as Acadia Park makes lives liveable that others may become too difficult. Green spaces filled with caring neighbours are key ingredients in what made us all survive being student parents, so to take these away for market housing densification is simply cruel and irresponsible. If UBC campus had a proper governance model with democratic representation, I am certain that changes of this nature would never pass in a municipal council vote. As such, the correct course of action would be to fully re-zone Acadia Park back to student housing and retract plans to build market housing on a cherished community.

Thank you for reading this love letter to Acadia Park. I am more than happy to provide more comments if you would like to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

Julia

Monica Lambton

UBC Land Use Plan Comments

Monica Lambton, Wesbrook Resident

Hello. My name is Monica Lambton and I am a Wesbrook resident. I am here to speak about my concerns with the proposed UBC Land Use Plan. While there are many encouraging and positive points outlined in the plan, which I support, I feel this plan is not sufficiently ambitious or detailed to match the challenges that are before us, as a society, today. And I believe it is certainly not up to the challenges that we will be facing in 2050, the end date of the plan's time line. In any case this is a very long time to imagine a project. But for a Land Use Plan in a time of rapid transition to a zero carbon economy and society, I do not believe the plan sufficiently demonstrates that it will be up to the task of building a sustainable community on campus. New hires who are beginning their careers at UBC today will be close to retirement at the end of this plan. Imagine all that they will be achieving, the new ways of thinking about things, new options that will be available to meet the goals of a sustainable environment and provide solutions to the housing crisis. I would like to focus on one aspect of the Land Use Plan – it's inflexibility.

Much of what this plan proposes is challenging and untested on a large scale. This is difficult work and I am alarmed that this plan may be approved by the Board of Governors and accepted by the Province and locked in for the next 30 years. As a resident I am not aware of any mechanisms that are in place that will direct a reflective way for how the plan will roll out. What access do residents have to submit questions about unforeseen impacts, specific concerns, or lack of adherence to the plan? Many consultation processes today have continuing ombuds offices, public relations offices, complaints offices, and the like, all with neutral directors empowered to investigate and remedy contentious or conflictual situations. I don't see anything of the like proposed with this plan.

I have been encouraging my neighbours to get involved with this feedback process. The most common response I have received is one of resignation. It seems people see no reason to put in effort in a process that will ultimately be carried out completely apart from them, despite their living and working in the middle of it. I see this as very concerning. I have worked in the field of education and movement building for social change for over 30 years and I can tell you

that without the dedicated commitment of residents who see themselves as key actors in what is happening, it will be very difficult to advance climate action (which I know is something yet to come, I just filled out the online survey regarding the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan). However, these elements are intertwined, for if you damper the citizen's engagement and disappoint their desires in the Land Use Plan, you will have tied your own hands with the Neighbourhood Climate Action Plan.

Some people think that opening up channels of dialogue and building trust between the University as a developer and the residents can avert these hazards. However, recent years of data and experience are showing us something else. Instead of relying solely on trust building, current best practices are emphasizing confidence building measures. These would be high degrees of transparency for how feedback has been, or has not been, applied, open reveal of positive and negative results as the plan unfolds and honest openness to alternative approaches.

Dr. Byron P. White is Associate Provost for Urban Research and Community Engagement at the University of North Carolina Charlotte. He oversees urbanCORE, an office that is charged with mobilizing, assessing and advancing efforts that connect the University's interdisciplinary, research resources to community assets. At a recent UBC conference on this topic, he told us that he thinks that 'trust is overrated'. But he encouraged us not to lose heart when doing consultation, cooperation and collaboration, because you can still do meaningful work, so long as you put your efforts into establishing trustworthy structures.

Unfortunately, I do not see any such structures or processes articulated in this Land Use Plan. For this reason I urge the Board of Governors to ask for the plan to be amended. Thank you.

