

**District of Squamish  
OCP Community Advisory Committee**



**MEETING NOTES**

Monday, November 28, 2016, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

**Location: Council Chambers  
Squamish Municipal Hall  
37955 Second Avenue**

**Public Attendees:**

Lisa Ames  
Christina Bergin (Absent)  
Bill Cavanagh  
Gary Fitzpatrick  
John Hawkings (Absent)  
Murray Journeay (Absent)  
Darcy McNeil  
Grant McRadu  
Sally Rudd  
Toran Savjord

**Council:**

Mayor Patricia Heintzman  
Councillor Karen Elliott

**Staff:**

Matt Gunn  
Sarah McJannet  
Jonas Velaniskis (Absent)  
Christina Moore  
Gary Buxton

**Consultants:**

Vince Verlaan (Modus) (Absent)  
Laurel Cowan (Modus) (Absent)

---

Matt Gunn called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**2. Draft OCP Feedback Review (Matt, Sarah)**

Staff advised that a part by part review might be more productive, rather than chapter by chapter. This might prove to be difficult to achieve in the time available.

The Committee asked about future CAC meetings. Once the document has been reviewed, the document will be going back to Council for review prior to public release. Staff are suggesting that CAC members could attend that meeting, and thereby still meet our proposed timelines. Staff also outlined that more feedback could be provided electronically through the forms provided. This is just one part of the possible ways to provide input to staff.

Staff wanted to focus the discussions at the meeting to something along the line of “What’s the essence of the message do you want to relay to staff that reflects the public input that we heard?” More detailed wordsmithing could be provided through the feedback document. Staff also reiterated the fact that not all comments can be honoured or included in the document, as Staff have to balance feedback from multiple sources, including the CAC members.

**The first section considered was: OCP Structure and Organization (& Style / Usability)**

Comments included:

- Some language is “wishy - washy” – a number of members repeated this
- Should, must, may, encourage all need some definition
- The document needs to be specific when necessary
- More definitive language, and if not, why not
- Readability seemed to be pretty good
- Keeping it simple is preferable
- There is quite a bit of repetition throughout – a number of members repeated this
- Look at the primary value a policy supports and link the policy to that value, and then cross reference to other values (rather than repeating in another section)
- Redundancies should be deleted
- Brevity is preferable
- Document overall is too long
- Succinctness would make it more concise
- There are a number of motherhood statements repeated throughout
- (A summary document would help with this and is still needed regardless of how the document ends up)
- Structure itself seems reasonable
- Specificity should be sought throughout – repeated by a number of members
- Vagueness does not help
- Use of the word “encourage” throughout was not useful
- Context or rationale for objectives and policies would also help but also make the document longer
- Caution was expressed about the use of definitive language throughout as it could possibly be too tight and restrictive – allowing some flexibility was preferable
- While it would be Council’s document to use and administer, the document itself belongs to the community and would extend beyond the current Council term
- Objectives need to be crystal clear throughout
- Policy language could be definitive where needed and loose also where needed
- The “voice” certainly indicated that there were two writers and disconnects in certain parts
- Clarity in terminology is needed throughout
- What was the population growth we were seeking to mandate through the document? Population projections were not clear also. This wasn’t clear from the document
- OCP is the main tool about how to accommodate growth, but expectations about how much growth and how fast are not currently clear
- Time frames for action items would also be useful for specificity
- Be bold where there is certainty and clarity and leave more vague language when we were more ambiguous about the outcome

**The second section considered was: Parts 1 and 2**

Comments included:

- Goal statements could be tightened up, with bullet lists reduced
- Goal statements need to be linked to our objectives and to our values

- Fundamentals section was missing (What is an OCP?, Why do we need it?, How does it operate? Who's accountable? How is progress tracked? What does this mean to me? How do I use it?)
- Vision seemed OK – repeated by a number of members
- Long list of bullets in the mission section was not as useful as it could be
- Graphics and imagery would be very useful in this section
- Vision makes more sense with repeated reading, but doesn't capture at first read, perhaps shorter would be better
- Vision is the chance to distinguish ourselves
- Make the vision shorter and use the goals to flesh out the vision –repeated by a number of members
- Truth and reconciliation section needs some work
- Community engagement & collaboration section should be moved up in the document
- Consider use of the term “cultural genocide”
- Be clear on terminology (First Nations, indigenous..... )
- “Bedroom community” – not sure this terminology adds any value
- A number of additions to the Mission Statement were suggested (these have been circulated via email)
- “Consilient” was proposed as a new goal statement
- A question was asked about Squamish Nation participation in the CAC
- Staff noted that an invitation had been extended to the Squamish Nation
- Need to engage with major developers and landowners
- The District was fully anticipating that these major landowners (& other special interests) will provide their input into the formal process
- The document was intended to reflect the community sentiment and embed those values into the document
- This would allow Council to respond to special interest requests

**The third section considered was: Part 3 – Objectives and Policies**

Staff really wanted members to use the feedback forms for detailed comments. Staff were looking tonight for major gaps from what was heard from the public

Comments included:

- Protection and enhancement of the downtown was not as robust as needed and contradictory in places
- Oceanfront and downtown were seem as the same place
- Definition and purpose and direction of the business park was not clear from the document (wishy - washy) – this was repeated by a number of members
- Downtown core, business park and highway commercial areas, along with neighbourhood commercial – need to ensure clarity and consistency between these policies, particularly need clarity on local commercial – this was repeated by a number of members
- Some concern that the downtown might “lose” if there are too many commercial options
- Clarity of intended commercial directions is needed
- Need a pub in the Highlands 😊
- Some consideration of a second access into the downtown area may be needed

- Protecting wildlife and natural areas was critical to the public
- But the document seems to lack protection around fish (salmonids) while focussing on terrestrial animals
- “Integrate Squamish estuary designations” had been expressed as a concern by the public – staff advised that a separate process involving the estuary management committee had been undertaken to address this issue
- Idea had been to take the estuary management plan material and enshrine it into the OCP
- This issue again spoke to context as to how this decision had been made
- Industrial park direction needs some clear vision
- Oceanfront direction was also needed
- Flood hazard policy in the downtown area was confusing in places
- Order of presentation of some of the policy sections were confusing. Related policies could likely be better clustered through the document
- Should be ordered as the concerns were expressed by the community
- Could the resulting document be searchable by user defined terms? Cross referencing related policies would be useful
- Woodfibre policy section needs updating given recent events
- Some questioning about whether the section on Woodfibre should be free standing
- Possibly make these policies related to EAO decisions provided to the District by the Province
- These EAO processes also should have robust engagement processes that build community (not divide)
- Brackendale – some concerns that decisions are being made that might make some of the sub area planning policies redundant
- Similarly for the Centennial Park – development may have overtaken sub area planning
- Some policy should also be required about the Northyards BCR lands
- Garibaldi Lake is not listed as a hazard
- Multiple hazards were addressed in other plans, such as evacuation plans, where risk was evaluated based on consequence and likelihood.

### **3. Looking Ahead: Phase 3 and 4 Public Engagement on Draft OCP**

Staff provided the following Phase 3 / 4 outline:

- Staff were looking to meet with Council in January to review a draft plan
- Squamish Nation engagement would also occur at the same time
- Draft plan release is being planned along with our consultant, Modus
- Communication would provide at least a couple of weeks lead time for the public
- A survey is planned to engage the public
- A large community event is also planned at an appropriate venue
- Mobile outreach is also planned. This would be reviewed with the Committee in 2017.  
Pop up events
- The Executive Summary is also planned to be released at the same time to increase interest
- Staff would look for assistance from the Committee in designing outreach and the public event – to play a role at the event

Timeline for the upcoming work is:

March 2017 – Phase 3 Engagement Summary Review, prior to plan revisions

April 2017 - CAC and Council - Revised Plan Review

- Members noted that some work on the Vision was needed
- Members asked about the cost of the project
- Staff committed to get the full project cost to Members
- Would the survey be “online”?
- Staff confirmed it would be online
- Staff haven’t finalized the planning for the large public event
- Event would allow for public discussions that aren’t possible online
- Event would allow for public to confirm if the document reflects public sentiment
- Is it possible to get an illustration of the Vision?

**4. Timeline for CAC and Next Meetings**

A meeting with Council was planned in the intermediate future to which members would be invited. Once scheduled, Staff would contact members and extend an invite.

**5. Next Meeting**

The next meeting schedule was to be determined.

The meeting terminated at 8:42 p.m.