

University Endowment Lands
Minutes from the
Community Advisory Council Meeting
Monday October 19, 2020
Zoom on-line meeting

CAC Members present:

Claire Huxtable, Area D
Mojan Nozari, Area D
Judie Glick, Area C
Vanessa Young, Area A
Marg Stuart, Area B
Moony Qi, Area A

Administrative Assistant: Dianne Owen
UEL Staff: Jonn Braman - UEL Manger

1. Call the meeting to order

A quorum being present, the meeting of the Community Advisory Council was convened at 6:04 pm. Dianne Owen acted as Administrative Assistant of the meeting and Claire Huxtable chaired the meeting.

2. Approval of the Agenda

- Three motions to be added

The agenda was approved by the council
Motion by Mojan Nozari and seconded by Judie Glick

3. Approval of the minutes dated September 21, 2020

The minutes of the council meeting held on September 21, 2020 need changes before being accepted

4. Delegations

4.1 Jen McCutchen, Electoral Area A Director

- I just want to make sure that you are aware that my next Town Hall engagement session will be on the topic of Complete Communities which is actually very timely with what the UEL is thinking about right now in terms of planning and development.
- This is a panel I've been planning for some time now and it's going to include an overview of what planners think about when they think about a complete community and what makes a neighbourhood a great place to live.

- Metro Vancouver will be providing some of an overview for some of that best practices and what is the best a neighbourhood could be. UBC is going to be providing some input into what their vision is and what they're thinking for this end of the peninsula which indirectly affects the UEL.
- Andy Yan of SFU will confirm his availability and then a final date will be chosen.. Jen will share this with us when it is finalized.
- With winter coming up, Jen was wondering if UEL would be interested in walking with their neighbours. 2 meters apart but being able to get exercise and talk in person. Jen would love to help this to happen.
- For trick or treating or handing out candy at Halloween Dr. Bonnie Henry has put out some good guidelines for being COVID safe this year. I encourage everyone to look at that. It was brought to my attention that those guidelines align very closely with guidelines for kids who have disabilities (A link was sent out with the second survey for Area D)
- Claire and the UNA board of directors and myself have continued conversations around a number topics one was a mutual interest including some funding opportunities that will be available in the next year or two for the purpose of that would be to have residents decide on what they see the funding will be available for so put on your thinking caps.

Jen is always happy to discuss or elaborate on the issues covered in any of the EAA Director's updates or any other relevant suggestions or concerns you may have. Please don't hesitate to reach out to Jen at this email address (areajen@gmail.com)

The comment below was from last month, I believe??

5. CAC Correspondence:

1. Bank balance was \$15,248.196 as of October 5, 2020

6. Actions from last meeting:

1. Post presentation to CAC website - Today's presentation up shortly
2. CAC to give ADP guideline for the ADP meetings for both the professional and residents - this is done and an ongoing project
3. A Community Gardens update may be added to the agenda for October or November - November meeting

7. Area D Plan presentation by the UEL office

An overview Presented by Heather Shay and Kamelli Mark

Please go to the [website](#) to see this presentation

Questions for Heather and Kamelli

Q. Thanks for the presentation. I have a question about why the request for rezoning of Liberta was rejected? I brought up that subject a few times and in both presentation previously and this

time it was rejected which clearly since last time no one actually reviewed it and you mentioned that based on some proposals or suggestions the two properties of Lutheran building and also Regent College parking lot and the property in the corner of Acadia and Toronto is now proposed to be high rise, 6 to 8 stories high. You're losing a wooded area and you're forced to live beside the towers, so why are you are not rezoning our property as well if you see the size of Liberta is almost maybe he's one of the biggest lot in Area D except Lelām. Why are you just considering every piece of land owned by one developer which I'm not sure about the relationship with UEL to be rezoned to high rise or mid-rise but exactly the only piece left from this study which was requested by all owners but it's just not changed. I know who previously I was told it can be considered for rezoning but that can't happen for every other Lots in Area D. Why are we going through this rezoning study? So just leave it as it is then every developer can come and request a rezoning application, so why that just applies to Liberta. The one in the corner of Toronto on Acadia actually is not suitable for an 18-story Tower because both Acadia and Toronto are very very narrow streets and there is no plan to increase those streets so if you go through a TA(?) study you see that number of the cars leaving that 18 the story tower every day and coming back it's going to cause chaos in that corner which is very close to University Boulevard.

- A.** As Heather mentioned in the presentation the referral of the Plan does not include any rezoning in the properties. So the Plan itself and the proposed amendments are proposing to “redesignate” properties which again is a guide to potential future redevelopment but certainly does not guarantee that anyone will be successful with the rezoning application. So in terms of when we looked at different properties to make a determination as to what may be appropriate some of the things that we keep in mind in general when planners are looking at these kinds of things are things around best practice one of those happens to be the age of the property in question and the buildings that are on it so the Liberta development is relatively new. I believe it's 2005.

Comment: The age has no relevance here; it's not relevant here.

A. I would encourage you to take a look in detail at the revised land use designation map Which clearly shows which properties have been proposed to be re-designated not all of the properties in Area D have been proposed for re-designation. I think there might be some confusion there. The other thing I wanted to mention about considerations was also what's surrounding or directly adjacent to properties so in the case of Liberta there is a school which is an elementary school and also it's next to a new development the block F Lelām development which is 3 story Townhomes.

Comment: If one side is 6 storey and one side is 9 stories one side is 3 stories and within 40 feet is a tower.

A. Certainly those comments please provide them to us if you haven't already to the email.

Q. Good evening neighbours Bruce Stewart here I'd like to specifically address a Lots 5 and 6. I'd like to ask quite a specific question of the UEL team, but let me just give my neighbour's some background on that lot because it's quite interesting. On April 9th of 2013 when Christy Clark was our MLA and Gordon Campbell was our Premier. A Ministerial order was created that

drew tiny little blocks around Lots 5 and 6 and for planning purposes MO-96 said that it was going to be part of Area D. On April 16th the Writ was dropped for an election and in that election Christy Clark lost the election and was replaced by David Eby. May 14th the government changed so this particular piece of real estate has been in play for quite a long time the developers that are working on this particular piece of real estate have been working on this project for quite a long time but they didn't own it all the way through they bought the final piece of it after Lots 5 and 6 begin being treated as part of Area D. So let me just get to the specific question.

During the development of the area D plan we've heard a lot about feedback but what I haven't seen is any strong connection between data or information that was gathered in the process and some very specific policy statements there are actually in the Plan. So my question is for the sake of myself and my 40-something other neighbours through on this call during the development what specific research was performed and or what specific pieces of data were taken from the Area A residents, especially those within a thousand feet of this that you used as the connection between real objective data and the policy statements that are now in that report? And either one of you could answer that question.

- A. As many of you know the Area D plan process does predate both Heather and I. It has been ongoing since 2018 from the very beginning the UEL did consult with UEL residence there were mail outs that went to all of the homes that were dropped in people's mailboxes hand-delivered there were posters the CAC was aware of the fact that the plan was going on there were pop-up events that occurred there were public meetings where people had the opportunity to provide feedback and comment. I realize that it appears that not everybody who currently lives in Area A seems to have participated however Administration can only offer the opportunity to people to participate if people choose not to participate then we don't collect the feedback at that time.

Comment: So I understand that, my question specifically is of the feedback that you did collect obviously significant feedback was collected or you would not be able to connect the feedback with a very specific set of policy statements that are going to have multimillion-dollar and multi-year implications. I'm just interested in this and I'm sure my neighbours are, especially those within a thousand feet of that development we're interested in this specific data not generalizations about feedback we're interested in the specific data that was gathered by a specific process that led to a set of policy statement the only ones who are they going to affect are people who live here and nobody who is involved in driving the process actually lives in the area. So we just want a direct connection between data that was taken out of the community and linking it to the policy statements. That's the only question I have. What links the data if there was no data if there's no objective data that you can point to then as a community we have to ask whether or not the policy statement conclusion to Lots 5 & 6 are in fact legitimate and that's the question so we're just looking for the linkage.

- A. You are asking for some very specific information. I completely understand why you are as I said this process has gone on since 2018 so this is not necessarily information that I have right at my fingertips to get you in terms of who responded when and what year and what numbers. In terms of that if you want to provide those questions by email to us so that we can look at the information and provide you with a detailed response that

certainly something we can do. In general when it comes to looking at potential land use designations as I mentioned earlier planners do look to best practice to adjacent land uses and this property as well as previously referenced was identified quite a number of years ago in the official community plan as a development approval information area partly because of the existing legal non-conforming institutional use that had been on the property for a very long time.

Comment: On that particularly this particular property could have gone either way it was designated institutional and single-family so this policy statement in fact could have read that rather than going institutional it could have said that it was going to be returned to nothing but single-family and the original. Ministerial order from 2013 could have been repealed or reversed so something happened here. This is the community, not just me. Something happened - maybe it's in terms of data maybe it's not in terms of data - but something happened to cause your consultant to write this. There are only 5 policy statements of this is one of the policy statement is very specific so I and my neighbours are interested in what information then obviously we don't have and it's obviously not in the report because I read the report by quite carefully, there is nothing in that report and the evidence of data gathering that cause somebody to connect the data that was taken out of the process and the conclusion that was arrived at in policy statement 4.2.6 so as a community we're kind of curious how that conclusion was arrived at given the lack of objective evidence along that line of planning.

A. So again we collected and put from a wide range of participants those who chose to participate in the plan process their feedback was collected this is where we are now in terms of the referral certainly you can provide detailed comments to us through the plan UEL email specific to the history that you were speaking of.

Q. I want to thank Bruce and enforce what he said because I think he's absolutely right. I also want to say thank you to Vanessa Young and to Moony for bringing this issue to our attention and the reason I who live on Western Parkway and have lived here for 34 years did not know what was going on is that I was told by Ms. Shay, quote: the Lots were previously identified in the UEL official community plan as development approval information areas on yet in reading section 7 of the OCP I and my neighbours would have had no idea which Lots were being identified and in fact when Bruce first said Lots 5 and 6 I wasn't sure that those were the Lutheran Campus Center lots so I want to be very clear that the plan for Area D to encroach on Area A has not been transparent. In fact I feel that it has been deceptive to suggest that neighbours have been asked for feedback for such a long time indeed many of us only knew in the last month or two that this was the Lutheran Campus Center that was being referred to in the OCP, thank you.

A. Thank you for the feedback again the plan does not propose to include those lots in the Area D neighbourhood there just included in the plan area they do stay within the Area A neighbourhood itself.

Q. Thank you Bruce for your question and Sharon for your feedback. I would obviously like to see those Area A lots taken out of this plan. At this time and I don't think the pressure will cease until that happens but in the event that the Ministry chooses not to do that at your office continues to put for the recommendation then I would like to just point out that anybody in future who goes into the revised OCP and sees an appendix called Area D neighbourhood plan and as you said correctly there is no intention at the moment to change the boundaries of Area D

nobody would think if they're buying a house or property or thinking of what to do or rebuilding an Area A across the street would think of looking in the OCP under Area D neighbourhood plan to find out what's going on with the Menno Center and Menno Hall so I think that the very very least the title should be changed it should be taken out but if it's not done the title should be taken out or all references to the Area A changes should be taken out what is a separate appendix and should be dealt with as a separate issue it would be no problem other than paperwork in the Ministerial Order to have an Area D neighbourhood plan which is indeed is Area D and a revised housing designation plan call it what you wish for Area A Lots 5 and 6 brackets Lutheran Center Menno Hall puts forward whatever you want with whatever references you want to any parts of the Area D neighbourhood plan but at least then you have transparency which I think the reason you see so many people on this call from all over the UEL single-family lots is because in the last month thanks to the work of our CAC they've done their great job of bringing it to our attention so that's point number one and I'd like to at least if you do nothing else take it out so that people in future know what they're looking at when they look down at table of contents of all the documents.

The second part is that in response to the DCC question which I've raised many times both community amenity charges in DCC one of my big concerns in the UEL has always being the inability and the lack of ability to charge developers with any kind of bonusing but they should get through a rezoning or a designation to chargeback for the benefits of the community in any way that resembles what happens in municipalities. We have only got amenities on the Leløin lot because we were told that the only way we could get any Community benefit was by putting restrictions on what happens and requirements on the Leløin lot. I think we're putting the cart before the horse unless you have some very specific way of not raising the expectations of developers and property owners in Area D or frankly the Menno Hall Center and any lots for a rezoning without making them have a very clear idea that a large part of the uptick in value is going to be reclaimed for the public benefit and if you're going to do research underway with something coming in the future then we're going to run into the same thing that people run into everywhere which is to say wait a minute I paid so much for the property I can't develop it to its best use now because we didn't have these DCC and CAC I think they have to be in place or a strong indication has to be in your plan that it says there will be an aggressive claw back for the public benefit through development cost charges or other mechanisms whatever they shall be so that anybody who is clapping their hands for density increase he's well aware that we're getting things back so that would be point number two.

The only other question I have for you those would be two comments my other question is you talked about next steps and you're seeing here a lot of community feedback and timing could you speak about the implications of the election and whether there are any for the passing of a Ministerial Order and also what's the point of community feedback like what you do with it at this point you told us you had it received it but what are you doing with it going forward or what's your plan to do with it going forward? So my questions are about whether you can get Ministerial Orders through in this election set up timing and what are you going to do with community feedback that you're getting?

- A.** Thank you for the questions and comments. So just briefly to speak to the comments appreciate your comment about transparency the revised or the proposed amendment to section 7 of the OCP does include a map which very clearly shows which properties are included in the plan area and the overall land use designation map for the UEL is

proposed to be amended as well to be very clear about land use designations.

Comment: But could you also please include it in the titles in tables of contents because people looking for things aren't going to go if they live in Area A to the Area D neighbourhood plan

A. Appreciate the feedback if you haven't provided it in writing, so the next comment about the development costs charges and density bonuses so we are looking into this in terms of development cost charges we have been for a while our administration model because we are part of the provincial government is different than local government so it's not as easy thing to do but it's certainly been an ongoing conversation in lieu of that though we have the ability right now to our works and services By-Law to have any servicing requirements needed to meet a new development met and paid fully by a developer and again with the land use designations that are being proposed should someone come forward with the rezoning application to propose additional density the plan is clear that public benefits would need to be provided in some shape or form and paid for by the developer but certainly DCC were continuing to explore. Because it is a tool that can be used to do these things very effectively and then...

Comment: I saw that in the plan but it needs to be said that you are going to be moving to if you like the most aggressive possible form of claw back for the community because these are huge density bonuses that are happening, basically signature by the Minister so I think the wording has to be strengthened in there..

A. ...appreciate the comment and you said you provided some of them in writing as well. And again those are maximum allowable density bonuses it certainly does not guarantee that anyone will get maximum and then to go on to your questions about the Ministerial Order and the community feedback so all feedback collected will be compiled and given to the Minister as part of the decision process in terms of administrative review of all the material decision by compiled I mean that in the most basic sense of the word where they just get put together into one giant PDF as is and it's you know hundreds of pages if we get hundreds of pages of comments so very big document and it all goes to the Minister. In terms of the ministerial order and you asked about the election specifically so right now we're in a period for the interregnum period. We are basically waiting for the results of the election, staff have limited ability to do things or provide information during this time.

Comment: Right so I take it from your comments that until there is a new Minister there cannot be a Ministerial Order and I take it from your comments that any community feedback you're getting now will not change what you're presented to us but will be incorporated in what goes forward to the Minister as response to what you presented to us is that correct?

A. At this point we're just in the referral period. And accepting the comments that's just a very general sort of overview of the process.

Q. And what about needing a Minister because we won't have a Minister for a couple months?

A. Hopefully there will be a Minister sooner than a couple of months but I am not party to that part of Government. So I will not know the results until you all know the results.

Q. Do you need a Minister place to have a Ministerial Order? Or can a Deputy do it?

A. So I am new to this part of the process and I would defer to Jonn. Actually Claire if it's all right with you do you mind if we just pause for a moment so that we can just sort out the sound? I'm able to have Jonn hear everything on my computer, but I just have to leave the meeting and come back. It will just take me a moment. Is that possible? Because this is not ideal.

I just wanted to go back to the question because I did get the answer. I've never gone through an election in this role and so this is why it's a little bit more challenging for me and better for Jonn to be able to answer. The whole package will be referred to a Minister when there is a Minister to refer it to in accordance with the process. So hopefully that answers the question that was previously asked.

Comment: Yes that does help in order to help the CAC figure out timing of response.

Comment: My name is Chris Wall and I live on Westbrook Crescent and I think just based on the feedback that I've heard over the last six or eight months from people like Sharin Kahn and Bruce Stewart and a lot of the people who live on Western Parkway it's been pretty obvious that from early on there was a lot of information that actually was not gained by immediate neighbours for this project at the Lutheran Church and as a neighbour in Area A I find that tremendously unfortunate. I remember being at a meeting at the CAC in January and Moony was sitting there and had no idea have a living after having lived across the street but this project what is it was even going to take place and I just get the feeling and I would like some feedback from Area A, B & C residence on this. I get the feeling it is going to get pushed through pretty quickly. I feel the manager wants this pushed through quickly. We have been given 30 days to look at 30 gigs of data which I find difficult with all the things that are going on in our lives and I also think it's a very dangerous precedence if you live in Area B or C you may expect to see some rezoning applications.

I know Maria in the past is spoken of the Government lands that's it between the UEL office and the UEL junior school so that could be up for rezoning the UEL office could be up for rezoning down Acadia we know the issues that they dealt with in Area C with the proposed metro dump the end of Sixth Avenue I think they're all kinds of areas in around all three areas of the UEL the could very easily be up for rezoning and I think with this Lutheran Church site it may not know about this site if you don't live on Western Parkway. I think that sets a very dangerous precedent for me. That's the key to this is that the Manager of the Manager's office can push something through that may not be in keeping with a residential area like social housing. I'm not sure that I would want to live on Western Western Parkway and live across the street from BC Housing. BC housing a floor or two of social housing in Westbrook Mall Eight or nine houses are seven or eight houses along Westbrook Western Parkway as someone who has a 750 people in the downtown Eastside I think it's social housing has its place but I'm not sure that it has its place in Western Parkway and you know make no mistake that is a

concession that was given to the developers The developers have requested that to make the project more favorable the product and and I just don't see that that corner the use for for social housing on that Corbin being positive at all. Particularly for the residents in Area A. But all 38 of you ask yourself about rezoning and ask yourself what's going to come up in the UEL in the next coming years in your area that is going to involve density and have you thought that this process has been fair? I don't think it's been a fair process. When I look at Sharon Khan sitting there and she's right across the street and she hasn't found out about this until four or five months ago I think that is a real void in the process and that is very unfortunate.

Comment: I felt when I first joined the CAC that there was a lack of transparency sort of with respect to those Lots. We had other members that were part of the ADP process that very much felt that those lots were already found institutional and it took a lot of discussion and teasing out even within the meetings in January and February to find what those Lots were zoned as. An email from Heather Shay from January where she wrote to me these two institutional lots were included in the plan with a recommendation of support from the Community Advisory Council, that wasn't even true. I didn't know that at the time but they were actually zoned single-family she went on to say at the time the plan was established in 2018 the Lots were previously identified in the UEL official community plan OCP as development approval information areas see section 7 of the OCP for background they have similar land use designations to the adjacent Regent College and they will need to respect and compliment the land use patterns and scale of both Area A and Area D neighbourhood. Well that wasn't true in any way shape or form and that's exactly what I was led to believe January 2nd less the two weeks since I was on the CAC so I don't know why would have been deceived like that when clearly they knew and even in the body of the meeting when we would ask and Judy asked, it was well no, they have an Institutional Covenant on them all of that was not true but it wasn't until Hugh Cartwright pointed that out that we finally got a clear answer from our Manager and I just find that inexcusable to be honest and a little bit like obfuscating or a little bit of deceit to the broader Community when you're like thinking well it's already institutional. I guess they have to do this, well they didn't have to do this, and they lead us down a path of fallacy and I have that letter and I'm happy to put that on our website and that's directly from Heather Shay January 2nd. Would anyone like to respond from the UEL office about that?

A. At that stage when I wrote that letter I was two months into the job and saying that the land use designation was institutional, it's zoned single-family as you say which is a district not a designation so I understand that there's confusion between designations districts what zoned what's not zoned I myself was a little bit confused when I began here but I didn't intend to deceive anybody.

Comment: But that's exactly what happened and people were led to believe that not only by you Heather even Judy in the meeting and she's on the ADP fully thought that it had an Institutional Covenant she continued to ask all the way through the March meeting.

A. Thank you for your comments, we certainly struggle with the fact that most people refer to things as zones and in the UEL, districts, so the language gets

confusing. The institutional nature of those properties is long-standing and that's always been made clear that the use of them is what is called legally non-conforming and what that means is that although the use is legal because it has continued to be used that way and nonconformity refers to the actual district that they are in and so the reason that they're legally non-conforming it's because they're in the single-family district but appreciate that there has been confusion certainly in the community about these two lots in particular.

Comment: I was on the ADP call where you spoke to this and we discussed the institutionality of it and when our By-Laws were created this church was in existence and at that time everyone chose to only make 5 lots institutional only and this one was specifically exempted where it could have been labelled institutional but the entire Community chose that it was part of a single-family neighbourhood and the By-Laws go on to state that we are to respect the unique flavour and character of each area and to protect it and that is probably why they chose not to make this lot institutional when they did with Saint Anselm's Church, Regent College and the other 3 and only three properties that they designated as institutional so it was not an oversight it was specific. It was a specific and with measured consideration that those two lots were specifically omitted as labelled for institutional use and they were granted a grandfather clause and they didn't have to tear down their buildings, but the idea was that it would revert to reflect the character and nature of Area A. Thank you.

Comment: A few years ago I was on the church committee for Saint Anselm's. They wished to add a residence to their lot. You know it's Saint Anselm's on University Boulevard. They wanted to add a much more modest residence to their lot for retirees from the church. This was not allowed; they were told that the lot had been granted to them for the church only and not for residence. I believe that the Lutherans also wished a few years ago to put up an apartment and I didn't think they would make it because Saint Anselm's were told that they couldn't do it. But there are supposed to be the same laws that apply to Saint Anselm's that apply to them. Not set aside for institutional purposes but for a church. Now they want to put up a high-rise multi-family residence.

A. I am unfortunately not familiar with the specific situation with Saint Anselm's and whether it was a question that was asked as a general inquiry. The Plan and the proposed amendments do not rezone anything and so any property owner that wishes to propose to rezone their property whether that is in the Area D area or someone else or somewhere else still has to go through the rezoning process and so that's something that St Anselm's certainly could look into I'd have to look more into the Land Use District regulations

Comment and Q: We need to address the January 19th letter which was again held up today as the CAC endorsement of this plan and I guess my quick question is how many of the signatures on that letter are in fact relevant? Okay so I'll answer my question first and I went through my notes and I found my at April meeting with the Minister of Housing herself and I have a David Eby's office notes from that meeting and one of the points there is: "on the Mennonite developments you voiced the desire of the CAC speaking for the community to have a park in that location as well as the desire from the CAC to

exclude that property from the area D Plan” and this is April I don't believe the Area D plan has left UEL office at that point so there has been no ambiguity about the community's interest and the CAC's support for the community's interest.

Comment and Q: How many signatures on the January letter are relevant? I would say two. It is not a relevant piece of endorsement for the plan and the UEL has known that since January. Second question is to Jen McCutcheon. Jonn mentioned twice that the pressures of the density in Area D in the Ministerial Order and in the plan were a result of Metro insisting on housing that was necessary so 18-story towers, developers making offers of bonuses to build higher and more through what we've always known as the heart or the village of of the UEL, all came from Metro. We've requested housing presentations from Metro to find out what's going on out there. I mean we're looking at Block F, fully approved doubling our population. We're watching the towers go up at UBC. We know that unit is charging ahead and doing just fine, maybe not in the last six months but it's doing fine, this is a huge population increase. What is Metro telling the UEL in terms of adding this kind of uncapped density to the Village?

A. Metro Vancouver has no jurisdiction over either the UBC lands or UEL so they cannot make UBC be more dense or less dense and they can't make the UEL be more dense or less dense. They produce projections not targets, projections of how the region is going to grow and there's definitely no doubt that our region is going to grow significantly Metro Vancouver provides predict projections for each area, each Municipality of Metro Vancouver as Electoral Area A we are not in municipality and they provide projections for all of the Electoral Area A so that by population 98% of the population lives in the UBC areas with other areas being large geographically but very very tiny in terms of population and really not a lot of that they're not going to grow. Most of those projections would be for UBC and UEL. Metro to my knowledge doesn't have that, wouldn't provide that, it's for the entire Electoral Area A which we can say is UBC and the UEL. Not sure what will be done with those projections I can't comment on what UEL will do with those projections, but from Metros perspective it cannot be a requirement you are governed by the UEL and the province, UBC which is also through the province

Q: So therefore you didn't put a significant pressure on the UEL to have to ask for uncapped densities?

A.I wasn't part of this process, and this would be done at a staff level so I wasn't involved in any of that but Metro Vancouver I can't say whether they put any pressure on they are looking to fill to think about the best places to put the density which is going to come we are going to be we're going to be a bigger region in you know in the coming years and so they are looking at their best practices for where to put those densities but they would not be saying you have to put density here or you know or are not prepared for an OCP/UEL.

Q.You have a meeting coming up on you think it might be November 24th? We're supposed to reply to the government by Friday. Our reaction to this whole plan you know however many you know megabytes of scrolling through it to try and figure it out, but something might happen at that meeting that talks about the strengths of communities as

it would be great to hear from your housing people about this sort of generalization of incoming populations to the Lower Mainland and you know how we sort that out I mean these are important issues. We can't do that in four days till Friday as we are part of Metro. We can't involve the thought of the bigger area and how we exist within that in 4 days. I'm not going to expect you to answer this.

A. I haven't been asked for my opinion but it does feel like it's not ready to move forward and given that there is no Government there is no Minister at the moment is it easier to put a longer window of feedback.

Comment: Well let's take that question. I think that question has been hanging and I was going to say this for the end but I think the level of frustration and disappointment from the community that has been clearly communicated on this call and prior to this call the CAC asks for an extension on October 9th the ADP panel unanimously supported that recommendation and yet we still have an October 23rd deadline for comment we have a fight we have a provincial election that does not give us access to Eby who has been very helpful on housing matters in the past we have tried to communicate with UEL office but because of the election process that is not an easy communication I'm extremely disappointed that the October 23rd deadline is still in place after everything we have done to ask for it to be extended and I am I'm turning that question over to you Kamili, Jonn, Heather I don't know who can answer that but honestly I don't see the need this plan goes out to 2050 why do we need to have comment in by October 23rd

A. So this was referred to the CAC, this is the end of three years of work you saw the draft plan back in January so you had lots of time to digest the vast majority of it. This is the referral of the draft By - Laws to the CAC and the ADP Required under the By-Laws under Section 8 , we will happily take your comments and pass that along to the decision-maker, you've had the draft By-Laws for a month now we have another week for you to get comments into us.

Comment and Q: We don't have a week, we have until Friday, I would appreciate at the very least a week and we have asked for a month. You heard again the level of anxiety and confusion around this plan. The month that we have had, started at the beginning of the last meeting we had the plan just before the meeting so it was impossible for anybody to look through the plan and to digest and ask intelligent questions so the clock really didn't start ticking for that. You say it is the draft plan and we saw it about January, there has been plenty of feedback from the community about specifically Lots 5 and 6 so it would have been a reasonable expectation that the plan that we got back would have incorporated more of that feedback and yet it's not there so to say that you know we kind of knew the plan as of January we didn't we got the plan 30 days ago. I think there is a window for comments, but I think we're at the very short end of that window for comments there's no reason why that we can't have the longer window for comment on it again particularly because we don't have resources that we normally would. Formal steps I remain nervous that it's the day before the election I would like assurances, that there is no way that this By-Law can be signed and I would like to understand the formal process digesting information that is being compiled and given back to the Minister. What are the obligations of the Minister once she gets this feedback?

A. That was multiple questions. When we get the all of the comments together here and

UEL office from an administrative perspective where we will compile it all with the Plan to the Minister when there is a Minister in place. While technically Deputy Ministers are in a position to make decisions, they don't typically do so on anything that's politically charged; it's usually administrative details that they do and I can assure you that it will go forward to an elected government official. What the Minister chooses to do in the process that is internal to the government, that I can't provide you with advice. Advice to government is not something that we speak of in the public realm and something we do not speak of in the interregment period.

Comment and Q: I live on Western Parkway for about 35 years now and I have a few things to remark on about the comments I heard here. It seems to me that the need for having these two lots rezoned as a zone D as high rise buildings are based on increasing population while we have a huge development on Lelām which is about two hundred metres from here so I don't see that pressure as being so high because if there is something which is going to be ready want to be for a few buildings in that way before this one. Second, what are the conditions for someone having his lot rezoned for high-rise. Can I go tomorrow and ask, look I like to have my zone on my neighbor's which I know well and he could put here the big building. Changing the zoning is not such a big deal because when we moved here 35 years I was told that this area is a single development and it is still Area A. Area A is still Area A but we have to include it in Area D. Why can't my lot be included and then I can ask for this because I can make more money. I don't think it's justified the way it is presented. I don't think so, so I would like to know if there will be any condition for rezoning because I've been told several times this Area A you cannot change the zoning.

A: I'm not sure what to comment about Lelām but in terms of the comments about rezoning. The rezoning process existed prior to the start of this planning exercise it set out in the UEL's bylaws already and so the ability to propose a rezoning has existed for a very long time that's not something new that we're proposing is part of this referral

Comment: I asked the Manager of the UEL clearly at the February meeting what it meant if the Lutheran Church site were redeveloped and what impact it would have on the neighbours and potential rezoning and his answer was I asked him as the provincial stance on this and he said clearly that anything could be requested to be resolved. So George the answer to the question is based on the answer I received from the Manager at an open public meeting in February is that you are quite welcome to ask for your house to be rezoned and the UEL will look at that on a lot by lot basis and I think that's an extremely dangerous precedent particularly in a residential area. I would also ask if the meeting is being recorded, is that correct? And can I ask that the recording be sent to Deputy Minister Kate Krishna Associate Deputy Minister Sillas Ramsey Assistant Deputy Minister Tara Feganello and Special Advisor Nicola Marrow. I like those for government senior representatives to have a copy of this tape.

Comment: I'm not sure about everybody else but I've heard an awful lot of non-answers so then I asked one very specific question I asked for a connection between objective evidence and one policy statement and my second question is there is two policy statements one affects the rezoning of Regent College parking lot and the other reflects the rezoning of a Frat House to 18 stories and what I'd like to do is I'd like to see the evidence not just feedback, general feedback I'd like to see the objective evidence that would result in policy statements that are that clear I

find it mysterious we have ethereal data and feedback that can't be attributed to anybody specifically connected to some very very clear monetarily huge recommendations as part of the policy statements. So my question is to anybody at the UEL - the same as my first question - can you connect any data that this process generated any specific data that we could make decisions on to the policy recommendations not only around Lots 5 & 6, but also around the Regent College parking lot and the fraternity house perhaps somebody could pick that one up.

- A. I realized you have expressed that you wish it wrapped it up by 8. In the interest of allowing other people to provide comments and questions those comments and questions were provided earlier and we did provide a response.

Comment: Hi there I'm actually a student at UBC and I live in the area and I just have a big question about I think it was Bruce sorry that was just talking about it about the frat house. I have some friends who live there actually but I was wondering... so you guys were talking about the fact there's going to be a lot of growth at UBC but from what I can tell most the UBC population most of that growth is from students and I can also see that because of this plan you guys are going to replace a lot of that rental housing with condos and flats and stuff that I meant to be on which students like me can't really afford and we're not eligible for social housing that's going to be allowed in there either so you're going to build 18 story buildings that students don't have access to in the name of growth which means you're pushing out a whole demographic of people that like actually really need to be here and I signed a petition about this I think a while ago about the residential tenant agreement act which would have protected this rental housing and it's not going to be protected, and you guys are just kind of like pushing students out from what I can understand in the name of like gaining money and that's really upsetting.

- A. So thank you for the comment. So the referral specifically includes By-Law amendments that would implement residential rental tenure zoning within the UEL should a rezoning application come through to secure a minimum of 1 to 1 replacement of all of the existing units as well as any additional units gained through density bonuses or just through more units being constructed on a property guaranteed as rental and there is provision for affordable housing we certainly appreciate the comments about the challenges with the property market here and the rental market and the prices.

Q. In relation to 1 to 1 housing mean you will build a condo that three to four students can share or is it just going to be like one bedroom rental because right now I have like friends that are living all together in a house or just one to one mean that you guys are just going to build like a tiny box that normally like six people would have actually be in one actual place like it's just it's a little frustrating in a lot of students don't actually know that this is going on it's really upsetting because like people don't know this is happening.

- A. Those are good questions because the Plan is a neighbourhood plan and so it provides a very general guide of what could be in the future but doesn't get into the specifics of a individual building and the unit makeup in the mix and the sizes which would happen at the time of a rezoning application where certainly those extremely important to be looked at so that's why you're not seeing something so specific in the plan because it's not setting out regulations on a lot by lot basis it's just a general policy framework and guideline.

Q: But shouldn't they be specific before they are decidedly built?

- A.** At the time of a rezoning application which is a whole separate process - which has a public consultation component - at that time, that's when zoning regulations themselves would be designed so it would go into what the actual building would be like and at that time the negotiation around rental specifically and those protections would happen and those comments about yes you know for students in a studio apartment that you know is not really good way I would say to deal with housing. It's at the time of the rezoning application that those very specific things would occur and that is a public process with public consultation that is built into it as well and it's a separate process.

The Plan speaks to the requirement for a diversity in the housing needs so it recognizes that there's a wide range of housing needs and students are among those, what the Plan does is it gives us a series of policies that we can rely on when somebody comes forward with the zoning application for a particular property, you can point to the plan and you can say that there is a policy here about this how are you going to meet that and by the same token the public during that public consultation process that Kamelli was speaking about in a zoning application can step in and hold a developers feet to the fire say how is this need being met? That planning this high-level planning gives us a series of policies that we can rely on in the absence of those if we don't have those we have to rely on our existing By-Laws and there aren't any of those sorts of policies in our existing By-Laws that would give us the support that we need when developers come forward with a change in Land Use applications. So this gives us the strength to do what you're asking us to do. It doesn't put the details in at this stage because the details are ironed out at later stages in the planning process at the zoning and development permit stages.

Comment: I just want to associate myself with Bruce Stewart's remarks. I agree with him. I feel like it should be an easy question for Kamelli to be able to provide the community with whatever data they have and should be able to easily tell us what the data was that they based these policies decisions on and it was why don't you just send a comment to us then thank you; we didn't get a response. I also was just questioning about the By-Laws specifically so section 12 with UEL land use Act for section 12.5 states that if you're going to change the By-Laws that you're supposed to be publishing this in a newspaper that's widely distributed in the UEL area for at least two consecutive weeks so that's 12.5 I was wondering if this has been done so that the broader communities have been notified of the changes?

- A.** That's a later stage, so that is the UEL Act Section 12.5, that would be the next step. Where we are at right now is pursuant to the land used By-Law Section 8 and that's the referral to the CAC in the ADP

Comment: I'm actually referring to the land-use By-Laws Jonn.

- A.** I think you're referring to the University Endowment Land Act section 12-5

Comment and Q: I'm not sure, it just says the Land use Act, University Endowment Land use Act. Chapter 4 6 9 section So are we not changing the By-Laws Jonn?

A. Vanessa the stage that we're at with Area D right now is the referral of the draft By-Laws to the CAC and the ADP pursuant to the land use building in community Administration By-Law Section 8. A later stage in this process is when we go to the Minister and we ask the Minister whether or not he or she wants to enact the By-Laws when that occurs, that 30-60 day process that's in the University Endowment Land Act section 12 subsection 5 that's the later stage.

Q. So the Ministerial Order doesn't specifically change our By-Laws?

A. The Ministerial Order, when the Minister enacts the Ministerial Order it would change the By-Laws.

Q. Right, so if this were signed then they would be changed?

A. That's correct.

Comment: That we wouldn't have had notification as per section 12-5.

A. That's because that is a later stage. We haven't got there yet.

Q. Couldn't she just sign up tomorrow without having any of this published in a newspaper?

A. No.

Q. Okay, that clears that up. My other question was a little about what Cassandra's just that one to one ratio and I had discussed that with Claire as well just be concerned if you got three students right now living in that one of the white buildings along University Boulevard renting and that's rental housing would developers be able to say that a one-room single-occupancy is a unit what is a unit to a unit we don't have that specificity I think we really need that to protect renters. You don't want a 1000 square foot unit being replaced with a hundred square foot shoe box and they could, those loopholes are something a truck could drive through.

A. Excellent points and definitely something that we would take a close look at should we receive any change in land-use application consequent to this By-Law being approved. If the By-Law is approved.

Q. This question is for Jonn, what are your concerns about groundwater when you see one developer after another proposing all kinds of bonuses for going higher and higher more and more dense going deeper and deeper for the parking problems and guess what the erosion gets worse and worse and we're already seeing evidence of that from development that going on maybe it's coming from UBC maybe it's coming from Block F who knows but we got problems and what's your opinion your professional opinion on letting this density be uncapped?

A. You're trying to link density to water issues and I'm not sure what the linkage was. The density is not uncapped, it's very much established in the plan for Area D. With respect to groundwater issues and development in Area D, we rely on the Works and Services By-Law that we already have which stipulates how groundwater and water will be managed; on-site stormwater management plans need to be developed.

The groundwater aquifer in that area is quite deep, albeit, there are some shallow lenses and as in when those come up the Geo tech on the site will need to address those to our satisfaction should we get to that point. Those are matters that are dealt with at later stages in the planning process.

Comment: Hi everyone, yes, so far we have around 40 or 50 people who answer the Area D survey we just sent out a few days ago. Usually if we give them more time I think it will average around 90 people, I think it's just because it's premature right now that's why we have like half of what we usually have. In terms of responses the majority of the respondents are from the UEL residents and then also like around 80 to 90% of them they were all in agreement that they would like to keep Area A as a single-family zone and then also that's what they were like more time to be given in terms of you know the deadline for feedback and then in terms of the question about whether they are aware of the two lots, it's a mixed answer and people that said yes they explained that they actually found out from either on neighbours knocking on their doors with a BlockWatch list. I have not seen any answers that they have learned it from a newsletter from the UEL and then someone just like for recently learned this from words of mouth by neighbours. This is pretty much the summary of what it is and many people also left comments you know that were consistent with what we discussed or what was what the questions that were raised in today's meetings by other UEL residents.

Comment: I thank you for that and your surveys have been incredibly helpful in bringing forward community comments. I hope everybody on the call has answered Moony's survey. If not it was included in the email that went out earlier today I think it's on the website as well. I encourage everyone to answer that and to include their comments. As it is late I am going to skip the reports from the committee's but I am going to reiterate and get a small summary of the clear feedback we had from the community. You can tell remains confusion and unanswered questions and it baffles me that in the context of an election where we won't have a Minister and I read this morning the election results may be delayed two weeks because of the preference of mail-in ballots without a Minister what is the point in having an October 23rd deadline for comments. Jonn at the January meeting you agreed to a two-week extension. Why can we not agree right now to a one month extension so that the concerns and the lack of information and the communication about the plan cannot be improved?

A. I have already responded to that. I have nothing more to add. Thank you.

Comment: Jonn, just for clarity do you actually have the power to extend the deadline I assume this is within your power?

Comment: Would anyone else like to comment about that? I mean this is ridiculous that you can't give us an extension, no one in the community was really aware that you were giving us this plan.

Comment: I completely agree with the chair in this matter. I think it's ridiculous that we have 30 gigs of data to review in 30 days. It's totally unacceptable and I agree with you Claire completely. I hope the bureaucrats in Victoria get this recording and they can review this on their own merits.

Comment: So that will happen and I just want to reiterate that the CAC has asked for since my comments to the Minister in April to have Area A removed from the plan and subject to its own separate process that would have addressed so many community concerns. We are going to have a motion.

Motion: Given the revised Plan was only disclosed on the day of the prior meeting and we do not have access to our MLA during the election, the deadline for feedback should be pushed back a month (to Nov 28th) with assurances that no Ministerial order will be signed before feedback is received.

All were in favour.

Q. Are there any comments?

Q. Can the CAC choose to withhold our comments collectively until Area A lots are pulled out of this plan. The Minister's funding the project and she's the decision maker for our community it's a clear conflict of interest.

A. It is a clear conflict of interest for the purposes of this motion. It's simply that Area A should be pulled out whether or not we give comments or not we can discuss that separately so do I need to read this again or we prepare to vote?

Motion: Given broad community feedback that consultation on the inclusion of single-family Area A in the Plan was inadequate and that the Ministry is conflicted in this potential zoning designation decision, Area A must be removed from the Plan.

All were in favour.

Just some housekeeping matters that we still have to attend to there is an addition to the ADP. We had asked Paul Sangha to be prepared to say that he would vote against a development permit if in his professional opinion he believed any project as a whole was not consistent with the best interests of the community and that they would expect any landscape design submitted for review to be signed off by fellow professional landscape architects. He agreed to this and so can we vote to add Paul Sangha to the ADP. Okay so can we take a vote on Paul Sangha.

All were in favour.

The next meeting will be November 16th sorry this couldn't have come to a more satisfactory conclusion with at least an extension of the deadline thank you all for taking time, two hours out of your evening to contribute your opinions and your input to the community it's that this is what makes the work meaningful here that people contribute their opinion so thank you all.

I call the meeting adjourned.

Public: Thank you this difficult meeting

8. Committee Reports and new members

Budget Committee

- Chair: Mojan Nozari,
Claire Huxtable

Communication Committee

- Chair: Judie Glick

Governance Committee

- Chair: Claire Huxtable
Vanessa Young

Community Centre Committee

- Chair: Mojan Nozari
Claire Huxtable and Judie Glick

Neighbourhood Committee

- Chair: Moony Qi

9. Old Business**10. New Business****11. Questions from the public****12. Setting the Next Meeting**

- **Monday November 16, 2020 at 6 pm on Zoom**

13. Adjournment 8:07 pm

This is from the saved chat on the Zoom meeting.

18:34:17 From Heather Shay, University Endowment Lands : Email for comment:
planUEL@gov.bc.ca

18:51:50 From GC : At the beginning of the presentation, it was mentioned that
Development Cost Charges research is underway. Is the intent to introduce and implement
DCCs on new developments at UEL?

18:53:02 From Sarah Wood : Residents are being given non-answers. Thanking us for
feedback and moving on is not productive or addressing anything

18:57:13 From Sarah Wood : if residents were not aware of your ongoing
"communication" re the Lutheran Church, perhaps the methods were ineffective

18:59:57 From Jim Van Vliet : Yes we are being given non-answers. You can look at the engagement phase 2 of the UEL Area D Plan. There was precious little engagement. Less than 115 people in all of the UAEI and this could even include UBC students

19:02:14 From Jim Van Vliet :
universityendowmentlands.gov.bc.ca/library/Area_DPhase2a_Engagement_Summary.ppf

19:03:00 From Jim Van Vliet : 115 people attended in person events including stakeholders

19:03:21 From Jim Van Vliet : 1300 flyers although I don't know anyone who got one

19:04:03 From Jim Van Vliet : 20 interviews and meetings with stakeholders

19:04:10 From Jim Van Vliet : 60 on line survey

19:04:22 From Jim Van Vliet : that's it as per their document

19:18:17 From harris : Based on what we just heard in response to Vanessa, these two lots need to be removed from the Area D NP and dealt with separately.

19:18:47 From harris : Than you Vanessa

19:22:03 From Trevor Newton : Totally agree, thank you Vanessa for getting the community involved

19:36:21 From Sharon Kahn : Thank you, Claire, for your strong support! I appreciate the work that you, Vanessa, Moony, Marg are doing on behalf of the community.

19:42:24 From harris : Chris, ask for the chat comments to be sent as well as the recording

20:03:25 From Trevor Newton : That is so unacceptable, Mr Breman's response

20:07:25 From sussan : A transcript of this meeting should also be prepared in addition to the video, and sent to the minister

20:07:44 From harris : Claire, thank you for chairing this complicated meeting so ably and for advocating so well on behalf of the community.