

University Endowment Lands Community Advisory Council

Minutes of the Monthly Public Meeting

Tuesday, July 21st, 2025, 6:00 pm

300-5755 Dalhousie Road

1. Call to Order (6:06 pm)
2. Adoption of the Agenda (6:06 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously
3. Adoption of the Meeting Minutes for April 2025 and May 2025 (6:06 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously
4. OCP Update
 - a. Speaking: Heather Shay
 - b. We've had our engagement with the community, which finished in May
 - c. We've been hard at work figuring out how to translate the feedback we've received into policy in our OCP
 - d. The CAC will hopefully see the draft of the document by September, but things are up in the air
 - e. Acknowledgement of land
 - f. Why the update?
 - i. Bills 44 & 47 were adopted by the province in December 2023, and in June 2024, we changed our land use bylaws to reflect those legislative changes
 - ii. Now we need to update the OCP to reflect our Housing Needs Report
 - iii. The UEL has met the expectations of the HNR for the next five years, but that must be officially reflected in the OCP
 - iv. We are going to update our greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, which MetroVan has asked us to do (as our current OCP is silent on this subject)
 - v. We also have to update our regional context statement
 - vi. All of this must be done by December 2025, although this may be pushed back due to the new Minister
 - g. Question from resident: Is Pacific Spirit within our boundary?
 - i. Answer: Yes, but it is run by MetroVan because we have an agreement with them
 - h. To recap everyone on the process
 - i. The CAC has been involved in informing the residents and facilitating discussions

- ii. We had two rounds of public engagement with multiple formats, including CAC meetings, webinars, surveys, and in-person workshops
 - iii. There was a decent amount of useful feedback
 - iv. During Round 1, people focused on housing, green spaces, tree canopies, livability, and amenities
 - v. During Round 2, people focused on nonresidential uses in SSMUHs, childcare centres, transit-oriented areas, neighbourhood character, and climate and the environment
 - vi. We released “What We Heard” reports after both rounds on the website with all the results
- i. Engagement
 - i. We also reached out to interested parties, including the 29 First Nations that have a greater interest in the territory, mostly because of the ocean
 - ii. We reached out to 72 UEL business owners that we had on file
 - iii. We reached out to 23 other key parties (including TransLink, Vancouver Fire, the Vancouver School Board, UBC, etc.)
- j. Key themes that we heard in both rounds of engagement
 - i. Livable & complete community, with more housing services, amenities, and commercial options
 - ii. Desire for gathering spaces, recreational facilities, community gardens, outdoor spaces
 - iii. More commercial options such as grocery stores, cafes, corner stores, etc.
 - iv. Desire for more types of housing: family-friendly homes (2-4 bedrooms), multigenerational homes, senior homes
 - v. Protecting/augmenting the parks and greenspaces
 - vi. Maintaining the character of the community
 - vii. Some support for non-residential and institutional uses to be permitted in certain areas, but not for additional height and density
 - viii. Ageing in place
 - ix. More inclusive and accessible design principles, keeping sidewalks maintained, and accommodating electric vehicles
- k. Note that we did not open up the entire OCP for a rewrite - we are maintaining much of the existing OCP wording and revising the old text where it's no longer accurate or if it's unclear
- l. We are also keeping the five objectives of the OCP concise, but we will restructure it somewhat for readability
- m. Introducing new sections (climate resilience & transportation), each of which will share a similar format and make use of graphics for better readability
- n. We are not touching the Area D plan for now

- o. The new legislation does require us to update the OCP now every five years with the next update in a few years.
- p. The OCP sections
 - i. Introduction
 - 1. Background - geography, history, governance
 - 2. Community context - housing needs, provincial housing legislation, basic data on demographic and employment
 - 3. OCP & Planning Process - update process and engagement
 - ii. Reconciliation
 - 1. We have reconciliation in the Area D plan but we created a dedicated section for it as well
 - 2. Commitment to reconciliation with First Nations
 - 3. High level work with the Declaration Act
 - iii. Land use
 - 1. We used to have on our old OCP a single-family designation; we are changing it from SF-1 to RS (residential small scale), which aligns with SSMUH rules and provincial guidelines
 - 2. Other land use designations remain the same
 - 3. The TOA has been added to the map
 - 4. A lot of maps have been updated
 - iv. Housing
 - 1. New RS (residential small scale) designation, up to 4-6 units
 - 2. Encouraging new developments to take existing neighbourhoods into consideration
 - 3. TOA - will outline the allowed densities by legislation
 - 4. Looking at affordability and working with consultants to do land economic testing
 - 5. Requiring new developments to have a minimum of 2-4 bedroom units, which are more suitable to families and ageing in place
 - 6. Introducing minimum unit sizes
 - 7. Diversity and affordability, including expanding on existing OCP policies by encouraging a diversity of housing types and affordable housing beyond just Area D
 - 8. We are also going to touch on childcare, retaining existing school policies but also encouraging childcare elsewhere in the UEL as there is a major shortage (Lelem had a waitlist of 2,000 people)
 - v. Neighbourhood Character
 - 1. Housing should try to maintain neighbourhood character and fit in
 - 2. Maintaining future design guideline amendments

3. There used to be a commercial development topic but we are removing that and moving it to a different section
4. Densification
5. Reviews & approvals, unchanged
6. Naming the Advisory Design Panel
- vi. Parks/Green Spaces/Natural Environment
 1. Bringing all of these concepts together into one umbrella section
 2. Retaining existing policies and strengthening some of them
 3. Tree management in particular came up many times, so we're going to expand that section - including targets for tree canopies, support for native plant species, etc.
- vii. Climate Resilience (new)
 1. Several policies focused on mitigating the effects of climate change
 2. Encouraging green infrastructure such as gardens/green roofs, which already exists in the Area D plan but is expanded upon here
 3. Habitat and restoration
 4. Exploring the UEL Climate Action Plan
 5. Also introducing the GHG (greenhouse gas emissions) reduction targets, reducing emissions from buildings, focusing on areas that have clean forms of transportation, promoting electric vehicles, etc.
 6. Solid waste and recycling - an older section moved here and updated in terms of wording
- viii. Transportation (new)
 1. Moving existing content about transportation to this section
 2. Promoting walking, cycling, and other modes of mobility like e-scooters
- ix. Commercial Areas and Local Economy (new, includes two former sections)
 1. The only new policy here is allowing small scale commercial uses at ground level within the TOA
- x. UEL Administration
 1. CAC, ADP, CCAB, etc.
 2. Bylaw compliance (wording unchanged for now)
 3. Describing the structure of the UEL and how we relate with and to UBC
- xi. Infrastructure and Essential Services
 1. Editing the wording of this existing section slightly to reference SSMUH and TOA

xii. Regional Context Statements

1. A lot of content needs to be updated for this section to ensure that we are aligned with the 2050 regional growth strategy according to MetroVan
 2. MetroVan has five goals: (1) create a compact urban area, (2) support a sustainable economy, (3) protect the environment, address climate change, and respond to natural hazards, (4) diverse and affordable housing choices, and (5) support sustainable transportation choices
- q. Updated figures, like maps (one example is the Roadways & Bikeways map, formerly known as the Vehicular Circulation Plan, which has been improved quite a bit)
- r. Next steps: finishing the draft of the OCP update, referring it out to the community, taking the community's feedback, making final revisions, having it go through legal review, and then briefing the Minister before the ministerial decision is made and a new bylaw is introduced
- s. Please refer to the UEL OCP Update webpage, where you can find more detailed information
- t. Question from resident: Initially, SSMUH was rental only and then at one of the meetings, Will said the UEL was possibly looking at strata?
- i. Answer: We have not been instructed to look at strata yet - the Minister told us to look at whether stratifying those units is possible, so we are looking into it, but we aren't changing that for this OCP update
 - ii. Question: So who decides if it is rental or strata?
 - iii. Answer: Our existing OCP does not allow subdivision/stratification beyond condos, so either the community will decide or it will be a provincewide declaration - right now, what is in our land use bylaw is what will happen
- u. Question from resident: As property owners, we are owners of property that can either be lived in or rented, so how can anyone change the designation of their property to be something else?
- i. Answer: If we build four units, you could live in one and rent out the other three
 - ii. Question: But you went in the direction of strata
 - iii. Answer: We don't permit that currently
 - iv. Question: That changes the nature of our ownership; how can somebody change the nature of what it is?
 - v. Answer: It wouldn't be changing it, it would just be permitting it

- v. Question from Madeleine: You mentioned that you had consulted with 29 First Nations - what was the feedback from them? Also, tell us what you mean about being on the front foot of reconciliation
 - i. Answer: Using the province's database, we sent out 29 letters and heard back from 2 (Squamish and Musqueam), mostly in support of stronger environmental policies, more visibility of culture and language, and wanting to be at the table for discussion of large scale land use - as for what reconciliation looks like, there are a few high level draft policies in play, following MetroVan and the province, but it's not very specific right now as it's meant to guide future policy
- w. Question from resident: What does that mean in practical terms?
 - i. Comment from Madeleine: It does sound nebulous, and in that there is risk as to how that will be translated down the road and what sort of reconciliation we might be exposed to, etc.
 - ii. Answer: Provincial overview will flag those risks
 - iii. Comment from Madeleine: They might have quite a different outlook from the individual homeowner
 - iv. Answer: I don't think that these policies will impact native homeowners, as they are more about native species, implementing more culture/artwork in signage
 - v. Madeleine: Even though those sound benign, some homeowners are already not thrilled with issues with battling dandelions and the wilding of certain areas, so perhaps along the way there might be opportunities for us to weigh in on those
 - vi. Answer: You'll see the draft(s) for sure, but that is good to point out
- x. Question from Alice: I'm curious about the Musqueam Cultural Centre because it seems like a good opportunity to learn more and build allyship - they don't really come to CAC meetings, and I'm not too informed on what their events are like, but could there possibly be a chance to organize something between the UEL and the Musqueam Cultural Centre?
 - i. Answer: Good idea, and we've recently just been trying to develop a relationship with their cultural liaison, and the UEL Administration has been invited to their Cultural Centre - the people there are very generous and knowledgeable, and perhaps they'd be open to having the CAC there as well
- y. Question from resident: How much additional tax revenue does UEL receive from Block F?
 - i. Answer: Not sure
 - ii. Question: Those projects do contribute to the tax base for the UEL, right?
 - iii. Answer: Correct

- iv. Question: So it's not like the United States, where First Nations are excluded from paying taxes?
- v. Answer: Yes, they pay taxes like everyone else
- z. Question from resident: Regarding climate resilience and sustainability, is there a plan to try and reduce the period of time for permitting solar panels, etc.? We want to encourage electric vehicles and other developments, so will the UEL be trying to accelerate that process?
 - i. Answer: Not sure about the details with BC Hydro, but we should follow up with our researcher who would love this question - we'd like to encourage those green technologies
- aa. Question from resident: Once the GHG targets are in the OCP, that creates an obligation to meet those targets, but as far as I understand it, we're stretched thin - does that mean incremental resources will be allocated to that?
 - i. Answer: Most likely, and we are reaching out for support from MetroVan
- bb. Question from resident: Even though we ask for increased affordability in ADP meetings, there isn't a way to compel developers - if it is written into the OCP, does that create an obligation for developers?
 - i. Answer: Any developer can apply for whatever they want, and we can say it doesn't match the OCP, which is something - but in the end it is a ministerial decision
- cc. Question from resident: Is there a requirement for 3-bedroom units?
 - i. Answer: The staff has been researching that and there will be a draft policy involving those units
- dd. Question from resident: Is there anywhere in the OCP where we address that about 50% of the single-family units in the UEL are currently owned by investors?
 - i. That is currently not in the OCP and I am not aware of any OCPs who have something like that, but we can research this to see if there is precedent - one thing we can do is not allow short-term rental
- ee. Question from resident: One item that wasn't mentioned was safety - as we have more people and children in the area, safety is occasionally already a problem as some people are going double the speed limit
 - i. Answer: We have some wording in the OCP about traffic calming, but we can double check that - might fit under infrastructure
- ff. Question from resident: Something that might need enforcement or education is that there are more and more scooters these days on the sidewalks mowing people down
 - i. Answer: Not sure what to do with scooters yet since they're a new technology and aren't in legislation yet - we should get on top of that

- gg. Question from resident: Ageing in place might not just involve bringing services into the home, but also alternate systems like long-term care, assisted living, etc. and we will have more and more need for that
- i. Answer: It's tricky because the UEL does not provide those kinds of services, and all we can do is make sure homes are accessible and flexible enough in size
 - ii. Comment from Alice: Lelem's childcare centre is a part of UEL - is it possible that future developments can include assisted living facilities?
 - iii. Answer: Right now the wording is that we encourage it, but there isn't an actual incentive (although we can trade height for amenities) such as reducing fees, etc.
- hh. Question from resident: Ageing in place and active transportation can conflict, as transportation pushes for bikes (which are hard for the elderly who prefer cars for safety), so it will be helpful if the administration puts those conflicting objectives under consideration and ensures that we don't overemphasise one over the other
- i. Answer: Good point
- ii. Question from resident: What about operating a business from home? The UEL bylaws prohibit us from doing so, but is that language going to be looked at as the world has advanced into the internet age?
- i. Answer: That's more of a bylaw question than an OCP question, but it is true that the way we define home-based business is old fashioned
 - ii. Comment from resident: Also, "running a business" and "working from home" need to be distinguished
 - iii. Answer: The intention of the home-based business definition was to have people seek approval based on the type of business, e.g., fixing cars versus selling things on eBay
- jj. Question from resident: When you review the budget, does it have both revenue and expenditures?
- i. Answer: We look at both, but it is driven by the mill rate, which we don't have input into
- kk. Question from resident: If we need more bike lanes, how much would they cost?
- i. Answer: The Minister of Transportation has jurisdiction over many of the streets, especially those are where the bike lanes are implemented
- ll. Question from resident: Students shouldn't count for feedback or votes since they don't pay taxes, and the population is starting to shrink
- i. Comment from Madeleine: Different areas have slightly different treatment
 - ii. Comment from resident: Area C does not have enough votes if it comes down to democracy, so keeping the demographics in mind is vital
 - iii. Comment from Madeleine: I'm not sure that's the case

- iv. Answer: We do consider the area when it comes to specific developments, of course - our existing OCP is set up by the neighbourhood and is overarching
- mm. Question from resident: Do you have information on the surveyors on Allison Road/Western Parkway? As well as the rumour about the land assembly of three homes on Allison Road as they have been offered 21 million dollars?
 - i. Answer: We've had realtors asking for information, but we haven't had any actual applications
- nn. Comment from Katerina: In Area A, there are two land assemblies that I know of (the other one is on Acadia/Knox)
 - i. Answer: We can't deny applications solely based on height or density
- oo. Question from resident: There are comments about thinking carefully about the progression of the TOA, as putting a multi-story building at the far reaches of the largest circle in many cases does not seem compatible with the notion of conserving neighbourhood character
 - i. Answer: Agreed, and we are looking at the design guidelines
 - ii. Question: So we have no ability to say no?
 - iii. Answer: We can ask for it to step back from the street - the fact is that anything within the purple circle can be built up to 12 stories through rezoning, green circle up to 8 stories - the only controls we have are neighbourhood notification during rezoning but we can't just deny it based on height, so we'd have to find other reasons
- pp. Question from Madeleine: Isn't the point of the OCP Update to do these things so we can encourage what we think is better urban design? Could we not suggest that it be graduated? (As in, 12 stories in the middle and less as it goes out)
 - i. Answer: We have to be consistent with what the legislation says
 - ii. Question from Madeleine: But we are also looking at improvements like higher minimum floor spaces - in *this community*, this is what planning looks like, as otherwise there is no distinction between here and Broadway
 - iii. Answer: This is for the bus exchange and not the SkyTrain - we should have that wording in our OCP
- qq. Question from resident: You mentioned having an excellent researcher, but is UEL paying attention to examples like Toronto, where too many units have been built? Please produce a report that considers the real estate market in the lower mainland, and what may happen when we have 8 to 12 story buildings
 - i. Answer: It is the market that ultimately decides what gets built
- rr. Question from resident: Could you have a high rise in Area C?
 - i. Answer: The zoning is for r4 or r6, but not high rises
 - ii. Question from resident: Because of the province? They'd need further legislation?

- iii. Answer: Yes - they could try a rezoning but it wouldn't comply
 - ss. Question from resident: What about the potential SkyTrain?
 - i. Answer: It would follow TOA legislation as it is now, and Area C would be impacted
 - tt. Question from resident: Where were the drill samples taken from for the SkyTrain?
 - i. Answer: The UEL does not have that information, as the Ministry of Transportation is the one doing the drilling
 - ii. Comment from Katerina: Will said about a year ago that the drilling was still under a business study and therefore not publicised
 - iii. Question from resident: Do we have to go to the Ministry of Transportation ourselves? The information will give us an educated guess on where they are planning to build the SkyTrain
 - iv. Answer: We can ask
 - v. Comment from Madeleine: If you Google "SkyTrain location UBC," there are a few articles but nothing definitive - yet even with the drilling locations it won't be definitive, so it's probably best to focus on issues that we can have an impact on right now
 - vi. Comment from resident: But this has an impact on whether or not I'd like to continue living here
 - uu. Question from Alice: Something that strikes me is that I've noticed that the quality of food tends to go down the closer you get to campus - the most abhorrent is a store in the basement that got shut down due to health concerns, but reopened a week later despite not having their business license anymore - Urban Fare is very expensive, and H-mart has a very small grocery section - it would be nice to have healthier and more accessible produce stores
 - i. Answer: Unfortunately, we don't have a lot of say when it comes to the types of tenants of commercial properties
5. Manager's Report (7:35 pm)
- a. Minutes from the past meetings have been received and will be posted to the website
 - b. Paladin Security is the new 24-hour contact, and cards have been left at the front desk - if there is a public works emergency (streetlight damage, water, etc.) please call the number
 - c. There was a cabinet shuffle last week and Minister Christine Boyle is the new Minister, who we look forward to briefing
 - d. Development Services Updates:
 - i. Public Notice Bylaw: the intent to enact the bylaw was printed on July 3rd and July 10th, and we are waiting for signatures (the new minister is currently being briefed on this)

- ii. Rezoning: 1 active rezoning for Toronto/Acadia, which has been sent to the minister for their intention to approve
- iii. Development Permits:
 - 1. Lelem lots H/I (25-26 story towers and 3-story townhouses, approved on June 25th)
 - 2. 1807 Knox Road (minor amendments, approved June 25th)
 - 3. 5938 Newton Wynd (new single-family home with 2 garages, approved in July)
 - 4. 1561 Westbrook Crescent (new single-family home, will go out for notification this week)
 - 5. No applications for August, so we are looking at September
- iv. The childcare centre in Lelem should open by September, and there was an opportunity for UEL residents to get onto the waitlist
- v. A call for responses in mid-August for an operator for the Community Centre - once they are selected it will be their responsibility to establish programming - the building will probably open in the new year
- e. There will be an Open House on Saturday, September 20th
 - i. The MLA, the minister, the CAC, etc. are all invited
 - ii. There will be a firetruck from 1960 that kids can go on
 - iii. It will probably start around 11:00 am and go for 6 hours or so
- f. Public Works Updates:
 - i. Significant work done to maintain the flower beds in the gardens
 - ii. Water main on Hamber Road to U-Hill Secondary
 - iii. Various maintenance projects planned throughout the summer and the fall
 - iv. Water quality report finalised and sent on the website - nothing odd to report
- g. Question from resident: The 26-story building is just off University Blvd., right? Was the public response to the height of the building taken into consideration at all?
 - i. Answer: We submitted all the feedback to Minister Kang at the time, last year - the ADP had some advice for the screening/elevator shaft which was taken into consideration
 - ii. Question from resident: I remember there was a heartfelt letter, ADP comments, etc. - was all of that taken into consideration?
 - iii. Answer: We know that the minister reads all of the comments, but they do not disclose how they come to conclusions
- h. Question from resident: Would the CAC be informed if there was a legal case against a decision?
 - i. Answer: That is to do with the Ministry - not us, since we don't make the decisions

- i. Question from resident: Musqueam Corporate is involved with the building, right?
 - i. Yes, it is their building
- 6. Adjournment (7:44 pm)
 - a. Seconded & approved unanimously