

**University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Council**

**Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting**

**Tuesday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 6:00 pm**

**5490 Shortcut Road**

---

1. Call to Order (6:03 pm)
2. Adoption of the Agenda (6:03 pm)
  - a. Seconded by Henry
  - b. Approved unanimously
3. Adoption of Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting of March 17th, 2025 (6:04 pm)
  - a. Seconded by Henry
  - b. Approved unanimously
4. Manager's Report (6:04 pm)
  - a. Presented by Will
  - b. The Manager's Report will be first today as Will is short on time, and has to attend a Ministry meeting in case any questions are asked regarding the UEL
  - c. We have a new after-hours emergency contact, Paladins Security, replacing Arpel Security, which was bought out by TELUS - Paladins Security will have a phone number for Public Works emergencies (e.g., streetlight damage, water on the road) that will function after hours - the number is 844-380-2129 - it's still not set up properly just yet as you need an access code, but we're trying to get it to be available without the code
  - d. Development Services
    - i. Bylaw referrals: The public notice bylaw, regarding how we provide public notice, now being referred to the CAC
    - ii. Rezoning: The Toronto/Acadia project has not gone to the Minister yet for decision, as the applicant is making their submission package more readable
    - iii. Development permits: Recently approved is the Regent House at Regent College, an 18-story residential commercial project approved on April 16th - the building permit was applied for and they are shoring an excavation phase and considering it for approval
    - iv. Recently, developments at Lelem lots H & I were presented at the ADP - two rental towers of 25-26 stories are pending the Manager's decision
    - v. Same with 5938 Newton Wynd in Area B, also pending the Manager's decision
    - vi. There are no applications planned for the ADP in May

- e. Public Works
- f. Construction on lower Acadia/NW Marine - the sewer work and landscaping are complete
- g. A new force main on the sewer system and road reconstruction are complete and deficiencies have been given to the contractor for West 7th
- h. Work has been completed and the path is open for use on the Ortona Trail, a project fully paid for and completed by Musqueam Capital
- i. A new EV charger has been installed at the Community Centre, which is getting pretty good use
- j. Upcoming Events
- k. The BMO Marathon is on May 4th, which goes down SW Marine, then up around NW Marine, back up to Vancouver
- l. Spring graduation lasts from May 21st to May 29th
- m. The Vancouver Half Marathon is on June 22nd
- n. There won't be any major disruptions to UEL residences/streets, although there might be some traffic being diverted on some streets
- o. Question from Madeleine: Regarding the ADP process for developments such as the one on Newton Wynd and Lelem lots H & I, is the Manager's review your review? Has the CAC given input?
  - i. Response from Will: Yes, opportunity was given to provide input during the process already - we heard from the Area D representative at the time, and the period is now closed
- p. Question from Madeleine: Regarding the Paladins Security phone number, when is "after hours"?
  - i. Response from Will: It is when the UEL office is closed, so 4:30 pm to 8:30 am, and on weekends - we will update the number on the website, and the answering machine will have that number as well - right now we're still using our on-call cell phone as a number, but this will be a better service because it will go through a central location and be answered for certain

## 5. Topic of Interest

- a. Presented by Madeleine
- b. Background: Areas A, B, and D have parking regulations and Area C doesn't - there is no bylaw that prohibits long-term camping - this isn't a problem at the moment but it has been in the past, and we'd like to anticipate that this might become a problem again and we'd like a way to deal with it
- c. The City of Vancouver has a precedent in this, because as recently as April 2025, there were updates to Vancouver's traffic bylaws - cars can't park in a residential area between the hours of 8:00 pm and 6:00 am for longer than 3 hours unless they're a resident of that block

- d. We suggest that we adopt something like that in Area C so that if there is long-term camping, we have something to fall back on
- e. Comment from resident: Parking in Area C has become a hot topic lately - we've been asked if we want permit parking (which we don't) or signage (which we don't as well), but camping has been a problem, and one example is when I brought my daughter to the park when she was 5 years old - while she was there, a camper asked her if she wanted to go into the park and look for a kite - fortunately she screamed and ran home - there was another camper there with a full motorhome with a barbeque, and I told him that the area wasn't a campground, and it was a residential space - the camper's response was that he didn't want to live with "Indians," leading me to phone the RCMP - other issues involve campers leaving garbage, robberies, foreign license plates, etc. - we suggest to copy what City of Vancouver has done across Blanca and have a bylaw restricting parking applied to Area C
  - i. Response from Will: That can't happen and won't happen, and there is no way for us to restrict parking in that way - the whole point of going through with permit parking was to address this issue - the consequence of not doing those things is that people could be parking there long-term, and there is currently no way for the UEL to enforce parking in Area C
- f. Comment from resident: Why can't we create a bylaw?
  - i. Response from Will: We can't make an enforcement bylaw because we do not have the enabling legislation to allow us to do that - we cannot issue fines according to the UEL Act - we can only tow through the permit system
- g. Comment from Madeleine: The crux is it's easy to identify a car that's parked for 3 hours - what isn't easy to identify is whether or not the owner of that vehicle lives in the area, and we don't have the ability right now to do anything without the permit system
- h. Question from resident: Who would I contact about enabling legislation?
  - i. Response from Will: Contact your MLA and the Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs - it isn't about the UEL's opinion - we have been trying to get the enabling legislation for quite some time, and the MLA and the Minister are aware of it - they haven't said no, but it's not a priority for them
- i. Question from resident: If someone in our neighbourhood gets injured or harmed by a camper, is there liability on the UEL?
  - i. Response from Will: I am not a lawyer and I can't comment on that - the UEL cannot do anything about a vehicle parked on the street in Area C - public safety (such as threatening individuals) would be an RCMP issue

- j. Comment from resident: The minutes of the meeting should reflect the safety concerns of the residents
    - i. Response from Madeleine: This topic was brought up as a preemptive discussion - because there aren't active campers, people being threatened isn't happening just yet, but we were hoping to put something forward - although it seems like it won't be as straightforward
  - k. Comment from resident: There are governance issues in the OCP
    - i. Response from Will: The purpose of this update isn't related to governance at all, but maybe it has some relevance
    - ii. Response from resident: There was a 2022 report on governance, but it hasn't been touched on since and it's a major issue
    - iii. Response from Heather: We haven't incorporated it into the OCP because it's separate from the OCP (the Ministry has not told us that we should do anything with the results of that governance study) but we hear you
  - l. Comment from resident: David Eby should return to one of these CAC meetings again
6. OCP Update
- a. Presentation by Heather Shay
  - b. We have been in the process of updating the OCP since January, and we have to complete it by December 31st, 2025
  - c. The scope is relatively small, but we have to update the OCP now once every five years
  - d. The focus of this one is implementing the legislation that came down from the Ministry on SSMUH/TOA
  - e. Outlining key terms as a recap, including OCP, SSMUH, TOA, etc.
  - f. Comment from resident: We have the UEL Act that calls for the creation and maintenance of the OCP, which dictates that the bylaws reference the OCP - if the OCP states that we don't wish our area to be used for camping/long-term parking, it seems to me that there is a mechanism that we can put in the bylaws
    - i. Response from Will: The UEL Act is not the legislation that says we must do the OCP - the UEL Act says that the Minister can look at Sections 14 & 15 of the LGA, which is why we need an OCP - also, the community can certainly put forth that safety is an important issue and that the community wants to regulate campers, but this will circle back to enforcement
    - ii. Response from resident: The OCP is meant to be descriptive, not prescriptive, so we should be describing what we want
    - iii. Response from Heather: If that is what you want, you can give us that feedback, but as Will has described, we still can't create a bylaw that specifically enforces parking without permits

- iv. Response from Katerina: We can add a safety clause, but as for enforcement, the most effective way to enforce is to have a permit system wherein we can use stickers to distinguish which cars are parked legally or illegally
- v. Response from resident: Campers are a noticeably different problem from students when it comes to parking, and the Vancouver solution is very simple
- vi. Response from Heather: The wording could be akin to “explore parking regulations to prevent long-term campers,” and then we will explore how we can do that specifically later on
- vii. Presenting maps of the SSMUH and TOA regulations
- viii. The OCP update itself involves SSMUH, TOA, and GHG emission reduction targets, as well as regional context statements (the last two are because we are part of MetroVancouver)
- ix. Summary of the Public Engagement timeline so far, specifically the first round, which included the meeting, the webinar, the survey, the workshop, etc.
- x. We are now in the second round of engagement, which will similarly include a meeting, a survey, a workshop, etc. - please fill out the survey, as we’d really appreciate the feedback
- xi. Please feel free to take a look at the boards and the sticky notes too
- xii. Once we have collected everything from the second round of engagement, we will draft some policies this summer, the draft will go the CAC and the community, and we will refine it before it goes to the Minister for their decision in December
- xiii. Question from Madeleine: Should we be looking at strata?
  - 1. Response from Heather: Strata will be separate from the OCP Update
- xiv. Comment from resident: We don’t want to allow strata - it is currently not allowed but we want to make sure that it stays that way
  - 1. Response from Heather: Tell us that via formal feedback - although yes, currently there is no subdivision/no stratification, and we are not considering changing that
- xv. Thank you for participating in the first round of engagement
  - 1. There were 96 surveys submitted, and the second survey has different questions so please fill that out (we only have 14 responses for that one so far)
  - 2. The results are on the website, and we also have the paper copies here tonight

- xvi. People's visions for the future of the UEL: community amenities, knowing your neighbours, parks and green spaces, and a thriving Community Centre
- xvii. Key Takeaways:
  - 1. A desire for a variety of housing types (purpose-built rental, senior-friendly homes, multiplexes, multigenerational family homes, etc.)
  - 2. A desire for more affordable housing and rental housing
  - 3. A desire to retain single-family homes as well
  - 4. Support for non-residential uses within SSMUH areas such as cafes or corner stores - there was less support for institutional uses like private schools or religious assembly structures
  - 5. For TOA, most people did not support additional heights and densities beyond TOA legislation - people were averse to height
- xviii. More Takeaways:
  - 1. Even though people don't want additional density for amenities, there is desire for the amenities themselves, such as cultural services and green spaces
  - 2. Support for establishing minimum unit sizes - some of the 1-bedroom or 2-bedroom spaces looked small or not livable
  - 3. Support for establishing a minimum number of 3-bedroom units - something that local governments also have (e.g., between a 5-20% requirement)
  - 4. Mixed support for student housing in the UEL - it seems like some folks really wanted it, and some really didn't want it
  - 5. Note: we have been instructed not to touch FSR
  - 6. Support for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, with some varying ideas on how to do that
  - 7. A desire to protect existing trees and expand tree canopy - we have a policy right now aiming for 40% tree coverage in the UEL
  - 8. Note: Enforcement when it comes to cutting down trees is the same as Vancouver where someone has to write a complaint, and it is hard to enforce by nature
  - 9. Desire to protect parks and greenspaces - a reminder that we have jurisdiction over Jim Everett Park, and the rest of the parks that were mentioned (Pacific Spirit, the greenspace over Area C to MetroVan, etc. is actually UBC)
  - 10. Concerns about increased density (traffic, noise, and community character, including some questions outside about how to maintain the community character)

- xix. Comment from resident: If Vancouver is densified, how will they handle the traffic?
  - 1. Response from Heather: The idea of the TOA is that people will take transit
  - 2. Comment from resident: How are neighbouring communities going to suffer traffic flow? On the weekend when you drive towards the TransCanada highway, it is a nightmare because no one thought through not having parking on 12th to 16th...
  - 3. Response from Heather: Traffic is definitely a difficult issue - but the MCC has told us they have a giant parking garage that is actually empty (despite the building being fully rented out)
  - 4. Response from Katerina: Perhaps this is because there aren't a lot of commercial services compared to what we see in Wesbrook, where there is bound to be a lot of traffic
- xx. Future engagement topics:
  - 1. Housing, development, transportation, and environmental protection - all of which should be addressed in the new survey
- xxi. Materials have been uploaded to the website

## 7. Public Comments or Questions

- a. Question from Alice: One of the questions asked was "Where in the UEL do you live?" and 75% of people lived in 1 of the Areas, while 24% said other, or living outside the UEL - are these people students? Or from the UNA?
  - i. Response: We didn't limit who could fill out the survey, since it was online - our guess would be that most are students, but we'd have to ask Urban Systems
  - ii. Response: Furthermore, City of Vancouver does not limit their engagement - that is why we collect all the data and parse it before giving it to the Minister
  - iii. Response from Madeleine: This information is somewhat relevant, but if they're weighing in on housing or density, do we need to discount them a little bit?
  - iv. Question from Alice: Are we still keeping track of this in Round 2?
  - v. Heather: It could also be people who are working here, or people who want to live here, so maybe we need to add specific details
  - vi. Question from resident: Is there verification for people who live in A, B, or C?
  - vii. Response from Heather: No
- b. Question from resident: Why are the response numbers so low?
  - i. Response from Heather: Urban System has been finding that it is harder for people to get engaged, and governance may be an issue

- c. Comment from Katerina: There is a suggestion to the administration that the UEL create a budget so that people can go on foot or go knocking door to door - this would be much more effective than word-of-mouth
  - i. Response from Heather: That would be a good idea, and we do have a certain budget to do this - we have talked about doing pop-ups, so that is something we might do in May, since 14 responses are not enough to direct us on how to write policy
  - ii. Response from Katerina: On-the-ground advice might have another advantage, as it will be based on people who actually live in the area
  - iii. Comment from resident: Block Watch may be relevant to this, since they have an idea of who is contacting them - maybe reaching out to a few people on each block would be helpful
- d. Question from Madeleine: I have not done the second survey yet - there isn't a question about governance, right?
  - i. Response from Heather: Correct
  - ii. Response from Madeleine: Maybe we could put those in the "Are there any other comments?" space
- e. Question from resident: How are we as a community going to deal with opposing preferences of UEL residents? Because the UEL used to be a community of ~5,000 single-family homes and now there are way more and varied, with conflicting preferences
  - i. Response from Heather: We did hear people say that they don't want any change - the fact is that legislation states that there will be change, though - the question is, now that the changes are going through, how do we still make the place desirable to live in?
- f. Question from resident: What happened to the opening of the Community Centre?
  - i. Response from Heather: We are still looking for an operator
- g. Question from Alice: For the "What type of housing do you currently live in/would you like to live in?" questions, there were less people responding to the latter - did they not fill that out? or did they not want to live in UEL in the future?
  - i. Response from Heather: We are unsure about that
- h. Question from Alice: For the "Do you live in 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, or 3-bedroom houses" question, breaking it down into sections, it seems like the same group as the "I rent my home" group...
  - i. Response from Heather: We did have facilitators, but here it is hard to see how many people who answered one way would have answered on other questions - this data would have been helpful for backing up housing vision
- i. Question from resident: Is our infrastructure capable of supporting the new developments?



- i. Response from Heather: The short answer is yes, at least for what is in our Housing Needs Report projections, but anything beyond that would need upgrades
  - j. Question from resident: Any update on where the subway will run?
    - i. Response from Heather: There has been no decision made for that
    - ii. Response from Madeleine: Just from what is publicly available, it seems like there will be a stop on 8th on Jericho, then it goes underground and comes up at 10th and Blanca, and then it goes above ground probably on University Boulevard, stopping somewhere on the golf course, and then to the transit hub
    - iii. Response from Heather: But it has not been decided yet, as it is still in the technical base case, and then it has to go into the business case, and there have been no financial commitments made yet either
    - iv. Response from resident: Where were the drilling samples drilled? We could use the map
    - v. Response from Heather: We don't have it, as it wasn't us who did the drilling
  - k. Question from resident: In Area C, the owners of the golf course cut the trees on the side of the golf course, making it really scary to walk because of the threat of being hit by golf balls
    - i. Response from Heather: We can speak to Musqueam Capital about this
    - ii. Response from Madeleine: Could you also talk to them about the fencing? Specifically, the side facing College Highroad has shabby fencing
    - iii. Response from Alice: The trees that line University Boulevard as well - sometimes I walk that way to the library and golf balls have bounced into the street
8. Adjournment (7:45 pm)
- a. Seconded by Henry
  - b. Approved unanimously