

University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Council

Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting

Tuesday, September 15th, 2025, 6:00 pm

300-5755 Dalhousie Road

1. Call to Order (6:03 pm)
2. Adoption of the Agenda (6:03 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously
3. Adoption of Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting of July 21st, 2025 (6:04 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously
4. OCP Update (6:05 pm)
 - a. We have gone through the comments/feedback, so the next stage is drafting the updated policies
 - b. Those must be reviewed by legal, which is going on right now (and will take a couple weeks)
 - c. The policies will be made available for comment to the CAC and the community
 - d. Question from Katerina: How much time does the CAC have to respond?
 - i. Answer: It is referred out for 30 days, and we will make sure we make it available on our website as well as through the CAC
 - e. Question from Madeleine: When will it be posted for the 30-day period?
 - i. There's a few back-and-forth/fine tuning things with legal, but definitely by next week, and possibly by later this week
 - f. Question from Katerina: What is the process like afterwards?
 - i. Answer: We'll refer it to the community, receive feedback, and then all of the information is sent to the Minister, who will make the decision on whether or not to enact the bylaw
 - g. Question from resident: Do the bylaws concern the entirety of UEL, or is this for Regent?
 - i. Answer: These reflect changes to the zoning bylaw (SSMUH and TOA) that were put into place last year - it is a broad, general update - it also includes a few other updates specific to this topic such as climate change
 - ii. Question from resident: So it is specifically related to zoning?
 - iii. Answer: Yes, generally - it is a bit backwards, but legislation decreed we had to do the zoning at a certain time and then update the OCP after that
 - iv. Question from resident: And the bylaw amendments that Regent was pushing for?

- v. Answer: That was a separate zoning change - last year, Regent Tower did their rezoning, and are working on construction
 - h. Question from resident: Regarding the process being backwards, do we need to take the zoning bylaw into consideration? In this dynamic, where exactly would the community feedback come into play?
 - i. Answer: The OCP is formed by the community's overarching, high level goals
 - ii. Comment from resident: Interesting, because usually the zoning bylaw falls out of those statements and it seems like we'll be constrained
 - iii. Question from resident: Also the OCP itself is a bylaw, right?
 - iv. Answer: Yes, the OCP is a bylaw - land use is separate, and that sets the zoning alongside other bylaws
5. Manager's Report (6:14 pm)
- a. The minutes from past meetings will be posted to the website
 - b. We still have cards on the desk for after-hours emergency contact through Paladins Security
 - c. Heather was here last meeting, and she mentioned that we have a new Minister for the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs: Christine Boyle
 - d. We've talked to her once and have given her a broad overview of our division (a two minute soundbite for the UEL)
 - e. BCGEU is on strike
 - f. UEL staff have not gone on strike yet, but that could happen any day since we respect the right to go on strike - if this happens, services may be impacted
 - g. We have three managers (Heather, Will, and Tyrone) who will be trying their best to keep things running
 - h. Things that will no longer be active include parking permits, building permits, water bills, garbage/organic waste collection, etc.
 - i. We will focus on essential services like water/sewage/health and safety
 - j. Not sure what will happen with the strike, but we all hope that there will be a resolution soon
 - k. Recently, there was a new public bylaw notice in August, a minor administrative change regarding how we provide notification of new bylaws
 - l. The minister has provided their intent to enact the rezoning for the Toronto/Acadia project, so expect that to be signed in October
 - m. Question from resident: Does the rezoning have a time limit?
 - i. Answer: Not sure? There's no built in timeline since developers rarely choose not to go forward
 - ii. Question from resident: We might be seeing that now
 - iii. Answer: H/I were supposed to pay their building permit fees recently, and that is still moving forwards

- n. Question from resident: What does “buildings not conforming” mean?
 - i. Answer: If you have a certain kind of zoning, the zoning states what you can and cannot have - we can try to find out more since I am not the Head of Development Services
- o. Question from resident: If the zoning changes, does the tax change?
 - i. Answer: Not sure as that is up to BC Assessment and not us
- p. For Regent, excavation is almost complete and we expect further disruptions on Western Parkway with parking
- q. For the TransLink rectifier, we are waiting on them to finalize their building permit and do the construction there - a reminder that there will be parallel parking instead of angle parking once everything is finished
- r. Development P Updates:
 - i. Minor permit amendments on Chancellor in Area C, related to landscaping
 - ii. 1561 Wesbrook Crescent in Area B - changes went out for neighbourhood notification and we’re waiting to determine if they will go to ADP or not
 - iii. There will be no ADP meetings in August or September - on that note, I’d like to ask the CAC to put out a call for nominations for the panel of the ADP - there are 2 vacancies in Area B and 1 vacancy in Area D
- s. There will be elections for the CAC/ADP next year in 2026
- t. There will be a public information session for a proposed project in Area A on Allison Road taking place on October 2nd, 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm, at the UBC Nest - a development group is holding an open house to share information regarding proposed development on 5 parcels of land on Allison Road - they haven’t made an application to us, so as far as we are concerned it has nothing to do with the UEL and is not official - the proposal is for a 6-story wood frame rental building
 - i. Question from Katerina: Do we know the developer?
 - 1. Answer: It’s not a developer I’ve seen before, but they seem well established
 - ii. Question from resident: Does it matter what the community says?
 - 1. Answer: It’s in TOA - the zoning is not there so they still have to rezone - in this, they can propose to build up to 8 stories up to 3 FSR, and the local government cannot say no based on those two things - when they apply, they would apply to rezone those 5 parcels to match what they are proposing
 - iii. Comment from resident: It’s a bit strange that they’re doing it in the Nest since that’s student population
 - 1. Answer: Well, it’s a rental and they’re going out to the community - that meeting in the Nest is their meeting and it’s voluntary - in the future they’d also have to go through us

- iv. Comment from resident: I would suggest that when they go through us they attend meetings in the UEL
 - 1. Answer: For sure
- v. Question from Madeleine: If they are trying to engage the community, they might try to do it in a place that has less opposition (since there might be more opposition in the UEL) - also, have they purchased these properties? I'd assume so, because otherwise, they can't apply to rezone them?
 - 1. Answer: Someone has to be authorized by the owner through an official letter - we don't know if they've purchased or have a right to purchase - however, they've already paid to have a predevelopment meeting so that can be better informed on what we are going to require, which demonstrates commitment - they also wanted to be at the UEL meeting today but there was a scheduling conflict
- vi. Question from resident: Can this move forward in any real way before the OCP is finalized?
 - 1. Answer: Yes, because the zoning bylaw allows for it in a certain way
- vii. Question from resident: Would there be any additional development fees collected from projects like this?
 - 1. Answer: We already have that in our bylaws, like fees for the development permit, the rezoning application, the building permit, etc. - the Works and Services Bylaw requires them to upgrade all adjacent facilities around the property
- viii. Question from resident: Do we have financial estimates? We need more resources for the RCMP
 - 1. Answer: Individual developments don't pay for more police - it would be broader - the RCMP have jurisdiction here and that's provincial - there are police taxes or some additional taxes on properties - we receive that amount and it's divided up according to the mill rate, etc. - presumably if you have a 6-story building with 385 units, they would pay a significant amount of tax compared to others
- ix. Comment from resident: We need to get ahead on funding for the police
 - 1. Answer: We have no direct role in policing - we can advocate it, but we don't have financial connections and we don't set staff rates for them

- x. Question from resident: We've been over how the RCMP is unable to get more staff, but how can we actually help? Maybe taxes going to the RCMP?
 - 1. Answer from resident: UBC has been advocating for the same thing - perhaps we could go to the Staff Sergeant through the CAC, or go to UBC/UNA and ask if there's any way we can join in with their efforts - our residents are the smallest group and the UEL won't be able to do anything about this except for maybe putting a word in with the Minister
- xi. Comment from resident: The connection that I'm making is that those ministers and agencies are the BC government - rather than us residents having to run around, I hope that I can reach the BC government in charge of the UEL and ask them to advocate for us on our behalf
 - 1. Answer: Yes, your MLA would be the best bet
- u. The Lelem daycare centre is in operation as of today, and they received their occupancy permit last week - it's been a long process to get to this point and it's a beautiful facility with 110 spots
- v. In terms of prioritising UEL residents, the operator said last week that 11 people from the UEL inquired, 1 family from the UEL signed up, and they have 1,900 people total on their waitlist
- w. For the Community Centre, we went through a solicitation to find an operator over the summer - we've closed that and have awarded the contract to YMCA - we just need to negotiate the final agreement and the Community Centre's tentative opening will be March 2026
 - i. The CCAB is made up of UEL, MCC, and 2 strata owners from Lelem - we've met before but things got sidetracked so we'll have another meeting and discuss things with the new operator to plan programming that the community wants to see
 - ii. Comment from Madeleine: That is huge, amazing news, and we should all be very happy
 - iii. Yes, we've been working on this for five years and it's been a lot of work - kind of numb at this point but it is a huge step to have the Community Centre finally moving forward
- x. Water rates are going to go up to reflect the cost of maintaining the system - up until now we've collected revenue from water sales that's gone towards maintaining infrastructure - our purchasing power capacity is diminishing and we're not able to renew as much of the water/sewage system as we have in the past
 - i. Comparing what the UEL pays to MetroVan, we're less than Vancouver, Richmond, etc. but we are moving up towards them a little bit, because we

are trying to increase the revenue that goes directly toward infrastructure renewal

- ii. This won't be too noticeable - the rate increase will begin in January (the off peak rate will go up)
- iii. Comment from resident: It would be helpful to know the long term plan for the budget and how our taxes are translated into that
 - 1. Answer: UBC's rate will go up as it's a bulk rate
- iv. Question from resident: Would it be helpful to the community to do a reserve?
 - 1. Answer: We can't realistically do a reserve because of the way the budget is balanced - we do have a plan on what we're doing in the next decade, which is primarily sewer separation (especially in Area B), looking at water mains, etc.
- v. Comment from resident: It would be good to be aware of these things
 - 1. Answer: When we go through the budget with the CAC, we do go through where the money is going annually - infrastructure operations are major, and like so many other municipalities we are falling behind on them - it would be nice to fix everything right away, but it takes time
- vi. Question from resident: Will residents expect spikes in taxes as we do these projects?
 - 1. Answer: We try not to "spike" unless we have to and we try to blend things out instead, keeping capital work at a fairly consistent pace - there's more pressure this year than most, as we had Urban Systems coming in for the OCP update - with the Community Centre, we've been raising the taxes in last few years so that we're not suddenly spending a million dollars extra for that one item - these upcoming projects are the same in the sense that we've already anticipated them
- y. The UEL Open House: We're still waiting to hear if our Minister who lives relatively locally will be able to join us, as well as whether a member of the Musqueam will be able to attend and give a welcome speech - otherwise, there will be displays of old photos, archived documents, commonalities (for instance, in the 60s, students parking on Wesbrook Crescent was an issue and we still deal with that today), activities for kids like painting and plants, barbequed food, fire trucks displayed, etc.
- z. Public Works:
 - i. Focusing on operations/maintenance projects
 - ii. We finished fixing the water main on Hamber Road, and had reduced some scope

- iii. Sanitary relining on Knox Road
 - iv. A sewer video inspection started today and is an ongoing project
 - v. There's been an improvement in compliance with landscaping and overgrowth issues and properties that had tall grass - we sent out letters to noncompliant properties and got good responses from those
- aa. Question from resident: Are we allowed to donate/sponsor things for the event? Like can we donate a cake?
 - i. Answer: Possibly, let's chat
- bb. Question from resident: A huge thank you to the UEL crew for the work they did on the sidewalks over the summer, minimizing the disruption for neighbours
 - i. Answer: It was BC Hydro who did that, but we've been on top of them
- cc. Question from resident: A whole bunch of graffiti turned up in Area C and Will and his team dealt with it really quickly, within 36 to 48 hours, which was appreciated
 - i. Answer: Tyrone was on it
- 6. Topics of Interest (7:09 pm)
 - a. Vandalism at Block F
 - i. Comment from resident: Block F is vandalized beyond belief
 - 1. Answer from Capital Core: I did reach out to my team and our Director of Development said we've begun planning for replacement work in October
 - ii. Question from resident: Is it a matter of being reactive? Or an ongoing security effort? There was chilling advertisement of murderous ideology
 - 1. Answer from CC: We don't always see it
 - iii. Question from resident: But we have someone whose duty it is to maintain the property [showing example pictures]
 - 1. Comment from Madeleine: Could I suggest someone from the golf course just make sure they circle back daily? As soon as it goes up, we should have it taken down
 - 2. Answer from CC: We've been watching the banners - it should be soon
 - 3. Comment from Madeleine: It's an extensive piece of "billboard signage," and we originally thought it was temporary
 - 4. Answer from CC: Should be removed by the end of October
 - b. Street camping in Area C
 - i. Comment from resident: I happened to run into a camper who was parking and attempting to stay - they said they were just checking their phone, which was obviously a lie - I asked them to move to a Vancouver campsite and called a non-emergency RCMP line and the camper chose to leave - is there a mechanism to remove those types of people? Can we call UEL?

1. Answer: You know what I'm going to say - there is nothing we can do about that - we proposed a permit parking system and everyone in Area C said no - it's an RCMP issue if the activity is something illegal
- ii. Comment from resident: A few weeks ago there was someone camping in his vehicle whom I confronted - he chased me down the street, he exited the vehicle and was ready to altercation with me physically, and we have no right to tell him that he can't camp there - anyone can camp in Area C and people have camped, robbed us, assaulted us, etc. - sure, we don't have permit parking in Area C but Vancouver has a good system in place that doesn't involve permit parking
 1. Answer: Nobody wants that in any neighbourhood, but we don't have the mechanism for any kind of enforcement bylaw - we simply do not have the legislation that enables that
- iii. Question from Madeleine: I think we're getting lost a bit - if we did have such a bylaw, you're saying the RCMP cannot come to a rescue if there were infractions?
 1. Answer: We can't, as an administration, issue tickets - we can only tow off of permits in a permit parking system
- iv. Question from Madeleine: But just imagine we want to put forward a bylaw that says "no overnight camping for out of area residents" - in the enforcement of that, residents might notice a van camping, and then call the RCMP and refer to the bylaw - would that not be a logical sequence?
 1. Answer from resident: A bylaw officer gives you a ticket (municipal), but because we are not a municipality there are no ticketing bylaws - what we do instead is parking permit that says "no parking" and allows us to tow - the UEL can have vehicles towed, and the UEL can take people to court, but the UEL currently can't have a bylaw officer that gives people tickets - in Area A that's why we have permit parking, as if someone is there without a permit, the vehicle is towed
 2. Answer: It would be a change to our Act, which is higher than bylaws and has to go to the Cabinet - the government must make the decision and amend our Act to enable our enforcement regime - we've been asking for it, but it's been delayed - at the earliest there's potentially something next Spring that will go to legislation
- v. Question from resident: We have a noise bylaw and the RCMP will come out in that case, so why wouldn't it be similar to that?
 1. Answer: Well that's a criminal issue - if you are being harassed, the RCMP should in theory respond to that

2. Comment from resident: Realistically it's tough, because they're overworked
- vi. Comment from resident: But it is provincial legislation that states that you are not allowed to camp - this should be enforced since this is provincial land
 1. Answer: There is no connection between that legislation and what we do - for instance, we can't enforce the Forestry Act
 2. Answer from resident: MOTI will probably just tell you that the UEL isn't enforceable
- vii. Question from resident: When did you last ask Area C about this?
 1. Answer: What the CAC can do is to create a recommendation to create a permit parking system in Area C again
 2. Comment from resident: We are criticized for people who are not welcoming to people from UNA or visitors who are just enjoying Vancouver - it would feel gated - that's why I don't like the idea of permit parking as an Area C resident
- c. Stray golf balls in Area C
 - i. Comment from Michael: Anytime stuff like that happens, reach out - it's our responsibility to come up with some kind of solution for that - also bear in mind this issue has nothing to do with the renovations
 - ii. Comment from Madeleine: I know you were kind enough to meet with the residents to look into the stray golf balls on College Highroad - we are looking for confirmation that along that stretch, there won't be netting put up facing the homes as that is incredibly ugly - one of the suggestions is fast-growing greens like laurel
 1. Answer from Michael: We are just trying to find solutions as best as we can
 - iii. Comment from Madeleine: I'm just relaying what residents have told me, including everything from people's cars getting dinked, people getting hit, trees being removed, etc.
 1. Answer from Michael: Where the trees were removed was not where the balls were hitting people
 2. Comment from resident: I think they were
 3. Answer from Michael: We will address what we can
- d. Metro Vancouver's overreach
 - i. A rumour about registering fireplaces
 - ii. Comment from Claire: Director McCutcheon has sent some info to the CAC about registering fireplaces - MetroVan has the responsibility to regulate air quality in the area - the bylaw has been phased in and so as of today (September 15th), there is a requirement for certain categories to

register in ur fireplaces - I'm not too familiar with it, but I believe you won't be required to register if your fireplace is your sole source of heat or if it's never used

- iii. Question from resident: Does MetroVan really have jurisdiction over this?
 - 1. Answer from resident: Yes
- iv. Question from resident: But that means they can do anything
 - 1. Answer from resident: They have responsibility for air quality control - e.g., in the past, burning barrels in backyards was an issue when I worked there
- v. Question from resident: How am I to be informed on what I need to report?
 - 1. Answer from resident: The information has been passed with some background through a link
- vi. Comment from resident: I refuse to communicate with the government via internet
 - 1. Answer from Will: They have communication campaigns, and you're hearing about it now

7. Public Comments or Questions (7:53 pm)

- a. Question from resident: I live in Area D and I am directly affected by the Toronto/Acadia project - what does "intend to approve rezoning mean"?
 - i. Answer: It is a part of the process - we refer out the bylaw, we receive feedback, and then we send all of it to the Minister for a decision, who says yes or no - actually enacting the bylaw would be signing a ministerial order - the former is saying "I'm going to do this in the future" or "I intend to enact this" and the latter is doing the signing
 - ii. Question from resident: The frustration is that we are not being allowed to live here - this is a sentiment for those of us living there - why is it that renter's rights are forwent and existing housing is being redeveloped for speculators? We also circulated a petition - where did that feedback go?
 - iii. Answer: There is a rental component of this proposal (6 stories) and then market housing (18 stories) - we have some protections in our bylaw such as Schedule 19 which is rental protection, so the developer has to do/offer certain things to existing renters - otherwise, it's a property owner's right to redevelop within the jurisdiction and the framing of the rezoning
 - iv. Comment from resident: For the record, the land owners have never once communicated to the tenants about anything, and the only reason I know about the development is because the UEL requires them to put a placard outside the building - there has been zero communication - I'm not even sure they know about Schedule 19

- v. Answer: Let me bring that back up - it has been a while since that's been talked about, but I can bring it up with Heather to see what was done and what needs to be done about that
 - vi. Comment from resident: I'm disappointed that the voices of the community do not feel like they matter, and that the developer's voice has a stronger voice than British Columbian residents - I asked our MLA how is it that someone can bring money in and say that they're densifying, but in reality they are actually just replacing people here? Speculators end up buying these places - the issue I explained at the time is that we residents are displaced and have to turn to the government to social services which is undermining our economy and making everyone spend more money - they are only offering housing to people who can afford 3 million for a 1-bedroom condo
 - vii. Answer: We appreciate that and recognise that it's not an easy situation - we do have affordable housing requirements, 30% affordable housing, etc. based on income levels, so part of this redevelopment has to incorporate that - it's what the local government can do to encourage affordable housing - but it will end up being more expensive for those who were already there
- b. Question from resident: I don't know how much we can do and you hear about this kind of thing all the time in Burnaby - there's a gap between the old buildings and the new buildings - displacing people out of a neighborhood is even worse - is there anything we can do? Is there potential to give tenants of existing properties notice so that they can choose to move out early?
- i. Answer from Madeleine: Developers are unfortunately self-serving
 - ii. Comment from resident: But they have some developments with below market rent
 - iii. Answer from Madeleine: Market rent people are being displaced too - it was shown as part of the OCP process that we're overshooting the amount of housing stock based on the requirements from the province - we've got a great neighbourhood of existing tenants who are living happily and getting displaced for it - this is an insane case study
- c. Comment from resident: The developers are self-serving and in the business just to make money - this is what I was talking about with the MLA - what are they doing to the BC population? BC people can no longer afford to live in BC - I'll have to move to Langley, from a 1-bedroom here to a studio there - the developers do not care - the MLA does care but it seems like there's not much they can do - it seems like in the grand scheme of things I'm not worth a nickel as a British Columbian individual and am not being treated with dignity and respect - in the

end it is the developers that win - the government can say that they hit the development goals, but in the end, who is living there?

- i. Answer from Katerina: I do remember something about a priority to renters as part of Schedule 19
 - ii. Answer from Will: Yes, that is a part of Schedule 19
- d. Question from Claire: If the minister is saying that they have an intent to sign, can we not say that there was no communication?
 - i. Answer from Will: It might be that it is part of the development permit process - they may not be at Schedule 19 yet since it is a long process
- e. Question from Claire: It is easy for the developer to keep moving forwards as long as it starts - so now it is the time to highlight the expectations
 - i. Answer from Will: We will absolutely make those expectations front and centre - the Minister is making a decision on zoning and such specifically at the moment
 - ii. Comment from resident: A letter in the mail would be nice too, from the developers
- f. Question from resident: What about the house at 6th/Blanca coming down? Is there any protection for leaving empty spaces and holes throughout the UEL?
 - i. Answer from Will: We've been on them to maintain the fence and safety standards, but there are a few examples of those
 - ii. Question from Resident: Maybe like a deposit?
 - iii. Answer from Will: Maybe, but that could only go towards safety
 - iv. Comment from Madeleine: It could be around what state the land is left in, as in maintaining a certain condition
- g. Question from resident: Would the ability to get legislation for bylaws be related to unsightly premises as well? Or just parking?
 - i. Answer from Will: Yes, there would enforcement bylaws (i.e., fines) for things listed in the bylaw, which would include unsightly premises - we would have to create a bylaw for it, and like any other bylaw, we would refer that out, get feedback, etc. - this process is not going to start until the legislation changes next year, maybe by summer or even fall - it could be 2-3 years until we see something on the ground
- 8. Adjournment (8:17 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously