

**District of Squamish  
OCP Community Advisory Committee**



**MEETING NOTES**

Monday, July 24, 2017, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

**Location: IT Meeting Room  
Squamish Municipal Hall  
37955 Second Avenue**

**Public Members:**

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

**Council:**

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

**Staff:**

Gary Buxton  
Sarah McJannet  
Jonas Velaniskis  
Matt Gunn

---

The meeting was called to order at 6:39 p.m.

**1. Welcome, Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**2. Phase 3 Engagement Summary and Next Steps**

Staff presented a summary of the Phase 3 engagement results, as well as the next steps in the OCP drafting and Bylaw reading process.

At the end of the presentation the committee had a number of questions and comments on the Phase 3 results, next steps and the growth management options.

***The following questions/comments were raised:***

- Was there any more data for the category “other” in the Participants by Affiliation section?
  - o Staff indicated that it is something we can look into to see if any more details could be pulled out.
- In terms of ongoing work, was the Development Permit Area review work being compared to other communities or peer reviewed?
  - o Some of the technical aspects (environmental and hazard terrain) are being done by outside consultants. The work is ongoing.
- A question was asked whether the Squamish Nation has been engaged.
  - o Staff have done staff-to-staff engagement early in the process. Staff are considering the Nation’s interests in the drafting process and are anticipating what the preferences would be.
- Is the community feedback in the drafting process being tracked?

- Staff are tracking the versions of the draft and revisions are being tagged to make sure that we can account why certain changes are being made.
- Is there an update on the Implementation Framework?
  - Yes, staff will be focusing on the framework during the remainder of the summer months. It will need to be incorporated into the OCP, data availability may be an issue for comprehensive list of indicators that could be tracked over time. A few committee members expressed interest/willingness to support framework conceptualization.
- A suggestion was made that the graph showing responses to the Growth Management options should include a separate graph showing the 244-signature petition for development on District Lots 509 and 510.
- A question was raised why it is only District Lots 509 and 510 that are in Growth Management Option 4, why not other future residential growth areas. Staff responded that what was being presented as Option 4 was a balance between the different responses we heard from the community, the significant trail assets, economic development, transportation connection opportunities, all of which seem to come together on District Lots 509 and 510.
- A concern was raised that Option 4 may not accurately reflect the qualitative feedback from those community members who expressed the need to prioritise infill.
- A question was asked regarding where did the 244 identical response forms came from. Staff indicated that by some accounts, the effort was headed by the land owner of DLs 509 and 510. Committee members agreed that the petition should be identified distinctly in the overall community response.

Staff asked committee members what they thought of Option 4. Responses generally included the following comments:

- Option 4 recognizes the value of key recreational assets;
- Yes to Option 4, but need to consider the other factors such as environmental constraints, Option 4 is based on values and preferences rather than the pure numbers coming out of the engagement;
- If option 4 is selected, it will need to be justified why to those who were concerned with sprawl;
- Option 4 does not reflect public response and sets the District for negotiation with other land owners who have not lobbied the public to support development on their lands, a cap of 22,500 should be maintained that's what those land owners bought;
- Should not put too much weight on the petition by developer, seems strange to single out one lot, a consistent policy approach should be used;
- Support for Option 4 because it serves the identity of this community's culture.
- Zero on future residential expansion will further negatively impact affordability in the community, Tough One.
- A suggestion was made to include a slide to Council on the trade-offs of Option 4.
- Another suggestion was made not to call it Option 4, come up with a different term for the option.

### **3. Next Meeting**

The next meeting date will be determined and scheduled via email. It will likely be in the fall.

### **4. Meeting Close**

The meeting terminated at 8:45 p.m.