

**District of Squamish
OCP Community Advisory Committee**



MEETING NOTES

Monday, May 1, 2017, 6:30-9:00 p.m.

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

Public Members:

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

Council:

Mayor Patricia Heintzman
(Absent)
Councillor Karen Elliott
(Absent)

Staff:

Gary Buxton
Sarah McJannet
Christina Moore
Jonas Velaniskis (left the
meeting at 7:27)

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m.

1. Welcome, Adoption of Agenda

Staff asked to revise the order of items #2 and #3. The agenda was adopted as amended.

2. Council OCP Growth Management Discussion Update

Staff summarized the recent Council growth management policy discussion held on April 18th, and the resulting 3 alternative policy options for long-term development phasing.

At the end of the discussion Council asked Staff to present 3 separate options to the community on growth management policies to solicit more informed and greater feedback. Staff also presented a “Growth Management” backgrounder / guide to assist in the public review and discussion. It outlines some background information and more details on the policy options. Staff did not seek detailed comment at the meeting but asked the Committee to take the next week to read over the document and comment on whether or not the guide is clear and written well. The intent is to release this with the Discussion Draft. It would be forwarded to the Committee on Tuesday May 2.

The Committee asked what a population threshold would be. Staff outlined that there were currently undeveloped areas next to existing residential areas that could be developed at any time but there was a desire to slow this to prevent sprawl, and Staff explained that it was a numerical population limit that needs to be reached before development is allowed on those lands. Currently the threshold is 22,500 people. The issue is when these areas are “unlocked” for development. All of these areas in question are inside the “Urban Containment Boundary” (UCB).

The Committee asked about the process for changing the UCB. Staff outlined that this would be an amendment to the OCP and there are criteria in the plan for reviewing such an amendment. The Committee suggested that the location (or existence even) of the UCB might be a good question for the public review, and how to ensure that the UCB doesn't become a future hindrance to development.

The Committee suggested that some additional clarity be provided for the options as they were not readily clear at present. The options needed better qualifying descriptions, as well as the language used in places. The Committee suggested that a future state or outcome of development be described to try and assist to explaining the implications of some of the decisions.

The Committee asked about the development potential already in the areas designated for residential development. Staff noted that it was in excess of 28,000, without the areas in question.

3. Upcoming OCP Engagement Activities

Staff outlined the draft Event Plan for May 24 public event, as well as other engagement activities, such as "pop-up" events and video production for release with the Discussion Draft.

Notification of the next phase would start with a May 11 "launch date" with an insert in the Chief newspaper and then continue for a month. The Executive Summary would go in the newspaper and then the discussion draft would go live on the web site. The survey and mobile workshops would continue for the month.

Brennan Park has been booked for the evening of the 24th. It is intended to be a family friendly event, from 18:00 to 21:00. Mobile engagement activities are planned in a number of locations across the community. Some are scheduled to coordinate with other events to increase coverage and exposure. Mobile events would be run by staff and Committee members are welcome to join. A more detailed schedule is pending that will allow people to sign up. These are intended to drive people to the online discussion draft and encourage feedback electronically.

The Committee asked about the "E-Collect" solid waste email notification, and if this could be used. Staff said it could, and would be added to our normal email newsletter list as well as the OCP database. The Committee asked if it could be circulated to sports groups. Staff do have a list that could be used to spread the message. Staff confirmed it would also be circulated to the School District.

The Committee noted that the bottom station of the gondola was busiest at 10:15 and the top station busiest at 11:15 and the operator could help with tents if needed. Staff confirmed they would be attending Howe Sound Secondary and are also planning another event at the school. The pop up events would be of short duration at each location, but would be many locations, and the schedule will be publicized when available.

Staff also reviewed the event plan for the May 24 event. It's a drop in format, where there are limited presentations and participants move through stations at their own speed and discretion.

There would be presentation boards on both the process, and the key elements of the discussion draft. The stations are oriented around the vision and the 5 primary goals, highlighting a number of critical policy areas under each goal. Maps and schedules would be included where needed. Separate tables would be provided to allow feedback to be provided at the event, as well as driving people to review content and provide comments online. It was recognized that the volume of material is too much to process in one night at the event, and that online feedback would be the best.

Staff will fill as many of the roles as possible. Committee members can be involved where they feel comfortable, perhaps at the orientation and welcome station to guide people to areas in which they may have an interest, or be a floating resource as needed guiding people to where they want to go.

The Committee suggested that we do guide people to where they may be interested, and orient them, rather than letting them wander around the event without direction. The participation would need some structure to be effective. The Committee advised that the mapping certainly would be a huge draw for participants.

The Committee suggested that there be a map or visual tool to guide people to the stations in which they have interest. This would help people navigate the event. Pamphlets or maps on the wall – a cheat sheet to navigate. The Committee assumed that all people arriving would receive a copy of the Executive Summary.

Staff outlined that a large floor map could be used as a family friendly item, to allow kids to develop a “kids’ guide” to Squamish.

The Committee agreed that the mapping would be of critical importance to the public and that these would generate input and that lots of mapping should be provided. Staff agreed, and that large format or multiple maps would be developed and presented. The maps would be distributed between the stations. The Committee suggested that sticky notes be available for people to annotate maps as an option, or that annotated dots could be used. Staff indicated that they would see what they could do in this respect. The Committee also suggested that the maps have key questions posted next to them to prompt thinking and feedback.

The Committee asked if there would be an opportunity to use apps (e.g. Poll Everywhere) on phones to submit feedback, and possibly to display on a screen the feedback as it comes in. You could ask specific questions or allow general feedback. Staff said they would look into the possibility.

Staff also outlined the new survey / feedback form, and the more focussed questions as well as a free form section, as well as brief demographic information. Staff asked the Committee to review and provide any feedback. Staff noted that the feedback form would not be distributed via the newspaper.

4. OCP Executive Summary + Discussion Draft Comments

Staff facilitated a roundtable discussion on improving the Executive Summary, OCP Discussion Draft document and companion materials.

The Committee provided the following comments (some members have already provided written comments):

- Exceptionally detailed in many places;
- It reads well and is connected;
- Like how policy is linked to goals;
- Represents best practice in many instances;
- One exception is around hazards and its impacts on potential development, and little description on the potential impacts on community. It is lacking a bit of a risk based approach. This is done for debris flow hazards but not for others. Could be done by merging sections 11 and 21;
- Strong and clear document;
- Nothing that was a red flag that couldn't live with;
- Sense that there was a direction that the OCP would result in developing existing neighbourhood areas and leave no amenity or green spaces. Not just developed park lands but also natural areas. This likely isn't the intent, but it could be read in that way. Need to pay particular attention to very sensitive areas in existing areas and protecting these areas. Perhaps need more discussion on redevelopment policy to retain natural areas (Staff noted that some of there has been some consideration of a conservation designation and dealing with this issue with extensive policy in development permit area guidelines);
- Numbering in section 10 needs review;
- Committee asked if there would be a rewrite based on the feedback in May. Staff confirmed that the document would be rewritten after an engagement summary has been drafted;
- There is some strength in the Executive Summary. Very few will read the entire document (Staff confirmed the Executive Summary will not be part of the bylaw and have legal standing – it will be a handy sidecar document);
- Concern of long term consequences from short term decisions, notably around parking decisions recently;
- In reference to the UCB, there should be a reference to both minor and major changes, so that processes can be more tailored;
- Section 9.2 – there was a concern that inter-government relationships might create an absolute roadblock to some decisions that should be addressed;
- In section 11 there is reference to a qualified professional, and terms of reference for natural hazard assessments. The District may want to consider limits on who can perform these assessments, subject to the approval of the District (not to be unreasonably withheld, for example);
- Policies seemed clear and specific;
- First page of Executive Summary could edited to move some of the material to subsequent pages and move more engaging material to the cover;
- OCP Fundamentals section was well done, but could be elaborated on in a subsequent edition, and outlining more how the document is used in the future; how is “consistency” with the document determined when it is used?;
- Only red flag section was in Part 2, People / Place, is that this section seemed incomplete (Staff were suggesting that an infographic may help in this regard but are unclear about how to integrate this in the Discussion Draft document);
- Vision seems robust / succinct;

- A possible performance measure could be the per cent of growth that occurs in areas of priority;
- Another possible performance measure could be number of problem bears or human / bear interactions annually;
- Another possible performance measure could be the per cent of residents that are in 10 minutes walk from parkland / green space;
- In Section 35 it is unclear if performance measures are adopted before or after adoption of the bylaw;
- Staff noted that the development of these measures is often difficult and time consuming;
- The Committee recommended developing a form of interim measures to bridge the gap;
- The Committee asked if it was possible to allow the plan to update as new knowledge became available, without the amendment process;
- Staff noted that this might be possible if the source of the information is clear and unambiguous, but otherwise not – an amendment would be necessary;
- Section 1.4, Drivers of Change could likely be enhanced to increase knowledge, and increase the rationale behind the plan;
- In the Executive Summary, the “Resilient” goal, the Committee couldn’t connect the objectives and policy highlights with the bullets under the goal – just seemed to be a bit of a disconnect here. The other sections seemed better in this regard;
- Executive Summary should include page numbers on the section linkages so that people can find material that they are interested in (Staff noted that this may happen the next time around and not with the Discussion Draft);
- The Committee asked if the policy highlights were a summary of the actual policy, and that this should be noted, so that people were not looking for this exact text in the Discussion Draft.

The Committee asked when the schedule for mobile events would be ready. Staff noted that it would likely be the end of next week (May 8 – 12).

The Committee asked when the formal version would be ready for Council. Staff noted that they would do formal referrals over the summer (when there was no engagement planned), with the intent that the plan get to Council in fall. The plan really has to be completed no later than January 2018 at the latest.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting date was selected as May 24, the actual public engagement event at Brennan Park. Subsequent meetings would be scheduled via email.

6. Meeting Close

The meeting terminated at 9:07 p.m.