

Hi Nancy,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our feedback on the definitions for 'Primary Village Centre Academic' and 'Area Under Review'. We really appreciate the effort you have put into recognising and addressing our concerns.

## Primary Village Centre Academic:

- a) We would like to reiterate the economic importance of this area to UBC and the AMS, and look forward to consulting on which businesses and services would best suit the University community.
- b) We would appreciate clarification on the second half of the statement: "until reaching the Alumni Centre where different mechanisms for engaging and welcoming the campus community at grade will be employed". It is not entirely clear what is meant by 'at grade' welcoming mechanisms.
- c) We advocate continued discussion beyond the current Land Use Plan amendment process on height limitations and restrictions along University Boulevard. We hope this will allow for better and more thorough consideration for the University and the AMS's sustainability and affordability priorities.
- e) As per our discussion, we are open to housing in this area also including people very closely associated with UBC but not formally a part of UBC staff, student or faculty groups, such as people working at TRIUMF. However, we would still ask that this housing be envisioned with a majority student population, ensuring vibrancy in this area of campus in the nature of that outlined in the preamble. We would reiterate that it is important to us that the housing only be available to those who are directly associated with the University, or associated in the manner discussed above.

We appreciate the attempts made to make this housing amenable to the activities and character of the area, and are very pleased with the specific recognition of weekend and year-end activities.

Proposed Changes:

- e) *[There will be] rental housing for faculty, staff, ~~(or mature)~~ [and] students ~~{will-be-encouraged}~~—in upper storey housing along University Boulevard. This housing will be designed to be small unit, affordable housing that is adult-oriented rather than child or family oriented, in order to encourage a tenant population sympathetic to the more active urban university lifestyle and activities likely to occur in this area during evenings, on weekends and at special times of the year such as end of classes.*
- g) We don't feel that this section is necessary in the definition of Primary Village Centre Academic, although we do support the sentiments that are expressed.

## Area Under Review:

The AMS remains firmly committed to Gage South being zoned as an academic area and used for academic purposes, for the reasons outlined in our policy on the area. However, we recognise this 'Area Under Review' zoning as a step towards this goal, and offer our support for this zoning on those grounds.

### Proposed Changes:

This area, known as Gage South, is designated as an 'Area Under Review' to allow for current planning processes regarding transit facilities, the aquatic centre and public realm improvements to be completed. At that time, the future use of this area will be reviewed in a consultative process that includes [the AMS], students, faculty, staff, residents and the adjacent University Endowment Lands Community.

We ask that the two following parts of the definition be removed for the below reasons:

1. The first part, discussing a housing density transfer of 28,800 gsm, is inaccurate as the current draft Gage South Neighbourhood Plan (Jan 2007) allocates only 19,207 gsm to the area. Since the Neighbourhood plan is the planned build-out for this area, the maximum amount of density that could be transferred from Gage South in our opinion, is capped at 19,207 gsm. This is based on the Neighbourhood Plan calculations of an FSR at 1.6, a land base of 12,005 m<sup>2</sup>, and a maximum of 207 units. In our opinion it is not a matter of transferring 28,800 gsm, because that number is not outlined anywhere in the Neighbourhood Plan, nor will it exist in the Land Use Plan until the amendment process is complete.

Furthermore, we feel that with the increases outlined in the Land Use Plan amendments, housing density and overall capacity will increase significantly, thus allowing other areas of campus to more easily absorb the originally slated density outlined in the Gage South Neighbourhood Plan. For this reason we believe that there is no need for mention of the transfer, and if it is imperative to do so, that the original 19,207 gsm be the measure.

2. We also ask that the second part, discussing the specifics of possible neighbourhood housing, be removed as it unnecessarily frames future debate. In the future, we hope to have a robust, positive debate over the best uses for this area, and are hesitant to strictly frame the future discussion of this area, especially given current sensitivities to the areas designation.