

**District of Squamish
OCP Community Advisory Committee**



MEETING NOTES

Monday, November 14, 2016, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

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

Public Attendees:

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

Council:

Mayor Patricia Heintzman
Councillor Karen Elliott (Absent)

Staff:

Matt Gunn
Sarah McJannet
Jonas Velaniskis
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. Welcome to new members + Introductions

The members introduced themselves and their principal interest in the OCP document.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Staff outlined the agenda for the evening. Items #4 and #5 would be switched in order. The agenda was adopted as amended.

3. OCP Process + Engagement Summary

Staff provided a summary of the past engagement process and the key results and inputs that informed the plan drafting.

- Where we are in the drafting process. Phase 1 and Phase 2 are complete, with the visioning session and the workbooks are complete. We're working in Phase 3 since the summer
- What CAC is receiving for review?
- Objective of Nov 14 and 28th meetings. Core Policy Content review. Initial review tonight and substantive feedback intended to come at the Nov. 28 meeting.
- In December the draft document will be shared with the Squamish Nation.
- Draft OCP is planned to be released to the community in January at a workshop, followed by mobile workshops. Modus will provide an engagement summary, which will be reviewed by the CAC when.

- Phase 4 will see a revised draft presented to CAC and Council and then start the formal review process.
- Targeting adoption by Council in June 2017.

Questions were raised about the issue of affordable housing and the timeline of a month for the community to review the plan. Staff noted that affordable housing was top of mind in developing policy, and the Housing Task Force had helped. It was also noted that if more time was needed in engagement, then we could delay, but there is a need for policy development to not be too far from the input. There was general agreement that 1 – 2 months delay would not be significant if it added to the quality of the engagement process.

Members asked if projects were being delayed by the OCP work. Staff said that it was not.

Members reiterated the need to have an ongoing connection/dialogue with the public throughout the OCP process.

Tonight the Committee would be looking at rough / draft core policy. Typos were not checked and the document was compiled in recent days. There may be repetition and duplication. Lots of work still needs to be done, but staff need Committee input at this stage. While the document is technically public, staff were asking that the document not be shared yet as it is still a rough draft.

Staff outlined the need in the final document to provide a narrative regarding preparation of the OCP document, which may enable the public to relate and connect to the document. The process has a story which can be used to connect the public to that story when the time is right.

Certain parts of the document (e.g. mapping, background, implementation, development permit area guidelines) are not yet developed or included. These would be outlined to Committee in the email that sends the document to Committee members tomorrow.

4. Draft OCP Orientation

Staff provided an overview of the draft plan organization and its' core policy content, including:

- Plan Foundations (Purpose, Scope, Mission, Vision, Goals)
- Plan Objectives + Policies
- Anticipated 'Hot Button' items for close consideration

Significant sections included:

- Growth management through compact urban form and sub area planning, focussing growth into specified areas and creating an urban containment boundary. Staff also noted that there were instances here and throughout the document that provide scenarios where some of the policy statements would possibly be altered and provides criteria for evaluating these scenarios.

Staff provided an outline of how an OCP would work with and interact with the Regional Growth Strategy of the Squamish Lillooet Regional District (SLRD). This is done through a regional context statement which does not have a lot of influence within the District, unless the District allows it to do so.

- Affordable and diverse housing was clearly an issue with the community. The plan proposes action across the housing spectrum. It was informed largely by the work of the

Housing Task Force and its' recommendations. Mixed income and forms of housing are planned to be integrated across the community. Direct District action is oriented to the modest market sector while supporting other agencies in other parts of the housing spectrum.

- Commercial policies focus on creating compact commercial areas (e.g. Downtown and Garibaldi Village). Supporting neighbourhood nodes is also important. These nodes are also identified, around which density and mixed use should be accommodated, along with transit connections. Further highway commercial is not encouraged.
- Employment and industrial policies talks about protecting existing employment lands and resolving current zoning incompatibilities, and that new adjacent uses don't adversely impact existing employment lands. Members did ask about the intent and identity of the Business Park and the review of the sub area plan.
- Natural environment was a key topic raised in the public engagement. Protection of critical habitat and ecological functions is significant.
- Transportation, mobility and access focusses significantly on alternate modes of transportation outside of private vehicles. Priority is proposed for complete, safer streets.
- Other sections were not covered in detail.

Document will be emailed to Members, along with the feedback form. Members were asked to focus on the main questions:

- *RED FLAG identification*
 - *Is the draft content on point and clear? (Usability/plain language)*
 - *What are the gaps and/or 'critical misses'?*
 - *Does the draft content meaningfully incorporate and reflect the community's input to date?*
 - *Is there anything proposed that you strongly oppose being in the public realm?*

Review by Members was asked to stay at a high / strategic level in terms of the review.

Staff wanted to make sure that the entire document was covered by review. It was asked that all Members cover sections 1 through 4. Sections 5 – 18 would be covered by one group and Sections 19 -30 by another group. The following groups volunteered:

Sections 5 – 18 – Lisa Aames, Grant McRadu, Bill Cavanagh, Sally Rudd, Gary Fitzpatrick

Sections 19 – 30 – Murray Journey, Christina Bergin, Toran Savjord, Darcy McNeil

Members reiterated the need for some sort of executive summary document to provide a short summary for readers, or dividing it into smaller, associated booklets that are less daunting. Staff reiterated that framing the future engagement around the higher level goals might help with this. Members also suggested a focus group might help in the review of readability and legibility.

Staff outlined the need in the document to make it easy and accessible for the public to read our document, including the need for appropriated design and pictures where necessary.

Staff noted that Modus were helping with the final phase of engagement and they were very capable in effectively engaging the public.

5. CAC Contributions and Inputs

Staff reviewed the Committee terms of reference and discussed first round of inputs sought from the CAC at the upcoming meeting, including:

- *RED FLAG identification*
 - *Is the draft content on point and clear? (Usability/plain language)*
 - *What are the gaps and/or 'critical misses'?*
 - *Does the draft content meaningfully incorporate and reflect the community's input to date?*
 - *Is there anything proposed that you strongly oppose being in the public realm?*

Comments are intended to be at the high level, looking at substantive core content, rather than detailed editorial at this point in time. The document was also somewhat of a “dumping ground” ideas that does need some sorting and clearing.

The intent of staff was to provide an orientation to the document tonight. Accessibility and ease of understanding were key objectives in preparing the document (readability, plain language). The primary audience is Council in its decision making role. Other key audiences were seen as the general public, other levels of government, developers and other community groups.

Significant inputs to the plan include the public feedback and engagement, but there was also input from other departments in the District, other agencies in the community, and some subject matter experts (e.g. on climate change from Quest, healthy community material from Vancouver Coastal Health). Input has also come from other plans completed over recent years have also been incorporated into the draft document (e.g. Employment Lands Survey, Sensitive Lands mapping, Economic Development Review etc.).

Draft document divided into 5 parts. Part 3 is where the majority of the policy material is located. Staff asked members to review Goals, Objectives and Policies to ensure that these are correctly sorted in the document. Staff have tried to keep them distinct but they are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Staff have developed a vision statement building on what has previously been seen in the OCP and what was heard from the engagement process, and embed some key themes. Staff asked if the Committee could review and comment on this at the next meeting.

Staff have also tried to develop a set of over arching goals. These could represent a way to frame the document with the community in the new year. These include: resilience, healthy, connected, liveable, and engaged.

Members noted that they appreciated the goals statements, and also that the document should easily connect the goals to the policy statements for the public. These linkages could be important in helping the public navigate the material.

Members also suggested that including some form of glossary might be needed for the public, to outline the use of terms such as “shall, may, encourage” so that people are clear about the policy intent and the common use of language throughout the document. Members also noted that context or rationale for the policy statements may also be necessary to include.

Members also suggested some form of executive summary to try and get around the desire of many to look at just certain sections, and to encourage readers to look at all parts as the document has many inter-relationships throughout. To summarize and pique their interest. Staff suggested that this might be a separate document outside of the formal document.

Staff also outlined the Feedback Form that has been provided. This is necessary because it would not be possible to go through the document line by line in committee. This allows for specific or detailed line by line responses from Members. Staff noted that a glossary of terms had been prepared to help read the document, and this would be provided to the Committee.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Monday Nov 28th in the same location.

The meeting terminated at 8:40 p.m.