

University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Council

Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting

Monday, January 20th, 2025, 6:00 pm

5490 Shortcut Road, Leləm Community Centre

1. Call to Order (6:06 pm)
2. Adoption of the Agenda (6:06 pm)
 - a. Seconded by Henry
 - b. Approved unanimously
3. Adoption of Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting of October 21st, 2024 (6:07 pm)
 - a. Seconded by Henry
 - b. Approved unanimously
4. Motion to appoint Madeleine Nicholls as an Area Representative of Area C to the Community Advisory Council (6:07 pm)
 - a. Seconded by Henry
 - b. Approved unanimously
 - c. Be it resolved that Madeleine Nicholls be a member of the Community Advisory Council
5. Manager's Report, followed by Q&A (6:08 pm)
 - a. Presented by Will Emo, UEL Manager
 - b. A reminder that we are now under a new Ministry
 - c. The October meeting minutes will be posted to the website in the next week or two
 - d. CAC elections need to be held, as they should every two years (we are also looking for new ADP Area Representatives)
 - e. The UEL Administration is currently fully staffed
 - f. Development Services
 - i. Construction is well under way for Menno Hall
 - ii. Construction is well under way for the daycare, which should be open by the fall
 - iii. Still waiting on the building permit for the TransLink rectifier - the work will include improvements to the public realm - e.g., shifting the parking, more sidewalk
 - iv. We are currently reviewing development permits and building permits from both Regent College (a.k.a. Regent House) and lots H & I at Leləm, which were both rezoned last year - we expect both to be proceeding to neighbourhood notification and ADP referral soon

- v. There are currently no projects under rezoning
 - g. Recently approved development permits
 - i. 5425 Shortcut Road - approved in November
 - ii. A single-family home at 4976 Chancellor Blvd. - approved in October
 - iii. An amendment for 5474 Newton Wynd - approved in December
 - h. Properties out for neighbourhood notification
 - i. (There was an ADP meeting last Tuesday)
 - ii. A new single-family home at 4925 Queensland Road
 - iii. Oxygen Yoga at University Village for conditional use as a yoga studio
 - iv. 4749 West 7th Avenue
 - v. 1512 Western Crescent - cancelled a development permit, as the house is now listed for sale
 - i. Note about the province's Bill 44, Bill 46, and Bill 47: the UEL has updated its bylaws as of last August, and as a result, there are several properties interested in development and engaging in pre-application meetings - the staff is looking at amendments, starting with aligning our bylaws with Bill 44 - this work will be concurrent with the OCP update that we're looking at today
 - j. The new Housing Needs Report was released in December, and is currently on the UEL's website
 - k. We have developed a process for proceeding with the OCP update, which we are sharing tonight, aiming to provide an opportunity for the community to share feedback on how the SSMUH and TOA policies will be implemented in the UEL
 - l. We have a Community Centre Advisory Board, which has met several times and will continue to do so - we hope to secure an operator for the Community Centre by the spring
 - m. Public Works
 - i. Force main replaced on West 7th - replacing an aging pipe to Blanca and then rebuilding the road completely - we expect the final paving to be finished in the spring
 - ii. Construction on lower Acadia and Marine Drive in Area D - the construction is complete with final paving expected in the spring - this was a 3.8 million dollar project amortized over forty years
 - iii. Water bills are now due, as they were all sent out in December
 - iv. Note: there is a proposed change to parking in Area C, but that is not on the agenda for tonight, so we will discuss that at the next CAC meeting
 - v. The budget for the fiscal year 2025/2026 is being prepared, and it will be shared with the CAC prior to the meeting in March
6. Presentation of the UEL interim Housing Needs Report (6:18 pm)
- a. Presented by Marcus, UEL Senior Planner
 - b. Background

- i. The need for a Housing Needs Report came about as a result of the 2023 amendments, including changes to timings and requirements of HNRs - the UEL is not technically under the LGA, and we were directed by the Minister to comply with Section 790, etc.
 - ii. The report has to be completed by a specific day, to follow a specific format, and to inform housing needs for the next 5 to 20 years
 - iii. Relatedly, Section 790 also requires an OCP update by December 2025
- c. 3 new requirements
 - i. (1) Identifying current and anticipated housing needs for 5-year and 20-year timeframes using the “HNR Method”
 - ii. (2) Looking at housing in proximity to transportation (including the parts of the Area D plan related to transit and infrastructure, the UBC Bus Exchange, the work underway now with the OCP, and the potential for a SkyTrain expansion with UBC in the future)
 - iii. (3) Looking at actions taken since the previous HNR (approving the rezonings of 1,500 new units, aligned with Bill 44, which allows for SSMUH) - at full buildout over a 50-year horizon, the new SSMUH and TOA rules could result in up to an additional 7,000 units
- d. Presenting the HNR Data Tables, which are generated in accordance with the HNR Method’s technical guidelines - specifically, taking a list of stats and producing numbers on housing needs within a 20-year period
 - i. (A) Extreme Core Housing - total number of new units required for those who are in vulnerable positions, i.e., paying more than 50% of their income for rent
 - ii. (B) Homelessness
 - iii. (C) Suppressed Household Formation - households unable to form between 2006 to the present due to constrained housing environments, such as young people having difficulty moving out of their parents’, roommates, etc.
 - iv. (D) Units & Anticipated Growth - including both local household growth via UEL census data & regionally based growth
 - v. (E) Housing Units & Rental Vacancy - checking to see if vacancy rates are healthy (3% is the ideal, which makes some of the current rates low, such as 0.0% for 2-bedroom units)
 - vi. (F) Housing Units & Demand Buffer - trying to account for additional demand to put less pressure on the housing system, such as in the cases of families trying to move closer to work, seniors looking to downsize, etc. - we do not have these stats for the UEL, but we use applicable averages from MetroVancouver

- e. From these values, the minister has told us to amend the OCP and the LUB (land use bylaws)
- f. In terms of numbers, there a total of 2,183 units or 49% growth in units expected in the next 5 years, and a total of 3,450 units or 135% growth in units expected in the next 20 years
 - i. The UEL will meet these projected figures with the bylaw changes (SSMUH & TOA) and newly approved zoning for projects in-progress (Menno, Regent, Leløm)
- g. Also, we are required to do a HNR every 5 years, so the next will be done by December 31st, 2028
- h. Question from public: On pages 14 and 15, you've shown ~700 and ~2,100 - why are the numbers so different?
 - i. Answer: 718 is the number calculated as a result of the 6 tables (the 2,100 units is the total, including the 718)
- i. Q: What about Block F that has already been approved?
 - i. A: There are some rounding of numbers but it is representative of our best assessment of the data
- j. Q: We need 700 units in UEL, and since then, UEL approved more than 1,200 units in Block F
 - i. A: We should have more than sufficient units for the next 5 years, and we are more than halfway there for the next 20 years, so we are ahead of schedule, so to speak
- k. Q: I am very sympathetic with the plans and things are moving well, but how can we make sure that buildings/projects that are neglected get built more quickly? There are numerous lots on Chancellor that have been sitting there for 4 to 5 years
 - i. A: We are very aware of that concern, and we are trying to develop policy to address that and streamline our development approval processes
 - ii. Q: But we've been looking at this for years, and it is very frustrating that there is little to no progress
 - iii. A: We cannot force owners to build, and their circumstances are out of our control - we can only control site safety, take away their permits, etc.
 - iv. Q: Could we potentially use notifications from the government?
 - v. A: We can look at how to incentivize building, but we can't force private land owners to build anything
- l. Q: There is confusion about demographics - are homeless people just in the UEL? Or is the homeless population Vancouver's issue that we have to pick up?
 - i. A: The persons experiencing homelessness (PEH) statistic comes from provincial data sources, and we consider ourselves as a percentage of that
- m. Q: I am currently working on a project downtown for the Sauder family with a mix of residential/office spaces and 9 stories, but it can't sell because nobody is

buying - similarly, Oakridge is also slowed to a crawl - people are referring to Vancouver as “the empty city” - at some point, if we keep overbuilding, everything is going to crash for everybody, and I think we need to pull back on development

- i. A: Don’t know if I can say anything to that specifically, but we can refer to the data
- ii. Q: How old is the data?
- iii. A: The datasets go from 2008 up to 2021, and there are some datasets that are newer at various stages
- iv. Q: There are developers out there that are losing their shirts
- v. A: Under legislation we have to provide this amount of housing to be built, and the market itself will confirm what actually happens
- n. Comment: It sounds like there is a disconnect between plans and reality when it comes to the province’s decisions, as we seem to be overbuilding and people cannot afford these places regardless
- o. Q: Given that the math confirms that we are vastly over the numbers required, do we, under Bill 44 or Bill 47, no longer need to approve new housing?
 - i. A: We have to implement Bills 44 and 47, meaning that we cannot say no to whatever is permitted within that legislation
 - ii. Q: So there is no threshold where we can say we have already approved beyond what the province has required?
 - iii. A: We cannot say no based on what the legislation says, but the market will decide that, as property owners will look and consider whether there is viability
- p. Q: Given all the development going on, what about services and infrastructure?
 - i. A: We are looking at amenities and infrastructure needed to meet this potential buildout, and we have meetings with MetroVancouver about the sewers/water, meetings with VSB about schools, meetings with UBC, etc.
- q. Q: Within the UEL we already have Jericho and a lot of other lots being developed, so pressure on services will be horrendous
 - i. A: We will go into detail on what “dwellings” are or what kind of buildings are being built later in the OCP update
- r. Q: You’ve been looking at 5-year and 20-year timeframes, and this is spatially predicated on the Bus Exchange at Blanca and 7th - there is already talk about the SkyTrain coming within the next 20 years, so does the current modelling already incorporate any additional requirements that might come, with the SkyTrain?
 - i. A: No, since this is based on existing census data and traditional UEL growth - new datasets will reflect changes in growth - the UEL Bus Exchange is currently “designated” by the HNR Method, so anything else, including the SkyTrain, would be subject to future modelling

- s. Comment: There are municipalities that are scrambling to complete their required housing numbers, and we are not one of those municipalities, so it would be nice to formalize that somehow
- t. Q: Block F is picking up everything, and we can go way through the required numbers - are we comfortable with this?
 - i. A: Block F is within our jurisdiction
- u. Q: Following up on slide H, there is 0.0% vacancy for 2-bedroom units, so are there a lot of 2-bedroom units being proposed for there?
 - i. A: We don't know exactly how many, but there are some
- v. Q: On my project I have several workers from Ecuador, Ukraine, etc. all worried about their immigration status due to the federal government's recent policies
 - i. A: We are not in charge of immigration
- 7. Short break (6:52 pm)
- 8. Presentation on the UEL Official Community Plan update & upcoming community engagement (7:12 pm)
 - a. Presented by UEL staff led by Heather Shay
 - b. Territorial/land acknowledgement - we are working with indigenous peoples across the province, especially with the Musqueam, on reconciliation
 - c. We needed to make changes to our bylaws based on Bill 44 and Bill 47 - part of that is changing our OCP by December 2025, which is a faster process than we've ever done, so for that reason we are keeping the scope limited to the legislation that we have been directed to change
 - d. Because of the compressed timeline, we hired a consulting firm to help us with engagement, and they have prepared a presentation for us tonight
 - e. Presented by Melissa and Kelsey from Urban Systems
 - f. Agenda
 - i. OCP Update - what is it, and why now?
 - ii. OCP Update - what is the scope?
 - iii. How to stay informed and find information
 - iv. How to get involved in the planning process
 - v. Questions/comments at the end, but if something comes up feel free to jot it down on your note cards to remember and we will make sure your question is answered at some point
 - g. Ground rules
 - i. Listen to the information, make space for others' perspectives, challenge ideas and not people, be respectful, and practice self-care
 - h. Introductions
 - i. Melissa Clements & Kelsey Shaumann (from Urban Systems, a multidisciplinary consulting firm)

- ii. Our role is to provide unbiased perspectives, gather feedback, compile it, and return it to the UEL

i. OCP Update

- i. The UEL has launched an OCP update
- ii. The existing OCP was adopted in 2005, so a lot has changed since then
- iii. There is new legislation we must align with, and so this is an opportunity to share your thoughts about it

j. Timeline

- i. Now until March is the first round of engagement
- ii. April to May is the second round of engagement
- iii. The OCP update will be referred to the Ministry in the fall

k. What is an OCP?

- i. Describes the long-term vision of the community
- ii. Addresses housing, transportation, infrastructure, and climate change
- iii. Includes goals, objectives, policies, for land use
- iv. Existing and proposed land use
- v. Existing and proposed public facilities
- vi. Plans for how major road, sewer, and water systems will be phased
- vii. Policies and targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- viii. These are the bare minimum/things that will almost certainly be included

l. Why are we updating the OCP now?

- i. The province has recently introduced multiple housing-related initiatives (Bill 44 - SSMUH and Bill 47 - TOA)

m. Recap: Bill 44 - SSMUH

- i. The UEL webpage includes detailed information about the legislation
- ii. Allows for 4 to 6 units on single-family lots depending on their lot size (for instance, if greater than 200 square metres you can have 4 units on those properties) and proximity to frequent transit (for instance, if within 400 metres of a bus stop that has been identified as frequent transit, that number increases to 6 units)
- iii. On the map, the lots within the orange happen to be within 400 metres of a frequent transit route
- iv. Note that the distance is counted as the crow flies
- v. The UEL bylaws were amended in September to reflect these changes

n. What does this mean for the community?

- i. There will be greater flexibility in terms of housing - now you can allow more units on lots where there were previously single-family homes
- ii. There will be more development options - instead of seeing lot after lot of single-family homes, you may start to see townhouses or triplexes or other types of development interspersed

- iii. The specifics are difficult to predict, but we anticipate that the development will be quite gradual

o. Recap: Bill 47 - TOA

- i. The UBC Bus Exchange has been designated as a TOA
- ii. Under the TOA, minimum heights and densities are now mandated
- iii. The legislation identifies different zones according to the centre point
- iv. On the map there are two zones
- v. The first is within 200 metres of the TOA, in which you now can develop up to 12 stories with an FSR of 4.0
- vi. The second is within 200 to 400 metres of the TOA, in which you now can develop up to 8 stories with an FSR of 3.0
- vii. The closer you are to a TOA, the more options you have
- viii. The bottom line is that projects meeting these regulations cannot be rejected based on height and density alone

p. How are we implementing the new legislation?

- i. The UEL Administration was directed by the Ministry to align the OCP with the new legislation, to be done by December 31st, 2025
 - 1. They have amended the bylaws already, and completed an interim Housing Needs Report, which will help with the process
- ii. Launching the OCP update now ensures there are multiple opportunities for community education and engagement

q. OCP Update - Scope

- i. This will be a very focused update, not starting from scratch
- ii. It will implement the new legislation around SSMUH and TOA, with housing needs identified by the HNR
- iii. It will combine community input and technical planning analysis

r. Cont.

- i. Housing is a major focus, but it is not the only policy being addressed
- ii. The OCP update will also explore:
 - 1. Accessibility for all ages/abilities
 - 2. Services and amenities - how can we make our communities livable?
 - 3. Land usage, specifically commercial/institutional uses
 - 4. Environmental concerns, including managing greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, and tree canopies

s. Stay informed

- i. There are a few ways to stay up-to-date
- ii. (1) The UEL webpage contains information about the OCP update (www.universityendowmentnetlands.gov.bc.ca)
- iii. (2) Email → planUEL@gov.bc.ca

- iv. (3) Materials outside include posters, comment cards, newsletters, and discussion guides (which will help you prepare for the upcoming meetings)
- v. (4) Also, please spread the word and let everyone know what's going on
- vi. Today is an introduction
 - 1. On February 4th, there will be a community webinar, an online event from 6 pm to 8 pm (please register through the QR code)
 - a. Sharing information presented this evening
 - b. Q&A with UEL project team
 - c. Small roundtable discussions on key policy areas
 - 2. There will be a survey launching on February 25th and ending on March 7th
 - a. It will have questions designed to learn more about what is important to you, and seeking input on specific questions we need the community's thoughts on
 - b. It is online, but if that doesn't work for you, we can also get you a paper copy
 - 3. There will be a community workshop on March 4th, from 4 pm to 8 pm at the Community Centre
 - a. This is an opportunity for small group discussions
 - b. Information boards will be on display, as well as interactive boards to gather community input
 - c. Small roundtable discussions on key policy areas
 - d. In-person, and feel free to drop in without staying the whole time
- vii. What to expect
 - 1. We will be writing a public report following the engagement period summarizing what we did, what we learned, and what's next
 - 2. There will be two rounds of public engagement, because we wanted to ensure that we heard you correctly

9. Public Comments or Questions (7:55 pm)

- a. Q: How much of what you will hear gets put into the actual policies?
 - i. A: With any planning exercise, it's a combination of what you hear from the community combined with technical planning analysis/what is required from the legislation
 - ii. Answer (from Heather): The draft OCP gets referred back out to the community, and the reports do get sent to the Ministry
- b. Q: Concerns about the TOA

- i. A: The TOA and SSMUH are mandated by the government, and the floor space ratios were already changed during the summer, which are already reflected in the bylaws
- c. Q: Are areas considered to be in the public domain, including the Bridle Path, Jim Everett Park, and Little Australia up for grabs? Or are they still public domain areas during this round of the OCP?
 - i. A: It is not our intention to revisit parks and open spaces that are already part of the OCP, but it is up to the community
- d. Q: Having taken part in the OCP process in 2009 to 2010 - the OCP is a community bottom-up plan, so why are we changing the OCP if the bylaws were already changed? - it would be preferable for the information gathering to take place in conjunction with the CAC & ADP - moreover, earlier statements about how environmental concerns were not covered previously are incorrect, as there are records of those conversations and the fact that nobody implemented the community's ideas was not the community's problem
 - i. A: The legislation requires the OCP to be changed by the end of next year
- e. Q: Are we aware of any constitutional challenges (specifically, would there be any legal challenges to us not mandating Bill 47, etc.)?
 - i. A: There are other communities that are not happy with the legislation, but we are not sure about the degree to which they have challenged the province
- f. Q: In regards to the TOA slides, there seems to be some contradictions with the wording
 - i. A: The local government cannot deny an application that is up to 12 stories, so you can come in with 6 stories or 12 stories, for instance, but we cannot deny the application based on height as long as it's up to 12
 - ii. Clarification: The actual "minimum height" is 1 story, and the limitations are technically not "maximum height" because the community could ask to go over 12 stories in exchange for amenities
- g. Q: For SSMUH, can you subdivide a lot into 2 lots (if it's large enough) and put 8 dwellings inside it?
 - i. A: Not sure, but perhaps it's worth discussing whether we should have limitations in the OCP
- h. Q: The scope of the process is good to know, but there are some important things to note that are explicitly out of scope but could still be important
 - i. A: We're just getting started so the scope laid out is a bit premature - we don't have to exclude things just yet
- i. Q: Are we going to be reviewing all the UEL bylaws? There are a lot of bylaws, including those that protect our sunlight, views, height of trees, etc. - what if these conflict with the 12-story buildings - also, in order for this community to develop

a plan, we need to know UBC's plan, as we cannot make any reasonable decisions about schools/sewage/waste/road maintenance without clarification about details that we don't have access to

- i. A: To your latter point, we are meeting with members of the Musqueam and UBC to coordinate this update - they do have their approved public documents available
- ii. A: To your first point about design guidelines, these are all things we will be looking at as part of this process
- j. Q: Regarding the TOA slide, it is intriguing that the Bus Exchange is moved as far east as possible - if it's really where it's going to be, we wouldn't have anything on that Western Parkway, so it seems like someone is trying to develop this space
 - i. A: The Bus Exchange is actually L-shaped, etc.
 - ii. Q: Who chose the point?
 - iii. A: It's consistent with what the Ministry of Transportation did in all the other TOAs across the province
 - iv. Q: This is a sad situation for certain people who are just within the TOA legislation
 - v. A: It's arbitrary that way, since some are just out of the range as well
- k. Q: What happens after the report is written and it is handed over? Is there an obligation from UEL and the Ministry to incorporate the feedback? Is there an expectation that the Minister will go through the decision-making and explain why certain things were included or not?
 - i. Answer from Heather: As a community planner, the job is to listen to the feedback, so is there an obligation to consider what the community says? Yes, but regarding the Minister, it is up to them to decide whether they provide rationale for their decisions
 - ii. A: The draft will be provided to the community first for input and refinement, and then the final draft will be presented to the Minister for adoption
- l. Q: Will the SkyTrain go along College Highroad beside the golf course? I received a notice of this
 - i. A: Not sure what notice you received
 - ii. Q: Do we have any insight or information on where the SkyTrain is going, based on the drilling close to the golf course/in the area?
 - iii. A: At this time, there is no established route for the SkyTrain - they are doing geotechnical work throughout the whole corridor from Arbutus to UBC, specifically drilling 160 points to test what the ground is like, which will inform the alignment
- m. Q: Shouldn't we know what the route is like?

- i. A: They haven't established it yet, but Sasamat, Jericho, etc. are options
- n. Q: Could you clarify whether SSMUH is rental or strata?
 - i. A: We don't currently allow strata on SSMUH, so it will be all purpose-built rental
- o. Q: What if someone owns the property but decides to develop multi-unit?
 - i. A: It will still be purpose-built rentals, regardless of ownership
- p. Q: In terms of the meeting on February 4th, there seems to be no communication between the CAC/ADP and your consultation team - I suggest that the parties find the work that has been done around 2010 with a draft that was submitted to the UEL, which would help set the stage so that we stop reinventing the wheel - the February meeting will hopefully be more inclusive, since it doesn't seem very helpful to restrict it to being fully online
 - i. A: We have a year to complete all of this planning work, so we want to start having the discussion as soon as possible - we know not everyone is comfortable discussing online, or discussing in-person, so we want a variety of formats for everyone to get involved - for those who can't attend in February, please check out the survey or come in March
- q. Q: Please confirm that the CAC is involved with the event for February 4th
 - i. A: The project has just launched
- r. Q: Are we able to see the survey commentary in between February and March? And can we see the responses as they come in online?
 - i. A: Typically we don't share the raw data - instead, we analyze all the results, theme it, and then report back on it
- s. Comment: You will get the most rich results from an organic, community group - it's not just having a pre-decided idea and then bouncing it off the group - you get the group to generate the idea and bring that forward
- t. Comment: This is like our Block F discussion, in which we gave our opinions but they didn't listen to anything
- u. Q: We are built off the CAC informing the UEL Manager, and now we are being informed that the CAC may not even receive raw data - this seems very inconsistent to our governance structure
 - i. A: The reports will be comprehensive, and will be available to all community members, including the CAC - we appreciate community responses, which is why we have small-group discussions
- v. Q: We are looking at this from a 3-month, maybe 2-month timeline - I understand what you are saying but it should be starting as soon as possible - we also need to see a schedule that includes specific topics
 - i. A: We can present the second round of engagement to you - all of this is a lot of draft policy writing over the next six months, so that the UEL can send a draft to the Minister in the fall

- w. Q: Can we have a draft of what was drafted 15 years ago? A lot of the same people are here
 - i. Answer from Heather: If someone could find it, that would be great
 - ii. Answer from Will: The current OCP which is in place right now was signed in 2006 -
 - iii. Q: Around 2009/2010, the CAC asked to form a group from all the areas of the UEL to draft changes, and the number of discussions that took place was enormous, including discussions about trees, lines of sight, bike lanes, the # of units in apartments, etc. - a draft was created after extensive conversation, presented to the UEL manager, and we never heard about it afterwards
 - iv. Answer from Will: It is 2025 now, and it is a new community - the whole point of this is that this is the opportunity for the community to have their input - it is a UEL Administration initiative based on the requirements of the new legislation - note that the meeting in March will be in the gymnasium
 - x. Q: After the amount of work that we did for that old OCP draft, how can the UEL administration not have that report?
 - i. A: We are not sure what happened back then, because none of our current staff were available back then - we do have the Area D neighborhood plan from 2019
 - y. Q: Can you make a concerted effort to find the old OCP draft?
 - i. A: Yes
 - z. Note from Katerina: The parking issue for Area C will be discussed in our next meeting
 - i. Also, ADP nominations are open for your areas, including 2 spots from Area A, 2 spots from Area B, and 2 spots from Area D, so feel free to email and get in touch with Katerina for the new term
10. Adjournment (8:18 pm)
- a. Seconded by Henry
 - b. Approved unanimously