

# University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Council

## Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting

Monday, January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2026, 6:00 pm

300-5755 Dalhousie Road

- **Community Advisory Council Members Present:**
    - Katerina Wong, President
    - Alice Wang, Treasurer
    - Henry Yong, Secretary
    - Madeleine Nicholls, Area C Representative
  - **UEL Administration Office Staff Present:**
    - Will Emo, Manager
  - **Guests Present:**
    - N/A
- 

1. Call to Order (6:03 pm)
2. Adoption of the Agenda (6:03 pm)
  - a. Seconded and approved unanimously
3. Motion to appoint Menno Mulholland, Representative from Area C, to the Advisory Design Panel (6:03 pm)
  - a. Seconded and approved unanimously
  - b. *This motion has been dissolved post hoc due to a limitation in the number of representatives for Area C*
4. Adoption of Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting of November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 (6:04 pm)
  - a. To be adopted later in the week to ensure accuracy
  - b. Seconded and approved unanimously
5. Topic of Interest: Area C Parking Regulation (6:04 pm)
  - a. Madeleine: Many of you are aware of the discussion that's happened through emails, last meeting, etc. - our meeting in November had a very full turnout, and it became apparent that the residents do not want permit parking as a remedy to control overnight parking - prior to that, 60% of residents in Area C have indicated that they want some kind of change, but the change they want is not permit parking - we thank everyone for their input on that - there was no meeting in December, but we are now at the following meeting, where the CAC Area representatives will now vote on a particular motion which represents the interests of the residents

- b. Katerina: The first motion is that we will suggest permit parking not be put up in Area C
  - c. Madeleine: In terms of next steps, in the last meeting a number of potential solutions were discussed, including No Parking signs along the south edge of Chancellor along Blanca and Drummond, or perhaps No Parking between 9 pm and 6 am signs along the north edge of Chancellor, west of Drummond - maybe other spots as well - at this point, our UEL Manager Will is going to take those suggestions into account and come back with a potential solution via signage in certain spots
  - d. Will: That's a great way to move forward with this, having signage instead of a blanket permit parking system - it can still allow people to use the area during the day, but it can restrict parking at other times - I'll go and take a look at this and bring back some recommendations - we're still bound by provincial rules, but we'll come up with a plan on where signs will be
  - e. **Recommendation to the UEL Manager: that the Manager report back to the CAC with proposed parking signage for Area C that indicates no overnight parking on Chancellor Blvd between Blanca St and Drummond Dr (South side), Drummond Dr between 6th Ave & 7th Ave (West side). No parking allowed on the perimeter bordering the park between Drummond Dr (South side) and Wycliffe Rd (North side).**
    - i. Vote: 4 in favour, 0 against
6. Topic of Interest: Area C Proposed Street Lighting Discussion (6:09 pm)
- a. Resident: I live on Queensland Road in Area C - thank you for the opportunity to speak, since comments usually seem to only be allowed at the end - this is the first time this issue has come up, so could someone perhaps fill me in on what the situation is, and whether it will involve the voting of the council for a recommendation to the UEL Manager?
  - b. Madeleine: There has been a lot of history on the lighting, and many of us aren't familiar with that - renovations and upgrades for the light fixtures have been going on throughout the UEL, not just in Area C - I'm going to suggest that Will give a little background on what is happening, as there've been concerns brought forth by some Area C residents - let's also keep in mind that not all matters actually get voted on
  - c. Will: A point of clarification - "proposed" is not my wording, and this is not a proposal - community members raised this issue, but it's a matter of maintenance - a resident of Area C raised concerns about the quality and brightness of lighting installed in the area - we've been replacing street lights for the past 9 years, and all the street lights that are out there were installed in the 1980s - the fixtures themselves are the same, but the bulbs are different - we've replaced the bulbs once before, from 300w bulbs to 40w LEDs - the fixtures are still old and the

glass/plastic is getting foggy, meaning the light isn't getting to the street - we replace about 50 fixtures a year throughout the UEL - in Area C, the street lights on Chancellor were replaced in October 2024, one light on 7th and Drummond was replaced before June 2019, etc. - over the years we've been focusing on replacing lights at intersections and busy areas, and now we're replacing other lights too - we base what we do based on the concept of CPTED (natural surveillance and crime prevention through environmental design), so making sure there aren't shadowed areas and limiting opportunities for crime - I've spent a lot of time going around the neighbourhood at night looking at these lights, having started the program in 2017 or 2018 - not a lot of light gets to the ground with the old lights and fixtures, which is a safety concern as people should be able to see vehicles and each other

- d. Resident: I was aware of the replacements of the lights within the fixtures, and now it sounds like there's a move to replace the fixtures themselves?
  - i. Will: Yes, it's been going on for a long time
- e. Resident: The reason I'm interested in the fixtures themselves is because in Area C, there are two different kinds of fixtures in the area, and I want to know if the intention is to put in new fixtures or if there will be an effort to unify the kinds of fixtures? My only comment would be that I find that the light levels for the lower fixtures on 6th and 7th are quite poor, and I don't think changing the bulbs have had much of an effect on providing more light - also, is there any consideration given to putting in slightly taller fixtures which would cast a broader spectrum of light on the ground? I'm curious to know what you're thinking of specifically when you're talking about replacing fixtures
  - i. Will: In Area C, we only operate the ornamental street lights, the low ones - the tall ones are under the Ministry of Highways, so the west half with the tall lights are all maintained by them - those would've already been replaced with more efficient LEDs - we don't work with those at all - if we need to we'd contact Cobra Electric - there's one light on Drummond between 6th and 7th which started this discussion - it was hit by a vehicle and we replaced the fixture - the other lights on 7th are still using the old fixtures
- f. Resident: Will the fixtures provide a better spread of light?
  - i. Will: The old fixtures are a bottom-mounted bulb - the new fixtures are top-mounted so they shine downwards, which is better for light distribution and is dark sky compliant - it is also a warm colour (3000K), which is better for wildlife
  - ii. Resident: The coyotes will appreciate it
  - iii. Will: They do like the area

g. Resident: I sent a letter to Will - I was responsible for us having those ornamental lights - at the time the lights were going in, there was a certain amount of money available, spent on areas here except Area C and we got Cobra's lights instead - there were some issues with the financing - I don't think there's any problems with the amount of illumination - the glare coming from these new LEDs is ugly and offensive and they don't provide more light - in the letter I wrote I referenced the fact that I've lived here for 48 years - the UEL admin at the time prepared a questionnaire by hand that was delivered to every address on the relevant streets, and I even canvassed myself - it was overwhelmingly in favour of going with the nicer lights, which were more aesthetically pleasing in the neighbourhood - I haven't heard anyone complaining about the lights not being bright enough, and I can't see any reason to make things more difficult - our street is quiet and a residential area and does not need those glaring lights

i. Will: It was not my intention not to respond to your email - I apologise for that

ii. Resident: Also, on the issue of parking, there's been a camper van parking here and there on Blanca in Area C, and especially our end where there is a vacant property - over the holidays I prepared a note, and now that person parks in different areas

iii. Resident: The older lights seem better for the animals; more pleasant

7. Topic of Interest: Area D Marketplace Improvements (6:25 pm)

a. Katerina: We sent an email to the administration at the start of January - if anyone is not familiar with this issue, we can give a brief summary

b. Claire: The tree wells that have become mud-pits around the marketplace is a source of consternation for Area D people - there are lots of soil issues - this has been an issue for residents all throughout the UEL, whether they are single-family, multi-family, etc. - there are comments on this from prior CACs dating back to 2011 and even before, requesting that action be taken to improve the situation - there was some action taken when the liquor store expanded, as a mat was placed down - it does limit some of the mud and dust but it's not particularly attractive - my request is that the CAC consider putting forth a motion to improve the appearance and the function of those areas

c. Katerina: We've heard from Claire for over a year about this issue, maybe 3 years, so everyone is well-aware of this situation - how do we feel about having the motion?

d. Madeleine: I know it was the developer's responsibility to do that work - where did that end up? Is the responsibility now falling to us?

i. Will: Generally, the frontage in front of the property is the property owner's responsibility, but that hasn't panned out despite our efforts

- e. **Recommendation to the UEL Manager: that the Manager report back to the CAC with options to address community concerns around the mud-pits at the University Marketplace commercial area, complete with a range of solutions and cost implications, as well as to petition the property owners for monetary contribution toward the improvements.**
  - i. Vote: 4 in favour, 0 against
- 8. Manager's Report (6:33 pm)
  - a. When we have the meeting minutes from November, we'll post those to our website
  - b. Development Services:
    - i. A single-family property development on 4971 West 7th - a minor amendment to landscaping/fencing
    - ii. A proposed development on Allison Road - 5 parcels on Allison, across from McDonalds, came in as a rezoning application - the proposal is to subdivide the 5 parcels into 1 parcel and build a 6-story residential building with 380 units - this proposal is currently going through a tech review, and it'll eventually go through community consultation after they get it back to us with edits
  - c. The ADP met last Tuesday for a single-family development proposal at 1561 Wesbrook Crescent - there are still 2 vacancies on the ADP for Area B
  - d. Last year, we also talked about proposed changes to the 99 B-Line on University Blvd related to bus speed and reliability, with the stop currently at Western Parkway - the proposal is to change it to be closer to Lelem by Toronto Road, both eastbound and westbound - there has been no update from Translink, and UBC hasn't heard anything either
    - i. Katerina: They want to come to a meeting to present the feedback, so that could be next month
  - e. Last time, I mentioned that MetroVan was looking at the dog park in Area C - they've removed a picnic table not to their design, and are currently looking for a replacement picnic table - they're also looking into dog policies, generally related to how dogs are managed in the park with leash areas and off-leash areas
  - f. Public Works:
    - i. We've been working on Area B to replace the water main on Kingston Road, which is pretty much complete today or in the next few days - this is in advance of a larger sewer separation project for next summer, separating rainwater and sewage water - Kingston Road will also have that work starting this summer and it's a 3.5 million dollar project that also includes rebuilding the road
    - ii. We're also tenuring a project right now for water main rehabilitation on University Blvd - instead of digging up the road, which was built not too

long ago, the idea is to reline it and burst the old pipe - that one is estimated at about 1.1 million dollars

- iii. Vancouver proposed a pedestrian cycling crossing at West 8th/Chancellor and Blanca, and updating the bus stops on Blanca by University Blvd - the preliminary design is being reviewed by the Ministry of Highways and Translink - Vancouver will reach out to the neighbourhood and possibly present at a meeting - Blanca is a shared jurisdiction, as half is in the UEL - there's been a need for a better crossing of Blanca and to align with the cycling route on 8th
- iv. Resident: Why does the bike lane not extend to 6th or 4th?
  - 1. Will: That's Vancouver's jurisdiction
  - 2. Resident: But you said it was shared jurisdiction
  - 3. Will: But the bike lane is something we did, not Vancouver - maybe the city hasn't identified a need for it - they have a design that they shared and I have some concerns with it, but it'll go out to the community and they'll ask for comments on those
- v. Resident: What about pedestrians crossing University Blvd? There are a lot of people who cross the trails, with no indication that pedestrians are crossing there
  - 1. Will: It's difficult, and again, that is Ministry of Highways - they're aware of that situation but it's a tough project in terms of the engineering due to the curve in the road, and how wide it is - it's kind of a highway, and you don't normally have crosswalks on highways
  - 2. Resident: They'll wait for someone to be killed?
  - 3. Will: They're aware and hopefully can come up with a solution, but it's more challenging than the 8th and Blanca location
- vi. Resident: While we're on that, is there a plan to put a left hand turn signal on that major intersection at Blanca?
  - 1. Will: Not that I'm aware of, but that is Ministry of Highways
  - 2. Resident: I think I've counted 3 accidents recently there and it's heavy traffic
  - 3. Will: Can definitely bring that up when they come because it ties into the new project
- g. In the last year, we've been working on updating the OCP - the Minister has given their intent to enact it, so we're just waiting for the signature which should be any day now - we'll get rid of the old OCP and have a new document with new policies incorporating the outreach we did over the last year - this modernised document will be available soon

- h. Also met with Alice with the Community Centre Advisory Board (which has representatives from the UEL admin, the community, property owners, and the Musqueam, and comments on the operations and programming of the Community Centre) - we aren't quite there yet with an operator but we are very close to finalising our agreement - it's been a bit of a struggle these past few months - there's no firm date for opening, but it's looking like it will be the summer since staff and management still need to be hired - we're very excited about getting going on that and opening the doors to the community - there's a lot of interest from Lelem residents since that was part of the whole development - residents are going to pay a membership for that, which is money that will come in after the centre opens
9. Public Comments & Questions (6:48 pm)
- a. Claire: Will, you had talked about the possibility of bylaw enforcement at the provincial level for the UEL, possibly in February? Is there anything to report on that?
    - i. Will: We need legislative changes for that, specifically changing the UEL Act - it is somewhat out of our hands but that is primed for this spring - if approved, maybe June is when the legislation would be changed to allow us to create an enforcement bylaw, which would enable us to hire a bylaw enforcement officer to issue fines for things like parking, noise, maintenance of properties, overgrown hedges, etc.
  - b. Claire: About Hines on Allison Road - your office is evaluating that, but against what design guidelines? It's a multi-family proposal in an area that has always been single-family, so there are no guidelines, really - are we having the developer set what those guidelines are going to be?
    - i. Will: There's an overlay on that area for TOA, so there are some baseline guidelines - the TOA allows for up to 8 stories and 3 FSR - we have an interim TOA policy document stating that until the OCP is signed (which is a matter of days), the UEL treats any TOA development as if it is happening in Area D
    - ii. Claire: So that includes issues like setbacks - it takes what you see in Area D and uses those as guidelines?
    - iii. Will: Generally, yes - I can't comment on all the details but an example is Menno Hall
    - iv. Claire: Is there any plan to refer design guidelines to the community, so that there's an opportunity to comment on them?
    - v. Will: There will always be opportunity through the rezoning process, which will be referred to the community - there's followup policy and bylaw work we need to do for that - for now, the design guidelines for

TOA developments are based on Area D because they are similar forms of development, i.e., multi-family

- vi. Claire: That's kind of putting the cart before the horse
  - vii. Will: A little, yes, but we were directed to implement this without support in place - we updated the bylaw, then the OCP - it's a lot of catchup to get things in place with limited resources, so that's why we created this interim policy - things looking like the Area D plan, since it'll be a similar form of development - certainly there will be opportunity for public comment through rezoning
  - viii. Madeleine: So they came and presented, and the UEL gave them feedback - are they going to come back and present to us here, with edits?
  - ix. Will: They're not required to, but we would present the actual application which would be available for review and comment - we'd definitely like to see comments
  - x. Madeleine: Other areas that have been developed are more like high rise areas - their plan seems like it will stick out like a sore thumb - that is a particular point that needs to be translated into the design guidelines for the area, retaining that sensitivity
  - xi. Will: We always say we know that any comment received goes to the Minister, who will read it - it's balancing the need/opportunity for development and these things - there's a lot to consider - the policies in the OCP will play to that and how the building fits into the existing environment
- c. Resident: This Hines development will be the first of many within the 400 metre zone - it's 380 units, meaning probably over 500 people, I think with 180 or 120 parking spaces underground? Where else are people going to park? What about water restrictions in the summer? I already know that there's 2-3 other land assemblies being looked at - is the area going to be able to cope with the population increase?
- i. Will: The short answer is yes, and we are also working on a development cost bylaw, with the intent being that the developer pays - we charge per unit and that money is held and used for future infrastructure upgrades - each development has an incremental effect on infrastructure but when there are several developments it's a different story - in general our utilities (water, sewage, etc.) are capable of handling it - the developers are also responsible for direct impact, so anything on Allison Road directly or related to fronting they would have to replace - they pay to upgrade local infrastructure and also future infrastructure - in terms of parking, it is about 120 stalls, but there is no minimum requirement for parking other than visitor and disabled parking spots

- d. Resident: Does the city have enough water? Water seems like it'd be a problem because of the shortages and the climate
  - i. Will: MetroVan is well aware of the amount of development that UBC and the UEL are capable of
  - ii. Resident: MetroVan did put a 100-year water plan together, looking at even higher growth projection - there is enough water for 100 years - the broader problem is that as a region, we are very wasteful with water - we have a mentality that we use water all the time so we do need to be more conscious as residents - either way, a thousand or a few thousand extra people is huge for us but a small piece for Vancouver
- e. Resident: Why aren't we making dams and reservoirs? It's because the government is inept
  - i. Will: The first step is conservation - we have existing infrastructure, including dams - we just have to use them wisely
  - ii. Resident: It's punishing people who have grass - we need to build more reservoirs at the North Shore
  - iii. Will: That has other impacts and you'd be transferring the problem
- f. Alice: This is related to what Madeleine was saying about Hines' rezoning application - you mentioned that they can look to Area D for guidelines, which I understand, but it's also different since Area D already has a lot of towers - I was wondering if they could also consider Menno Hall in Area A, which took into consideration the fact that it is surrounded by single-family homes and did a step arrangement
  - i. Will: That's the first project that we point to when discussing with them - how Menno Hall incorporated their design with the existing community
  - ii. Alice: Were they open to that?
  - iii. Will: I'm not sure - I can't speak for them
- g. Resident: You mentioned dealing with infrastructure and sewage? Has there been thought on separating the runoff water from the sewage - trying to use a heat exchanger on the sewage like they do at False Creek?
  - i. Will: There is a heat exchanger in Lelem, in the village area - it works well for that area - I was just talking to someone from UBC the other day for the potential on that - yes and no, as some areas it's viable but the terrain plays a role - it's a whole other system that needs to be installed
  - ii. Resident: So people are thinking about it
  - iii. Will: Yes
- h. Katerina: In terms of parking regulations in Area A, I know that we are a permit parking zone - with the TOA changes, will there be a decal given to owners within those areas? How will the parking be situated?

- i. Will: Any multi-family building after 1970 is not eligible for permit parking, so no one who lives in Hines can park in Area A - that's our policy going forward
  - ii. Resident: But they can park in Area C?
  - iii. Will: Anyone can park in Area C
  - iv. Resident: Do we have an active commissionaire?
  - v. Will: Yes, they patrol every day
- i. Resident: This is interesting to learn - I thought you said it was up to the developer to decide on parking, but now I'm hearing that whoever is in there cannot get a parking permit to the street - sounds like it'll be a mess
  - i. Will: The intent is that development near rapid transit like the bus loop will require less and less parking because we want to promote transit use - there's no mandatory minimum and this is part of the regulations as put forth by the government
  - ii. Resident: This is provincial legislation?
  - iii. Will: Yes
  - iv. Resident: Can the UEL initiate a required minimum?
  - v. Will: That could be part of bylaw, perhaps? They could say you're not allowed to set a minimum, and in that case, no - I'm not sure about the legality of it - Lelem underground parking is always half empty because a lot of people use transit
- j. Resident: In Area A, there are many houses that are abandoned, especially on Chancellor Blvd where there are at least 4 empty lots - there's nothing being done about them
  - i. Will: On that stretch on Chancellor, 7 out of 9 are under construction - one of them started in 2017 when I started here - I think there's real estate pressures - some properties are going through family issues and sorting that out, or bank issues - some do develop but take a long time to do the work - our building inspector is active on that to make sure they're safe with fencing to avoid open pits - in the bylaw, it says any inactivity more than 6 months leads to the permit being void - we're not looking to come down hard on developers taking their time because it is an arduous process to get a new permit, but we have told people that their permit has expired - we mostly just want to ensure the site is safe, and encourage the owner/developer to do something with it - a lot of the time it's forces outside of our control - it is an eyesore, though
  - ii. Resident: It's not safe, though - when I walk at night, there are squatters and fights going on - I'm glad I have my dog with me

- iii. Will: We follow up with owners regularly and we try to get voluntary compliance - we can bring in the Fire Department to enforce some things - they've boarded up that house before, but people are still able to get in
- iv. Resident: It doesn't make sense to spend all this effort on new developments when we have vast stretches of our area abandoned, and apparently no rule or ability to find anybody - some of these houses have been empty and full of litter and the UEL does not seem to have any agency to deal with the problem
- v. Will: It's not an uncommon situation - the alternative is that the city comes in and forces someone to do something or they take it over - but they can't feasibly force someone to build or work
- vi. Resident: What about repeated fines?
- vii. Will: That doesn't solve the problem - it could actually compound the problem if they are fined repeatedly since it'd be more difficult for them to do the project
- k. Resident: For Hines, do they own the 5 lots already?
  - i. Will: I don't know
- l. Resident: More and more lot assemblies will occur - just look at Westbrook Crescent - my dog is nearly 70 pounds and she gets lost in the grass in the summer
  - i. Will: That's definitely a valid concern
- m. Resident: I think there should be a levy if you are starting a project, where if you aren't finished in time, you forfeit the money - that'd be some kind of incentive to finish the project
  - i. Will: Yes, something like a letter of credit may be a good idea
- n. Resident: That house on the corner is being occupied by squatters and the owners solved the problem by tearing it down - there's no permit required for a teardown
  - i. Will: There is a phased permit to demolish a house, but it's been gone for years
- o. Resident: Is anyone here from Area C? How do we feel about the proposed parking changes?
  - i. Resident: I'm in favour of anything - Chancellor down to Drummond, etc. - those campers use my side lawn as their bathroom and I'm sick of it, and our favourite white van guy is still there 3 days a week - the Fire Department arrives and he gets pissy and moves - if Will is coming back next month with some recommendations, I'm fine with that - I don't want overkill with permit parking and I don't want to penalise the students who are gone by 7 or 8 in the evening - it's the clowns who stay overnight - I want that ended

- ii. Resident: I can get behind Chancellor specifically - there's a lot of people parked there
- iii. Madeleine: We are not going to have a permit parking system because the residents do not want that, but the next steps are going to be Will going off and coming back with a solution involving signage and limitations in certain spots such as the north portion of Chancellor
- iv. Resident: That would solve my concerns - after all, we've got visitors, renters, etc.
- v. Madeleine: It would remain status quo for them, yes
- vi. Katerina: Just to remind everyone, the next meeting will be on February 23rd
- vii. Resident: Thank you to the RCMP for patrolling our areas
- p. Adjournment (7:25 pm)
  - i. Seconded and approved unanimously