

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

2008005

Ministerial Order No.

**ORDER OF THE MINISTER OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND MINISTER
RESPONSIBLE FOR SENIORS' AND WOMEN'S SERVICES**

University Endowment Land Act

I, Ida Chong, Minister of Community Services and Minister Responsible for Seniors' and Women's Services, order that effective February 1 2008,

1. the Community Plan Bylaw for University Hill, adopted as B.C. Reg. 160/89 as validated by the *University Endowment Land Amendment Act*, 1989, S.B.C. 1989, c. 41, is repealed, and
2. the Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw, adopted as B.C. Reg. 160/89 as validated by the *University Endowment Land Amendment Act*, 1989, S.B.C. 1989, c. 41, is amended
 - (a) by striking out any reference to "Advisory Planning Committee" and substituting "Advisory Design Panel", and
 - (b) by striking out any reference to "Ratepayers Association" and substituting "Community Advisory Council".

January 29/08
Date

Ida Chong
Minister of Community Services and Minister
Responsible for Seniors' and Women's Services

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

Authority under which Order is made:

Act and section:- *University Endowment Land Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 469, s. 12 (1)
Other (specify):-

January 17, 2008

The following is an excerpt from:

BILL 12 — 2008
MUSQUEAM RECONCILIATION, SETTLEMENT AND BENEFITS AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT

which received Royal Assent on March 31, 2008.

Land Use, Building and Community Administration
Bylaw and the Official Community Plan

4 (1) In this section:

"Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw" means the Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw as confirmed and validated by section 4 of the *University Endowment Land Amendment Act, 1989*, S.B.C. 1989, c. 41, and amended under the *University Endowment Land Act*;

"Official Community Plan" means the University Endowment Lands Official Community Plan, adopted on October 4, 2005 by the minister responsible for the administration of the *University Endowment Land Act*.

(2) On the effective date, despite the *University Endowment Land Act* and section 8 of the Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw and subject to subsection (3) of this section,

(a) Schedule 1 to the Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw is conclusively deemed to be amended to include Block F in the Multiple Dwelling District, Low-Rise (MF-1) Land Use District, and

(b) the Official Community Plan is conclusively deemed to be amended in

(i) Section 2.2 to include Block F in the description of Area D,

(ii) Figure 1 to include Block F in Area D,

(iii) Figure 2 to include Block F in RMF1: MULTI-FAMILY (low rise), and

(iv) Figure 3 to exclude Block F from Pacific Spirit Regional Park.

(3) Subsection (2) does not operate and must not be interpreted to prevent the enactment or variation of a bylaw under the authority of the *University Endowment Land Act* after the effective date, including, without limitation, a bylaw or variation of a bylaw that applies to Block F.

The University Endowment Lands OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

Adopted by: Ida Chong Date: October 14, 2005
 Minister of Community Services



NOTE Any reference in this document to "Current Bylaws" means the bylaws in force at the date of adoption of this Official Community Plan.

Table of Contents

1.0	University Endowment Lands Context Statement	
1.1	History.....	2
1.2	Present Conditions	2
2.0	Introduction	
2.1	What is an <i>Official Community Plan</i> ?	3
2.2	What Makes up the University Endowment Lands?	3
2.3	What is the Relevance of an OCP for the UEL?	4
2.4	How was Information Gathered?	4
2.5	Document Organization	4
3.0	Core Policy Objectives Overview	
3.1	Five Objectives for the Future	5
4.0	Policy Objectives	
4.1	Ensuring Effective Administration	5
	and Community Participation	
4.2	Sustaining Environmental Quality	8
4.3	Maintaining Neighbourhood Character	12
4.4	Expanding Livability Options	15
4.5	Providing Essential Services	16
5.0	Land Use: A Conceptual Map	
5.1	Introduction	19
5.2	Statement of Housing Policies	19
5.3	Residential Development.....	20
5.4	Commercial Development	21
5.5	Recreational Development	21
5.6	Institutional Development	21
5.7	Industrial and Agricultural Sites	22
5.8	Hazardous and Environmentally Sensitive Areas	22
5.9	Sand and Gravel Deposits	22
5.10	Location and Type of Waste Disposal Sites	22
6.0	Regional Context Statement	
6.1	Introduction	23
6.2	Protecting the Green Zone	23
6.3	Building Complete Communities	24
6.4	Achieving a Compact Metropolitan Region	24
6.5	Increasing Transportation Choices.....	25
	Figures	
	Figure 1 – Context Plan	26
	Figure 2 – Land Use Plan	27
	Figure 3 – Vehicular Circulation Plan.....	28

1.0 University Endowment Lands Context Statement

1.1 History

The University Endowment Lands (UEL) consist of approximately 1,200 hectares (3,000 acres) of mostly-forested land nestled between the City of Vancouver and the University of British Columbia (UBC), on the Western tip of British Columbia's Lower Mainland. These lands are the physical legacy of the *University Endowment Land Act of 1907* (last revision 1996), which established a lands trust to raise capital for the formation and initial operation of the University of British Columbia. The first residential lots were sold by public auction in 1925, marking the beginnings of a residential community in the UEL, an area commonly known as *University Hill*. Since then, approximately 280 hectares (692 acres) has been subdivided into residential, commercial and recreational property. In 1989, the balance of undeveloped land was given by the Province to the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) for park use, creating Pacific Spirit Regional Park.

1.2 Present Conditions

The Province of British Columbia is the governing body for the UEL, presently administered through the Ministry of Community Services. The *University Endowment Land Act* (the *Act*) is the governing legislation for the UEL, enabling the Minister to, amongst other things, levy property taxes, enact bylaws, and appoint a person to administer the University Endowment Lands. Changes to the *Act* must be done by the legislature, while the Minister can make new bylaws and amendments as long as they are consistent with the *Act*.

The community is administered under the *Community Plan Bylaw for University Hill* and the *Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw* (the *Current Bylaws*) made pursuant to the *Act*. Within this governance system, a Manager is appointed by and responsible to the Minister of Community Services for the administration of the UEL. Advisory bodies to the Manager are appointed as a directive of the *Current Bylaws*, and are currently represented by the UEL Ratepayers Association and the Advisory Planning Committee. (*see Section 4.1 regarding changes to the advisory body structure*). Under the current form of administration, the responsibility for decision-making rests with the Manager. Appeals from residents of decisions made by the Manager can be made to the Minister.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 What is an *Official Community Plan*?

An *Official Community Plan (OCP)* is a broad statement of objectives and policies to guide decisions on planning and land use management within the area covered by the Plan. The *Local Government Act* lays out the essential inclusions of the document, and its need to align with the regional growth strategy. Once adopted by bylaw, an *OCP* becomes a legal document.

This *OCP* has been derived from a consensus-based process to provide an enhanced framework for administrating the collective decision-making of the community – from service provision to development applications to zoning regulations. It can also be used to protect existing conditions and sensitively manage local change as issues arise.

The *Official Community Plan* is not a static document. It outlines the community's vision, goals and aspirations for the future and is subject to modification as required over time; recommended at five-year intervals. This document is the culmination of input from meetings, workshops, questionnaires and multiple citizens' committees review sessions. At its core, it is a community-built document.

Once an *OCP* is adopted, all subsequent bylaws enacted and public works undertaken must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Plan. However, an *OCP* does not commit or authorize the UEL to proceed with any suggested policies or directives as contained in this document.

2.2 What Makes up the University Endowment Lands?

Although this *Official Community Plan* deals primarily with the urbanized portion of the UEL, it does cover the forested, undeveloped lands of Pacific Spirit Regional Park and the University Golf Course. The urbanized portion of the UEL is also commonly referred to as *University Hill*. Both terms are in common use and used interchangeably in this document, though it should be understood that *University Hill* is a community within the greater UEL.

University Hill is made up of four distinct *Areas* (see *Figure 1*):

- *Area A* is bordered by Chancellor Boulevard, Acadia Road, University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall;
- *Area B* lies between Chancellor Boulevard and NW Marine Drive;
- *Area C* is between Blanca St., 6th Avenue, Tasmania Crescent and College Highroad; and
- *Area D* is bordered by University Boulevard, Agronomy and Toronto Roads, and Wesbrook Mall. (See OIC 2008005 to view amendment adding Block F to Area D)

The *Village* is a one-block, mixed-use commercial/retail/residential zone on Block 97 of *Area D*, bordered by University Boulevard, Western Parkway, Dalhousie and Allison Roads.

2.3 What is the Relevance of an OCP for the UEL?

This *Official Community Plan* allows the UEL to meet its obligations to the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) under section 875-2 of the *Local Government Act*, as well as meet its Provincial obligations as a “local government” in the *Local Government Act*.

More importantly, the process of building the *OCP* provides an opportunity for all residents to discuss their community’s future.

This process has produced a document that can be used to guide future decision-making within *University Hill*. Once established, these guidelines can reduce resident uncertainty about the future of the community. However, not everything that occurs in the UEL is directly controllable by local policy. Wherever possible, strategic partners should be identified and engaged in the creation of the local vision that is consistent with regional and provincial policy.

2.4 How was Information Gathered?

The process to develop the *OCP* began in the fall of 2002 and continued for approximately two and a half years. Community input and communication included three information mailouts, four open houses, three public meetings, one detailed resident questionnaire dealing with general community issues, a second questionnaire seeking guidance regarding a new advisory body, as well as input from public workshops and citizens’ committees.

2.5 Document Organization

This document has been organized around key policy objectives derived from community input and visions of the community’s future. Each of the **Core Policy Objectives** is broken down into a brief issue-contextualization, followed by policies and actions. A **Conceptual Land-Use Map** is attached, both addressing specific items required in the *Local Government Act* and building each issue-area into a descriptive mapping of community land-use. Finally, the **Regional Context Statement** then addresses how the *Official Community Plan* fits into the GVRD’s *Livable Region Strategic Plan*, as required by the *Local Government Act*.

3.0 Core Policy Objectives Overview

3.1 Five Objectives for the Future

The public consultation process has provided an abundance of information regarding the vision of UEL residents for the future of their community. The information collected has formed the basis for the following five policy objectives. They are intended to serve as goals from which all policy can be broadly measured. They are not organized hierarchically and should be viewed as equal and interdependent:

- Ensuring Effective Administration and Community Participation;
- Sustaining Environmental Quality;
- Maintaining Neighbourhood Character;
- Expanding Livability Options; and
- Providing Essential Services.

These policy objectives are followed by specific action items also derived from public input, most notably the community questionnaire conducted in February 2003. Each objective is followed by a summary of respective background issues and supporting policy intended to reflect community values.

4.0 Policy Objectives

4.1 Ensuring Effective Administration and Community Participation

a) General Community Issues

Background

Most communities are self-governed under the *Community Charter or Local Government Act* as a Village, Town, District, City or Regional District. The UEL is unique among communities in British Columbia in that land use, development, taxation, services and other local issues are primarily the responsibility of the Provincial Government and not of a Municipality or Regional District. A Manager is appointed by the Minister responsible for the UEL to administer the University Endowment Lands. The Manager is responsible for decisions on matters regulated under the *University Endowment Land Act* and associated bylaws.

The *University Endowment Land Act* makes no provision for community involvement in the Manager's decision making process. However, as a directive of the previous *OCP*, the involvement of the UEL Ratepayers Association was established to provide comment and opinion to the Manager on relevant issues.

During the creation of this new *Official Community Plan*, it became apparent that there was a need to create a fairly elected advisory body representative of all UEL residents.

A committee composed of an equal number of residents from the single-family areas (*Areas A, B and C*) and the multifamily dwelling area (*Area D*) was formed to examine how this new advisory body could best be established.

Policies

The committee evaluated numerous potential structures and identified two options for a new advisory body best suited to provide fair representation for all UEL residents. These were presented to the community for review and comment by means of a questionnaire. The information received back from UEL residents provided a definitive direction to be taken and supported a new seven member advisory body to the Manager to be known as the Community Advisory Council (the Council). All UEL residents meeting the requirements of a *resident elector* as defined in the *Local Government Act* may stand for election and be eligible to vote.

The seven member Council will be comprised of two representatives from *Area A*, one each from *Area's B and C*, and three representatives from *Area D*. Members of the new Council will be elected to a volunteer position on a neighbourhood-only basis. This simple structure is intended to ensure that each of the four neighbourhoods has representation reflecting in general terms their respective population. Detailed issues regarding the election and structure of the Council will be determined by residents, as required. Matters referred by the Manager to the new Community Advisory Council for comment will include any revisions or amendments to bylaws and any items likely to have a significant effect on the cost, quality or capacity of community services. The Manager will also review and discuss with the Council the draft annual Budget and Property Tax Requisition before submitting it to the Surveyor of Taxes.

The Community Advisory Council will prepare an annual budget for its operations and submit it to the Manager for approval no later than December 31st each year. Subject to provincial regulations and policy the Manager will approve the budget and include it within the overall operating budget of the University Endowment Lands. Day-to-day expenditures will be the responsibility of the Community Advisory Council and be subject to review and audit.

b) Development Approvals

Background

The *Current Bylaws* established an Advisory Planning Committee consisting of nine UEL residents. Through the public participation process in the creation of this new *OCP* it was identified that community interests would be better served if the opinions forwarded to the Manager by this advisory body was derived from a more objective and professional perspective. It is respected however that having resident opinion provides a special resource and should also be reflected in the composition of the new Advisory Design Panel (ADP).

Policies

The Advisory Design Panel's role is to give opinion in the best interests of the community so that the Manager can take these interests into account in exercising his authority. Matters referred for comment to the ADP by the Manager will generally be items or issues that are related to land use planning, development applications, and other matters pertaining to the administration of the *Land Use, Building, and Community Administration Bylaw* including any additions, revisions or deletions of Schedules.

The Community Advisory Council will appoint an Advisory Design Panel consisting of seven Professional Members as follows:

- three members will be Registered Architects to be placed under the recommendation of the *Architectural Institute of British Columbia*;
- two members will be Registered Landscape Architects to be placed under the recommendation of the *British Columbia Society of Landscape Architects*; and,
- two members will be Registered Engineers to be placed under the recommendation of the *Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia*.

UEL resident participation will augment the structure of the body as follows:

- two residents from each of the four *Area* neighbourhoods (Neighbourhood Members) to be elected at the time of the Community Advisory Council elections. If there are less than two candidates for any *Area* at the time of the elections, or due to the prolonged absence, resignation or dismissal of a member between elections, the Community Advisory Council will fill any vacant positions by appointment. These members would participate in the ADP review process only for proposals within their own neighbourhood.

Five members shall constitute a quorum for the new ADP of which two members must be architects. The members of the ADP shall annually elect from among the Professional Members a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and recording secretary. The ADP will meet as required to supply recommendations or comments on matters referred for review by the Manager.

Neighbourhood Members shall have a two-year term with no limit to the number of terms served subject to removal or replacement at the discretion of the Community Advisory Council. The terms of tenure for architects, engineers and landscape architects will be governed by their respective associations. Services will be provided on a volunteer-only (no compensation) basis, except that Professional Members will be reimbursed for disbursements necessary for the business of the ADP that have been approved in advance by the Manager.

c) UBC Information Interface

Background

UBC is one of the UEL's largest neighbours and is one of the nation's largest universities. With significant plans for expansion over the next 30 years, good communication with UBC is an essential factor in continued livability for UEL residents.

The UEL does not have any direct control over UBC development plans. It can, however, establish a framework to facilitate cooperation and the timely exchange of information. A majority of residents support the establishment of comprehensive and detailed information resources and a regular liaison between the UEL and the University.

Policies

Mechanisms for the timely transfer of knowledge and early public input on UBC development plans should be established. The formation of a Charter, like that established between UBC and the City of Vancouver, should serve as a model to set out a formalized liaison structure between the UEL Community Advisory Council, the UEL Manager and UBC development and planning agencies¹. In addition, community information resources accessible to UEL residents, such as a website, should be set up to allow for timely information on upcoming developments.

d) Bylaw Compliance

Background

There is near-unanimous support in all *Areas* of the UEL that new, more effective means of ensuring bylaw compliance should be sought without incurring significant new cost.

Policies

Enforcement options that will not incur significant new costs should be investigated, including forms of non-court leverage, as well as mediation and arbitration.

4.2 Sustaining Environmental Quality

a) Greenspace

Background

Greenspace is central to the UEL's character and livability. The forests and parks throughout the UEL inspire themes that are carried through *University Hill* neighbourhoods. The visual predominance of natural vegetation is central to maintaining park-like streetscapes and gardens, privacy provision, noise hindrance and property demarcation.

¹ In 2005, these include: UBC Properties Trust, University Town, UBC Campus and Community Planning, UBC Board of Governors and the University Neighbourhoods Association.

Policies

- i) Each of the UEL *Areas* have evolved over time with their own style of landscaping on private properties and should now have a set of landscaping guidelines created specific to maintaining their respective character. Any new guidelines should also consider limiting the extent of impervious surfaces permitted for each property;
- ii) Ensure that the 700 hectares (1800 acres) of Pacific Spirit Regional Park between UBC and Greater Vancouver are maintained as undeveloped land;
- iii) Ensure that Lot 3483 (the UEL Worksyard) be retained to allow only existing uses, and/or community service and/or recreation uses (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference No. 1*).
- iv) Restrict the use of Block D, Block 1, District Lot 6494 (Plan 11469) to be preserved as publicly accessible parkland (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference No. 4*);
- v) Maintain Block 98 as Jim Everett Memorial Park (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference No. 5*);
- vi) Preserve the greenbelt on Western Parkway between Agronomy Road and NW Marine Drive;
- vii) Preserve public access to all existing servicing right-of-ways in *Area B*;
- viii) Preserve the University Golf Course as a publicly accessible open space to be only used as a golf course with related accessory uses; and
- ix) Preserve the hedge on the west side of Wesbrook Crescent south of Chancellor Boulevard and north of University Boulevard as a visual and sound barrier.

b) Tree Management

Background

The *Current Bylaws* for all *Areas* state that where issues of managing trees are present, removal, rather than preservation, should be the over-riding directive. The resident survey has shown however that each of the *Areas* have their own priorities for tree management. The establishment of a mechanism for mediation and voluntary arbitration should be established across all UEL *Areas* to manage any differences that arise over tree issues. All solutions should focus on minimizing ecological impact ensuring that the least-invasive measures are the first-choice option.

Policies

The following are listed on an *Area by Area* basis reflecting their distinct character and priorities:

Area A

Tree management strategies for this *Area* should encourage provisions for limbing, spiraling or windowing to balance between the need for view/sunlight penetration and the safety of neighbouring properties but does not preclude the removal of trees.

Area B

Tree management strategies such as limbing, spiraling and windowing should be implemented as first-choice policy options prior to tree removal. View preservation and sunlight penetration should be central factors when managing tree issues in this *Area*.

Area C

Tree management strategies for this *Area* should encourage provisions for limbing, spiraling or windowing to balance between the need for view/sunlight penetration and the safety of neighbouring properties but does not preclude the removal of trees.

Area D

Overall tree preservation should be established as a new policy priority for *Area D*. Trees should be maintained with safety as the primary concern.

c) Solid Waste Reduction and Recycling***Background***

At present, the *University Hill* recycling program is limited to a voluntary deposit area located in the UEL Worksyard. While having some effective impact, it is not within walking distance for a majority of community residents, nor accessible to the elderly because of necessary heavy lifting required. For a variety of reasons, the majority of UEL residents (63%)² desire an expansion of recycling services.

Policies

To bring *University Hill* into greater conformance with Regional and Provincial waste reduction objectives, the UEL should undertake to:

- i) Establish waste reduction targets and build locally-relevant frameworks for achieving them³ through a recycling program that seeks to optimize neighbourhood participation. This program should be accessible to all residents equally, have clear information regarding its use and utilize innovative practices whenever possible. This program could also include facilities for garden waste and/or composting; and
- ii) Examine means for offsetting the costs of supporting recycling and waste reduction programs.

² UEL Official Community Plan Community Questionnaire, February 2003

³ Setting targets to 1990 levels is the GVRD benchmark.

d) TrafficBackground

The University of British Columbia has grown to become the second-largest commuter destination in the lower mainland. *University Hill* neighbourhoods in close proximity to arterial roads, popular service centres, or UBC itself have been impacted most acutely by this increase. Safety, noise and pollution are central to the concerns of the community.

Respecting there is a general goal to maintain a quiet setting while enhancing pedestrian and cyclist safety, each *Area* requires solutions to its own unique set of circumstances.

Policies

- i) Implement traffic calming measures as needs arise in each *Area*. If and when implemented, they should serve to slow speeds, impede inter-arterial shortcutting, and direct non-local traffic to main arterial roads;
- ii) Encourage the provincial Ministry of Transportation to install new on-road bicycle lanes on all roads within the UEL under their jurisdiction; and
- iii) Encourage bicycle use through requiring new multi-family developments to provide a safe, secure and convenient storage area in conjunction with exterior visitor bicycle racks. New commercial developments of significant scale should, in addition to the above requirements, provide change/shower rooms for tenant use.

e) TransitBackground

Transit service, like the issue of traffic, is directly tied to the University. UBC's main transit terminus is directly aligned with University Boulevard, providing a high frequency of service to adjoining neighbourhoods, while leaving gaps elsewhere. At present, four in ten residents believe that present transit service is effective.

Policies

- i) Maintain a proactive stance and advocate community needs directly to Translink and UBC;
- ii) Presently, 26% of UEL residents⁴ support a rapid transit link between UBC and Greater Vancouver. Any proposals should be evaluated to minimize adverse effects to the community;

⁴ Results from the UEL Official Community Plan Questionnaire, February 2003

- iii) Ensure that the provincial Ministry of Transportation maintains University Boulevard as an arterial road designed for alternative public transit use and for on-road bicycle lanes; and
- iv) Report major changes to transit services to UEL residents through community information resources (*see Section 4.1(c) Ensuring Effective Administration: UBC Information Interface*).

4.3 Maintaining Neighbourhood Character

a) Building Patterns

Background

The UEL is a community strengthened by the diversity of its neighbourhoods. Single-family homes dot the landscape of *Areas A, B and C*, each neighbourhood with its own distinctive characteristics. South of University Boulevard, *Area D* presents a village-like atmosphere of high and low-rise apartment buildings, townhouses and retail development.

Policies

Retain the established pattern of development for each of the neighbourhood *Areas*. *Areas A, B and C* should retain their single-family detached housing form character. South of University Boulevard, more flexibility in medium-density patterns can be considered. In the *Village* mixed-use commercial/residential is encouraged.

b) Design Guidelines

Background

The UEL is a community of communities. Although the sum of these parts creates one of the most desirable locales in the west side of Vancouver, each of the *Areas* have over time forged their own unique identity. From the winding, hillside roads of *Area B*, to the parkside homes of *Areas A and C*, residents have expressed the value of neighbourhood identity.

Maintaining and managing the distinct character of each *University Hill* neighbourhood is to be respected as a challenging and evolving objective. Traditionally the review of proposed projects has consisted of a panel of resident volunteers. To better achieve objectivity and deal with technical evaluation criteria, a new Advisory Design Panel comprised of professional architects, engineers and landscape architects as well as citizens will be established (*refer to Section 4.1 (b) Development Approvals*).

Policies

The UEL design guidelines⁵ should be tailored to each respective *Area* as follows:

Area A

New *Area A* design guidelines should not deviate significantly from present guidelines laid out in the *Current Bylaws*. Guidelines, if amended, should focus on issues of building form, landscaping and building location.

Area B

There is strong support in *Area B* to amend present design guidelines to have a higher degree of control over design proposals specific to this *Area*. When drafted, these guidelines should focus on: (in descending order of importance) view preservation, building form, building finishes and landscaping standards.

Area C

The majority of residents of *Area C* believe that the existing design guidelines are working well for their neighbourhood. This *Area* should remain under the present guidelines outlined in the *Current Bylaws*.

Area D

New *Area D* design guidelines should not deviate significantly from present guidelines laid out in the *Current Bylaws*. When revised, guidelines should focus on building form, followed by building location and landscaping.

c) *Densification**Background*

The GVRD, through its *Livable Region Strategic Plan (LRSP)* is seeking to create a compact metropolitan region for the Greater Vancouver area. To achieve this, established communities across the lower mainland are re-examining existing developments for non-intrusive means of increasing density while maintaining quality of life and environment.

Maintaining the single-family visual character of *Areas A, B and C* is of paramount concern to the respective residents. For *Area D*, achieving a human-scaled streetscape for future higher density developments is to be a fundamental design directive.

Policies

- i) It is appreciated that there are potential benefits in the legalization and regulation of secondary suites in *Areas A, B, C and D* which would allow for a measured increase in density and housing options. Future studies need to be undertaken for each *Area* examining the feasibility of legalizing secondary suites and taking into account issues such as the management of additional parking, increased demand on services and limitations on the gross area of a secondary suite – all to be measured by the goal of preserving the existing visual character of the neighbourhoods;

⁵ Existing design guidelines contained in the *Current Bylaws for Areas A, B and C* are designated as '*Design Guidelines for University Hill Single Detached Dwellings*'. *Area D* is governed by *Design Guidelines for the University Hill Village Commercial Area and Design Guidelines for the University Hill Multi-Family Developments*.

- ii) The existing higher density mixed-use projects within *Area D* have been designed to respect a human-scaled streetscape experience. Allow redevelopment in *Area D* to optimize density levels established in the *Current Bylaws*. Ensure that a human-scaled streetscape environment be a prerequisite consideration for approval;
- iii) Amend the *Current Bylaws* to require new multi-family developments to provide safe, secure and convenient bicycle storage;
- iv) Identify through further study, bylaw mechanisms that promote the provision of rental accommodation for all new or renovated residential developments;
- v) For any development application seeking an increase in the density allowable, require a minimum of 20% of this additional area to be below-market price and/or special needs housing; and
- vi) Survey results demonstrate general support to allow for some form of senior's housing, such as a senior's oriented apartment complex within the UEL. Seniors housing in either an 'active' or 'assisted form' should be considered as a new 'Conditional Use' in the areas defined as *Institutional: Church and Seniors Housing* districts in the *Land Use Plan*. Any proposal for such uses would be required to be evaluated on its own merits and be subject to public review.

d) Commercial Development

Background

Commercial development in the UEL has been limited to the *Village* in *Area D*. Commercial activity should continue to be confined within this block. There remains considerable community support for a grocery store and/or gas station in this *Area*.

Policies

- i) Existing commercial buildings nearing the end of their life cycle should be considered for mixed-use residential/commercial redevelopment, which could include a modest expansion of shops and services, not exceeding the current maximum allowed in the *Current Bylaws*;
- ii) Amend the *Current Bylaws* to enable a restriction on the hours of operation for businesses where late night activity has proven to be a disturbance for neighbouring residents;
- iii) Support home-based businesses in all *Areas* and amend the *Current Bylaws* as necessary for *Area D* to have the same approval mechanisms as *Areas A, B* and *C* for obtaining a business license; and
- iv) Any commercial redevelopment plans should be evaluated in conjunction with UBC's commercial expansion plans as a factor.

e) Review and Approvals

Background

New development and expansion or renovation of existing buildings should be managed so that a reasonable balance is found between the preferences of the proponent and those of neighbourhood residents.

The existing review and approvals process laid out in the *Current Bylaws* require that applicants give residents and adjacent property owners 30 days to respond to applications and, if necessary, consult with the Advisory Planning Committee before proceeding with development⁶.

Policies

- i) The community has shown at this time that the existing review mechanisms dealing with the extent of notification and time allowed for response supports a fair and equitable process and should be retained without significant revision.

4.4 Expanding Livability Options

a) Secondary Suites

Background

While the *Current Bylaws* allow for a homeowner to have boarding accommodation, only a single kitchen in the residence is allowed. Secondary suites are self-contained units with a second kitchen area and are not permitted under current conditions. Appreciating the benefits of providing a broader range of housing opportunities within the UEL, this would have to be balanced with the goal of maintaining the existing neighbourhood character for each *Area*.

Policies

- i) Review the *Current Bylaws* on an *Area* by *Area* basis to consider more affordable housing options by allowing regulated secondary suites. Being able to maintain the visual character of each *Area* is a pre-requisite condition to be addressed. If enacted, conditions would be established addressing health, safety, parking and *BC Building Code* compliance. A fee structure could also be established that while not being onerous would reflect the marginal costs of compliance monitoring, utility usage and municipal infrastructure.

⁶ Information on revising the existing Advisory Planning Committee can be found in Section 4.1 (b) - Ensuring Effective Administration: Development Approvals.

b) Community Recreation and Leisure

Background

With approximately 2,800 residents, *University Hill* is a small community. While this is an asset in many ways, it presents problems for certain types of service provision appreciating that economies of scale and critical mass are needed to make projects viable. The community however has significant recreational opportunities available via proximity to some of the best facilities in North America at UBC and the City of Vancouver.

Policies

- i) Investigate the viability of turning University Hill Elementary and Secondary schools into “community schools” to expand services and programming most desired in a community centre; and
- ii) The UEL should continuously monitor facility sharing opportunities with UBC and the City of Vancouver to arrange flat-fee/unlimited use agreements for the use of recreation facilities in proximity to local UEL residents.

c) Schools

Local elementary and secondary schools provide an opportunity to educate children from kindergarten to grade 12 within the UEL. Educational facilities will be supported as a key resource for *University Hill's* quality of life.

Policy

- i) Negotiations with UBC, the Ministry of Education and the Vancouver School Board should be initiated to ensure UEL resident accessibility to these facilities as they experience increasing elementary and secondary student growth from new family-oriented housing projects at UBC.

4.5 Providing Essential Services

Developable land within the UEL served by local roads, sewers and water has been maximized. Local infrastructure for *University Hill* was constructed in three phases. In the 1920s, the majority of the infrastructure was installed as part of the development of *Areas A, B and D*, while most of *Area C's* infrastructure was put in place in the 1940s. Various capital improvements took place throughout the late eighties, including new street lighting fixtures. The UEL Administration is fiscally responsible for maintaining physical capital infrastructure including sewer, water, sidewalk and local road systems. Local roads are residential streets adjacent to homes (*see Figure 3*).

a) UEL-Funded Projects**Background**

A recently completed Infrastructure Rehabilitation Program identified a budget and operations plan to ensure that services and streets are maintained throughout the UEL. Funding to complete these works will continue over the next ten years or until the work is completed. Future upgrading includes:

- i) Sewer systems (storm, sanitary and combined);
- ii) Water systems;
- iii) Local road surfaces; and
- iv) Sidewalks.

Policy

- i) Budget for the completion of the Infrastructure Rehabilitation Program in a timely and cost-effective manner.

b) Development Cost-Recovery**Background**

Services within the UEL are sized to accommodate the current state of development. The Infrastructure Rehabilitation Program is not increasing servicing capacity to accommodate unplanned future development.

Policy

- i) If any proposed real estate development requires or results in off-site servicing upgrades, the costs of these required improvements should be paid by the developer.

c) Stormwater Management**Background**

The present storm water infrastructure is adequate to accommodate existing UEL development. The following policies seek to minimize the need for increasing capacity of the existing system.

Policies

Stormwater management should be accomplished through a combination of:

- i) Improvements to the stormwater system as required;
- ii) On-site controls such as groundwater recharging or retention; and
- iii) Landscape guidelines limiting the amount of impervious surfaces.

d) Arterial Road Projects and Upgrading

Background

All arterial roads that run through the UEL, including University Boulevard, Chancellor Boulevard and NW Marine Drive, are owned and maintained by the Province of BC (see Figure 3). Non-arterial local roads throughout the UEL are maintained by the UEL. Other roads, including portions of Wesbrook Mall, are maintained by the University of British Columbia.

Future upgrades of arterial roads not under the control of the UEL include:

- i) Tunnel ramps (inlet/outlet) for below-grade UBC bus loop on University Boulevard at Wesbrook Mall; and
- ii) Reconstruction of University Boulevard.

Policies

Any projects anticipated to move forward on these roads are either funded by the Ministry of Transportation (MoT) or UBC. As such, a UEL representative should actively participate in the planning process with UBC, MoT and other invested parties to ensure that, with any road project:

- i) Vehicular speeds do not increase;
- ii) Traffic is not diverted through UEL residential areas;
- iii) Bikeways and pedestrian routes are respected and enhanced;
- iv) Aesthetic quality of the boulevards and parkways are retained; and
- v) General safety and livability of the UEL is augmented.

e) Emergency Services

Background

The University Endowment Lands are fully serviced by emergency services and access to regional 911 service.

- i) Ambulance Service is provided through BC Ambulance Service, a subsidiary of the Province of British Columbia, from a station on Wesbrook Mall;
- ii) Policing is provided through the Richmond-based RCMP detachment, which also serves the UBC community from a station on Wesbrook Mall; and
- iii) Fire services have been provided to the community by the Province through a contract with the City of Vancouver to serve the UBC and UEL communities from a station on Wesbrook Mall. The Province recovers the UEL's portion of the contract through local taxes.

Policy

- i) Ensure continuation of required emergency service levels to the UEL as the needs of UBC increase.

5.0 Land Use: A Conceptual Map

5.1 Introduction

In addition to developing community-specific policies as in Section 4, the *Local Government Act* requires that standardized land-use issues also be addressed in the *Official Community Plan*. While the previous Section established policy directions, this Section defines the geographic space to which they will apply.

This section breaks the UEL into commonly recognizable pieces and names them according to their most common use. Uses will only be permitted in accordance with provisions of bylaws, a separate legal tool that enables communities to establish the look and feel of their built environment in more detail than the *Official Community Plan*.

This *Land Use* section should be interpreted wholly within the context of the *Policy Directions* set out in the previous Section.

5.2 Statement of Housing Policies

The UEL is committed to providing a fair and equitable housing stock as is reasonably possible through a private market system. All *University Hill* housing is privately owned, with no public housing managed by the local UEL administration or otherwise. There is a broad range of rental and sale housing available throughout the UEL.

Area D has the widest variety of private rental stock, including 1 and 2 bedroom apartments and townhouses. Further densification will occur over the next 5 years as some parcels of existing multifamily stock are redeveloped to their maximum potential. Twenty percent of any redevelopment seeking higher buildable density which occurs within *Area D* will be dedicated to below-market price housing and/or address special needs housing including seniors housing.

A majority of the single-family homes in *Areas A, B* and *C* are owner-occupied, though rental homes do exist and are available through market mechanisms. It is expected however that the number of ‘affordable’ units would increase if future studies support secondary rental suites as an option for existing single-family dwellings throughout the UEL.

5.3 Residential Development

The developed neighbourhoods of the UEL are comprised of four main *Areas* spatially separated by both Pacific Spirit Regional Park and the east-west arterial connections between Point Grey and the University of BC (see *Figure 3*).

Three of these *Areas* contain single-family residences with the remaining *Area* comprised of medium to high-density residential development. As such, this Section will be broken into *single-family housing* (*Areas A, B and C*) and *multi-family housing* (*Area D*) to address the relative needs of each *Area*'s dominant design theme.

a) Single-Family Housing

The three neighbourhoods that make up the single-family areas of *University Hill* consist of 441 lots, all of which have been developed with low-density, detached houses. Further subdivision of existing lots is not permitted, nor are developments encroaching on Pacific Spirit Regional Park land. The key issue in *Areas A, B and C* is development management: the redevelopment and renovation of existing stock.

Although each of the three neighbourhoods has its own specific character – from the sweeping vistas of *Area B* to the treed boulevards in *Areas A and C* – residents agree that the single-family character is worth preserving. At present all other uses are restricted.

The inclusion of secondary suites in the present housing stock would enhance GVRD density and affordable housing requirements, while retaining the single-family dwelling neighbourhood character for *Areas A, B and C*. If adopted for a specific *Area*, suites would have to conform to conditions outlined in the bylaws.

b) Multi-Family Housing

All higher-density residential development has been restricted to *Area D*. This *Area* is a mix of low and high-rise apartments, townhouses, and mixed-use residential/commercial development, representing building styles over the past 80 years. Within this broad range of housing forms, there is a significant proportion of rental accommodation. Redevelopment areas include lots 5-6 on Block 89 for multi-family housing (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference No. 2*) as well as any other buildings in *Area D* nearing the end of their life-cycle which might be considered for redevelopment.

5.4 Commercial Development

Commercial development in the *University Hill* area has been limited to the portion of the *Area D* zone commonly referred to as the *Village*, and has recently seen the development of mixed-use retail/residential on Parcel P of Block 97.

Structures on Lots 1-5, 13 and 14 of Block 97 (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference No. 7*) are reaching the end of their life cycle, and should be considered for redevelopment. Parking for this area is limited to street parking around Block 97, storefront parking in front of Lots 1-5, and a parking area cut into Western Parkway. New underground parking facilities have been built with Parcel P and underground parking for future development is encouraged.

The majority of the *Village* retail businesses are dependent on UBC's student population for solvency. This dependency may be reduced in the future as the projected number of permanent residents in *Area D* and UBC's East Campus increase.

Any plans for expansion, densification, or redevelopment of the *Village* should not proceed without detailed discussions with the UBC Campus and Community Planning Department and a review of their plans for commercial expansion on University Boulevard west of Wesbrook Mall and in the South Campus neighbourhood.

5.5 Recreational Development

The residents of the University Endowment Lands have a multiplicity of recreational opportunities from which to choose. Pacific Spirit Regional Park provides kilometers of walking, hiking and off-road cycling trails. These trails combine with bikeways on every major arterial through the community to provide a network of non-automotive access points from the Endowment Lands all the way to downtown Vancouver and beyond. Greenways, bikeways and trails should be well-kept and accessible for all residents. Public parking for these amenities should not interfere with local residents' access to homes or general mobility.

The University Golf Course is an 18-hole public course within 2 km of all *University Hill* residents. These lands should remain for recreational public use and any accessory development should be consistent only with the primary land use as a golf course.

Close proximity to UBC provides residents with access to the recreation facilities of one of Canada's foremost universities, which are open to the public for a fee. The new Community Advisory Council may wish to explore the option of entering into an agreement for discounted use by UEL residents.

5.6 Institutional Development

There are presently five sites designated for *Institutional* uses in the University Endowment Lands: University Hill Elementary School on Chancellor Boulevard; University Hill Secondary School on Acadia Rd.; St. Anselm's Anglican Church on University Boulevard; University Chapel (non-denominational) Church on University Boulevard and Regent College on Wesbrook Mall.

The elementary and secondary schools provide an opportunity for UEL residents' children to attend from kindergarten to grade 12 within the community. Educational facilities will be supported as a key resource for University Hill's quality of life. Negotiations with UBC, the Vancouver School Board and the Ministry of Education should be initiated as these facilities undergo pressure from new neighbourhood development at UBC.

St. Anselm's Church and University Chapel provide places for community worship and in the case of University Chapel, a preschool program and community meeting space. These organizations may be considered as potential partners in the development of future Seniors Housing.

Regent College is a self-sustaining private college that offers graduate courses in theological training. It is not a public institution, though it does offer continuing education and public seminars.

5.7 Industrial and Agricultural Sites

Given the highly compact region of the UEL, there are no industrial or agricultural land use zones with no intent to re-designate any areas for such use.

5.8 Hazardous and Environmentally Sensitive Areas

The University Endowment Lands contain some of the most valuable natural amenities on the west side of Vancouver. Pacific Spirit Regional Park, while under the jurisdiction of GVRD Parks, should be protected as an indispensable resource for UEL residents and the greater surrounding community.

The foreshore lands of Pacific Spirit Regional Park on the north side of Marine Drive are a special asset as a place of repose with vistas to the water. View corridors, tree management, public safety and shore stabilization should be addressed and managed by all relevant jurisdictions.

5.9 Sand and Gravel Deposits

There are no known deposits of extractable sand or gravel in the UEL, nor does the community support any such operations near *University Hill* residences.

5.10 Location and Type of Waste Disposal Sites

The UEL administration has traditionally used its own truck to collect household refuse twice weekly, although this practice is currently under review. Refuse is transferred off-site as per agreement with the GVRD. There are no plans to integrate a disposal site on the Endowment Lands.

Recycling is currently done on a voluntary basis where items are brought to a specially designated area located within the UEL Workyard (*see Section 4.2 for policies affecting future services*).

6.0 Regional Context Statement

6.1 Introduction

The *Local Government Act* states that all *Official Community Plans* must have a section outlining how they fit into their region's growth strategy. Although the UEL is not a municipality, it is a member of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, which administers the *Livable Region Strategic Plan (LRSP)*. The UEL is located within the Growth Concentration Area as defined in the *LRSP*.

The *LRSP* is based on the following four fundamental strategies:

- Protecting the Green Zone;
- Building Complete Communities;
- Achieving a Compact Metropolitan Region; and
- Increasing Transportation Choices.

This Regional Context Statement outlines what the UEL will be doing to align local policies with the regional priorities established in the *LRSP*.

6.2 Protecting the Green Zone

The intent of the Green Zone policy is to protect the Lower Mainland's natural assets and establish a boundary for urban growth. The undeveloped parts of the University Endowment Lands are themselves a green zone, acting as a development buffer in a high demand single-family area.

As indicated in Figure 2 - Land Use Map, the UEL supports this initiative by:

- a) Protecting Pacific Spirit Regional Park as over 700 hectares (1,800 acres) of undevelopable land between UBC and Greater Vancouver in a coordinated effort with GVRD Parks;
- b) Setting aside Block 98 as Jim Everett Memorial Park (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference 1*);
- c) Placing restrictions on the use of Block D, Block 1, District Lot 6494 (Plan 11469) to preserve as publicly accessible parkland (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference 2*);
- d) Preserving the greenbelt on Western Parkway between Agronomy Road and NW Marine Drive;
- e) Preserving the University Golf Course as publicly-accessible open space;
- f) Preserving the hedge on the west side of Westbrook Crescent south of Chancellor Boulevard and north of University Boulevard as a sound and visual barrier;
- g) Preserving public access to all existing servicing right-of-ways in *Area B*; and

- h) Ensuring that Lot 3483 (the UEL Worksyard) be retained only for current administration uses and/or local community recreation purposes (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference 3*).

6.3 Building Complete Communities

The *Livable Region Strategic Plan* has identified four main components of building complete communities, including a balance of jobs and housing, housing options, service provision and transportation options. A complete community offers a great diversity of choice and convenience, where people can live, work and play without having to travel great distances.

The UEL supports this initiative by:

- a) Identifying through further study, bylaw mechanisms that promote the provision of rental accommodation for all new or renovated residential developments;
- b) Requiring any development application seeking increases in the density allowable, to include a minimum of 20% of this additional area to be below-market price and/or special needs housing;
- c) Encouraging mixed-use residential/commercial redevelopment in the *Village* area. Parcel P of Block 97 (*see Figure 2 – Legal Reference 7*) in the *Village* was redeveloped to standards that promote the human scale and a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere through the use of open plazas, active streetscapes, narrow retail frontages, rain protection, generous tree planting and comfortable street furnishings, while offering affordable rental housing above;
- d) Allowing redevelopment in *Area D* to optimize density levels established in the *Current Bylaws* while maintaining a human-scaled environment at street levels;
- e) Reviewing the option of allowing secondary suites in established single-family areas to allow more residents to remain in their houses as well as providing affordable housing options, thus increasing density without affecting the built form and character of existing neighbourhoods;
- f) Supporting home-based business uses allowed in the *Current Bylaws* for all *Areas* of the UEL; and
- g) Allowing seniors housing (active or assisted) on *Institutional: Church/Seniors Housing* designated lands.

6.4 Achieving a Compact Metropolitan Region

The UEL's current resident population of 2,800 is supported by approximately 1,061 residences. Single-family type housing accounts for 441 units (42%) with the balance of 620 units being multi-family located only in *Area D*. Growth estimates based upon the potential for new development (anticipated only in *Area D* as new multi-family units) to occur by 2011 will create a total population in the range of 3,800 with a residential unit

count of 1,500. The proportion of single-family dwellings is expected to decrease to 29% with multi-family units representing 71% of the total housing stock.

There are currently 10,220 square meters (110,000 square feet) of commercial/retail uses in the UEL with an estimated employment base of 360 people. Development plans anticipate that up to another 930 square meters (10,000 square feet) may be added in the future, which would bring the total employment base to 400.

The intent of the GVRD's regional plan is to promote growth within the urban boundary zones identified as Growth Concentration Areas. This includes infilling undeveloped areas and growing established commercial centres. Compact metro regions are the end result of strong green zones and managed growth at the local level.

The UEL supports this initiative by:

- a) Focussing and densifying commercial development within established commercial areas;
- b) Densifying existing multi-family residential zones through redevelopment initiatives; and
- c) Supporting growth close to existing transit lines and promoting public transit use for all UEL residents (such as utilizing off-peak capacity for reduced fares) through discussions with Translink.

6.5 Increasing Transportation Choices

Increasing transportation choices by promoting the use of transit, cycling, walking and carpooling is intended to minimize the impact of single-occupancy vehicles and maximize the use of present infrastructure in the lower mainland. Single-occupancy vehicles are the largest single source of air pollution in the lower mainland.

The UEL supports this initiative by:

- a) Lobbying the MoT to maintain University Boulevard as an arterial road designed for alternative-transit use;
- b) Amending the *Current Bylaws* to require new multi-family developments to provide safe and convenient bicycle storage;
- c) Encouraging the MoT to install an on-road bike lane on Chancellor Boulevard between Acadia Rd. and the City of Vancouver's 8th Avenue 'Off-Broadway' cycling route; and
- d) The University Endowment Lands are located adjacent to a major transit line primarily serving the University of British Columbia. Morning inbound buses run at capacity to the campus with a corresponding outbound peak in the afternoon. Considering programs to make this excess capacity in the opposite direction attractive for use by UEL residents will encourage transit usage.