

DISTRICT OF SQUAMISH

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee of the Whole held Monday, September 11, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. at Council Chambers, 37955 Second Avenue, Squamish, B.C.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Patricia Heintzman
Councillor Blackman-Wulff (arrived at 1:51 p.m.)
Councillor Karen Elliott
Councillor Ted Prior
Councillor Doug Race

ABSENT:

Councillor Susan Chapelle
Councillor Peter Kent

ADVISORY IN ATTENDANCE:

Linda Glenday, CAO
Robin Arthurs, GM Corporate Services, Recreation & Culture
Terry Murray, Executive Assistant
Sarah Dicker, Legislative Assistant
Gary Buxton, GM Community Planning and Infrastructure
Chris Wyckham, Director of Engineering
Jonas Velaniskis, Director of Community Planning
Sarah McJannet, Planner
Matt Gunn, Planner

Mayor Heintzman called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

1. Welcome to the Squamish Nation Traditional Territory

Ha7lh en skwalwn Kwis tl'iknumut tl'a Skwxwuu7mesh Uxwumixw

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was moved by Councillor Elliott,
seconded by Councillor Race,
THAT Council adopt the September 11, 2017 Committee of the Whole
Meeting Agenda.

CARRIED

3. BUSINESS

(i) Squamish2040 OCP Growth Management & Phasing Options

M. Gunn, Planner and S. McJannet, Planner were in attendance to discuss the Squamish2040 OCP Growth Management and Phasing Options. Information included:

- Background on the OCP process to date
- Growth management tools
 - Land use designations and the future residential neighbourhoods
 - Population thresholds and projections
 - Policy precursors
 - Urban Containment Boundary.

Council questions and comments included:

- Discussion on the meaning/definition of 'Urban Containment Boundary' (UCB)
 - Staff clarified the meaning of UCB: A UCB is intended to be the ultimate rural versus urban boundary beyond which servicing is generally not contemplated.

- Suggestion that the UCB does not have to take into account land ownership but could contemplate the type of land that is suitable for development
 - Staff indicated that sometimes it is not possible to know which parts of the land are developable until there is a sub area plan and studies carried out on the land at the development stage
- Discussion regarding including the Airport within the UCB in relation to servicing the area and the cost of servicing
- Suggestion to include a map of the Highlands/Alice Lake and area beyond Quest University where the proposed Urban Containment Boundary is and whether or not this should be changed
- Discussion on the need to give the UCB a 20 year life span versus a shorter lifespan.

Staff's presentation continued:

- Information on growth management tools and changes to sub area planning were provided.

Council questions and comments included:

- Discussion on the current sub area plan and rezoning process
- Suggestion to add language into the OCP which prioritizes some areas for community development planning
 - Suggestion to begin community planning workshops for the North Yards
- Suggestion to add a surcharge in the zoning fee if changes are made to the sub area plan after it has been approved.

Staff's presentation continued:

- Growth management options considered:
 - Staff provided an overview of the options considered in the public engagement phase of the OCP process
 - Staff advised that SORCA and B. Cheema had submitted correspondence, which have been included in Council's agenda package
- Growth Management Policy discussion.

Council questions and comments included:

- Discussion on the benefits of Option 2, particularly because of the flexibility that it allows
 - Comment surrounding the necessity of making any changes to the OCP to allow for development. Once the OCP is created, there should be no need for changes within this timeframe.
- Discussion on the benefits of Option 3 and the further flexibility that it lends to Council
 - Suggestion to add strong language to address OCP amendments and the amount of significant benefit gained by the community for an amendment to be approved
 - Suggestion to add policy and language regarding population and density caps before allowing specific lands to be developed
- Discussion on the preference of Option 3 over Option 4 as it does not single out

particular land owners

- Suggestion to better define 'significant community benefit'
- Discussion on implementing proper guiding policy for the standard of development
- Suggestion to include the statistics on single family residential lots versus multi-family within the OCP
 - 48% of housing stock is detached, according to the 2016 census
- Suggestion to have a step from growth management Option 2 to Option 3 if the population cap is reached before the next OCP revision
- Comment that there is a need for densification and that improving the levels of servicing for existing communities is currently difficult without density
- Discussion on population thresholds and what happens if the infill of existing residential lands does not occur
 - Staff advised that the community feedback indicated that the public do not want urban sprawl and do want to maintain the small town feel through increased connectivity.
- How neighbourhoods are serviced by transit should also be considered before developing new neighbourhoods
- J. Cooke, SORCA spoke to the need for forested lands and proximity to nature within the containment boundaries in perpetuity, to loss of mountain bike trail concerns and that guaranteed greenspace should be essential to OCP discussions
- How to define "significant community benefits" needs further discussion
- Importance of having the necessary policy in place before decisions are made
- Remove the language regarding compensating for trails was suggested and "ensure connectivity" wording should be used
- B. Cheema, property owner lot 509/510, spoke to community engagement and comparison to other greenspaces adjacent to his property
- Further UCB discussion is required and should be for residential development mostly
- Remove segregated Cheekeye portion and keep the narrow eastern boundary
- Airport needs specific language in the boundary
- Final draft to return to Council
- Staff suggest the following definition for "significant benefits":
 - Provide a transformative improvement to the community encompassing multiple values across the social, economic or environmental spectrums or
 - Resolve a major community challenge for which no other viable solution exists

Council suggests adding to the definition:

- Be more specific regarding community values and brand
- As values vary from person to person- consider only proposals that "raise the bar"